

By Mr. HÉBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY) (by request):

H.R. 11745. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that commissioned officers of the Army in regular grades below major may be involuntarily discharged whenever there is a reduction in force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 11746. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FASCELL, Ms. SCHROEDER, Mr. PREYER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. GUNTER, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois):

H.R. 11747. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to research and develop new building designs and construction methods which utilize solar energy and to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to increase the maximum amount of mortgages insured under title II of the National Housing Act for certain facilities utilizing solar energy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 11748. A bill to extend State jurisdiction over certain lessees of Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. DORN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. BELL, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 11749. A bill to amend the National Trails Systems Act to authorize a feasibility study for the establishment of certain bicycle trails; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BYRON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. CONLAN, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. GUYER, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois):

H.R. 11750. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to authorize a feasibility study for the establishment of certain bicycle

trails; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 11751. 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.

By Mr. SHOUP (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HUBER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, and Mr. TOWELL of Nevada):

H.R. 11752. A bill to provide for the imposition of an embargo of the shipment of goods and materials to Arab nations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11753. A bill to amend the Walsh-Healy Act and the Contract Work Hours Standards Act to permit certain employees to work a 10-hour day in the case of a 4-day workweek, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN (for himself and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.R. 11754. A bill to implement the UNESCO convention on the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export, and transfer of ownership of cultural property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 11755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of housing facilities for agricultural workers by permitting the amortization over a 60-month period of the cost, or a portion of the cost, of constructing such housing facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.J. Res. 840. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to open admissions to public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. McFALL, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARENDS, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. GRAY):

H.J. Res. 841. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove on the Potomac; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POAGE, Mr. FISHER, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr.

YOUNG of Texas, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. ECKHARDT, Miss JORDAN, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. PRICE of Texas, and Mr. STEELMAN):

H.J. Res. 842. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove on the Potomac; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 726. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "The Impact of the Energy and Fuel Crisis on Small Business," House Report No. 91-1751; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 727. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration By Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business," House Report No. 92-719; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 728. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration By Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business," volume 3, "National Gas Survey and Synthetic Fuel Development," House Report No. 92-1404; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 729. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration By Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business," volume 2, "Tennessee Valley Area," House Report No. 92-1313; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LEHMAN introduced a resolution (H. Res. 730) to express the sense of the House of Representatives that Aaron Stern be commended for his scientific contributions and hope that the fruits of his lifelong labor receive the recognition they merit, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

369. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Energy Crisis Subcommittee, Minnesota House of Representatives, relative to fuel allocation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONWIDE BICYCLE TRAIL

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in the establishment of a nationwide system of bicycle trails. Today, with the increased emphasis on outdoor recreation, greater available leisure time and the current deemphasis on the use of gasoline I think the time has come for the implementation of this idea.

I, with the cosponsorship of 39 of my colleagues, am today introducing a bill to amend the National Trails Systems

Act to authorize and direct the Secretaries of Transportation, Interior, and Agriculture to conduct studies to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing national scenic bicycle trails and to report the findings of those studies to the President and to the Congress with recommendations for such additional administrative and legislative action as may be needed.

The bill designates three routes for potential inclusion in the National Trails System as bicycle trails. An East coast trail paralleling U.S. Route 1 from Maine to the Florida Keys, passing through Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington and many other historic places. A West coast trail following U.S. 101 from Olympia, Wash., to

San Diego, Calif., passing through Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles—one of the most scenic trips in the country. A cross-continental trail along the route of the original cross-continental road, the Old Lincoln Highway, Route 30, from Atlantic City, N.J., passing along the route that our pioneer and immigrant forefathers took westward, through Cheyenne and along the Columbia River to Astoria, beyond Portland, Ore.

During this time of energy scarcity expanded use of bikes for family vacations and local trips could help to save oil and at the same time provide a healthful experience. Last year there were more bicycles sold in the United States than

cars, some 15 million, and the demand does not seem to be slackening.

Department of Transportation studies show that bicycle transportation is a viable alternative to the use of automobiles. For instance, over one-half of all the workers in the United States drive less than 5 miles to their places of employment. Many of them could just as easily drive to work on a bicycle as in an automobile. If they did, they would be utilizing a very efficient means of transportation. The U.S. Department of the Interior's Office of Energy Conservation compared the energy efficiency of urban passenger transportation modes and found that bicycling consumes 180 B.t.u.'s per passenger mile as compared to 5,060 B.t.u.'s per passenger mile for autos.

The Federal Highways Act of 1973 provides \$120 million for bicycle and pedestrian recreational facilities. Money appropriated in that act for urban and rural and for primary and secondary highway systems can be used to construct separate and preferential facilities for bikes in conjunction with federally aided highway projects. And land not now along highway right-of-ways can be used for bikeway purposes as long as the routes accommodate bicycle traffic that would have otherwise used the federally aided highway.

I believe that America should build a network of bicycle and recreational trails that would serve as a framework on which the several States could connect similar systems. Creation of these trails will provide a safe recreational space and focus attention on historical and scenic parts of America while helping to reduce energy consumption.

What could be a more fitting contribution to America's 200 birthday celebration than the creation of a recreational and utilitarian vehicle such as a cross country, interconnecting system of bicycle trails that would enable Americans to get a close look at the beauty and heritage of this country and at the same time, have a healthful recreational experience?

The text of my bill is as follows:

A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to authorize a feasibility study for the establishment of certain bicycle trails

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1241-1249) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 11. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Transportation are authorized and directed jointly to conduct studies for the purpose of determining the feasibility and desirability of establishing national scenic bicycle trails along the routes specified in the succeeding provisions of this section. Such studies shall be made in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies administering lands through which such additional proposed trails would pass and in cooperation with interested interstate, State, and local governmental agencies, public and private organizations, and landowners and land users concerned. When completed such studies shall be submitted to the President and to the Congress, and shall include recommendations as to such additional administrative and legislative action which should be taken

with respect to the establishment of such trails.

"(b) The following routes shall be studied in accordance with the objectives outlined in subsection (a) of this section:

"(1) U.S. Highway Number 1, extending approximately 2,450 miles from Kent, Maine, to Key West, Florida.

"(2) U.S. Highway Number 30, extending approximately 3,350 miles from Atlantic City, New Jersey, to Astoria, Oregon.

"(3) U.S. Highway Number 101, extending approximately 1,530 miles from Olympia, Washington, to San Diego, California."

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK E. GORMAN

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on November 27, 1973, one of America's outstanding labor leaders, Patrick E. Gorman of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, was honored by a papal decoration in recognition of his half century of service as a labor leader, statesman, and humanitarian. At the age of 81, Pat Gorman continues to perform vigorously as secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated and as one of the leaders in the American labor movement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of President Joseph Belsky, presenting the papal decoration to Patrick Gorman, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH FOR PRESENTATION OF PAPAL DECORATION TO PATRICK E. GORMAN, NOVEMBER 27, 1973

His Eminence Paul Cardinal Yipin, Reverend Clergy, Secretary Gorman, members of the International Executive Board and Advisory Council, ladies and gentlemen.

I am pleased to welcome our friends who have come from distant points representing both labor and management to pay tribute to Pat Gorman.

The presentation of a Papal decoration is an occasion of tremendous joy and pride, but when it is bestowed on a man such as Patrick Gorman, it becomes, for all of us who are privileged to share in the event, a time of humility and gratitude. We are humble before this great man whose greatness lies in his simplicity and his concern for his fellowmen; we are grateful for the opportunity to work with him, to know him, to honor him.

For 50 years Pat Gorman has been a great labor leader, a distinguished statesman, a humanitarian. He became president of our union in 1923 at the age of 30, and since then has built its membership from 10,000 to its present 550,000. He has always been elected by the membership of this union to its highest office without opposition.

Pat has never become too important to be a friend of the working man. Whether on the picket lines, visiting members in their homes or writing in the butcher workman, Pat has constantly demonstrated his concern and dedication to American labor and to the amalgamated. He has won from unionists and employers alike the fond title of "Mr. Amalgamated". And as such, we in the labor movement salute him.

As I work alongside this wonderful human being, whose life has been a constant

source of inspiration to me, I am ever amazed at his depth, his brilliance and his understanding. He has never moved far from his roots . . . the son of a poor, devout Irish immigrant family, Pat has always been a champion of the poor, the worker and the minorities.

Pat Gorman will never grow old, for he has never lost interest in the world around him. His ideas are young forward-looking . . . Although not always popular because Pat never looks for the easy way out.

Now tonight on his 81st birthday one of the highest honors a man can receive comes to Patrick Gorman. But because he is the kind of man he is Pat has turned this great papal tribute to him into yet another occasion to help his brothers and sisters all over the world. True to his concern for others Pat has been the prime mover in using this dinner to provide much needed scholarships for worthy students at Fuzhen Catholic University in Taiwan and to provide funds to erect a new building at that university which appropriately will be known as the Patrick E. Gorman Hall.

This great honor bestowed by the Supreme Pontiff is one few men receive . . . and few deserve so richly as does Pat Gorman. We are proud of you Pat and delighted to be here with you to share this wonderful night. And as we join in congratulating you and wishing a happy birthday we offer our own tribute which will be forever in the hearts of union members everywhere . . . our continued love, admiration and solidarity with "Mr. Amalgamated" who in the words of that old song is indeed a "Jolly Good Fellow." Happy Birthday Pat!

THE INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE COMPLETION ACT

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1966, Public Law 89-761 established the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore for the purpose of preserving "for the educational, inspirational, and recreational use of the public certain portions of the Indiana dunes and other areas of scenic, scientific, and historic interest and recreational value in the State of Indiana."

Now more than 7 years later, the entire \$27,900,000 authorized for land acquisition has been expended, but the park is far from complete. The original authorization made reference to some 8,330 acres, which included the Indiana Dunes State park with its 2,182 acres. Approximately 3,490 acres already established are now in Federal ownership, with some 1,872 acres in private ownership still to be acquired. In other words, that \$27,900,000 authorization purchased only 3,490 acres. Great hardship and loss have been endured by the landowners and businesses in the area, due in part to the vague boundary description and in part to the long delay in land acquisition. For example, I recently received a letter from an elderly lady who owns a plot of land lying, apparently, within the authorized boundaries of the park. She had purchased the land many years ago as an investment for retirement income. Since 1966, however, she has been

unable to do anything with her land—except pay taxes on it. She cannot develop it—it lies within supposed original park boundaries. She cannot sell it—who wants to buy land that may soon be condemned by the Government? The Park Service says it may buy it—someday, when it has the money and gets around to it.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of the injustice endured by my constituents. There are hundreds more.

Development of the national lakeshore is likewise way behind schedule. After 7 years, and the expenditure of \$28 million, all that we have in North Porter County is a formally dedicated jungle—a real disgrace to the fine area and to our Nation.

Obviously it is way past time to get serious about development of the area already under Government ownership, as well as completion of the purchase of the originally vaguely defined authorization.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 11699, entitled "The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Completion Act." This bill would amend the authorizing legislation, Public Law 89-761, as follows:

First, it substitutes a legal boundary description for the present loosely-defined boundary described only by a map on file in the office of the director of the National Park Service. This new boundary description, prepared by the surveyor of Porter County, Ind., details every single plot line contained in Porter County. It does not, however, include Pinhook Bog in LaPorte County since this is outside my district and thus outside my proper jurisdiction. In cases where the present boundary appears to cut right through an individual's property, the new boundary includes the entire property. This new boundary does not substantially change the present boundary, except for minor additions totalling roughly 10 acres. It does, however, allow everyone to know definitely whether or not their property is included within the park boundaries. Thus those not included will be able to proceed with whatever plans they have for their land—development, sale, et cetera.

Second, the bill seeks a revised or updated master plan with developmental priorities clearly spelled out. The National Park Service has prepared master plans in the past, but no development is evident.

Third, there is a provision dealing with interim usage of the lakeshore by the public, so long as it is consistent with good conservation practices. One of the main purposes of the park is to provide recreation. There are many activities that could be provided at little or no additional cost while land acquisition and development is being completed. For example, my office has worked closely with park officials and interested local citizens for establishment of horseback riding trails. Minor improvements in already existing trails would allow horseback riding to begin almost immediately.

Fourth, the bill authorizes "such sums as may be necessary" to complete land acquisition. As I have indicated, it is very unjust to place area landowners in a sort of limbo while the Government drags its

feet on land acquisition. The earlier the land is acquired, the fairer the treatment to local landowners and businessmen.

The last provision of the bill stipulates that the land within the authorized boundaries shall be acquired and developed prior to any other land acquisition.

By emphasizing interim usage and prompt completion, the bill is consistent with our national policy of making parks more usable, of "bringing them closer to the people" for their use and enjoyment.

By precisely defining the boundaries and by authorizing funds for acquisition of the remaining land, this bill would minimize the hardship endured by local landowners and business establishments.

And by emphasizing quick completion and stabilization of the lakeshore, without expensive and unnecessary additions and before escalation of land values, my bill comes closer to being fiscally sound and responsible than those bills introduced by several of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope this bill will receive prompt consideration. All interests concerned—the users, the landowners, the taxpayers, the business concerns, and the conservationists—would be best served by rapid completion and stabilization of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

RALPH NADER JUNK

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, there is no question about who is the most effective radio personality in the eastern part of my State. His name is Jack Rider, who operates station WFTC in Kinston, N.C., and its FM affiliate, station WRNS.

Jack takes a stand, Mr. President, every day of his life—and the people for miles around dearly love it. When Jack Rider takes the air to express his opinions, the people nod their heads and pat their feet.

I want to place in the RECORD, Mr. President, a radio editorial aired by Mr. Rider on November 27. To be sure, all Senators will not agree with it. Nevertheless, they would be well advised to be attentive to it, because what Mr. Rider has said, millions of other Americans believe is sound and possible.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING

(Jack Rider—Station WFTC)

It is an ill wind that blows no good. A friend reports that in his small way he tried to abide by the Presidential suggestion of a 50-mile-per-hour speed limit.

Much to his pleasure he found that his trip-gas mileage improved from 11 miles per gallon to 14 miles per gallon. This is nice. To be both patriotic and thrifty with the

same effort. But when he bragged a little about this to a friend, the friend suggested that if he really wanted to help the President's fuel crisis he could do a lot more.

Such as what, my friend wondered? Such as disconnecting that Ralph Nader junk that is supposed to control pollution. My friend was both thrifty and filled with curiosity, so he decided to see if the suggestion had any real merit. He disconnected the Ralph Nader junk and took a 300-mile trip on which he very carefully checked his mileage-per-gallon, while still driving at that patriotic 50 miles an hour.

Guess what? Would you think his mileage went up, or down, stayed in the same place? A quick recap: Driving at the posted speed limits, with a new car, he had averaged 11 miles to the gallon; dropping his speed to 50 miles an hour on trips his mileage moved up to 14 miles per gallon. But, believe it or not, when he short-circuited the Ralph Nader junk, his mileage soared to 22 miles per gallon. Think of it! With over 20 million cars dragging that Ralph Nader junk around, if they were all disconnected the gasoline shortage would vanish overnight.

If one can jump miles-per-gallon from 14 to 22 on a standard make, luxury liner car by kicking Nader's junk in the head, just think of what that would add up to on 20 million vehicles. It boggles the mind. And it boggles the mind that nobody in Congress, nobody in the White House, just nobody but a few shade tree mechanics has bothered to find this simple, sudden solution to the gasoline shortage. Wake up Washington, the British are coming.

BAN THE HANDGUN—VII

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on November 22, the 10th anniversary of the assassination of President Kennedy, the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy issued a statement assessing that the lack of adequate controls on the possession and transfer of firearms makes America unsafe for people, for political campaigns and for democracy itself.

I share that belief, and commend the council's statement to readers of the RECORD. The statement follows:

AMERICA'S GUN MANIA A DECADE AFTER DALLAS
TEN YEARS OF NEGLIGENCE

Ten years have passed since President Kennedy was shot to death with a mail-order rifle. It took the Federal government nearly five years to muster enough determination to make such personal shipments illegal. It would have taken even longer if the gun assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King and Senator Robert Kennedy had not reopened the 1963 wound in the nation's conscience and made the neglect of this problem all the more painful.

Major legislation was passed in 1968, but it was aimed only at controlling more effectively the commercial traffic in guns and ammunition and restricting their purchase from bona fide dealers. Congress roundly rejected efforts to tackle the rest of the problem—the need to limit legal possession of guns to people who possessed the basic credentials for responsible gun ownership, and to hold such licensed gun owners strictly and legally accountable for every gun in their possession. Thus, the assassins of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King and Robert

F. Kennedy could just as easily now as then obtain the guns that fired those shots heard round the world.

With every passing year, thousands of lesser-known but no less respectable Americans are attacked, wounded or killed with guns—statistics which the nation seems to accept as routinely as it does the ball scores and the stock market quotations.

In the ten years since the murder of President Kennedy, nearly 100,000 Americans have been murdered with guns. Another 100,000 have committed suicide with guns. Another 700,000 have been wounded by guns, and another 800,000 have been the victims of robbery with guns but without gunfire. More Americans have been shot to death in the homes, shops and streets of America in this century alone than have been killed in all the wars in American history. More Americans have been murdered by gunfire in their own country since the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy than were killed in Indochina during the entire period of U.S. military involvement there. Since the flow of all kinds of guns into all kinds of hands for all kinds of purposes remains unchecked, the danger to life and limb from the misuse of guns is greater now than when President Kennedy was killed—and gets greater with every passing day.

Strict gun control is not the only answer to this carnage—this man-made plague. But it is an indispensable part of the effective answer that urgently needs to be found. A government that does not face the facts of gun violence and face up to the urgency of stopping the easy accessibility of guns and ammunition to individuals not qualified to keep and use them responsibly deserves the strongest rebuke from the American people. Such a government is either inexcusably insensitive to the hard realities of violence in America or is playing short-sighted, shabby politics with the safety of the American people by yielding to the "gun lobby".

The abysmal failure of the Federal government and nearly all state and local governments to adopt effective, reasonable and responsible gun-control policies in the overall public interest (the interest of law-abiding Americans who own guns as well as those who do not) leaves America unsafe for its people, unsafe for political campaigns, indeed unsafe for democracy.

Today on the 10th anniversary of the death of President Kennedy—a sad remembrance amid holiday observance of Thanksgiving—the nation should ponder its failings regarding violence in general and gun violence in particular. The American people should then call on their leaders to lead the way to making this the safe country it urgently needs to be.

What statistic are we waiting for?

U.S. SENATOR SAM NUNN

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in the November issue of Georgia magazine an excellent article on U.S. Senator SAM NUNN, which I bring to the attention of the Senate.

Though a Member of the Senate for less than a year, Senator NUNN has been busy earning a reputation as a hard-working, energetic, and extremely bright U.S. Senator. He is proving himself to be a credit to the State of Georgia and the Nation he serves.

Senator NUNN is about to complete his first year in the U.S. Senate, and I take this opportunity to salute him for a job well done. I ask unanimous consent that the article on Senator NUNN be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM GEORGIA

(By Bill Seddon)

The dominant theme in America today is change. It is happening everywhere, to everything; it is so pervasive it seems redundant even to mention it. Some things never change, the sages used to say, but now they do, and even death and taxes are no longer sacrosanct; scientists are working madly to find the way to freeze us forever and no taxpayer needs to be reminded that for the rich there is always a way out. We are accustomed to change daily, a good deal of it is even for the better, and it doesn't startle us so much any more; we can read "Future Shock" without being shocked, we can take Watergate and energy shortages with equanimity, we can be droll about our President consorting with the heads of Soviet and Sino Communism. We have lost the capacity to be bothered very much by it all.

Traditionally in this country some of the most successful resisters to change have been our governmental institutions and the South, which has been a kind of governmental institution in itself in its own baronial way. But both are now subject to it; the Presidency is weakening, the court is less obtrusive, all the old giants of the Senate are dead, and by January of 1971, on the death of Georgia Senator Richard Russell, there was already the developing belief that a New South was emerging. James Reston of The New Times had this to say: "The Old South is mourning the death of Sen. Richard Russell of Georgia, but there is a New South, now partly liberated from history, and the tragedy of Dick Russell is that he was sick and old when the political transformation of the South took place."

Russell's successor, Samuel Augustus Nunn of Perry, is at age 35 neither sick nor old, and his election last November brought forth a spate of speculation that he might remain in the Senate as long as his predecessor, who had made it his home and his life for more years than Nunn has yet lived, 38 of them. As longevity is the first requisite for power in that institution, the questions rise: What kind of senator will Sam Nunn be?

Georgia has had throughout this century more than a single state's share of strong and powerful senators. When the harangues of old Tom Watson ended with his death in 1922, young Walter F. George, age 44, was elected to fill the vacant seat. He held it 34 years, establishing one of the most formidable records in Senate history, building a reputation as an internationalist foreign policy architect, serving as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Finance Committee.

George never lost in a political campaign, not even after he fought Franklin Roosevelt's plan to "pack" the Supreme Court in 1937 and Roosevelt appealed to Georgia voters to unseat him. George was re-elected and went on to steer the lend-lease program through the Senate in 1941; still later he was a foreign policy advisor to President Dwight Eisenhower. George finally relinquished his seat in 1956, at age 79, and died within the year. His successor, Sen. Herman Talmadge, has held the seat 17 years now and will hold it much longer; he is coming into his own as a Senate power as chairman of the Agriculture Committee. (National recognition—and a decidedly improved image—has come from his service as a respected member of the Watergate Committee. His intelligent, concise questions have won him

many public fans; but the fans who count are still in Georgia.)

Richard Brevard Russell, like Walter George, (and like Sam Nunn after him) ascended to the Senate upon the death of an incumbent, Sen. William J. Harris, in 1932. Russell was 35 years old; he had been a member of the Georgia House of Representatives since age 23, and had Speaker of the House at age 29 and had been elected governor of Georgia in 1930, at age 33. Russell stayed in the Senate for 38 years and more than anyone before or since made it his life; like George he outlasted his colleagues to become dean of the Senate, the body's most respected member, the Senator's Senator, an advisor to six Presidents, and when he died two years ago at age 73 President Richard Nixon called him "one of the most magnificent Americans of all time."

So 35-year old Sam Nunn has a long way to go before he can be judged a worthy successor to Richard Russell or Walter George. He also has a lot going for him—his age, his background, his ambition, and, less certainly at this early point in his career, his ability. An obscure State Representative from the little town of Perry, he showed himself a formidable campaigner last year in wrestling the Democratic nomination from a covey of would-be's with longer records and larger reputations. "I began so far back in the pack that I considered it progress when the reporters began to call me an underdog," he exulted after beating them all and a tough Republican opponent too, largely by endlessly promising Georgia's voters that he was a man who would "Get Tough in Washington." But his Democratic primary run-off opponent, Gov. Jimmy Carter's appointee David Gambrell, who has praised him since, served a word of warning after losing to Nunn: "A lot of the things he talked about during the campaign have either already been done, are being done, or can't be done. But he still has to try."

Nunn gives every evidence of being a man who is willing to try. He has always been a scrapper—he set the course record of 66 on his home golf course in Houston County, and at 5-10, 140 pounds he competed with the bigger boys in basketball and football at Perry High School—and he knows how to enlist the aid of those who can help him. An early pre-election poll last year showed him to be a 98 per cent unknown; soon he had won endorsements from George Wallace, the Atlanta Constitution (which called him "a constructive conservative"), Rep. Phil Landrum of Jasper, dean of the Georgia Congressional delegation, and even Sen. Herman Talmadge, who makes endorsements about as often as most politicians make confessions. One of the important endorsements Nunn failed to get was that of Lester Maddox, a friend of GOP candidate Fletcher Thompson—but even there Nunn got Maddox's brother Desley to help in the campaign in south Georgia, and after he had won he said he "completely understood and respected" the lieutenant governor's neutrality.

When he wasn't talking about "Getting Tough in Washington" during the campaign (at first it seemed ludicrous, this slender, mild-mannered, bespectacled young fellow, he sure didn't look so tough), Nunn was citing Georgia's happy tradition of sending young men to the Senate, giving them time and room to maneuver, supporting them through the years so that finally their seniority, prestige and influence has outstripped that of their colleagues. Electing young senators had worked for Georgia before, witness Russel and George, and young Nunn left to doubt he wanted to match their years of tenure. Now that he's in, however, he is less anxious to talk about things in the long-range—"It would take away from my effectiveness now to look 10, 20 years ahead." Ask him the question, perhaps unfair, about how he will fare in the footsteps of Russell,

and he answers slowly, "He set the shining light for all senators, not just for the ones who takes his former position. I knew, of course, before I came here that he was considered one of the finest senators in the history of the body, but I've found out a lot more."

Richard Russell. There are those on Capitol Hill who still revere his name. One of them is Dan Minchew, administrative assistant to Sen. Herman Talmadge, who is succinct in his assessment of Russell's sources of strength: "1. A prodigious amount of work in preparing himself. In a parliamentary battle he knew more about procedure than anyone else; it was the same way in a military or appropriations matter. Just plain hard work. 2. The primary thing, hard to pin down—Russell's character. It was sterling, beyond reproach. The old school where a man's word was his bond. For this he had unparalleled respect from his colleagues. 3. His seniority gave him authority. When you have ability, hard work and character it magnifies the effect of seniority."

Proctor Jones, a former Russell assistant now working for the Senate Appropriations Committee, talks much the same way of his old mentor. "His intellectual capacity was great, he had one of the best minds in the Senate," Jones asserts. "And he had the advantage of a complete mastery of parliamentary procedure, which is part of being a hard worker. Also he had good plain old common sense, a rare quality that a lot of people think is missing up here nowadays. His manner, his bearing, his ability to get along with people was also important; he had the rare ability to get along with colleagues even when he was having bitter disagreements with them. He had the capacity to make devastating arguments without hurting anybody's feelings."

Russell's oldest assistant still on the Hill is Bill Jordan, also now on the Appropriations Committee staff, who left the Georgia town of Monticello to join the senator in 1955. "There are three qualities that I saw in Russell that I thought people have a right to expect in their senators: ability, integrity and the capacity for hard work. I find it hard to get beyond those three; Senator Russell had them to the fullest measure. He also had a fourth thing, humility. I measure any other senator against those criteria. Some rate high in one, some in another, but none have them all in the same proportion as Richard Russell."

A freshman Senator is not often given the opportunity to display any of the qualities mentioned except humility and hard work. When he arrived he had the temerity to seek and the questionable fortune to attain a seat on the Armed Services Committee, one of the Big Four, which Russell chaired before taking the helm of Appropriations. It will be a long time before Nunn (or any other newcomer) makes a name for himself on that panel, which is run close-to-the-vest by Chairman John Stennis of Mississippi, has no strong independent subcommittee to offer a spotlight and requires the slow accumulation of technical knowledge. "With just a few months experience I can't stand up in committee and make arguments on complex weapons procurement," Nunn concedes, "I'd be treated with rightful contempt by my colleagues." What does a lawyer from Perry, Ga. know about weapons? So he is concentrating on the hard work of learning. Some first-term Congressmen and Senators have been known to feel frustrated with their inability to do things on such committees, but Nunn claims to feel no frustration so far: "I have contributed as much as my knowledge and ability should allow," he avers, "as much as I could or should."

It may be that Armed Services will not be the place in which Sam Nunn makes his mark. He denies any desire to switch committees, at least for now, but when discussing

issues he speaks most confidently, and apparently most competently, about finances and budget reform. He could be headed for Appropriations (which Russell also chaired). The Senator realizes that to win the respect of his colleagues, to become generally influential within the body, he must first build up a sphere of expertise; Nunn thinks budgetary reform could be his sphere. He is pushing for a "disciplined" budgeting procedure that "tempers the political process as much as possible, that is viewed more as an economic matter and less as a political matter." The Senator gets wound up talking budget. "I think I have had significant input in budget reform already," he claims, and then momentarily forgetting his station adds, "I think I know as much as anyone else about it." Then he remembers. "I don't mean I know as much as anyone else, but I certainly can make a contribution."

Some of the other issues Nunn is interested in now are, perhaps not surprisingly, the ones he promised to "get tough" about during the campaign. He has introduced his bill to penalize "delinquent" fathers who run away from home and leave their families on welfare; he wants compulsory rehabilitation for drug addicts; he wants to end the lifetime tenure of federal judges. One of the get tough issues that seems to have died down for the moment is school busing; one suspects the Senator will get as tough as he can about that when the time comes that he has to; for the moment it's a good thing to let alone.

And, of course, military matters. Nunn says he wants to get involved in the future of NATO and the volunteer army. "I want to make sure we remain strong, that we don't let down our guard and encourage aggression," he declares. But even here he can't escape the desire to talk budget reform. "If the military is going to stay we must practice economy. We have to save money in all areas to enjoy the confidence of the American people." Clearly, Nunn would like to be on Appropriations, and just as clearly he never can be, unless the Senate changes its rules, while he remains on Armed Services. Does he foresee a switch? "It certainly depends on circumstances," he says. "But I am very pleased with it (Armed Services) right now and have no intention of asking to switch Armed Services demands continuity."

But the only kind of continuity that should be expected in this overgrowing country over the next few decades, the decades in which Georgia Sen. Sam Nunn will have the chance to grow in power and influence in Washington, is the continuity of change. A senator who starts out young and hopes to be re-elected five or six times at six-year intervals will have to keep a careful chart of the way things are moving, will have to move with them, will have to be a little bit different each time he faces the voters back home, lest he discover too late that they have changed more than he has. This is not to say that he will have to alter his basic principles with every re-election effort; only that over such a long span as is contemplated for a Sam Nunn to match the record of a Richard Russell or a Walter George, he will have to change more than Russell or George did. The country will change more in the next 38 years than it did in the last 38. So will the South; so will Georgia.

Sam Nunn, who was big on planning while in Perry and in the Georgia House of Representatives, sees change coming in the South but also professes to see great stability. "I think Georgia is changing every day, not so much in a political sense as in an economic sense. And economics play a vital role in our thinking, not so much consciously . . . It was my goal in Perry to develop industrially. We have a wonderful agricultural economy, but we need industry too. Georgia has great assets, it has the potential to be a real leader in the southeast, and I think the southeast

is going to be more and more a leader in the country in economic development. I look every day at how this is going to affect us 10 years from now. That's part of my regular thought pattern, from my experience in planning."

"As Georgia's economy becomes more like the rest of the nation's the differences will be less and less," Nunn contends. He believes the political and philosophical mood of the nation is approaching that of the South. "I do think that Georgia is in the mainstream now. I don't think we're sitting out there like a sore thumb. We're in the middle of the road. I'm not sure that was the case 10 years ago." Politically, he believes the South is still more stable, although he knows the era of the Solid Democratic South is ending. "The South is still more stable in what we believe about the broad issues, foreign policy, the military, economy," Nunn avows. "In New York or California you might elect a left-wing radical one year and a right-wing conservative the next. That is not going to happen in Georgia. Middle-of-the-road conservatives are going to be elected, that's not going to change."

If it is true that the attitudes of the South and those of the various other regions are merging, and many observers believe they are, Sam Nunn may enjoy a political advantage that was always denied to Richard Russell. Russell, as is well known, wanted to be President, he tried hard for the Democratic nomination in 1952, but the South and its racial attitudes were an albatross for him; even Harry Truman said the distinguished Georgia Senator could well have been President had he not come from the Deep South. "Russell represented very accurately the mood of his state, which was not the mood of the nation," Sam Nunn declares, recalling without mentioning the filibuster his predecessor led as general of the Southern bloc against the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The South is changing now, too late for Richard Russell but in plenty of time for Sam Nunn.

How much of an advantage the new South will be to the new Senator depends to some extent on how far the new Senator decides he wants to go. Being from the old South and representing its attitudes did not diminish the effectiveness of Richard Russell within the United States Senate; it was only when he tried to go beyond the Senate that he found himself constrained. It may be that the South is coming due for its share of Presidents and Vice-Presidents, and many observers believe they will continue to come from the ranks of the Senate. Indeed, there are those who think the Senate, no longer the great and powerful deliberative body it once was, has become a training ground for Presidents. Sam Nunn, naturally disclaims any desire ever to be President, Vice-President or anything else but U.S. Senator. "I have no ambition to be President," he exclaims. "I love the legislative process. If I wanted to be in the executive I would have run for governor or lieutenant governor. Working on and perfecting law, this is the part of government I like. Being administrator over thousands of people would not be enjoyable to me." Then he adds a disclaimer to the disclaimer: "It would be foolish to say I will never do anything else (like run for President or Vice-President), although my present outlook is that to be an effective Senator is the height of my ambition."

So Sam Nunn has a long road ahead to become the kind of effective Senator that the man whose seat he took was. It will take years of unrelenting hard work—although no one can expect him, a married man with children, to devote the time to it that bachelor Richard Russell did. But if Nunn applies himself, keeps his eyes on the change back home and keeps his integrity within the Senate, stays around long enough and builds a reputation for wizardry in financial or military matters, perhaps he can be the next

giant of the Senate. The Senate, like the Congress as a whole, has been at a low ebb as an independent power in government but there are those who see its resurgence ahead. Perhaps Sam Nunn will be one of those who will restore it to its rightful place—the place it held through most of the years its last great giant, Richard Russell, made it his life.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the discussion over the solutions to the energy crisis has brought forth considerable editorial commentary. One of the more imaginative, inquisitive, and interesting articles which I have read, was a column by Michael O'Hearn, editor of the News, a publication serving South Suburban Cook County, Ill.

Michael O'Hearn, author of the weekly column entitled the "From the Glass House" is read avidly by his fans which is well understood upon reading this particular article that I now insert into the RECORD:

FROM THE GLASS HOUSE

(By Michael O'Hearn)

It seems like our federal government loves to play games. Now there is the toying with a ban on Sunday driving. Wouldn't it be nice to see empty high-ways all across the nation on any given Sunday. I think President Nixon is just jealous of those nations in Europe which have experimented with a ban on Sunday auto traffic and have successfully driven the people to such healthy diversions as bike riding and walking. Nixon likes power and would feel like a powerful king if he could force Americans from the roads.

No one has proved to me that there is a shortage. It looks like a special interest is receiving special treatment. Oil company profits have soared in the last year, and Americans are willing to pay any price to keep mobile. If this whole thing is another ploy to make some wealthy individuals more wealthy, I hope it back-fires. Whenever it becomes in the self-interest of the energy suppliers to start pushing more and more consumption, I can only hope there will be many millions who have found pleasure in such cheap hobbies as walking and bike-riding.

It is some coincidence that two years ago ecology experts had convinced the American public that an Alaskan pipeline was not necessary. Furthermore these experts claimed there was danger of causing earthquakes with the construction of this pipeline. The oil interests wanted their pipeline badly, and started a huge propaganda program to win over public opinion, but nothing happened. President Nixon just recently signed into law the go-ahead for the pipeline. Could this whole "crisis" be nothing more than the most cleverly conceived "program for pipeline?" We don't know how, but one day we will.

If the crosstown expressway isn't dead now, the energy scare is sure to kill it for good. We certainly don't need another main artery into the loop for any good reason. I want to poll our local representatives on their support or lack of support for US Steel's proposed plant on the shores of Lake Michigan. If we want the lake to become as dead as Lake Erie, we should support such projects, but if a dead lake is not what we want . . .

The quickest way to turn this land of the free into a land of tyrannical rule would be for the government to forbid private car ownership with the right to go any where the driver wants to go. If we all find ourselves riding in public vehicles in a few years (months) we can be sure our movements are all under government surveillance. Governmental power is used too much especially at the federal level. I thought everyone would laugh when the President actually stuck his nose in raises for individuals, but no, we took this intrusion in our supply and demand system seriously!

You can't trust party labels anymore because President Nixon is a Republican, who believes in an extremely active federal government. Government intervention used to be what Democrats were most accused of. We voters are going to have to listen to our representatives from both major parties (as well as independents) to see who believes in individual rights, and less government direction (dictation).

BASIL PATERSON SPEAKS ON THE FUTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Basil Paterson, vice-chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was recently interviewed by Rev. H. Carl McCall of the Amsterdam News on the future of the Democratic Party.

Paterson, a former New York State senator from my own community of Harlem, is leading the fight for an increased voice for minorities in the making of Democratic policy. Building upon the base of 1972, Paterson is working to guarantee that racial and ethnic minority groups, women and youth are fully represented in the decisionmaking process. If the Democratic Party is to continue to grow, if it is to win both moral and electoral successes, then it must recognize the diversity of the people of the United States. The exclusion of significant portions of our population can only result in a thwarting of democratic goals.

I am pleased to share Basil Paterson's views with my colleagues in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Amsterdam News, Dec. 1, 1973]

BASIL PATERSON: BLACK POWER IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(By H. Carl McCall)

You no doubt remember that a rather radical new set of rules were put into effect prior to last year's national Democratic Party convention in Miami affecting the process of selecting convention delegates. The new rules came as the result of the work of a special commission headed by Senator George McGovern who emerged as the Democratic nominee for President.

State delegations were required by the rules of the McGovern commission to represent appropriate percentages of delegates from ethnic and racial minorities women delegates and youth delegates.

Old line party regulars (like, for example, Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago) found themselves shut out from the 1972 national Democratic Party convention as state delegations opened up to meet the required

"quotas" of Blacks, Spanish-speaking, youth, women and so on.

After the 1972 convention and the subsequent overwhelming defeat of Senator McGovern in the presidential election, Democratic party regulars and power groups launched an attack on the rules governing delegate selection.

NEW RULES

A new set of rules were adopted which flatly outlawed "mandatory quotas" but which require "affirmative action" in each state to involve racial minorities, youth and women.

I asked Basil Paterson to shed some light on these rewordings and new developments.

"First, let me describe four important new commissions," Mr. Paterson answered. "First of all, there is a Vice Presidential Commission, created by the Democratic National Committee to recommend a new procedure for the selection of a Vice Presidential candidate. It came as a direct result of the Thomas Eagleton fiasco. But it also relates to Richard Nixon's candidacy for Vice President, when it was discovered after he was the nominee that he had a slush fund. The story goes that Eisenhower wanted to drop him as the Vice Presidential nominee.

"The system now is that the Presidential nominee decides who he wants for a running mate, sometimes within a matter of hours after his own nomination, and there isn't sufficient time to do an adequate check to see that the Vice Presidential candidate is 'clean.' They're not worried about philosophical differences. They're worried about cleanliness! The only question is, 'Does anybody have anything on 'em?'"

SPECIAL COMMISSION

The second commission mandated by the 1972 national Democratic Party convention, Mr. Paterson explained, was a special commission to prepare for the 1974 national conference. The Democrats will be holding an off-year national convention to deal with issues of party structure and any other issues deemed to be important. The convention will be held December 6-8, 1974, in a city yet to be determined. It will be a major national party gathering with more than 2,000 delegates attending.

"Now we get down to the two commissions causing the most noise right now," Mr. Paterson continued. "A commission—called the Black Commission—was mandated by the 1972 national convention to come up with rules and guidelines for the selection of delegates to the 1976 Presidential nominating convention.

The commission, by the way, was named after Wayne Black from Utah rather than having anything to do with us! But that same commission now has to come up with rules and guidelines for selecting delegates to the 1974 off-year convention.

ALL MINORITIES REPRESENTED

"Now there was a big fight, which everyone knew was coming. The old-liners—like big labor as represented by George Meany of the AFL-CIO—insisted that one of the reasons the Democrats were so overwhelmed in 1972 was that the convention was not representative of the Democratic party.

Of course, anyone who was there in Miami knows that the 1972 National Democratic Party Convention was probably the most representative convention ever held in any major political party!

You never saw so many people of so many different persuasions. Not just ethnically, but also philosophically! It ran the gamut. It was no longer one of those boss-dominated, selected and delegated conventions. This was a convention that was truly representative of people around the country in the Democratic Party.

"But many of the old-liners felt excluded. They criticized the McGovern commission guidelines which called for 'fair representa-

tion,' insisting that 'fair representation' was just a code name for 'quotas.'

"So a fight took place in the Delegate Selection Commission. But we had some strong Black representation on that commission. Mayor Richard Hatcher of Gary, Indiana, led the fight to preserve guidelines which would ensure adequate minority representation at the 1976 convention. He was supported by such strong voices as Hanna Atkins, a Black legislator from Oklahoma, and Lavonia Allison from North Carolina.

"It was known from the beginning that the wording was going to be changed, and we Blacks did not have the votes to prevent it. But under Dick Hatcher's leadership a compromise was effected which may prove to be just as much of a safeguard as anything which ever came down the pike from the McGovern commission. And the so-called 'radicals,' or McGovernites of the Democratic Party feel it was a legitimate compromise. It wasn't all give, but there was some take also'

DELEGATE SELECTION PROCESS

The new procedure, Mr. Paterson explained, called for the establishment of yet another commission, a 17-member group called the Compliance Review Commission (CRC). Each state is required to submit plans for the selection of their convention delegates to the CRC for review and approval.

Membership of the CRC is determined as follows: 5 members selected by Barbara Mikulski, Baltimore Cit. Council of the Delegate Selection Commission; 5 members selected by National Democratic Party Committee Chairman Robert Strauss; 1 member each selected by the Democratic Governors' Conference, the Democratic members of the Senate and also the House of Representatives, and the Democratic Party State Chairmen. The remaining three members are Ms. Mikulski, Mayor Hatcher and Alex Smith of Chicago.

Basil Paterson sees real possibilities and opportunities for Black representation under the new procedures. The two "bottom lines," he feels, will be how strictly the guidelines are adhered to and how strong the CRC actually turns out to be.

"Now we have made certain demands," Mr. Paterson emphasizes. "We have demanded, for example, four Black members out of the seventeen on the CRC. That's an interesting number. We're not forgetting we represented 20 percent of Sen. Hubert Humphrey's vote in 1968, and 25.8 percent of Sen. George McGovern's vote in 1972."

STRUCTURE

That's the structure for monitoring delegate selection to the 1976 convention, but what of selecting delegates to the critically important off-year convention next year?

The original plan called for two different sets of rules governing delegate selection to the two conventions. Guidelines for selecting delegates to the 1974 convention were couched in such meaningless phrases as "encouraging maximum participation!"

Minority group representatives got together and decided that since a liveable compromise had been worked out for the 1976 convention, with the creation of the CRC, the same pattern should be applied to delegate selection to next year's off-year convention.

Through careful political maneuvering, a decision was reached to establish a Compliance Review Commission for the 1974 convention consisting of the Executive Committee of the Democratic National Committee where, Mr. Paterson insists, "we do pretty well."

THE BLACK AGENDA

"Though we can be out-voted," Mr. Paterson explains, "the Executive Committee has yet to even attempt to out-vote us, because of the attempt by Chairman Robert Strauss to show that he is bringing the party

together. But in this atmosphere of togetherness, we must never lose sight of what our agenda must be.

Togetherness is alright for those who can afford to give up something. Blacks have never asked for more than the bare minimum. All we've ever asked for is some equity. And if you give up that equity, you're dead. That's all we've ever demanded and so far our demands have been accepted."

Taking the two guideline procedures for the '74 and '76 conventions together, Mr. Paterson sees equity on the horizon.

"My feeling is," Mr. Paterson says, "that the language of 'fair representation' which the McGovern commission had dictated before came to mean 'quotas' in the good sense because of how that language was implemented. Therefore, the language isn't as important as the implementation of whatever language you've got.

"I feel if we are able to exercise some muscle by making temporary alliances with other interest groups, we may be able to muster the votes to see that the implementation of the guidelines will guarantee no less representation than we had in 1972. That was the greatest representation Blacks have ever had at any national convention and I don't believe we're going to go below that."

QUOTAS PROVIDE A BASE FOR BLACKS

Mr. Paterson also feels that the newspaper headlines over the past few months, telling of the struggle within the Democratic Party over delegate selection procedures, was probably necessary for "other peoples' consumption."

"Quotas had become the incendiary word for some of the old-liners," Mr. Paterson explains, "and for some of those who are alleged to be very liberal too! But to Blacks, quotas has always been a good word, because all its ever meant to us is a base from which to start. For others it has different connotations."

And Basil Paterson insists the base is here to stay in the national Democratic Party. Before the McGovern commission influence on the delegate selection process for the 1972 convention, there was not a sufficient number of Black delegates to even meet. Now there is a Black Caucus in the Democratic Party.

"We now have outstanding Blacks with their own constituencies," Mr. Paterson enthuses. "Blacks who will stand up and make statements without worrying about what's going to happen as a result. Non-intimidatable Blacks! We've got two Black State chairmen—Aaron Henry from Mississippi and Bill Lucey from the District of Columbia. We've got dynamite people!"

"We now have approximately 35 Black members of the National Democratic Committee, out of a total of 300. And it's an increasing number. Of course we should have far more than 35 out of 300. But the number has grown from about 12 to 35 over the last nine months."

BLACKS DEMAND REPRESENTATION

Pushing the point of Black influence in the National Democratic Party further, I raised the question of the skepticism surrounding the election of Robert Strauss as National Democratic Party Chairman. Mr. Strauss comes from Texas, a state with conservative inclinations which might not be in tune with increased Black influence in the Democratic Party.

Mr. Paterson answered that he did not know Robert Strauss before he attempted to become Party Chairman. Mr. Paterson and the Black Caucus voted against Mr. Strauss, and Strauss, according to Paterson, has always been disturbed by that lack of Black support.

Mr. Strauss had offered eight new Black members in an effort to gain support, but, Mr. Paterson is quick to point out, "We got the eight new Black members even though

we didn't support him. We got them on a demand basis."

"I think what's starting to come through to a lot of us," Mr. Paterson continues, "is that Robert Strauss wants to be the best damn chairman the Democratic, or any other party, ever had. He's trying to bring the party together and, therefore, he has to pay a philosophical price.

He can't pursue whatever his personal philosophy might be. He has stated on national television that a National Party Chairman cannot afford the luxury of a personal philosophy. He has to be an umbrella attracting all kinds of philosophies.

And I think he's trying to adhere to that. Along with this, I would suggest that one of the things that has been of greatest impact for Black people is that our representation on the National Committee has been strong. People who are strong in their own right. Strong voices like that of Barbara Jordan, Congresswoman from Texas."

What then of the relationship between Chairman Strauss and Vice Chairman Paterson?

"I have had an almost totally unencumbered situation," Mr. Paterson emphasizes. "Mr. Strauss has made it very clear that he needs me. I'm Black and I'm from New York. He's white and he's from Texas. If I walked out, it would be very, very embarrassing to him."

"When he became Chairman, Mr. Strauss changed the rules so he could add a woman as Vice Chairman, since there had been pressure in that direction. But he made it very clear I was First Vice Chairman. He stays in constant communication with me, and he has stated to a gathering of mayors and the New York press corps that he deems me as his number one political advisor. I do know that whenever anything of consequence comes up, I don't have to call him. He's on that line."

A ROLE FOR ALL BLACKS

So what does it all mean for us at the grass roots level of potential political involvement? Is there any way we can relate delegate selection procedures, implementation of guidelines, and structural party struggles to our lives and responsibilities? I asked Basil Paterson what we could do to support him and the kinds of things taking place on the national level. Or, indeed, is there any role we can play?

"Well, it sounds almost trite to say it," Mr. Paterson replied, "but it all gets back to what kind of participation we have and what are our numbers at the moment at the polls. I used the numbers before of how we were 25.8 percent of George McGovern's vote. And yet that represented far fewer numbers of Blacks voting than when we were 20 percent of Hubert Humphrey's vote. McGovern got a small vote, and that's why our percentage numbers increased.

"But we fell off greatly in 1972, and I can fully understand why. With all due respect to George McGovern, I don't believe he excited Black voters. There were some attempts made to induce George McGovern to speak directly to Black voters, but it didn't happen. We don't want Black votes taken for granted in the Democratic Party.

"By the same token, for us to have leverage, we have to have numbers. We don't have the financial resources that some other communities have in buying influence. The revelations of Watergate and the Richard Nixon campaign show us there have been very few political contributions ever made in this country.

"There have been investments made. Under Richard Nixon, the investor got back a return before he even made the investment, like ITT, or the airlines, or the milk dealers. They got returns prior to having to invest money in the campaign.

"Black people don't have the kind of busi-

ness interests where we can lay out \$50,000 or \$100,000 to a political candidate with the understanding that this is going to come back to us. But what we do have are numbers, and key numbers. Everybody talks about our rising numbers in major urban centers, but those are major industrial areas.

"Of course, they're always going to try to find devices to try to undercut what we are doing. In Gary, Indiana, the state found it 'necessary' to pull a section out of Gary. Why? Because taxes were going to support a city that was dominated by a Black administration.

"But even more than numbers, we've got talent in the Black community that's special. Look at a Tom Bradley in Los Angeles with an 18 percent Black population and he gets elected mayor. Some people say he didn't campaign as a representative of Blacks. I don't care what they say. He's Black, and when he stands up as a Black man, Tom Bradley knows from when he comes. Or look at Ken Gibson in Newark, Maynard Jackson in Atlanta, Coleman Young in Detroit.

"Any time I speak to a Black group, young or old, and I ask them how they think they compare with their white counterparts in whatever occupation they're in, they think they compare favorably. Which means, of course, they think they're better. And I don't think that's Black chauvinism!

"I think it's the truth. We find, no matter what field we're engaged in for us it make it, we've got to be better. Most of us have had to survive in a hostile environment. That's Darwin's theory—survival of the fittest!

"What we really need now is to get more vitality into politics. That's no put-down of Black politicians. Every one of us in politics knows we've got far greater talented Black people outside of politics. I'm not suggesting they give up whatever occupations or businesses they are now in.

"What I am suggesting is that they start giving some of their time and their talent. When someone has an idea how I can better do my job as Vice Chairman of the National Democratic Committee, pick up the phone, or drop me a note, or come in and see me. I respond very quickly, and I don't know a Black politician who doesn't respond."

Part of the new Black vitality in politics can be seen, according to Basil Paterson, in gatherings of Black Democrats and Black Republicans meeting together and expressing the shared awareness that "we're Black first and members of a particular political party second." Or in a Saturday morning gathering in New York City where sizeable funds were raised for the candidacy of Maynard Jackson in Atlanta.

"We've got to recognize," says Mr. Paterson, "that there can never be geographical boundaries for Black people in the United States."

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON H.R. 10792

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H.R. 10792, to establish a uniform law on the subject of bankruptcies. The hearings will begin on Monday, December 10, 1973, at 10 a.m., in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building.

On the above date, the subcommittee

will hear testimony from Harold Marsh, Jr., Esq., former chairman of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States, and Prof. Frank R. Kennedy, former executive director of the Commission.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

FUEL OIL EXPORTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks there have been numerous newspaper articles concerning the export of fuel oil. Many Americans are disturbed by these shipments, especially since fuel oil is desperately needed in the United States.

Sharing this concern, I called the Cost of Living Council, the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior and raised questions about the exports. The stories surrounding these exports are greatly exaggerated. From an impact point of view, they are less than 1 percent of total U.S. consumption. It is true that the projected exports for 1973 are 284 percent higher than 1972. 1972, however, was a depressed year. In fact, 1973 projected exports are 69 percent of 1969, 88 percent of 1970 and 69 percent of 1971. The rise in 1973 appears to be a return to a historical level.

Therefore prohibiting these exports is not a real solution to our energy problem. The amount being exported is just a drop in the bucket when compared with our vast energy needs.

Furthermore, even this export figure of less than 1 percent is totally misleading. Many of the countries which receive refined oil from the United States are also shipping far greater quantities of crude oil to the United States. Venezuela, listed among the top six importers of our petroleum distillate fuel oil, is a case in point.

During 1972 Venezuela shipped an average of 962,380 barrels of petroleum products per day to the United States, 255,615 barrels per day of that being crude oil. The United States in turn has sent to Venezuela distillate fuel amounting to about four-hundredths of 1 percent of the petroleum products we receive. Mexico, another leading importer of our refined oil, shipped 7,710,000 barrels of petroleum products to the United States during 1972. This compares with our shipment to Mexico from January through September of this year of only 323,345 barrels of distillate fuel. It would be foolish for the United States to consider prohibiting fuel oil exports when we receive so much more from these countries in crude oil and petroleum products. Such a move might well lead to retaliatory action and a complete cutoff of foreign oil shipments, leading to

even greater shortages than we presently face.

I also want to mention one other factor that is causing some of these exports and many other of our economic difficulties—the wage and price controls. Because of these controls more money can be made by selling products abroad where there are no controls than can be made by selling these products in the United States. The oil exported, for example, sold at a price per gallon of 145 percent above last year's price. Shortages in steel, copper and numerous other products are also developing because it is more advantageous to sell abroad than at home.

I opposed wage and price controls when they were originally enacted and I fought against extension of these controls last spring. I am now supporting legislation to repeal these controls. Phases I through IV have brought chaos to our economy—shortages, increased exports, business closures and high interest rates. Price controls should come off immediately to allow an efficient allocation of resources. Failure to do so can only result in further chaos, shortages, rising exports and business closures.

DAVID BEN-GURION

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the world was saddened over the weekend upon hearing of the death of one of the greatest men in its history—David Ben-Gurion, the founder of Israel.

Few men see their dreams come true in their own lifetime. Mr. Ben-Gurion was a man who did.

At a young age he moved to the Middle East. His dream was to reestablish the homeland of the Jewish people and to call the diaspora to it. His years of struggle, tragically aided by the Nazi holocaust, allowed the Hebrew nation to be born. The young state turned to him as its first Prime Minister and he led Israel through the difficult first 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, two types of great men die and are mourned.

One type is the young statesman who shows greatness and promise early in his career before being snatched from us—men like John and Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King. We grieve their passing by mourning the lost potential to do good which these men possessed.

The other type of great men are those who have accomplished great things and die after completing their work. Our mourning for them should be in the form of tribute—tribute to potential realized and put to work for mankind. As the Washington Post said this morning:

Few public men ever lived a life of the prophetic intensity and historical achievement of David Ben-Gurion. Certainly no modern figure has been of more central and comprehensive importance to the whole life of his people. In a real sense, Israel is his personal monument.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I said that Mr. Ben-Gurion had seen his dream come true—reestablishing his people's homeland. But in a sense his dream is not complete. Israel exists as a strong and viable state, thanks to his leadership. But it does not yet exist in peace.

The world's greatest memorial to David Ben-Gurion would be to complete his dream—insuring a place for his people to live in peace. Let us all say a prayer of Shalom—for David Ben-Gurion and for his country.

UNITED STATES IMPORTING COMMUNIST AGENTS FROM CHILE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the Chilean people have been forced into a revolution to overthrow a Marxist government to prevent a Communist coup, many Americans may be unhappy to learn that our Government under a special "parole" arrangement has offered sanctuary to the Communist "refugees" of the new Chilean Government.

Many of these so-called leftist refugees are reportedly nationals of other Central and Latin American countries who do not want them to return to their native land. Use of the new "parole" arrangement does not charge the refugees from Chile or whatever other country they enter from with the immigration quota applicable under the normal immigration procedure.

Not only is our Government now importing unsuccessful but Communist agents but not one word of opposition has been voiced by the population control lobby.

I ask that a related newsclipping follow.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 1, 1973]

U.S. SOFTENS ENTRY RULES FOR LEFTISTS CAUGHT IN CHILE

(By Terri Shaw)

The United States has offered to allow foreign refugees stranded in Chile after the September military coup to immigrate to the United States under a special "parole" arrangement allowing them to bypass certain immigration restrictions.

The U.S. offer was made to the U.N. High Commission for Refugees more than a month ago, but so far fewer than 30 persons have applied to come to the United States.

This is a tiny proportion of the estimated 3,000 foreigners, mainly from other Latin American countries, believed to have taken refuge in embassies, private homes and several "safe havens" in Chile set up by the U.N. refugee office.

Most of the refugees are leftists who fled their countries for political reasons and were welcomed to Chile by the socialist-led government of the late President Salvador Allende. The military men who led the Sept. 11 coup in which Allende died conducted a harsh campaign against foreign "extremists" and arrested hundreds of foreigners in the first weeks after the coup.

Use of the "parole" system to bring in refugees from Chile was suggested last month by the Senate refugee subcommittee.

The system has been used in the past to allow Hungarian and Cuban refugees to enter the United States without going through the usual lengthy bureaucratic processes.

State Department sources suggested that the number of applicants from Chile was low because many of the refugees would not consider the United States a "congenial" place to live and because they were aware of the strict "security and political" restrictions on immigrants to the United States.

Sources who have been following the refugees' situation, however, said that conditions in Chile are so bad and there are so few places for the refugees to go that many are desperate to leave.

A cable sent to the World Council of Churches from refugees living under U.N. protection said: "We consider the security conditions under which we exist to be precarious and full of serious danger."

Some European and Latin American countries have agreed to accept small numbers of refugees, and as of Nov. 13 almost 250 had left, State Department sources said.

ANOTHER VOICE JOINS THE CALL TO CONVERT ST. ALBANS HOSPITAL TO A VETERANS HOSPITAL AND NURSING HOME

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long haul to convince the Defense Department not to let St. Albans lie empty when there is a valuable use for it—that of a Veterans' Administration hospital and nursing home. However, through the efforts of the many New York veterans organizations, in conjunction with the continuing work by Congressman JOSEPH ADDABO and myself, we feel we are on the verge of accomplishing this task.

It has been gratifying to know that the New York media outlets have been with us in this fight. I ask that an editorial supporting our efforts broadcast by WOR radio be included at this point in the RECORD.

WOR 710 EDITORIAL No. 26, OCTOBER 29 AND 30, 1973

(Speaking for WOR, Herb Saltzman)

Saint Albans Naval Hospital is no more—a victim of Pentagon budget-cutting. But there is no good reason why Saint Albans shouldn't open again as a hospital to serve the people of Long Island.

Many residents of the Saint Albans area of Queens have been trying to have the old Naval facility turned into a Veterans Hospital. Carl McCarden, Commissioner of the Mayors' Office for Veteran Actions, says that more than 500-thousand veterans live in Queens and neighboring Nassau Counties. . . . none of those half-million currently are served by a VA hospital. That is the largest concentration of veterans in the country without a hospital.

A number of New York's law-makers say they are working in Washington to have the Veterans Administration take over Saint Albans. It's up to Congress and the VA to decide if the closed hospital can re-open to help the people of Queens and Nassau.

Commissioner McCarden has said:

"Only a closely coordinated effort by veterans organizations, the community, the City and State administration, as well as the 100 per cent cooperation by members of the Congress representing the State of New York,

will bring about a successful conclusion to this vital fight on behalf of the residents of Queens and Nassau Counties. If the public interest is neglected in this critical medical issue, then there is little hope for consideration by the Federal government in other veterans matters.

We couldn't agree more.

HINDSIGHT NOT 20-20

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the November 29 edition of Thursday—a new and promising weekly newspaper in my hometown of Columbus, Ga.—shows remarkable clarity of vision on the Mideast situation.

From a background of concentration and displaced persons camps to the present colossus ideal of hard-fought independence, this exceptionally well-written editorial outlines the growth of the State of Israel. More importantly, perhaps, it puts in perspective what could well be the only "good thing" about our present energy crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I highly commend this editorial entitled "Hindsight Not 20-20" to the attention of our colleagues.

The editorial reads:

HINDSIGHT NOT 20-20

In further reference to the oil situation, there are those who, since the oil boycott, would say we chose the wrong side in the Middle East and that our policy was dictated by the heart rather than the cold realities of life. We question the accuracy of that hindsight vision.

Soon after the end of World War II, our government and its wartime partners made a moral commitment to the new state of Israel. This commitment was not altogether altruistic. Margaret Truman, in a recent book about her father, went to great lengths to point out that her father, then President, had been totally unswayed by Zionist pressures, but on the contrary extended recognition to the new state of Israel under pressure from our field commanders in occupied Europe. There was no other place on earth these pitiful destitute homeless people could go.

President Truman backed Israel in order to empty the concentration camps—by then called displaced persons camps—and to end what our generals felt was becoming a continuing commitment to these people for protection, food, shelter, clothing, and housing for generations to come. In washing our hands of one responsibility we took on another.

While Truman's decision was pragmatic, the enthusiasm with which it was received and supported by the American people came from the heart. Historically we understood what it meant to be oppressed and destitute. Our forefathers came to these shores oppressed and downtrodden. Methodists, Quakers, Catholics and Jews. Our history was one of mutual respect and mutual aid. In America, all had finally done well. The famished Irish Catholics became Kennedys, the oppressed Scots became Carnegies and persecuted Jews became Frankfurters, Irving Berlins and, of late, Kissingers. It was only natural for the nation whose gateway is guarded by the Statue of Liberty with its invitations. . . .

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to be free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to
me.

I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

... to applaud and support the home for the homeless, the new State of Israel.

If there is any room for hindsight, it would reveal our error not in our support of Israel but in our reliance on any foreign power for our supply of basic energy. Such a policy of foreign reliance makes about as much sense as marrying a woman relying on her first husband's alimony as a means of support.

Even the Arabs have more sense than that. Kuwait is a desert wasteland except for its oil. Its only water is the rare rainfall. Its drinking water is brought in by water tankers, yet only 30 miles away in neighboring Iraq are dams and lakes harnessing the waters of the mighty Tigris and Euphrates rivers. Iraq has stood ready and willing to pipe in the water to turn the dry deserts of Kuwait to fertile gardens. Kuwait has wisely preferred its waterless deserts to dependency on Iraq, knowing that it would be very easy to get used to an abundance of water and that as soon as it became accustomed to the water it would be used by Iraq to control them if not take them over.

We are indeed fortunate that the Arab Sheiks chose to cut off our oil now—rather than three to five years from now when with the growth of our demands we would have been so dependent upon Arab oil as to be subject to their whims.

We have every confidence that America will now buckle down to developing its own total energy sources. It will be inconvenient for a while but not really painful—five years hence it could well have been fatal.—JBA

PUNISHMENT OF CRIMINALS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the appendix of the RECORD a guest editorial appearing on WJBK-TV 2 in Detroit by Mr. Joseph Clark, vice president of the Detroit Police Officers Association.

Mr. Clark has made clear the views of professional police officers, that what is needed is punishment of those who criminally misuse firearms and not disarming law-abiding citizens. I thoroughly agree with this viewpoint and commend Mr. Clark for his wise and needed comments.

The editorial follows:

GUEST VIEWPOINT: JOSEPH CLARK

A TV 2 Viewpoint recently focused on the ineffectiveness of handgun control laws. With a Guest Viewpoint on the subject, here's Joseph Clark, vice president of the Detroit Police Lieutenants and Sergeants Association:

The Detroit Police Officers Association joins the Detroit Police Lieutenants and Sergeants Association in its counterinterview on "Put Your Guns Away."

Police Commissioner Tannian made a plea to the people of Detroit to "please put your guns away."

Gun control is not the only answer to the problem of violence and crime. It is not even the best answer. If Detroit citizens really want to rid our streets of killers and gun toters, they must demand that the judges

in our courts do their job by putting the killers and gun toters where they belong—behind bars.

If criminals knew they would be punished, crime would decrease. In 1972, there were more than 16-hundred gun cases disposed of in the Detroit Recorder's Court. Of those cases, only 137 received any kind of jail sentence. Total non-convictions of gun cases over 1971 went up alarmingly.

We challenge the criminal courts to rid this city of crime and violence. We ought to rehabilitate criminals who commit acts of violence or who are prepared for such acts. But until we find a way, they should be kept out of society.

We must control the man who pulls the trigger before we can control the gun.

That's our Guest Viewpoint. I'm Joseph Clark.

This Guest Viewpoint is not necessarily the TV 2 Viewpoint. If you have an opinion to express, let us hear from you . . . by mail . . . or by phone during normal business hours.

HOW TO HANDLE BLACKMAIL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador George Kennan has crystallized the reaction of millions of Americans to the Arab oil boycott in an article in the Sunday, December 2, New York Times. He moves beyond simple outrage at this attempted blackmail into a superbly reasoned statement of what our reaction as a nation should be to this irresponsible policy.

AND THANK YOU VERY MUCH

(By George F. Kennan)

PRINCETON, N.J.—On Nov. 17, 1973, The New York Times carried a story, from a Washington correspondent, based largely on statements of the President, concerning speculation that the Arab oil embargo on shipments to this country might soon end—that the Arab governments, or at least certain of them, soon "relent" and resume the shipment of oil to this country.

The story contained no hint that in such a case the United States would not gratefully accept the renewed shipments; it seems, on the contrary, to have reflected an assumption on the part of various highly placed people that the United States would do just that.

This assumption causes me, as one who was once moderately involved in the planning of national policy, no small measure of amazement. I would have thought that if the events of recent weeks had taught us anything at all, it would have been the danger of allowing ourselves to remain unduly dependent upon foreign suppliers for raw materials vital to the continued prosperity of our society, especially when it is a case of suppliers who are obviously not inclined to acknowledge the responsibility they assume when they permit great industrial nations to become dependent upon them in this manner, and who feel they have no reason to respect our interests.

Particularly is this a lesson to be pondered when it relates to the Saudi Arabians. It is obvious that the government of that country already has far more foreign currency than it needs or could even use to any particularly good effect. This has two connotations that should concern us:

First, we should reflect whether we wish, on principle, to place more money in the

hands of people who are unlikely to use it to any good purpose.

Second, it means that the money with which we would be paying for further shipments of Saudi Arabian oil would be essentially valueless in their eyes. They could see these shipments, in the circumstances, only as a form of charity on their part, or as a means of assuring future arms shipments.

Either alternative is undesirable: the charity, because it represents a poor peg on which to hang the security of the supply of a commodity vital to the stability of a country's economic life; the assuring of arms shipments, because if the government we have to do with here does not hesitate to bring to us the sort of injury implicit in this abrupt withholding of oil shipments, what assurance can we have that arms placed in its hands would always be used for purposes any more compatible with our interests.

Today, of course, a further price is being asked of us: a political price; and the nature of it is such that we ought fervently to wish that we might not again be placed in a position where we are vulnerable to this sort of demand. In addition to its being a price that can be paid only at the expense of a third party—a situation undesirable on principle, regardless of the rights and wrongs of the matter, it is one that promises no secure return, for the payment of it would leave us no less helpless and vulnerable tomorrow than we are today. If it should be demonstrated that we could be successfully whipsawed by one such demand, we would be naive to suppose that we would not soon be faced with others.

The relatively minor adjustment we would be obliged to make in order to get along without Arab oil, or at least without the oil of those who have cut us off at the present juncture, should be seen only as a beginning on a much wider process of self-emancipation from dependence on foreign-controlled sources of energy which we ought anyway to be putting in hand, with vigor and determination, at this stage in our national life.

We can be grateful that we were kicked into such a beginning. If we quail at this minor inconvenience, it will be a bad omen for our prospects for coping with the larger problem, for it will mean that our addiction to the wastage of energy, particularly through the medium of the automobile, is so abject that we prefer to face the loss of a considerable portion of our independence of policy rather than make even a minor effort to overcome the addiction. This would represent a humiliation which earlier American statesmen would never have accepted, and for which future generations of Americans would be unlikely to forgive us.

These observations flow from no hostility toward the Arabs, nor are they meant as a commentary on the rights and wrongs of their conflict with the Israelis. One can understand that certain of them have their own problems and feel themselves the victims of a historical injustice, for the remedy of which all means are fair. But justice is not an invariable feature of international life, nor is it always easy to determine to everyone's satisfaction. And a relationship of one-sided dependence, which one of the parties has shown itself quite ready to exploit for ulterior political purposes, provides a poor foundation on which to build for the future.

There are times in international life, no less than in personal affairs, when it becomes possible to live satisfactorily with people only when one has demonstrated the capacity to live without them; and this would seem to be one of those times.

The day may well come—let us hope that it will—when we have been able to create, in one way or another, sufficient bargaining power to deal with our Arab friends once again on even terms and against a background of mutual respect. But this day, ob-

viously will not be soon in coming. Until it comes, let us treat them with courtesy and with no ill feeling; but if faced with offers to resume the sort of shipments of which we are now being so usefully (for us) deprived, let us thank them very much and tell them frankly that we have ways of assuring the continued functioning of our national economy that are less costly in terms of our international position, of the independence of our national policy, and of our own self-respect.

TOWN MEETING: ALIVE AND WELL IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported revenue sharing on grounds that it recognizes the fact that we do not have all the answers here in Washington.

Earlier this year, the Office of Revenue Sharing in the Treasury Department inadvertently lent strength to this position in a questionnaire sent out to determine how the funds were being spent. It demonstrated that Washington not only does not have all the right answers, but does not even have all the right questions.

A sampling of local officials received a six-page questionnaire with 18 questions, some of them more sections than questions, including:

As a result of General Revenue Sharing, has there been any change in the level of citizen participation in the budgeting process to date?

As a result of General Revenue Sharing, do you anticipate any change in the level of citizen participation in the budgeting process over the next few years?

If you anticipate an increase in citizen participation in the budgeting process as a result of General Revenue Sharing, which of the following might be involved?

Whereupon it lists a variety of interest groups.

One of these questionnaires went to the Town of Fitzwilliam, population 1,400, which has an annual budget of about \$450,000, including a \$340,000 contribution to the regional school district.

Selectman Howard C. Holman, in a response to Director Graham W. Watt of the Office of Revenue Sharing, succinctly illustrated the questionnaires conflict with the principles of revenue sharing:

It is our understanding that the original concept of Revenue Sharing was that local governmental units would be and are better able to determine how allocated funds are to be used. Part-time officials do not have the time to devote to questionnaires, small print rules, regulations and planned use reports that seem to be generated by the Revenue Sharing Act.

It is our opinion that, at least in New Hampshire, the local budgeting, appropriation and auditing procedures are adequate to ensure the prudent use of the funds.

I would put it this way: "Haven't you ever heard of the town meeting?" I am not qualified to give a definitive assessment of the survival of the traditional

town meeting elsewhere in New England, but I can tell you it is alive and well in New Hampshire. We may not call it citizen participation, but that is the game by any other name.

Citizens are fully informed of each budget item to be acted upon, and have an opportunity to debate the budget line by line, item by item. Just this year, a State attorney general's ruling held that even the matter of accepting Federal disaster relief must be subject to town meeting and those are 100 percent Federal funds, requiring no local expenditure.

THE DEATH AND LIFE OF A NOBLE PRIEST

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, while the storms of daily life rage about us unabated, there are those who continue the work of life quietly and constructively. They are the glue which holds society together. One such noble man graced my congressional district for many years in the form of Msgr. Vincent Genova. Recently he passed away, to the sorrow of thousands of Canarsie residents who knew, respected and cared for him very deeply.

Monsignor Genova was the man who provided spiritual leadership to his flock while vigorously promoting spiritual brotherhood and equality between the varied ethnic and religious groups composing the Canarsie area. For years he labored quietly, with determination and dedication, for these goals, advancing them by example to several generations of people.

I knew him as a man of the cloth, as a guide, as a friend, and as an outstanding citizen. Thousands of children gained a better understanding of this country and their faith because of him. Thousands of people in my area are closer to one another as a result of his life work.

He was a magnificent priest, who was able to be educator, administrator, and above all, religious leader to so many of us.

He was a noble man of the cloth, who practiced what he preached.

He was a dear friend who is already sorely missed by all of us.

May the Almighty grant rest to his soul.

The Requiem Mass for Monsignor Genova was held on November 24, at Holy Family Roman Catholic Church in Brooklyn, officiated by His Excellency Francis J. Mugavero, Bishop of Brooklyn. The eulogy was preached by Msgr. Francis B. Donnelly, of Our Lady of Angels Church in Brooklyn. At this point I insert that eloquent expression of affection and commemoration.

EULOGY

The Diocesan "green book" of *Priests and Parishes* gives only two lines to Monsignor Genova—Vincent O. Genova, M.A.—Italy 2/15/05, Sulpician Seminary, Washington 6/12/28, St. Joseph Patron—35, Holy Family,

Flatlands (now to be filled in 11/20/73). Oh yes, there are two asterisks too, to signify—Domestic Prelate of His Holiness. This is a very short biographical sketch for a priest ordained 45 years.

These, of course, are the skeleton facts, without the flesh and blood of daily life and the uplifting power of divine grace. There is a far greater ensemble of facts in the 45 years of Monsignor's priesthood. These can all be summed up as a fulfillment, I believe, of the assignment Our Lord gave to Peter, his chief priest in which every priest shares—"Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." This is what gave fullness and meaning to Monsignor's priestly life.

The first way he fulfilled his assignment was in being a "desk-priest". That often is belittled in the life of a priest, but Monsignor didn't sit at a desk; he worked at his desk. That was his base of operation. There he carefully planned and gave financial stability to Holy Family's new church, its new school, its new rectory, its new convent, as each of these was built, with the valued assistance of his dear friend, George Sole. There is where he planned so many parochial projects over 38 years. There he gave counsel and direction to parishioners and parish leaders, of whom he had so many; offered suggestions and the benefit of his experience and practical help to the pastors of Our Lady of Miracles, St. Jude, St. Lawrence, as these parishes were divided from his own. With pencil and paper, with erasures and corrections, he would methodically consider and analyze a decision that had to be made. This was the basis of so much of his success. He was painstaking in everything.

MONSIGNOR WAS A CHURCH PRIEST

The dignity and sanctity of the liturgy was his main concern. He had much to say to make this a warm, colorful church. He was very concerned to have inspiring church music. He was sensitive to, and at times critical of certain changes in the liturgy, but only because he saw the deeper need of a dignified and holy place of worship and liturgical celebration. However, he never resisted to the point of putting his judgment above that of his ecclesiastical superiors.

MONSIGNOR WAS A SCHOOL PRIEST

The children, Sisters, teachers who are in Holy Family School and those who have passed through it knew him because he was "present" in the School—he was part of its daily life. Here he demonstrated one of his great characteristics—his personal touch, his deep personal interest in each individual. The staff of the School and that of the rectory, who were with him through the years, always were aware of his warm, fatherly regard and love for them—Holy Family PTA was one of the first PTA's in our diocesan schools, but it was not merely for school business but was very effectively used for Catholic adult education, long before these words became bandied around almost as a slogan.

MONSIGNOR WAS A PRIEST'S PRIEST

He had a great capacity for abiding, thoughtful friendships—with close friends, with priests who studied or lived with him. His friendliness and warmth and hospitality for all priests were evident when you met him in a "smile" that was special. As a young priest he loved to bring priests together to play basketball; later it was for a few sets of tennis; and more recently, he loved to bring older and younger priests together for a soft-ball game and some pasta and wine. He constantly showed brotherliness for his brother-priests.

MONSIGNOR WAS A COMMUNITY PRIEST

Saying Monsignor Genova almost means saying Canarsie. He was a spiritual leader here for many years, and many times he brought together his ministers, rabbis and priests to work together. Often he took com-

munity leadership, not by confrontation (though he was capable of this, if it was needed) but as a motivator and by raising sights to important goals. Because he reflected and took advice and worked tirelessly, he knew how to put a project across. A recent instance was a very proper amendment of the State bingo law. I have said of him to others, and I said the same to him, he was quite an "operator", but never for himself. He was widely honored and praised—for example, a dinner in his honor is scheduled for December 8th—but he always took what was said and done gratefully and humbly.

MONSIGNOR WAS A CATHOLIC-JEWISH PRIEST

The word "priest" and the concept it represents came into the Christian religion out of its Hebrew tradition. Therefore the Jewish men and women here to honor Monsignor's memory will understand, and perhaps feel honored, if I say he was a Catholic-Jewish priest. Let me explain.

He had always maintained and sought to maintain excellent relations with the Jewish community in Canarsie. This was well-known in our Diocese. Hence, when Archbishop McEntegart was asked to send representatives to a B'nai B'rith meeting on the problem of anti-Semitism, Monsignor Genova was requested to go with Monsignor Divney, our Vicar-General. This meeting led to subsequent meetings, and finally to the formation of a Catholic-Jewish Committee, composed of rabbis and priests and Catholic and Jewish laymen in equal numbers, with a co-chairman on both sides. Monsignor was the first Catholic chairman.

This Committee engaged in a variety of programs on the basis of parity and reciprocity and was instrumental in developing an understanding and some degree of regular contact between these two religious communities. In time it became evident that agreed-on guidelines were needed for practical situations involving Catholic and Jewish people. As you might suspect, while there were consultation and contributions on all sides, it was the driving force and determination of Monsignor that brought this work to a happy conclusion. When they were completed, the guidelines were accepted and published in the name of Cardinal Cooke, Bishop Kellenberg of Rockville Center as well as Bishop Mugavero—and became a model for such guidelines throughout our country.

MONSIGNOR WAS ALSO A FAMILY PRIEST

His brothers and their families, and particularly his sister, her husband and their daughters and son were very much part of his life, and he of theirs. It seems there was always a marriage or a baptism by "Uncle Father" and, later, "Uncle Monsignor." His nieces and nephews were dear to him and he was happy as each made his or her own life. His family will miss him very much, but his memory should be an inspiration for them to live for God and others as he did.

In such practical, down-to-earth ways Monsignor Genova fed the lambs and the sheep Christ gave to him, and in this is an example particularly to his brother-priests.

The other day when I called up a priest who was a friend of Monsignor's and mine to tell of his death, the first words of the priest were, "He was a noble priest." I believe that is a proper epitaph—"he was a noble priest." May his soul rest in peace.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in honoring the memory

of an old friend, Tom Pelly. Tom represented Washington's First District for 20 years, and served his constituents well.

I first came to know Tom Pelly several years ago when I chaired special subcommittee hearings of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in Washington on the problems of Northwest fisheries. I worked closely with Tom on these hearings. I came to have a warm regard for him as a person and a special appreciation for his many and varied talents.

I am sure many of my colleagues also have special and personal memories of Tom Pelly—he was that kind of person.

Mrs. Hanna and I extend our sincere sympathy to the Pelly family. We will all miss Tom.

SHORTHAND REPORTERS' HEAD RAPS COURTROOM VIDEOTAPE EXPERIMENT

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have become accustomed, in the 20th century, to the increasingly important role which machines play in our lives, often to the point that we expect as much or more out of a machine as we do a person. In some cases, computers being the most notable, this confidence is well justified. In many others, however, machines must play a supporting role instead of being the stars. One example of this concerns the issue of courtroom reporters, many of whom presently use video and audio equipment to supplement their efforts, but who are now faced with a move to rely solely on these machines to the detriment of human reporters. The Chattanooga News-Free Press recently carried a very thorough and well-written article on this subject and I would like to commend it to my colleagues as follows:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Nov. 4, 1973]

SHORTHAND REPORTERS' HEAD RAPS COURTROOM VIDEOTAPE EXPERIMENT

(By George W. Brown)

Videotaping in the courtroom to replace the use of court reporters will be implemented in state court here on a trial basis soon, and Richard Smith, president of the National Shorthand Reporters Association, has leveled sharp criticism of the program, sponsored by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

"We do not consider this (use of audio and video recording) a threat to our profession but rather an unwarranted expenditure of the taxpayers' dollar that has acted as a deterrent to talented people entering the shorthand reporting profession . . .," he said. He indicated that his profession presently has a shortage of personnel.

The video tape program will be used in Judge Tillman Grant's criminal court beginning Jan. 1 and is scheduled for completion June 30. The LEAA is an arm of the U.S. Department of Justice, according to Mr. Smith, and he said thus far it has expended in excess of \$1 million for the program.

Mr. Smith attacked videotaping on grounds it is subject to the foibles of mechanical error and the fact that trials are a "one-time thing." He quoted the Federal

Judicial Center as having said in August, "While we appear to be dealing with a relatively simple configuration of equipment, keep in mind that there are at least 37 things that can go wrong during record or playback."

Additionally, he said, "Think of the failure of the Dean tapes by President Nixon on simple audio recording device."

He cited the case of the State of Ohio vs. Felton Lamar Lewis in which the only record provided to the defendant of the proceedings against him were "21-hour-long, unindexed tapes," in short; no typed transcription.

He said the memorandum from the case quoted the defense attorney as having said, "It takes approximately two hours to listen to each hour of tape. Counsel is forced to listen to all forms of irrelevant, minutiae-swearing in, waiting for witnesses, waiting while attorneys ponder their next question, etc. Briefly stated, it is impossible to properly review an audio record of a trial" (as extracted from a videotape).

Mr. Smith said that appellate courts will experience even more difficulty because "new equipment will have to be installed on the appellate level for each judge, to be available at all places where he studies the 'record.'" He said technicians will be necessary and delay problems may be compounded in appellate decisions.

He further asserted that during court proceedings if the video is subjected to replay, comments made at that time will not be recorded. He declared also that there may be no record of comments made by persons who might have their heads turned from microphones.

"Unless each juror is equipped with a microphone during the qualification of jurors by counsel their responses for the most part cannot be recorded," he said.

He further stated, "Tennessee law, and the law of many states, now makes the jury the exclusive judges of the facts and videotaping of trials is seen by many legal advocates as a step to take this important part of our Anglo-Saxon legal heritage away from juries and place (them) with appellate courts."

Taking a crack at the economic aspects, Mr. Smith said, "Video recording and processing the official record of trial proceedings is the most complex application of video technology, and entails the heaviest investment in equipment."

"The charge for tape alone in a day-long trial is \$161 and these tapes must be preserved for possible use in perjury proceedings, etc."

"Magnetic storage files are incredibly expensive. It is quite a different story trying to regulate the humidity, temperature and so forth so that the tapes will not deteriorate."

Mr. Smith, spokesman for the 6,500-shorthand-reporters' group, indicated that about 30 states are using the video method on a trial basis.

He voiced disapproval of the LEAA "Over \$1 million has been appropriated through the LEAA for audio and research in a program that was originally advocated as a vehicle to 'fight crime in the streets,' yet when we ask for funds to upgrade a proven and working program that is functioning in the daily trial arenas at all trial levels we are turned down."

Mr. Smith commented on speed of comprehension and said, "Law clerks and appellate judges looking at video have at best a reading speed or comprehension speed of 150 words a minute (counting delays in asking questions and witness answering) swearing in witnesses, while the same clerk or judge has a reading speed of approximately 600 words per minute."

Mr. Smith offered in evidence for support of his case statements by two legalists. One man is U.S. Court of Appeals Judge Joseph F. Weis Jr., who concluded: "Furthermore, I can tell you from the standpoint of the

appellate judge that I don't think that the videotape record of a trial is going to be an adequate substitute for the typewritten transcript which we must have for purposes of study and appeal."

The judge continued, "It would be a valuable exhibit certainly to get across the flavor of a particular witness's testimony, but for the judge to use it in his research and study would not be practical."

Another man who denigrated the use of mechanical recording procedures, was Stephen Goldspiel, staff director of the National Conference of State Trial Judges, who wrote to Mr. Smith: "Once again, man has been let down by the machine, for our tape recording of the joint meeting, from 9 a.m. to noon on Friday, Aug. 3, discussing the topic . . . turned out to be a blank."

Mr. Smith is in favor of video recording in some instances, namely the taking of legal depositions. He is the president of the Judicial Video Services, Inc. here.

He said, "We court reporters must be for modern technology and we are adapting to it where it contributes to the proper and efficient administration of justice, such as the use of video depositions for expert witnesses that are unable to be present at the time of trial."

Mr. Smith, no friend of blanket use of videotaping in the courtroom, points to other institutions affected by the mechanical recording apparatus.

He stated, "The United Nations has the ultimate in sound recording equipment at its command, yet the official record is made by a shorthand reporter, the Watergate hearings are televised with the most expensive and refined video equipment, yet the official record is made by the shorthand reporter."

EMERGENCY ENERGY LEGISLATION

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the National Emergency Energy Act as passed by the Senate stands as a direct threat to the legitimacy of the legislative branch to make the laws of this Nation.

It was my belief that the Bay of Tonkin resolution had enlightened Congress to the inherent dangers of emergency powers and to the realization that such powers are only palatable to our democratic system of Government when they are written by Congress and exercised by the Executive.

On November 19, the Senate of the United States indicated that it is again ready to abdicate its responsibility by transferring the legislative prerogative over to the Executive to meet the problems of governing during the energy shortage. This action is especially ironic since it comes at a time of general dysfunction within the Executive and a growing tendency of Congress to assert its constitutional mandate to make all laws.

In the National Emergency Energy Act, the Senate has declared a nationwide energy emergency and authorized the President to take certain temporary measures. With little or no definition, these measures include: Control of transportation; restriction of recreation; limits on commercial establishments and public services, including schools; the implementation of a rationing system;

lifting of environmental provisions; and the creation of a National Emergency Advisory Committee whose members are appointed by the President to advise him on the implementation of this act.

It is the duty of the Congress not to be vague in its work, but to be precise and to allocate power to the Executive responsibility. The language of the Senate bill, especially title II, is vague. And the burdening of the Executive with all substantive decisions during this emergency is irresponsible. The only safeguard which the Senate has given Congress in this piece of energy legislation is the power to disapprove by concurrent resolution, within 15 days. By an absence of action, we have, in essence, congressional approval. It is my hope that the House of Representatives will stop this legislation by omission and require that the Congress must approve every action which the President takes under the heading of emergency fuel shortage contingency programs. Such positive action could mirror the mechanism employed within the War Powers Act for prompt congressional action.

That the people are willing to make sacrifices during this emergency is self-evident—whether it be through lower speed limits or lower thermostats. But at the same time, the people have the right to voice their dissent against policies which they feel precipitate untold hardship or economic dislocation. Congress is the voice of the people. In response to the people, I will not be the one to say that I have no power to help, because I lent my signature to a blank check, deposited to the account of the White House.

There is no question that we need action, but not the abdication of our right to say yes or no.

ILL-ADVISED SUPREME COURT DECISION ENCOURAGES WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY, INCREASES COURT CONGESTION, AND KEEPS POLICE TOO BUSY TO FIGHT REAL CRIME

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Los Angeles television station KNBC broadcast the following editorial on November 21 of this year, and I believe it deserves the attention of the Congress.

EDITORIAL POSITION ON THE COST OF PROSECUTING OBSCENITY TRIALS

You'll get a different dollar amount quoted to you, depending on which source you ask, but there's not much doubt that we taxpayers are spending an awful lot of money trying to stamp out dirty pictures.

Here are some of the costs: Los Angeles County spent a quarter of a million dollars this summer trying to prove the movie "Deep Throat" violates community standards. That trial ended with a hung jury, so there'll be another trial in January. It won't be any cheaper.

There are now some 200 obscenity cases awaiting trial in the Los Angeles Municipal

courts, and each of those cases will cost some \$20,000 or so to try if they go that far.

And the courts are just one part of the costs. Policing is another, maybe smaller cost. But it's starting to look to us as if all the costs are too great because the laws we're trying to enforce are unclear and unsound to begin with.

They're unclear because they're based on what the Supreme Court says should be community standards, but no one can tell precisely what constitutes a community. It could be West Hollywood. Or it could be the West Coast. And who's to determine what those standards are, anyway? That whole idea is just too vague, in our view, to make good law.

And that brings up the other point. Should debatable moral questions be written into criminal laws. Granting that what is shown in cheap skin flicks like "Deep Throat" is a sin. Should that make it a crime for the rest of society to punish?

It's our view that showing dirty pictures is a crime only when they're forced on children or an unwilling public. That's where our laws and our law enforcement should end.

VETERANS' PENSIONS WILL BE PROTECTED

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my deep concern over the problem of social security increases causing reductions in veterans' pensions on many, many occasions during this Congress. On the first day of the 93d Congress I introduced H.R. 1305 and H.R. 1306 to protect veterans' pensions, and on June 12 I testified on behalf of these bills before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. On four separate occasions I have spoken on the floor of the House on this problem, most recently on November 15 while the House was debating passage of the social security benefits increase. At that time, I said:

A problem which is even more pressing to millions of Americans is the effect of next year's 11-percent increase on veterans' pensions. Once again the Congress is giving with one hand and taking away with the other hand. We have not even solved the problems caused by the last social security increases. H.R. 9474, a bill providing a 10-percent increase in veterans' pensions, is still bouncing back and forth between the House and Senate. The intent of this legislation was to restore the cuts caused by the last social security increase. With luck, it will receive final Presidential approval before Christmas. Yet veterans who are also dependent on social security payments will have a "breather" of just a few short months before they are once again penalized by a social security increase.

Mr. Speaker, since I made those remarks, the situation has changed for the better and the Congress has been given firm guarantees by the Veterans' Affairs Committee leadership and by the Veterans' Administration that veterans' pensions will not be reduced during 1974 and that remedial legislation will be placed before the Congress next year.

On November 14, the House repassed H.R. 9474, providing a 10-percent increase in veterans' pensions, but deleted a Senate amendment which would have

raised the allowable income limitations by \$400, thereby restoring those cuts from the pension rolls by the social security increase of last year. I supported the Senate amendment and was therefore most interested in the leadership's explanation of why it had been deleted. The Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Benefits, assured the House as follows:

In connection with retaining the present income limits, we were assured by the Veterans Administration that the bill would restore practically all of the reductions in pensions which occurred as a result of the social security increase last year.

Congressman TEAGUE added his promise that the committee would take up the problem again next year, and noted that the Veterans' Administration would not be able to reduce pensions because of the impending social security increase because its end-of-year income questionnaires had already been distributed.

On November 16, the Senate also re-passed H.R. 9474, thus clearing it for the President's signature. At that time, Senator VANCE HARTKE, chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee pointed out "House, Senate, and administration commitments to general pension reform legislation in 1974." He also commented on the possible effects of the pending social security increases and reiterated Congressman TEAGUE's interpretation of the law.

The Senate Committee strongly believes that there should be no departure from the traditional interpretation of the end-of-the-year rule. . . . Any departure from the standard interpretation would also seriously undermine assurances made on the floor of the House and Senate during consideration of social security increases in July. It was our understanding then as it is now that any social security increases effective next year will not affect the amount of pension that a veteran or his survivor received during the 1974 calendar year.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that Senator HARTKE repeated his guarantee of protection during the Senate's consideration of the social security increase legislation yesterday. He stated flatly that "no veteran's pension will be affected by this social security increase next year," and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an official memorandum from the Veterans' Administration. This memorandum stated, in part:

We find no legal basis for adjusting the pension rate in 1974 based upon increased social security payments expected later that year.

In summary, those of us who are deeply concerned about protecting veterans' pensions have received a guarantee from the VA and from the Veterans' Committee leadership that no pensions will be cut because of social security increases in 1974 and that corrective legislation will be reported to the House and Senate for consideration before the end of the 93d Congress. As one who has worked long and hard for this goal, I am happy to see the interests of our veterans and their survivors being protected in this instance.

IMPEACHING POLITICS PAST

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday's Washington Post there is an article by William Greider. Mr. Greider is a member of the national staff of the paper. I have known him for several years and know him to be a man of fairness and honesty. In his article he sets forth evidence that wheeling and dealing has occurred in each Presidential election over a long period of years. I feel that at this time it is appropriate to submit the article for the perusal of the Members:

IMPEACHING POLITICS PAST

(By William Greider)

Impeachment has a sticking point for the politicians of Washington, an unspoken impediment which helps explain why senators and congress of both parties are so reluctant to become judges and jurors over Mr. Nixon's scandals.

It is the silver of official hypocrisy which lies concealed behind the public tempest. They know—the politicians—that the Nixon offenses which have so shocked the public's sense of constitutional government are not exactly unfamiliar to this town. Many of them have happened before, before Nixon, before Haldeman and Ehrlichman.

By comparison, the past instances seem pale and innocent. But the excesses of this particular President—the arrogant use of governmental power, the political spying, the cozy special-interest dealings—are not new sins.

Thus, if Congress renders a judgment on the individual guilt of Mr. Nixon, it must also to some extent impeach unpunished activities of others who came before him. If Congress defines the "high crimes and misdemeanors" committed by this chief executive, it will also be defining what is intolerable for congressmen and senators.

While the men and women in Congress do not talk about this much, the public has an interest in confronting the point directly. If the public outrage over Mr. Nixon is to be honest, it must measure the Watergate crimes in terms of their past. In that sense, the public's interest is distinct from the interests of the politicians on both sides—perhaps even hostile to them.

For the public, the bundle of offenses gathered under the dirty cloud called Watergate confronts the national government with questions it can no longer duck—a chance to halt an erosion of constitutional rights which has proceeded unsensationally for years, an opportunity to bridle the crude excesses of White House power.

But from the public's standpoint, the impeachment question could also evolve into a dreadful precedent—one which effectively obliterates those constitutional safeguards that the politicians cherish in their speeches, if not always in their deeds. If Congress is allowed to walk away from this decisive moment, doesn't Watergate then become a reverse milestone—a laundry list of all the things which future Presidents can safely get away with?

19 ACCUSATIONS

The bill of particulars issued by the AFL-CIO gives a measure of the problem. George Meany's campaign for impeachment lists 19 accusations, some of which are redundant and some too vaguely worded to qualify as crimes.

"He has caused an erosion of public confidence in our democratic system of government." Even Nixon friends might agree on the accuracy of this complaint, but surely it is not a high crime in a politician. If it is, a lot of congressmen are in big trouble.

Or, "He has consistently lied to the American people." The numerous Nixon untruths are on the record, perhaps headed by his speech defending the invasion of Cambodia in 1970, when he artfully failed to reveal that U.S. warplanes were already bombing that neutral country in a war known to the enemy but not to the American people. Lying in high office, especially the profligate lying of Watergate, makes ordinary citizens mad as hell. But politicians, including Democratic politicians, may be more inclined to put the deceit "in perspective," as a White House spokesman might say.

It is, after all, a bipartisan failing. In this century, American Presidents from Woodrow Wilson to FDR to Lyndon Johnson (all Democrats) have lied to the people on the most important subject—war and peace. Indeed, if mendacity becomes an impeachable offense, we may wind up with a revolving-door presidency (not to mention a lot of turnover in Congress, the statehouses and city halls, where truth also has been known to perish).

BEGUN BY DEMOCRATS

Still as a whole, the AFL-CIO list represents at reasonable summary of the charges against the President. The accusations could be grouped into four categories: secret wire-tapping and other invasions of civil liberties; secret special-interest dealings; obstruction of justice in both the Watergate and the Ellsberg cases, and finally general negligence of presidential responsibility.

The AFL-CIO states the first charge this way: "He instituted in the name of national security a plan which violated civil liberties through domestic political surveillance, espionage, wire-tapping, burglary, eavesdropping, opening of mail and military spying on civilians."

On down the list, the labor handbill adds other elements to support the same charge—intimidation of the press, the secret tapes of presidential conversations, a secret police force in the White House, the use of government agencies against "political enemies."

For starters, one problem with the AFL-CIO complaint is that the "military spying" which it mentions was a Democratic scheme. If it was an impeachable offense, the charge should have been brought against Lyndon Johnson. Robert McNamara was secretary of defense when the Army intelligence units were unleashed to spy on civilians. That action, of course, was taken in secret, and the rationale naturally was "national security."

In one form or another, domestic political surveillance has been going on for years, usually under the same justification. Robert F. Kennedy was attorney general when the FBI launched its electronics surveillance against Martin Luther King. Just as the Nixon White House tried to leak dirt against its enemies, J. Edgar Hoover tried to peddle to newspapers the dirty stories about the nation's leading civil rights advocate.

Ramsey Clark was attorney general when the domestic spying was escalated to an enormous surveillance operation, aimed at black community leaders, antiwar activists, New Left radicals—anyone the Johnson administration regarded as a threat to "national security." We still do not know the full story about this period, but it's clear from the fragmentary record that thousands of informers were recruited in black neighborhoods, phones were tapped, mail and bank accounts were inspected, community organizations infiltrated, campus groups watched.

When these activities were exposed in the

"Media papers" stolen from FBI files, neither Republicans nor Democrats were eager to investigate the implications—not even Sen. Sam J. Ervin, whose Judiciary subcommittee on constitutional rights was alarmed by Army spying but not by FBI spying.

NO MONOPOLY ON PARANOIA

The AFL-CIO accuses: "He created a special and personal secret police, answerable only to the White House, to operate totally outside the constraints of law."

The "plumbers" group which Mr. Nixon established was, indeed, a presidential first; as far as we know, none of his predecessors attached a burglary squad to the White House staff. The Army spying which the Democrats started probably comes closest. It was clandestine and extra-legal, and it sprawled aimlessly across the society, even hounding some liberal congressmen.

On the other hand, we do know that breaking-and-entering—without the benefit of a search warrant—was regarded as a legitimate investigative tool by the FBI at home and the CIA abroad long before Gordon Liddy went on the White House payroll.

The precise nature of political investigations aimed at Sen. Barry Goldwater when he was the GOP candidate in 1964 is not known, and it's probably too late in history to find out. The Arizona Republican has complained that Democrats dug around in his past, searching for dirt, and the political gossip confirms that. For that matter, LBJ was convinced that the Republicans were spying on his staff and, in a fitful moment he promised retribution after the election. It is not known however, whether illegal tactics were used by either side.

A great deal has been made of White House paranoia as the motivation for these violations of constitutional rights. So perhaps it is worth remembering that Lyndon Johnson suffered from the same fears. At one point, LBJ was so irritated by antiwar demonstrators outside his window that his Secret Service proposed a "buffer zone" around the White House to prohibit political demonstrations in the neighborhood. Instead, compromise regulations were imposed to severely limit the size of demonstrations outside the White House, controls which a federal court later found to be unnecessarily stringent.

The AFL-CIO also charges: "He and his subordinates sought to use the power of the White House, the Justice Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the Securities and Exchange Commission and other government agencies to punish a list of political enemies."

As it happens, that is approximately what the steel company executives said about John F. Kennedy when he blitzed them with the threat and substance of government action in the steel-price controversy of 1962. Later, Kennedy joked about tapping their phones and turning the IRS on them—only a joke apparently. But Kennedy did mobilize a bristling show of strength, including an instant investigation by the Justice Department and the famous middle-of-the-night calls by FBI agents.

JFK was widely praised for staring down the corporate titans, but the Republican congressional leadership viewed the episode as "a display of naked political power never seen before in this nation. . . . We have passed within the shadow of police-state methods."

The charges of special-interest dealing—illegal corporate campaign donations, the ITT antitrust settlement, the milk money—strike at the heart of the democratic credo. If government serves all equally and favors none, then it is surely a high crime to manipulate important policy decisions in exchange for generous campaign contributions.

CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS

The AFL-CIO charges: "Officials of his campaign committee and his personal attor-

ney extorted illegal campaign contributions from corporations which were dependent on maintaining the good will of the government."

In the broad sense, that challenges the past of both parties, nearly all presidential candidates, senators and congressmen. By loophole or evasion, the usual fund-raising practices do not constitute illegal extortion, but the distinctions which make them lawful are lost on a great many citizens. The public sees both parties sucking up corporate money (and union money, for that matter). In exchange for generous contributions, the donors receive special consideration when they seek self-interest legislation or policy changes.

Lyndon Johnson invented the President's Club, a device to shower special attention on the biggest contributors. It was the Democratic Party which dreamed up expensive ads in convention programs as a way to milk money from big defense contractors (the Democrats then secured an IRS ruling that the cash was tax-deductible as a legitimate business expense).

When the ITT scandal first surfaced, it was only mildly embarrassing to Sen. Edmund Muskie, the Democratic presidential candidate, that one of the central players—ITT director Felix Rohatyn—was also serving on Muskie's campaign finance committee.

In money politics, the players sometimes get mixed up that way. Milton P. Semer, who was chairman of Muskie's election committee in 1972, was the man who delivered \$100,000 in milk money to Herbert Kalmbach, the Nixon lawyer, in 1969. And, as the President himself pointed out recently, the dairy lobbyists found other friends in Washington besides the White House when they were pushing for increased price supports on milk in 1971.

The scores of Democrats who bombarded the Agriculture Department on the milk issue were presumably representing their constituents, the dairy farmers of America. Or were they smuggling up to a lobby which hands out lots of money to both parties at election time? Nobody has said much about why the dairymen gave \$51,600 to the weakling presidential campaign of Rep. Wilbur Mills, who writes the tax laws as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. Or why the milk lobbyists gave \$6,100 to Sen. Hubert Humphrey, especially the \$5,000 to help pay off his campaign debts after he lost the Democratic nomination.

"There is no better food, no more wholesome food, no more nutritious food than milk or dairy products," Humphrey told the Senate when he urged that the milk price supports be jacked up even higher than Mr. Nixon's level.

The dairymen also gave \$15,000 to Sen. Walter Huddleston (D-Ky.) and \$7,500 to Sen. Richard Clark (D-Iowa) after they were elected. Both freshmen serve on the Senate Agriculture Committee, where the dairy cooperatives were pushing legislation. They even gave \$2,500 to Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kan.), who is not up for reelection until next year—but who also serves on the Agriculture Committee.

"I wouldn't give a damn if they didn't give a dime," Sen. Humphrey once explained to a reporter, "I'd still work for the Minnesota dairy farmer." That is probably how most would explain it, including the President.

The point is not that these contributions were bribes, but that the shadowy areas of *quid pro quo* and special-interest favoritism are hardly unique. They lurk behind most big issues in Congress as well as in the executive branch. It has been, and is, the way of Washington. One could make the same point by matching AFL-CIO campaign contributions against the roll calls on crucial labor legislation.

BACKROOM CONTACTS

Back-channel dealing did not begin with the ITT case either. The settlement of that giant conglomerate's antitrust problems involved an extraordinary series of private consultations between ITT men and the White House, the Attorney General and his deputies, with the as yet unproved inference that the GOP settled in exchange for a \$400,000 donation.

In the early 1960s, when the du Ponts of Delaware had a billion-dollar tax problem, they hired Clark Clifford to guide their argument through the inner chambers of the executive branch. Ordered to divest its General Motors stock because of antitrust implications, the family faced a tax liability of more than \$1 billion unless Congress passed extraordinary legislation of forgiveness. Congress, as usual, was willing, but would the Kennedy administration go along?

Clifford, who was advising President Kennedy on foreign intelligence matters then, arranged some appointments for the folks from Wilmington—private audiences with the Treasury secretary, the attorney general, the deputy attorney general, the assistant attorney general for antitrust, and the general counsel of the Treasury.

The arguments were apparently persuasive, because the administration retreated to a position of neutrality. The Justice Department originally had opposed any special tax consideration for antitrust violators, but the Treasury conveyed to Congress that the administration would leave it to the lawmakers. They promptly passed a law cutting the potential tax liability by approximately \$650 million.

Two years later, when Johnson was President and Clark Clifford was his close adviser, the du Pont tax matter came up again and Clifford helped negotiate a favorable interpretation at Treasury of the 1962 settlement—one that saved his clients about \$56 million in taxes.

One accusation which the AFL-CIO handbill doesn't mention is the mysterious \$100,000 from Howard Hughes, supposedly a campaign contribution but for some reason delivered to the President's close friend, Florida businessman Bebe Rebozo. Of course, the same Hughes delivery man also took \$50,000 in cash personally to Vice President Hubert Humphrey for his 1968 campaign.

OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

The charges of obstruction of justice are virtually unique to the Nixon White House. Nothing in previous administrations comes close to the wholesale cover-up activities—going to the paper shredder with incriminating evidence, persuading key witnesses to perjure themselves, blocking FBI agents from pursuing leads. The episodes surrounding Watergate and the Ellsberg cases probably provide the strongest criminal case against the administration, though it is still disputed whether the evidence directly implicates the President.

In the Ellsberg matter, Mr. Nixon is accused of directly trying to influence the outcome, first by suppressing evidence of the "plumbers" burglary, then by having the FBI director's job discussed with the trial judge in the middle of the trial.

Backroom contact with judges is usually considered unethical. LBJ did it with his old friend, Abe Fortas, though not on pending cases. When Fortas was on the Supreme Court, he also sat in on President Johnson's war councils, developing Vietnam strategy, even though the Supreme Court ultimately would be faced with crucial war-related issues—the free-speech rights of antiwar activists, the constitutional limits on presidential war-making. When the Senate failed to confirm Fortas as chief justice, that private dealing with the White House was part of the case against him.

When the Bobby Baker case surfaced, Pres-

ident Johnson did not block the prosecution of his former Senate aide, accused of influence peddling. However, people high in the Johnson administration did try to sidetrack at least part of the case against Baker in the pre-trial stages.

A memorandum, purportedly signed by B. W. Fridge, special assistant to the secretary of the Air Force, was leaked to the press, intended to discredit Don Reynolds, one of the key witnesses against Baker. The memo revealed derogatory information from Reynolds' service record. The New York Times reported that White House aides approached at least two publishers, attempting to have them kill or alter articles based on the Reynolds testimony.

White House attempts to use the CIA in the Watergate cover-up are also part of the case against Mr. Nixon. Nothing quite like that exists in the past, but the CIA was heavily implicated in domestic affairs long before now.

Under Eisenhower and Kennedy, the CIA pumped millions of dollars into domestic institutions which supposedly were independent—labor unions, foundations, magazines, everything from the National Student Association to the American Newspaper Guild. The CIA money was funneled to them in secret; the rationale was, as usual, national security.

That brings us to the last charge—the negligence of presidential responsibility—which, in effect, sums up all of the Watergate crimes which happened right around Mr. Nixon and holds him responsible for them. As President, he promised to uphold the laws and the Constitution, and it is for congressmen and senators to decide where his failure to do so is of such a magnitude that he ought to be removed.

James Madison made the point of presidential responsibility in 1789 when he argued that the chief executive must retain control over the removal of officers he has appointed. "It will make him, in a peculiar manner, responsible for their conduct and subject him to impeachment himself," Madison declared, "if he suffers them to perpetrate with impunity high crimes or misdemeanors against the United States, or neglects to superintend their conduct, so as to check their excesses."

A LINE IN THE DUST

The past excesses of presidential power, the antecedent scandals of spying and manipulation and evasions, of course, do not make the present ones more acceptable. The President could build his defense around them, if he ever comes to trial in the Senate, but a public already shocked by his stewardship is not likely to find that approach very appealing.

What the public has to understand is that if it asks Congress to impeach and try Mr. Nixon, it is really asking for much more than that. Impeachment on these offenses implicitly requires Democrats and Republicans alike to rethink a lot of recent history, a great many examples of excessive governmental power, and to render judgment not just on Mr. Nixon, but on the political past.

That could produce a new and higher standard. It could distill a more cautious definition of presidential power, of the meaning of "national security," and of the sanctity of the Constitution. To draw a line around those offenses and declare that they are forbidden, Congress must tacitly acknowledge that electronic spying, excessive presidential secrecy and power, abuses of special-interest dealing—that all these are maladies of this era, not just of this President.

Impeachment would be a line drawn in the dust, and explicit halt to the drift toward presidential supremacy, set above the Congress and above the law. The act of indictment would specify the forbidden activities for all time.

If Congress chooses not to face that painful therapy, the consequences are fairly clear. In the ways of Washington, the past slides

easily into precedent. The noisy controversy fades and future history asks merely: What happened? What happened when all of these presidential offenses were revealed to Congress? If the answer is nothing, that is what will shape the precedent.

Just as the Nixon White House looks back on the unpunished excesses of recent history to justify its own abuses, future Presidents would be able to look upon Watergate as their license, not their proscriptor.

LATVIA INDEPENDENCE

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, Latvian people throughout the world commemorated the 55th anniversary of the proclamation of their independence. Unfortunately, this commemoration was not jubilant, for Latvia is no longer free.

As we all know, Latvia was one of the three Baltic States which was forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940. Since that time, the citizens of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have been oppressed. Despite this subjugation, their love of liberty and quest for freedom has not diminished.

We in the United States tend to forget the value of freedom and self-determination. In fact, to many of us, the concept of oppression is extremely vague. We have never faced persecution; we do not understand what it is like to be denied certain inalienable rights—rights which we all take for granted.

Yet, when we hear about the hardships borne by Latvian people, our hearts go out to them and we are saddened by the sorry state of their existence. At the same time, however, we are somehow awed by their inner strength—a strength which has kept the spirit of liberty and independence alive throughout the long years of captivity.

We can only hope that as the great powers continue their search for true cooperation and détente throughout the world, the people of Latvia and her sister nations will not be forgotten. We hope that they will, once again as a free nation, commemorate the anniversary of their independence. Until then, we will continue to extend to them our sympathy for their plight and our encouragement for their valiant efforts to attain true liberty. The courage and determination of the Latvians is indeed commendable, for it clearly exemplifies the importance of freedom. It makes us better understand what our own War of Independence was all about.

THE BLACK VOTE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the turbulent sixties, the

black vote has emerged as a potent and effective means of achieving political power for the black community. The black vote has been used to elect officials who will serve their interests and not ignore them. The black vote has helped give us a Supreme Court Justice, a Senator, 16 Congressmen, and many other elected and appointed officials.

Recently, however, black voting participation has decreased, especially in this year's elections. Roy Wilkins, in his syndicated column, addressed this problem and what it means for black people. I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD hoping that this decrease in voting participation by blacks is not the beginning of a downward trend:

[From the New York Post, Nov. 17, 1973]

THE BLACK VOTE (By Roy Wilkins)

Just as it appeared that the Negro minority had made some additional breakthroughs in the elections, census figures tell us that the Negro American total vote has declined about 5.5 per cent from the total registered in the Presidential election of 1972.

The black population was ready to celebrate new black mayors in Detroit, Mich., the nation's fifth largest city, and in Raleigh, N.C., an important Southern metropolis, when the census revealed that the Negro totals has declined at a greater rate than those of the whites.

As has been the case for many elections voters showed up badly, with only 63 per cent of those of voting age actually voting in 1972. That came to 85,766,000 votes. These included 7,032,000 black votes and 2,103,000 whose background was Hispanic.

In those with less than an eighth grade education, blacks and whites came out about equal. Thus it cannot be said that less educated blacks forced their ballot box choices on the whites.

But the black total was about 386,700 less than it was in 1972. Of course, some of the drop should have been expected because fewer people vote in an off-year election. But the decline among blacks was greater than that among whites. There were other factors such as lack of interest in local issues or personalities.

However, black citizens were on their way up, politically. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, which provided for the sending of federal registrars into counties where there has been no attempt to register Negroes since Reconstruction, spurred the black population to new activity. The census figures show that only Southern Negroes held or increased their voting.

A discouragement to Negro voting gained a small following several years ago when the prophets of "no progress for blacks under the American system" went about preaching largely to younger blacks and to various disappointed ones.

Now, however, is no time to spread hopelessness. A black mayor has been elected in Raleigh where only about 30 per cent of the population is black.

Thomas Bradley is mayor of Los Angeles, where the black population is about 20 per cent. Maynard Jackson is mayor in Atlanta and a black mayor has been chosen in Detroit. Both candidates in Detroit played down the race issue and emphasized the problems facing the city as a whole.

Every election of a member of a minority as mayor of an American city is important. A non-white mayor of San Jose, said to be by its boosters the fastest growing city in California, is in a challenging spot.

The election of a black man is doubly important especially where black voters are a minority that never could elect a candidate by themselves (even if every black vote were

cast and counted). This is why the Los Angeles and Raleigh votes are significant.

There may be, among the 87 black mayors, others where Negroes are in the minority. But the record was handed down by Sen. Brooke of Massachusetts where only 3 per cent of the population is black. It means that the American electoral process is working out.

Negro Americans are beset by many troubles, some of their own making, but mostly those visited unfairly upon them. They can fight their way up and rise in the esteem of their fellow citizens by the caliber of the men they put forward for public office.

The pace is slow by impatient standards, but swift as time goes. The system will work for those who take the trouble to study it, prepare themselves and make it work.

RUSH TO THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a rush is on to see who can help the Soviets the most. Neither our Government nor many in the business community seem to be hesitant when it comes to building the Soviet Union. I have been pointing out the direct links between the buildup of Soviet industry and the buildup of the Soviet military machine.

Unfortunately, these warnings seem to have fallen on deaf ears in the executive branch of the Government. The American people showed their disapproval of the Soviet wheat deal in letters to congressional offices and a number of other ways. Once the full impact of present moves in Soviet "trade" are felt, I do not doubt that there will be an even larger public outcry.

It seems that each week the newspapers contain more articles on expanded dealings with the Soviet Union. Two recent deals are reported below in stories from the Washington Star-News of November 26, 1973, and from the Daily News Record of the same date. The Star-News article details the building of a plant manufacturing a chemical which is one of the building blocks of the petrochemical industry. The texts of the articles follow:

[From the Washington Star-News, Dec. 3, 1973]

U.S. FIRMS TO DELIVER FACTORY TO UKRAINE

St. Louis, Mo.—Monsanto Co. of St. Louis and a New Jersey firm signed a \$45 million agreement with the Soviet Union on Friday for the design and the technology of a chemical plant in the U.S.S.R.

The \$45 million covers the licensing fee for the technological rights from Monsanto and the cost of design and planning. Construction will be handled by Soviet construction ministries.

Spokesmen for Monsanto and the Lummus Co. of Bloomfield, N.J., said the deal was the first between the United States and Russia to involve a completely equipped production plant. Previous deals were for separate pieces of equipment only.

The deal was concluded with Technomashimport, the Soviet agency responsible for importing technological processes.

Under the agreement, the Soviet Union will provide a 10 percent down payment and the rest will be financed in the United States.

Spokesmen for the two American firms said the financial arrangements have not been completed.

However, they said the Export-Import Bank was expected to extend its "standard" terms which would range from eight to 15 years.

The two firms will design and deliver an acetic acid plant to be erected in the Ukrainian city of Sverdlovsk. The plant will produce 150,000 tons of acetic acid annually by 1978. Spokesmen explained that the chemical is a major "building block" of the petrochemical industry.

The acetic acid production process was developed recently by Monsanto and is used at the firm's Texas City, Tex., plant. Soviet engineers will be trained there before the Sverdlovsk factory begins production.

[From the Daily News Record, Nov. 26, 1973]

TWO U.S. FIRMS PLAN PLANT FOR RUSSIA

(By Matthew Kasten)

NEW YORK.—Willcox & Gibbs, Inc., and an unnamed American producer of men's and women's outerwear are planning to jointly build a turnkey manufacturing plant in Russia.

The plans are a result of a 14-day U.S. Apparel Trade Mission visit in October to Belgrade, Budapest, Prague and Moscow.

Alfred O. P. Leubert, president and Chief executive officer of Willcox & Gibbs, in revealing the plans, said his firm and the outerwear producer, which he declined to identify, "see eye-to-eye" on the project. Leubert plans to visit Russia again in about five months in line with the turnkey project.

"It's a market we can't say no to. The Russians are keenly interested in turnkey programs. It's the big market for sales of sewing machinery," he emphasized.

The other countries the group visited are more interested in exporting apparel products. The Russians are not producing enough apparel items for home consumption, he said.

The mission was organized by the American Apparel Manufacturers Association and sponsored by the U.S. Department of Commerce. It was said to be the first major U.S. trade mission in consumer goods to the USSR and the other Eastern European countries.

Leubert said he feels Russian consumers are putting pressure on the government to make more merchandise available and to put more styling into apparel.

"One of the Russian ministers asked one of the American mission members why it was necessary for his shirt to have a stripe pattern," Leubert related. Before the American could answer, Leubert said, "the female Russian interpreter asked the minister why the fashion stripe should not be there."

There is a very limited amount of apparel styling in Russia, although some young women were seen with fashionable hair styles. Apparel plants operate under a five-year plan in Russia and manufacture a quantity of a product which must be almost completely sold out at the retail level before it goes into production again, Leubert explained. In addition, the quality of the merchandise is poor and there appears to be no quality control at the plants.

Also, the prices are very high. There is no relationship between production and cost and retail price. "We saw Yugoslavian-made apparel priced way out of line," Leubert said.

The mission wasn't permitted to visit a Russian apparel plant, but it is believed the plants do have good equipment. The problem there, as in plants the mission visited in Yugoslavia and Hungary, is that there is no knowhow, initiative, planning or utilization of equipment to the fullest capacity.

The U.S. mission saw no automated sewing equipment at sites it visited and believes there are none in any of the Russian plants.

"There is no labor shortage in Russia," Leubert said, "consequently there is no need

for any of the sophisticated devices or equipment available from Western countries. That includes such items as automatic needle positioners, automatic thread cutting and fabric transport systems.

"In addition the work pace at the plants in those four countries is considerably slower than in the U.S. In Yugoslavia, productivity is about 50 per cent of what it is in the U.S., and in Hungary it is about 60 per cent. In Russia, it takes up to six hours to make an outerwear garment that takes about 1½ hours to make in the United States."

The Russians, it is believed, make some of their own sewing room equipment and buy some from East Germany.

The plant the mission visited in Yugoslavia had 5,000 employees and fairly recent Italian-made machinery, some German-made and a few Japanese. But work handling methods and the pace of operation weren't up to U.S. standards.

The country is seen as a very good market for sewing machine sales.

Garments are being made for export to Western Europe and to major department stores throughout the U.S., he said.

This one plant made a wide variety of products—suits, slacks, sport coats, rainwear, and heavy outerwear. It is Government owned on a co-operative employee basis. Private enterprise is permitted where a plant has 25-30 employees.

In Hungary, the picture was not too dissimilar from Yugoslavia's. Equipment wasn't the latest available and material handling and quality control problems were evident. The plant did only cut-and-trim work, and, as in Yugoslavia, pay was very low. Garments were being made for export to East and West European countries.

Leubert noted that there were some U.S. joint ventures in Yugoslavia, but that none is permitted in Hungary at this time although applications for them are being taken. Leubert said he sees Hungary ripe for a joint venture involving its Sunbrand operation.

The trade mission found Czechoslovakia to be in a highly depressed state because of its political situation.

Styling was missing on the clothing items seen at Czech stores and Hungary retailers showed more fashion-oriented items than those in the other three countries, he said.

Although the group couldn't visit a garment producing facility, it was told machinery used is made in Italy and in East and West Germany.

Willcox & Gibbs, Leubert said, was able to arrange for a sales representative in Czechoslovakia.

U.S. production know-how far exceeds that found in the four countries toured and has become an even more important factor in recent years as the labor shortage—skilled and unskilled—continues to worsen.

EARLE CABELL FEDERAL BUILDING

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House today joined the other body in unanimously approving a bill to name the Federal Building in Dallas, Tex., the "Earle Cabell Federal Building."

As a civic leader, mayor and Congressman, Earle Cabell worked tirelessly in responding to the needs and wishes of the people of Dallas, Tex., and the Nation. His entire career was directed toward more efficient government administra-

tion, and he can be very proud of his many years of public service.

I have talked to Congressman Cabell today and would like to assure the Members of the House of his appreciation. This legislation is a very appropriate tribute to a great Dallas leader, and I know I join all of my colleagues here today in wishing Congressman Cabell a long and prosperous life.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the energy problem is, at the present, the item of greatest concern to many Americans. The debate over what should have been done in the past to avert this problem will continue to rage; but we must take a good hard look at the realities of the situation.

The political use of the oil by the Arab States is obvious. The subject is very properly addressed in this morning's Chicago Tribune in an editorial which follows:

GIVE SHALE OIL A TRY . . . OR ELSE!

Secretary of the Interior Morton's decision to make some federal land available to oil companies for the experimental production of shale oil has raised such a hullabaloo that a couple of significant points have been drowned out.

First, the amount of land involved is only about 50 square miles, or about one-fifth the size of the city of Chicago, and it is scattered in six tracts in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah. Second, the purpose is simply to give the companies a chance to determine whether the commercial production of shale oil is feasible and what effect it would have on the landscape. The government will sell leases on the land beginning next month.

Of course it may be argued that 50 square miles is a foot in the door, and that it will soon become 500 and then 5,000. But this argument depends on the assumption that oil production will destroy the land, making it permanently useless for agriculture, recreation, or the support of wild life.

This is still just an assumption, and a major purpose of the planned experiments is to find out whether it is true. Four of the six prototype plants will process the shale on the surface, heating it to about 900 degrees Fahrenheit and thus "melting" out the oil. This will probably denude the land, much like the stripmining of coal; but with coal, we have begun to learn that the land can be rehabilitated, though it is costly. In determining the commercial feasibility of producing shale oil, the cost of restoring the land certainly should be taken into account.

The two experimental plants in Utah will try to heat the shale underground and pipe the oil to the surface. If this works, there is no reason it should clutter up the landscape much more than an oil well does now.

What we know right now, without any experimenting at all, is that until other sources of adequate power are available—and this may take 15 or 20 years—we are going to be hard up for fuel. The tighter the pinch, the more dependent we shall be on imports.

Mr. Morton estimates that there is enough oil in the shale and to supply us, at the present rate of consumption, for 100 years. Maybe we won't need it all; but whatever the future holds, it would be silly to let all this

oil just sit there without even finding out what would be involved in extracting it.

What if we don't develop new sources of oil in the next few years? One thing that would happen is that we would forfeit one of the greatest advantages this country has had over the years. We have never been utterly dependent on imports for any of the raw materials essential to our way of life. In our relations with foreign countries, therefore, we could act on the basis of reason, not of dire necessity.

In the last few days, the Arab countries have shown how an oil embargo can make a country's policies wither and bring foreign ministers crawling for forgiveness. Fortunately the embargo has not affected us as much as it has affected Western Europe and Japan; to us it is still more of an inconvenience than a disaster. Nor do we have much right to complain. This isn't blackmail, as some charge; it is a historically accepted form of economic pressure against countries regarded by the Arabs as friendly to their enemy.

But the line between economic pressure and blackmail is a fuzzy one; and the decision of the Arabs to extend the total embargo on oil to South Africa, Rhodesia, and Portugal cannot be explained on the basis of national security. It is purely a political maneuver designed to bring black Africa into the Arab camp and to divert attention from the conflict which so often develops between Arabs and Africans, as in the Sudan.

In short, the Arabs have learned the power of oil as a political weapon. They are going to use it whenever they can agree with one another on what to use it for. And they will very likely find reasons to use it against us even when and if the dispute with Israel is settled. Our goal now, as Mr. Nixon says, should be to make ourselves self-sufficient in energy.

THE ENERGY CRISIS AND THE NATION'S WATER RESOURCES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Orin E. Atkins, chairman of the board of directors of Ashland Oil Co., recently delivered a timely and relevant address at the Convention of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association held in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Atkins emphasized the importance of water resource development in terms of coping with the energy crisis with which our Nation is confronted.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place excerpts from Mr. Atkins' address in the RECORD herewith.

The excerpts follow:

WATER RESOURCES AND THE ENERGY DILEMMA

The privilege of being with you tonight is one which I value highly. Over many years, all of us at Ashland Oil have admired the work of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association. We have had faith in its mission. We have tried to prove our faith by active, wholehearted support. . . .

American leadership has long recognized the Nation's dependence upon our waterways and their improvement. Some years ago the commitment of American policy was broadened to include comprehensive river basin development. In this, flood control, water supply, reclamation and other water

resources values have been combined with navigation.

These comprehensive programs are vital to the country. They strengthen the national defense. They revitalize depressed regions and help agriculture. They stimulate economic growth and improve the balance of population as between country and city. Above all, they release untapped resources, stabilize the economy, cut costs and hold back the forces of inflation. For a long time we have considered it obvious that development of our water resources must proceed vigorously in order to meet the needs of a growing population and an increasingly complex economy.

The past history of water resource development is an excellent example on the benefits which can grow out of an enlightened governmental policy which recognizes the far reaching benefits of the development of our natural resources.

The OVIA can take great pride in the fact that over its history it has played a major part in promoting the original canalization of the Ohio River, involving 53 locks and dams from Pittsburgh to Cairo and the redevelopment of the River through replacement of the original system of low-lift dams and 600-foot locks with 19 modern structures with a 1,200-foot lock and a 600-foot auxiliary. Of these 8 of the permanent structures have been completed, 6 are under construction and 5 remain to be started.

OVIA has also taken an active part in encouraging water resource development through flood control, water supply and low-flow betterment. The completed list of projects covers 58 reservoirs and 80 local protection projects and 33 projects under construction, including 23 reservoirs and 10 local protection projects.

These projects have helped to assure prosperity to not only the Ohio Valley Basin but to the adjoining areas and to the Nation as a whole.

But, in recent years, American leadership has been losing its bearings in this field. A minority has been loudly broadcasting the notion that water resource spending is a wasteful "pork barrel." Highly vocal extremists, with lots of money to spend, have taken over what was once a wholesome concern for the environment. These political pressures have put budgetary shackles on water resource development. Water resources have fallen to the lowest priority among our major national programs.

In 1965, out of every dollar of federal expenditure for all purposes, a little more than one-half of one cent was devoted to new work on flood control and navigation projects. In 1972, this had fallen to one-third of a penny. Meanwhile, inflation had cut down still further the amount of construction which could be purchased with a dollar.

The recently published report of the National Water Commission reflects this negative mood. The report contends that our long-standing federal policies as to water resource development are out of date. It says that the time has come for the federal government to abandon its financial responsibility in this area. The report says that the burden for water resource development should be shifted to the river valley communities on the theory that they are the only ones benefited. The report glosses over the devastating impact on the whole country which such a policy would exert. It ignores the implied discrimination against our riverports and communities. The Commission report contains nothing as to the damage its policies would do to the Nation's energy supply—nothing on the injury to our balance of payments. On the rising costs of living and numerous other closely related issues, the report is silent.

Now an additional threat has come up. On August 3, the Federal Water Resources Council has issued complex new standards designed to destroy all but a few water

projects. The Corps of Engineers has made a preliminary estimate as to what this change will mean and finds that less than half of authorized water resource projects which are now under active consideration could survive such a standard.

Under the new water project rules, regional development and social well-being are rejected as worthwhile objectives. The Council would measure the benefits of navigation and flood works by how much the people in the valley communities would be willing to pay if they had to build them with local money. Such negative and restrictive policies leave little hope that we can achieve urgent national goals in this area.

The energy problem confronting this country is a big one, and it can become a real crisis. It is extremely complex. We cannot meet this problem with makeshift measures and "business as usual" while pursuing the well-worn pathways of the past. We must raise the energy problem to one of the dominant issues of our time. It bears not only on the standard of living. It bears fully as much on the public health and safety. It challenges the most fundamental values of our national life.

Let's think just a moment of the urgent task ahead of us. We must find, if we can, enormous new deposits of oil and natural gas in this hemisphere. We have to develop and improve techniques for getting petroleum liquids from such sources as shale deposits and coal. Somehow we must perfect methods for solvent refining of coal so as to make use of our high sulphur deposits without polluting the atmosphere. Yet, other energy resources cannot be neglected either. We have to give high priority to the perfection of means for the safe production of nuclear power on a vast scale.

This far-reaching complex of programs calls for a public policy encouraging to the utmost the unmatched potentials of the private enterprises of our citizens. Capital investment on a vast scale will be required.

Our energy deployment capabilities and their consideration must become the dominant concern of public policy before the decade is past. This concern must transcend all other environmental, economic, and political issues. Certainly, in this deployment of our energy potential, the vigorous improvement of our water resources must prove basic.

The time has come for a rapid acceleration of our water resource development program. This can be realized only if we redirect our thinking to the new realities. Our supplies of water are not unlimited; they can never exceed what falls as snow and rain. Yet our use of it rises year after year. Our needs for flood control, navigation and other water resource benefits expand as our population grows and our living standard rises. The Department of Transportation estimates that domestic water transportation—Great Lakes, rivers and coastal—will increase by 78% over the 20-year period ending in 1990. Most of this traffic will be in coal and petroleum and its products. Similarly, a doubling of water withdrawals for all uses by the end of the century is projected by the Interior Department. We have entered an era when we must undertake a program of comprehensive conservation and development of our water resources on a scale far greater than anything we have ever experienced. The cost of neglect is beyond calculation.

The current thinking of the National Water Commission and the Water Resources Council is based upon the same fundamental error as that which has resulted in the misdirection of our energy policy. This thinking reflects the false assumption that we still live in a time of abundance. In fact, shortages will become endemic unless we get about the urgent business of full development of our

resources. We can no longer afford to live in the world of fiction. It is time for a new look at the facts.

Never before has the historic mission of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association been of greater urgency. The mounting crisis in our energy supply has moved water resource development into the front rank of national priorities. It is my earnest hope, therefore, that this Association enlisting ever broader participation will carry to the people throughout the Ohio River region a message of reeducation. The purposes and goals of this Association are fundamental to our national aspirations for freedom and prosperity. They are critical to the Nation's continued preeminence in the cause of world peace and justice.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 7130

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Budget and Impoundment Control Act will be before us on Tuesday and Wednesday. The bill is essentially a good one, but it is inadequate in this respect: it deals with direct expenditures, but not with tax expenditures. Representative JOHN ANDERSON and I intend to offer the following amendments to H.R. 7130, to make sure that Congress is fully informed on both tax and direct expenditures when making important budget priority decisions:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 7130

1. Page 44, line 8—Section 2 is amended by inserting the following new paragraph (3) and renumbering accordingly:

"(3) the term 'tax expenditures' means those revenue losses attributable to provisions of the Federal tax laws which allow a special exclusion, exemption, or deduction from gross income or which provide a special credit, a preferential rate of tax, or a deferral of tax liability representing a deviation from the normal tax structure for individuals and corporations. The term 'tax expenditures budget' means the enumeration of such tax expenditures as published by the House Ways and Means Committee in 'Estimates of Federal Tax Expenditures'. Such enumeration shall correspond to the functional classifications shown in the most recent budget of the United States."

2. Page 47, line 21—Title I, section 111(c) is amended by inserting after "paragraph (a):" the following new sentence:

"In carrying out this function, the committee shall review and consider existing tax expenditures (the tax expenditures budget), their effect on Federal revenues, and their relationship to budget outlays and new budget authority."

3. Page 48, line 4—Title I, section III(c) is further amended by deleting "and" in line 4, by changing the period to a comma and adding the word "and" in line 8, and by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(3) 'to request and evaluate continuing studies of tax expenditures, to devise methods of coordinating tax expenditures, policies, and programs and direct budget outlays, and to report the results of such studies to the House on a recurring basis. In discharging the duty provided by this paragraph, the committee shall utilize reports prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.'"

4. Page 49, line 4—Title I, Section 121(b) is amended by inserting the following new paragraph (4) and renumbering accordingly: "(4) the existing levels of tax expenditures (the tax expenditures budget) by major budget categories."

5. Page 59, line 12—Title I, section 128 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (d):

"(d) REPORTS ON LEGISLATION PROVIDING NEW TAX EXPENDITURES.—Whenever a committee of either House reports a bill or resolution to its House providing a new or increased tax expenditure during a fiscal year, the report accompanying that bill or resolution shall contain a statement prepared in consultation with the Legislative Budget Director detailing—

(1) how the new tax expenditures provided in that bill or resolution will affect the existing levels of tax expenditures as set forth in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year, and the reasons for the deviation from those levels;

(2) the relationship between the proposed new or changed tax expenditures and other existing or proposed Federal outlays in the corresponding functional budget category; and

(3) a projection for the period of five fiscal years beginning with such fiscal year of the tax expenditures which will result from that bill or resolution in each fiscal year in such period."

6. Page 65, line 20—Title I, section 146(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) PRESIDENTIAL BUDGET TO INCLUDE TAX EXPENDITURES.—Section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Budget transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year shall set forth the existing levels of tax expenditures (the tax expenditures budget) by major budget categories, and an estimate, based on projected economic factors and projected changes in the overall income tax rates, of any anticipated change in the levels of tax expenditures for that fiscal year. For purposes of this subsection, the terms 'tax expenditures' and 'tax expenditures budget' have the meanings given to them by section 2(3) of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1973."

7. Page 73, line 24—Title I, section 173 is amended by inserting after the word "appropriation" the following words:

"or tax expenditure"

8. Page 73, line 26—Title I, section 173 is further amended by inserting after the words "budget outlays" the following words: "and revenues".

DAVID BEN-GURION—SYMBOL OF AN ERA

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Ms. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the State of Israel paused yesterday to pay homage to a giant: David Ben-Gurion. More than any man, Ben-Gurion could truly be called the father of his country, and his passing symbolized for many the end of an era.

Part genius, part man and part myth, Ben-Gurion richly deserved the love and honor he received from people throughout the world. A brilliant, complex man—he spoke and the world listened. A simple, humble man, he was equally at

home working in the fields of his beloved land.

Fittingly, Ben-Gurion was put to rest in a plain, unpainted wooden box covered simply with the blue and white colors of Israel, the nation he built. Ben-Gurion led a rich, full life, a life of massive accomplishment.

No eulogy could do justice to this man. Like his countrymen, we can only pause briefly to bid farewell.

GOOD TIME FOR REEVALUATION OF UNITED STATES-GREECE POLICY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials in the Washington Post and the New York Times make the point that the Nixon administration has never been in a better position to reevaluate U.S. policy toward Greece in order to extricate ourselves from giving tacit, as well as military support, to the new junta, and to promote the return of democracy to this most ancient land.

This is exactly the point I made on November 27 in a letter to Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, urging that the United States seize this moment, when the new regime is vulnerable to foreign public opinion, to let it be known that the new policy of the United States will be to encourage a return of the Greek Army to its barracks and the formation of a "government of unity" so that democratic government in Greece can be reestablished.

The text of my letter to Secretary Kissinger and these two editorials follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1973.

HON. HENRY KISSINGER,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is a moment of opportunity for U.S. policy toward Greece. A fleeting moment.

I am writing, therefore, to respectfully urge that you adopt what would, in view of the U.S. stance of recent years, be a "novel" position of supporting the democratic majority in that ancient land.

Quite frankly, U.S. policy on Greece since the mid-1960s has taken comfort in receiving supposed military advantages under non-democratic circumstances while failing to assert, in a credible manner, support for democratic means and traditions. A supposedly "realistic" policy has been in reality short-sighted, an excuse for avoiding hard thinking, and therefore politically as well as morally wrong.

The new Greek junta, it seems to me, is likely to have a much shorter life cycle than the Papadopoulos junta. Its cabinet is said to be mediocre, the apparatus of suppression has been partially dismantled and purged, public tolerance is nearly at an end, and the economy is in very serious trouble. In short, it is vulnerable.

The logic of the situation calls for a return of the army to its barracks and the formation of "a government of national unity" headed by a respected conservative figure such as Karamanlis or Canelopoulos. This would provide a bloodless, orderly transfer

of power by which this junta could retire with some honor.

The United States indulged itself in bland official statements and excuses for Papadopoulos after the April, 1967 coup, thus helping to open the door for a long period of oppression and dictatorial rule. In retrospect, many admit now what some of us were saying then, namely that early U.S. pressure in the form of a clear position would have helped bring an end to the dictatorship.

U.S. silence is tantamount to "intervention", for the Greeks, who are well-aware of the U.S. role in Greece since 1947 and our large military presence there today, regard silence as approval.

The new junta needs international approval, credits, and arms. It should be encouraged to consolidate and stay on. If not encouraged, the logic of the situation could become abundantly and incessantly clear.

Let us move, at long last, to position ourselves, in these first crucial days, in favor of an immediate return to democracy and freedom for Greece. Not only might such a position prove decisive, but it would salvage some of our tattered prestige with the Greek people, and be morally and politically right.

Respectfully,

DON EDWARDS,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Post,
Nov. 30, 1973]

TAKEOVER IN GREECE

In Greece, ex-colonel George Papadopoulos, who took power by coup in 1967, has been removed by coup, and without lamentation. As is the style of military takeovers, everywhere, the new officers promise to banish "anarchy, chaos and vandalism" and to install "tranquility and unity." Some observers in Athens believe the new clique acted out of fear that Mr. Papadopoulos did indeed mean to proceed to parliamentary elections next year as he had promised, despite the recent popular protests against his rule. Other observers believe he was ousted because his panicky violent manner of putting down those protests had given military rule a bad name. No doubt other explanations will be forthcoming.

How indeed does a dictatorship turn back into a democracy? In the Greek case, Mr. Papadopoulos had offered a gradual process of "normalization." But many center and center-left politicians decried his offer as a sham intended only to apply a facade of parliamentarianism. And officers on the right evidently opposed the offer as an invitation to "anarchy." Not for the first time or in the first place, left and right joined in an effective tactical alliance to undercut formation of a consensus in the middle. Unhappily, there can be no guarantee that the same tendency to polarization will not undo any initiative which the new generals may launch to return to civilian rule. It will take great skill by the politicians and great forbearance by the military to bring about that "government of national unity" which is every decent Greek's idea of a halfway house on the way back to parliamentary government.

The American position, already acute, becomes more so with each new convulsion in Athens. There is no reason to credit the fresh accusation of professional anti-Americans like Andreas Papandreou, who blames the CIA for the latest coup. The fact is that many Greeks believe the continuance if not the coming of military government in Athens is the result of the support tendered by the United States to serve a policy that places the requirements of strategic rivalry with the Soviet Union over the democratic values of the West. The new coup may, nonetheless, offer Washington an opportunity that was not available earlier; Mr. Nixon, after all, inherited the Papadopoulos government, he did not create it. Why should not the United

States say that it is suspending any further consolidation of its relations with Greece until it sees what steps the new generals are taking to restore parliamentary rule?

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1973]

DISMAL START IN GREECE

In his first policy pronouncement, the obscure lawyer chosen by Greece's new military junta to head the Government sounded like an earlier version of the ousted President Papadopoulos, Premier Adamantios Androussopoulos spoke of the need to "cleanse" Greek society before it could return to democracy. He said the country would be "lead to elections" only when the regime deemed it ready; meanwhile Greece will be ruled by decree.

This is almost a carbon copy of the Papadopoulos prospectus in 1967, which failed repeatedly in its six-year trial. In present circumstances it is a formula for certain disaster. If the junta's strongman, Brigadier Dimitrios Ioannidis, intends to "rescue" the armed forces from the embarrassing and untenable position into which he says Colonel Papadopoulos led them, this is emphatically the wrong way to go about it.

Brigadier Ioannidis and colleagues are said to be perplexed that top-rank political leaders are unwilling to join the new Government and that two of them have openly criticized it. They should understand that, after courageously opposing the Papadopoulos junta from the outset, these men will not accept responsibility in a regime whose commitment to democracy is vague.

Junta leaders are soon likely to discover something else: The Cabinet of nonentities and mediocrities they have assembled will be unable to resolve Greece's pressing home-front problems, including raging inflation. Nor will the program projected by Premier Androussopoulos ever succeed in restoring Greece's international standing, especially its desperately needed political and economic links with an impatient European community.

In the existing situation, the United States should remain aloof as its European allies from the new regime. Senators Pell of Rhode Island and Jackson of Washington deserve support for their bill to prohibit all military assistance to Greece until the Athens Government is ready to fulfill its obligations to the Atlantic Alliance, including adherence to "the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

Burned badly by its association with the Papadopoulos dictatorship, the Administration should at the very least shelve indefinitely its plans for expanding the United States Navy's home-porting program, which would base 2,500 more American families in the crowded Athens area. Even if the first phase of this project had not aroused widespread opposition in Greece, to expand it now would be taken everywhere as an act of approval and support for an arbitrary regime that has not earned it.

INCREASE FUNDS FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to longstanding, previously scheduled commitments last Friday evening, I was not present for the vote on the Gonzalez amendment to increase funds for State grant programs for vocational rehabilitation.

Had I been present, I would have voted

"aye" on rollcall No. 612 and "aye" on rollcall No. 613, the final passage of the bill to make supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1974.

FORT WAYNE, IND., JOURNAL-GAZETTE PUTS THE ENERGY CRISIS IN FOCUS

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the impending energy crisis. Each of us, and I am no exception, have been making public statements about it, instructing our staffs to conserve energy and have been carefully considering a great deal of legislation in this House.

While all this activity is necessary, I think we must be cautious that we do not trade off important environmental safeguards for transitory relief from the fuel shortage. The November 11, 1973, Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette has editorialized on this point and I commend these excellent comments to my colleagues.

FACING REALITY ON ENERGY

An ominous indication of the public's erosion of trust in the presidency was the reaction to Mr. Nixon's energy message. Most of the voluntary fuel-conservation measures he asked likely will be ignored by a public which attaches little importance to present presidential pronouncements.

This is particularly regrettable because many of the voluntary cutbacks have great validity. Driving at slower speeds and lowering the thermostat at home and in the office are relatively painless measures that in ordinary times may have the public's cooperation. Even contingency plans for gasoline rationing represent a wholly rational approach to remedying the energy shortfall. Such a move might, in fact, alert the public to the reality of the emergency more effectively than any amount of official "persuasion."

Other emergency measures requiring approval either of the Congress or state and local officials, likewise have merit. The public easily can live with 10 per cent fewer commercial jet flights for example, and the establishment of year-round Daylight Saving Time is a possibility worth examining. Providing incentives for greater use of mass transit and car pools is another common-sense proposal that would be equally valid even after the passing of the current "crisis."

Not all the President's requested emergency powers were as wisely conceived, however. Most questionable of all was his desired authority to "temporarily" suspend air and water quality standards to encourage more use of high-sulfur coal. Any congressional grant of authority of this type must be accompanied by an absolute time limit, or the nation will find itself in an even greater crisis than the energy shortfall. "Temporary" measures have a way of becoming entrenched unless they are forcibly terminated. And before the Congress acts at all the administration must demonstrate conclusively the indisputable necessity for a greater reliance on coal during the winter months ahead.

The President's call for the Atomic Energy Commission to speed the licensing of nuclear power plants likewise is a dangerous proposal. The logic of the AEC proceeding with anything but the greatest of caution should be obvious. Energy crisis or not, the total safety of proposed nuclear operations must be thoroughly established before any go-ahead is

given. The Bally 1 plant site on the edge of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is a vivid example of a project whose costs in natural values must be carefully weighed against its benefits, even if questions of public safety were resolved.

The current energy bind can be turned to good advantage if the public can be persuaded its gluttonous appetite for energy must be curtailed. The President noted that the average American consumes as much energy in a week as most other peoples do in a year. This is precisely why the population growth rate in this country is so critical, despite the fact it's lower than in other nations.

The time to conserve fuel and other energy sources is before they run out, and there's nothing like the impetus of upcoming shortages to make this fact evident. How the public reacts to the current situation will determine how the country survives the months of reckoning ahead.

MOAKLEY LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as a woman and legislator, I am gratified whenever a male colleague shows concern about the inequities women still suffer in our society, and translates that concern into legislative action. In this regard I want to note the record of Congressman Joe Moakley—a freshman colleague from Massachusetts—who has made significant contributions in the area of human rights, and the particular area of women's rights. In less than a year since arriving in Washington, Mr. Moakley has introduced no less than 10 bills to remedy and ameliorate the economic status of women. In addition to introducing original legislation, he has cosponsored the major legislation in the area of women's concerns.

I look forward to Representative Moakley's continuing participation in the struggle to gain economic and social equality for women. With appreciation for his present accomplishments, I call that record to the attention of my colleagues and the American people with the hope that others will work as vigorously to provide for the rights of all our people.

The list follows:

MOAKLEY LEGISLATION TO HELP REMEDY ECONOMIC AND RELATED PROBLEMS OF WOMEN

DATE, BILL NUMBER, AND LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE

June 29: H.R. 9111, to prohibit the unfair treatment of women in the granting of credit.

July 12: H.R. 9699, to allow for flexible hours of employment for Civil Service jobs—would help end unfair treatment generated by the standard pattern of working hours.

July 19: H.R. 9415, to provide a remedy for the unfair treatment of women by the insurance business with respect to the availability and scope of insurance coverage for women.

July 19: H.R. 9417, to carry out the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and responsibilities.

July 23: H.R. 9484, to provide that the remarriage of a widow, widower, or parent shall not terminate his entitlement to insurance benefits or reduce their amount.

July 23: H.R. 9485, to establish with the Social Security system the concept that those with the job of maintaining a household should be entitled to Social Security in their own right.

July 24: H.R. 9517, to provide equality of treatment to married women Federal employees in connection with compensation for work injuries.

August 3: H.R. 9832, to require that men and women be treated equally with respect to the appointment and admission of persons to the service academies.

August 3: H.R. 9833, to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sex with respect to enlistment in the armed forces.

August 3: H.R. 9834, to provide veterans maternity care in Veterans' Administration facilities, to extend job counseling services to certain survivors and dependents of veterans, and to liberalize widow's pensions.

CAUTION URGED ON ADMINISTRATION PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO EMERGENCY ENERGY LEGISLATION IN HOUSE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be beneficial for the Members of the House to be aware of what I feel are necessary comments I have made in correspondence, December 1, 1973, to the Energy Policy Office of the White House regarding the administration's suggested amendments to the emergency energy legislation under consideration at this time in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I, therefore, enclose for the attention of our colleagues my letter to Gov. John Love, Director, Energy Policy Office:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., December 1, 1973.

Hon. JOHN LOVE,

Assistant to the President for Energy, Energy Policy Office, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR LOVE: In a November 27, 1973, letter to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, you recommended a number of amendments to the emergency energy legislation which we are currently marking up. For example, you asked that we consider establishing a statutory basis for the Energy Policy Office which you head and which was established on June 28, 1973, by Executive Order 11726; a provision protecting various unspecified oil company executives from the provisions of the conflict-of-interest laws; a provision to open up the Naval Petroleum Reserves to oil exploration and development; a provision exempting tanker shipments from certain provisions of the Jones Act; and several devastating provisions amending the Clean Air Act, including the vehicle emissions sections of that Act.

Many of these amendments involve matters which are under the jurisdiction of other committees of the House, including the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on which I serve. To consider them would involve us in a jurisdictional dispute and possibly delay passage of this emergency legislation. Also, these suggestions, some of which, but not many, may be quite meritorious, do not qualify, in my judgment, as emergency provisions that need to be enacted in this session of Congress.

I strongly urge that the Administration refrain from insisting upon such broad and controversial measures for this emergency bill. The Executive Branch has already waited too long to deal with the fuel shortage problem. Now that the Administration has finally made some concrete suggestions to Congress for emergency legislation, I suggest that the Administration resist the desire to tag on to such a bill provisions that are not needed now and will only serve to bog down the bill to the detriment of the American public.

With every good wish,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, in a poll recently conducted in my district, no issue was of greater concern to my constituents than the problem of drug abuse, particularly illicit use by our young people. In response to this public concern, I have been working closely with drug abuse prevention, law enforcement, and treatment experts both at the State and local level and in the Federal Government.

Law enforcement is proving increasingly effective in curbing the supply of illicit drugs. Certainly, much more needs to be done in this area. On another front, treatment programs also have been vastly expanded to provide the necessary medical supportive services which will permit drug abusers to break their habits and return to productive lives.

In the long run, our real goal must be to prevent drug abuse, and this has been the most difficult challenge of all. "Scare tactics" have not worked; young people throughout history have been notoriously immune to efforts to frighten them out of doing something dangerous or harmful. Nor has the provision of factual information proved effective in preventing drug abuse: at the very least, information is seen as irrelevant; at worst, it is an encouragement to some young people to experiment with previously unknown substances.

At last, however, we are coming to see drug abuse among young people for what it really is: a symptom of a larger problem of adjustment. This point was made clear at hearings which I chaired in Franklin, Tenn., on October 29. At that time, a spokesman for the Tennessee Board of Education discussed the State's new suggested approach to drug abuse education. The basic objective of this new approach is not a purely negative one of simply "preventing drug abuse," but a positive one of helping students to make wise decisions in their lives. The new approach involves an intensive series of inservice training programs which can include teachers, school administrators, school nurses, members of the PTA, members of the community, and the students themselves. The training includes not only providing the facts about drugs and drug abuse, but an attempt to define

the particular problems of the individual communities, the types of drugs in use there, their source, and ways to deal with the problem on a communitywide basis. Significantly, the new approach does not see schools as the institutions with all the answers: the schools merely become the focal point for a communitywide educational process which links in families, civic organizations, churches and other community institutions in a comprehensive alliance to combat drug abuse.

The new approach recognizes that drug abuse is possibly a symptom of a larger problem: depending on the community and even the individual family, drug abuse may be an expression of rebellion, an indication of lack of communication, an expression of a sense of alienation or just a sense of boredom. The community may need to reexamine its resources, to make a greater effort to provide alternative forms of activity for its young people. Part of the answer may lie in more adequate recreational facilities, or structured programs permitting greater cooperation between generations. Part of the answer may lie in a more extensive guidance counseling program in the schools, one which can help students to deal with the increasingly complex problems of growing up.

The Federal Government, in fact, has recently identified a guidance counseling program in New York City which consistently has reduced not only drug abuse, but such additional problems as truancy, failing grades, and disruptive behavior. The White House Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention has been so pleased with recent evaluations of this program that it is presently developing plans to initiate a nationwide demonstration project based on the New York City program.

A balanced and cooperative program between drug abuse education and prevention to control drug demand and law enforcement to control the problem of supply is the key to saving future generations from the scourge which has afflicted our youth in recent years.

It should be a nationwide effort in which we can all participate and from which we all can learn. I am delighted that the State of Tennessee, and the people of the Sixth District, are demonstrating concern about this problem and much more that they are doing so much to meet it. These efforts deserve our continuing support; they certainly have mine.

ENERGY CRISIS SLOGANS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have started a collection of new energy crisis slogans to which I invite your additions. The following items are on hand to date:

The Public Be Dimmed
You Can't Fuel All of the People All of the Time
Kill-A-Watt

Close the Generation Gap—Save Electricity
Waste Watt, Want Watt
Join the Current Re-Volt
Power Shortages Leave Me Cold
Upon Atom
Coal: No Fuel Like an Old Fuel
Up On Coal—Dig Out of the Energy Hole
Oh Coal 'O Mio
Try 68 Degrees—You'll Like It
Save a Gallon a Day—Keep Rationing Away
Take an Arab to Lynch
As you Freeze in the Dark Remember that this Energy Crisis Comes to You from the Same People *Who:
Delayed the Alaska Pipeline for Years
Picketed Nuclear Power
Stopped Bridge, Marble Canyon and other Clean Hydro Dams
Blocked Offshore Drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel and Off the Atlantic Coast
Banned Building Refineries and Petroleum Docks
Imposed Unrealistic and Arbitrary Air Quality Regulations
Priced Natural Gas So Low that People Stopped Exploring for It
Insisted on Automobile Emission Devices Which Drastically Slash Gas Mileage
Subject to availability I will award a gallon of gasoline for the best slogan submitted by Pearl Harbor Day, anniversary of another infamy.

THE U.S.S. "TARAWA"

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, December 1, 1973, an important and significant upgrading of our Armed Forces occurred with the launching of the new U.S. Navy ship, the U.S.S. *Tarawa*, the first of five scheduled LHA's—general purpose amphibious assault ships—especially designed for the roles and missions assigned the U.S. Marine Corps. The date almost coincided with the 30th anniversary of the famous battle in World War II for a Pacific atoll—November 20, 1943—and the decision to name this ship for that magnificent show of great courage cannot help but make the LHA a source of inspiration and example to every marine who will set foot on its decks as long as it serves in the fleet.

The U.S.S. *Tarawa* float-launching was in Pascagoula, Miss., in the ultra modern shipyard of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Division of Litton Industries. As so many things have been written and said about the LHA program, touching on nearly every aspect of it, except its importance to the Navy, and particularly to the Marine Corps, and their combined ability to undertake any mission anywhere in the world, it seemed to me that all concerned Members of Congress should have an opportunity to review the remarks as stated by men who know the stakes and the task:

WELCOME AND REMARKS BY MR. N. J. MARANDINO, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF LITTON INDUSTRIES AND PRESIDENT OF INGALLS SHIPBUILDING DIVISION, ON THE OCCASION OF THE LAUNCHING OF THE LHA-1, "TARAWA," ON DECEMBER 1, 1973, AT PASCAGOULA, MISS. (Actually delivered because of Mr. Marandino's absence.)

*You may have trouble finding them to express your gratitude—they don't seem to be coming around much any more.

dino's illness by Philip Erkenbrack, Ingalls LHA Program Manager.)

Secretary Middendorf, General Cushman, other distinguished officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps, our lovely Sponsor, Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of the 18,700 employees of Ingalls—the men and women whose hard work made this ship and this day possible—I welcome you to the christening and launching of TARAWA, LHA-1.

Every ship launching is significant, and here at Ingalls more than 200 vessels of all types have been launched for the Navy and Merchant Marine fleets. But of all the launchings of the past, none has been more significant than the last one and this one—the launching on November 10 of the first of the new SPRUANCE class multi-mission destroyers, and the launching today of the first of a new fleet of general purpose amphibious assault ships.

To those who really understand the urgency for a more modern and stronger Navy fleet, these events have meaning far beyond the speeches and fanfare of the christening ceremonies. They represent a giant step forward in the defense capability of this country.

One very obvious fact about the ship we are launching today is that it is big. In fact, it will be the second largest ship in the Navy fleet, second only to a modern-day aircraft carrier. The LHA stands 20 stories high, is 820 feet long, 106 feet wide, and when she joins the fleet she will displace 39,300 tons fully loaded. That's big in the water. But a few days ago, this ship was on dry land—covering the site we occupy today—and was moved on to the launch pontoon at a weight of 19,500 tons, becoming the heaviest man-made object ever transported on land.

LHA is an entirely new class of ship, unlike any other amphibious assault vessel the Navy has ever had. But Ingalls, builder of ships for 35 years, is not new to the Navy's amphibious assault forces. This shipyard has built for the Navy 18 specialized amphibious warfare ships, including nine Dock Landing Ships (LSDs), two Amphibious Assault Docks (LPDs), two Amphibious Assault Ships (LPHs), and five Tank Landing Ships (LSTs).

The lessons of the past learned by Ingalls in the building of amphibious ships was vital to Litton in the late 1960's, when it won the design competition for the LHA—a ship that will give the Marine Corps and the Navy amphibious forces the largest, fastest and most versatile ship in their fleet.

In the design of the LHA, and in its building phase today, Litton considered not only the hardware requirements necessary to effectively carry out the ship's mission, but also factors essential to the life-cycle cost of operating the LHAs. The Navy wanted a ship, an entirely new kind of ship, that would get the job done, and get it done at minimum cost in operation. And that is exactly what LHA is designed to do.

It is a recognized fact that the LHA is not just "a ship". It is several ships in one. For example, the Navy has pointed out that it would require 14 separate amphibious assault ships (8 LPDs, 4 LKAs and 2 LPHs) to achieve what only five LHAs can achieve in troop, vehicle and cargo transportation. And even then, these separate ships would not have the speed, helicopter capability, rapidity of cargo and troop off-load, medical facilities and integrated tactical design features present in the LHAs. This one ship is designed to carry and deliver a Marine Battalion Landing Team with all its combat support equipment and supplies.

This "several-ships-in-one" concept will result in hundreds of millions of dollars in cost savings over the life cycle of the LHAs. In crew size alone the five LHAs will require 1,000 less men than would the 14 separate

ships that would be necessary to perform their missions. This savings in manpower expense over the life of the ships amounts to about 200-million dollars. Millions of dollars more will be saved in the over-all maintenance of the ships because of Litton-designed features that took into consideration the latest in marine automation and electronics and the application of construction materials which require less maintenance.

These life-cycle cost reductions must be acknowledged when one considers the initial cost of producing a sophisticated weapons system such as LHA. And more important than absolute dollar cost, of course, is actual value received, and this is a consideration presented very clearly in a recent article on the LHA which appeared in SEA POWER magazine, the official publication of the Navy League of the United States.

Sea Power notes that the LHA combines the best capabilities of several different types of ships, which undoubtedly would cost more than the LHA if built separately. Additionally, SEA POWER says, the LHA could mean (quote) "... the difference between protracted conflict and an early end of the fighting; the difference for beleaguered U.S. allies, between their rapid reinforcement and their equally rapid capitulation; perhaps even the difference, merely because of its muscular presence, between war and peace..." (End of quote from SEA POWER).

Fortunately, there are those who do understand that message expressed by the editors of SEA POWER. They know not only that quality ships don't come cheaply, but more importantly that quality in the long run is the best economy.

As you probably know, the ship we christen and launch today is named in honor of the battle of Tarawa, one of the most difficult, most controversial, and yet most important, battles of all of World War II.

It is interesting to note that the battle of Tarawa 30 years ago—just like this ship that carries its name—had its shares of critics. There were those in 1943 who didn't agree with the decision to send troops ashore at Tarawa. The critics argued that there were centrate upon, and that there were too many unknowns, too many problems, too many difficulties in attacking a heavily defended island atoll—and some even agreed with the Japanese commander on Tarawa that it could not be taken. Even after the battle had been won, the critics charged that the price of Tarawa was too high.

Fortunately for America, those who fought at Tarawa didn't take stock in what the critics had to say. The Marines who went ashore at Tarawa met the challenges, they solved the problems, and they carried out their mission. And when the war was over, the Battle of Tarawa was not only vindicated as the right decision, but the victory there was recognized and acknowledged as one of the most important of the War.

Tarawa of 30 years ago demonstrated that success in an objective in which one has faith can be achieved even against the odds of the critics, but not without a price, and even then, success doesn't come easily. For those of us at Ingalls, for the employees of this shipyard, we see a common thread between the challenges at Tarawa atoll and the challenges we have faced and will continue to face in the building of an entirely new fleet of ships such as LHA.

We have had our share of unknowns—our share of problems—and more than our share of critics. But I can tell you now that the odds for success are in our favor because we have a work force here that understands what needs to be done. Our employees know that the only answer to the unknowns is to define the problems. They know that the only answer in facing problems is to find solutions. Moreover, they have the maturity, experience, pride and motivation to do just that. And they know that the only answer

to the critics is to get the job done.

The Marines at Tarawa had no plan to retreat. Neither do we at Ingalls. The workers here are determined to carry out our mission to build these ships, and to build them well.

Our employees understand fully what is yet to be done. They are not overwhelmed by the challenges that still lie ahead.

While the building of TARAWA is important to all 18,700 Ingalls employees, there are some in our work force for whom the building of this ship has very special meaning.

Sixteen of our employees took part in the battle for Tarawa atoll 30 years ago, and eight of those who were actively on the island are with us this morning. These employees realize better than any of us what this ship will mean to the fighting forces of America and for the Marines in particular. They are here today as representatives of all of our shipyard workers, and I should like for you to meet them.

Robert Miller was 18 years old and a Marine Corps private when he engaged in his first combat at Tarawa. Now he is a senior draftsman in our Engineering Department.

Hughes R. Michael was a 25-year-old Marine Corps sergeant, assigned as a combat artist at Tarawa. He works today in our management control section.

Earl Jackson was a 21-year-old Marine Corps private when he went ashore at Tarawa with the first assault wave. Today he is a storeroom keeper in our submarine overhaul warehouse.

Pascal Daughdrill was an 18-year-old carpenter's mate third class with the Seabees at Tarawa. He went ashore to help rebuild the island airstrip and today is a combination burner-welder at Ingalls.

Robert D. Jenkins was 17 years old and a seaman first class with the Navy amphibious forces at Tarawa. He went ashore with troops in the fifth assault wave. Today he is an Ingalls machinist.

Charles M. Shepard was a lieutenant with the Coast Guard and served as a group commander for landing boats at Tarawa. Today he is a squad leader in our hull technical department.

Wilfred Trochessett was 23 years old and a boatswain mate first class with the Coast Guard. He was in charge of a gun crew at Tarawa. Today he works in our safety department.

Henry Laird was 23 years old and a boatswain mate second class with the Navy at Tarawa. He went to the island on the second day of battle to maintain communications. Today he is a quality assurance inspector with Ingalls.

Let's give these men a round of applause, not only for their services at Tarawa, but for what they, and other Ingalls employees, are continuing to do today for the defense of this country.

REMARKS BY GEN. R. E. CUSHMAN, JR.,
COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS

As the Under Secretary has indicated, our declining curve of amphibious lift capability shows promise of "bottoming out," with this historic launching of the first LHA today. That is surely a source of relief for all of us with a stake in the continued strength of our Navy-Marine Corps Amphibious Team.

But beyond this sense of relief are a sense of exhilaration and a sense of purpose:

Exhilaration... at the impending arrival of a versatile amphibious assault ship designed from keel up with the requirements of its landing forces in mind. In the current vernacular, this one really "gets it all together."

And a sense of purpose... for we have much to do in preparing for TARAWA's delivery fifteen short months from now. The LHA will be the backbone of our amphibious forces for the rest of this century, and it is mandatory that we begin with LHA-1 to

develop, test, and evaluate this ship's impressive new capabilities—and exploit them to the fullest. In this regard, aggressive action is already underway, coordinated by a Navy-Marine Corps LHA User's Group. This group will consider the integrated use of all the ship's systems in support of the amphibious force and landing force elements and in relation to amphibious warfare doctrine and techniques. It is a formidable task, but we are off to a good start.

I would like to take a moment to put the LHA in perspective with respect to the development of amphibious warfare:

In the 1930's, we laid the foundations of modern amphibious warfare, through the efforts of many hard-working, foresighted, and innovative Marines.

In the 1940's, these amphibious warfare doctrines and techniques were tested, proved, and refined under fire.

In the late '40's and the 1950's, we adapted to the requirements of nuclear warfare, developing a vertical assault capability with the helicopter.

In the 50's and the 60's, we proved the techniques for extended deployments and saw improvements in the amphibious fleet, with the introduction of the twenty-knot ships.

And so far in the 70's, we have been breaking ground in the use of command and control facilities of the LCC.

The arrival of the LHA represents another such historic milestone—bringing almost a quantum jump in capabilities available to assist the amphibious force and the landing force in accomplishing a variety of amphibious missions. Since this ship shows promise of doing practically everything but reproducing itself, there is a natural tendency to want to make it represent All Things To All Men—and to load it down with missions which might properly belong to other ships and other organizations. We intend to maintain a sense of perspective on this, planning for the use of this fine ship for its intended amphibious purpose, so that we will suffer no drawdown on the increased amphibious assault capabilities we have wanted all along.

As we consider the current turmoil on the international scene, it becomes very clear that the LHA is coming along at a time when it is sorely needed. For we are faced with an apparent dilemma:

We must maintain overseas presence and influence and maintain a voice in the major events and decisions which affect our worldwide interests, while responding to continuous pressure to reduce the number of Americans permanently based on foreign soil.

The answer lies in our mobility and our use of the seas. America is a maritime nation, and our National Security Strategy of Realistic Deterrence, in my view, contains distinct maritime implications.

For as we reduce our forward based military forces—Europe being the one major exception at present—the strategic significance of forward deployed amphibious forces rises accordingly. These forces even represent a political, economic, and military flexibility which cannot exist when our units are tied to the requirements of a particular host country.

Operating in international waters, amphibious forces interact with our allies by offering presence without automatic commitment. They provide greater assurance than forces based in the Continental United States, while avoiding some of the problems associated with providing overseas-based American troops.

Amphibious forces are available for use anywhere along the world's littorals. Independent of developed ports and airheads, they are uniquely capable of forcible entry or sustained operations—if necessary—in

hostile and underdeveloped regions of the world.

Amphibious forces are suitable for a wide range of operations, from show of force to hot warfare. They can disengage and leave the scene quickly when the job is done. Their versatility extends to non-combat assignments, as well. Two thirds of the more than fifty non-routine deployments of amphibious forces in the past quarter of a century have involved evacuations, humanitarian assistance missions, and other non combat roles.

And finally, amphibious forces are credible in deterring assaults on US interests because they are visibly ready, with a backup war-fighting capability if deterrence fails. Their self-contained, self-sustaining packages of integrated naval, ground, and air components are unique among the world's military forces. Linked through training and tradition, these Navy-Marine teams enter crisis situations with their operating procedures and priorities already sorted out and understood. Their historic fighting ability is established as a matter of fact, not conjecture, for America has a record of actually using her amphibious power when required—a fact which much surely be taken into account by anyone considering a test of wills.

In each of these areas—availability . . . suitability . . . and visible readiness—our capabilities are greatly enhanced by the LHA. All of you who have participated in the LHA project are helping meet a significant need . . . both of our County and of our Marine Corps. You have had to face a formidable challenge in building this ship, using the innovative techniques of this yard.

In this sense, you—the builders of TARAWA—share a vital quality with the brave men who made the name "TARAWA" an indelible part of our American history. They, too, were faced with a task which had never been accomplished before—amphibious assault against defenses at the water's edge which, in the words of the atoll's Japanese commander, "had been built to withstand assault by a million men for a hundred years."

They landed. And when things started going wrong they still kept coming—across the reef and through the fire-swept lagoon and over the coconut-log barricades and into the pillboxes and bunkers whose defenders fought to nearly the last man. And in seventy-five hours and forty-two minutes to hell in a half-mile square they proved it could be done. They blasted open the front door of the Japanese Empire.

In doing so, they dealt a coup de grace to the enemy's Pacific strategy, which had been predicated on the assumption that America would be unwilling and unable to pay the price of retaking its lost ground, and would sue for peace rather than make the effort.

In doing so, they accomplished a number of "firsts" which provided a baseline of experience for future amphibious operations:

—The first landing across a reef in the face of opposition;

—The first use of amphibious tractors;

—The first use of coordinated close air and naval gunfire support for an opposed landing;

—And the first use of tanks in an amphibious landing.

And in doing so, they established a personal standard of bravery for all Marines to emulate.

With your heads, your hands, and your hearts, you have perpetuated the spirit of Tarawa. It is up to us—and to the men who eventually sail on this fine ship—to keep this spirit alive.

You can rest assured we will.

INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION FOR THE CREATION OF A LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON MEMORIAL GROVE ON THE POTOMAC

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to introduce today a joint resolution that would allow a memorial grove to be established in memory of Lyndon Baines Johnson, our beloved 36th President, in the Lady Bird Johnson Park on the Potomac.

This bill will cost the U.S. Treasury nothing, as the grove of trees, and related facilities, will be financed by private donations, raised all across America.

Leadership Members have joined with me in introducing this legislation, as have Members of the Texas delegation.

The proposed grove is a fitting first memorial to President Johnson here in the city where he labored with such love for over a generation and a half.

Few realize how much this big man from the hill country of Texas loved natural beauty. Few realize how he loved to see this Capital City take on new life with the flowers and beautification efforts his wife tenderly spread throughout the city.

For, Mr. Speaker, he firmly believed that the quality of life was made better if each of us took care to preserve nature's work, and took care to respect the powers of natural growth.

Throughout his public career, much of his superhuman work effort was dedicated to bettering our surroundings. The record is there, and the world is better for his efforts. And we are grateful.

Now, today, we start the legislation that will honor his work for beauty and nature.

The grove will be situated in the Lady Bird Johnson Park, which borders the Potomac. The park has a very good view of the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, the Washington Monument, with the Capitol Dome capping the view in the horizon.

Preliminary plans for the grove suggest that a small rise be placed in the center that would give the visitor to the area the full view of the skyline so loved by President Johnson.

In the center of the grove there will be recorded some of the President's inspiring words that spurred so many forward to conquer man's enemies of poverty, disease, and inequality.

This proposed grove will meet with the approval of all citizens, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the February 18, 1973, Washington Star News be placed in the RECORD. This editorial will illustrate that kind of response this proposal will have:

AN L. B. J. MEMORIAL

No subject under the sun is capable of producing more dissension, more agonizing

debate and more bureaucratic spinning of wheels than memorials to our former presidents. Remember, for example, the furor over those giant slabs of stone proposed in West Potomac Park to memorialize Franklin Delano Roosevelt?

So, too, in the natural order of things, such controversy may well up in regard to the most recently deceased of our chief executives, Lyndon B. Johnson.

But perhaps not.

At the very least, in the proposal unveiled the other day, we are off to a good start. The idea, as initiated by Laurence Rockefeller, involves a grove of trees—possibly encompassing a sculpture of the late President—within the park area already named for Lady Bird Johnson on the Virginia side of the Potomac River between the Memorial and 14th Street Bridges.

Nash Castro, a former director of National Capital Parks who is working to advance the proposal, says he already has discussed it with Mrs. Johnson, and quotes the former First Lady as being "touched and moved" by the concept.

Well, we are, too. This city owes an immense debt of gratitude to Mrs. Johnson for the areas of annual flowering beauty which she initiated here—as indeed the nation is indebted to Lyndon Johnson for his own efforts in the fields of beautification. The 150-acre Lady Bird Johnson Park is itself a lovely setting, which could be made more so by an attractive grove of trees.

One more thing is to be said in the idea's behalf: With Mrs. Johnson's personal involvement, there is a good chance that the job would be done right.

It is not our position that a memorial in Washington to every deceased president, especially in view of many of the grandiose proposals that have been advanced in the past, is a necessity. But we think this one would be fitting to the man, and an asset to the city.

Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Baines Johnson was bigger than life. He was a vibrant man who turned his love for people into living testimonies.

A living grove is a small testimony for this man whom we loved.

ONE WRITER'S VIEW—HOW TO AVOID FUEL AUSTERITY: BE STINGY

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the December issue of the American Legion magazine there appears an interesting commonsense article on how the individual homeowner and consumer can contribute to the national effort to avoid energy austerity: Be stingy with the amount of energy wasted.

While it is essential that we take immediate and strong steps to manage our dwindling fuel supplies and develop alternative sources of energy, I believe that if each consumer followed the suggestions contained in the reprinted article, considerable savings would result. I commend it to readers of the RECORD concerned about saving energy: *How To Make It On Less Fuel This Winter*

(By R. P. Daille)

Whatever the government and the fuel industries are going to do about the threat-

ened critical shortage of fuel this winter, it is within the power of John Q. Public and his wife to strike an enormous blow to make their fuel supply and the nation's stretch, and perhaps avoid the sort of frigid austerity that many have been predicting.

Talking with fuel oil men this fall, we know that the customers have gotten the word and are out to act on their own behalf. The early evidence is that families which buy and burn their own fuel oil no longer wait for automatic deliveries. As soon as there is room at the top of the tank, many have been calling their oil companies to come and fill her up again. This is natural. If rationing should begin on December 19 or January 8, everyone wants to start with a full tank.

One also assumes that everyone is interested in *stretching* his fuel as far as he can. The fact is that if each and every one of us who has any control over fuel consumption would cut corners on energy consumption, the total national fuel saving could go a long way to make any cold weather crisis evaporate.

How do Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public go about saving energy, given the desire to make a serious effort?

We are not dealing with an attempt to conserve only heat, but to save the total national energy supply. Economizing on gasoline consumption in your car will free more petroleum for heat. Conserving electric light in your home or office saves fuel down at the power plant, and liberates more energy for heating purposes.

So the trick to get the nation through a potentially cold winter is to save energy in *any form possible*. Fortunately, this will also keep our fuel, utility and gasoline bills down.

There are many ways by which one can save his and the nation's fuel right around home without actually suffering. Most of them are entirely obvious. Don't leave lights on when they aren't needed. Look for cracks around windows and doors where little icy fingers of cold air come in, and weatherstrip them. Don't carelessly overheat roomspace if you can control it, and don't keep unused space very warm. Learn how much you can comfortably turn the thermostat down overnight. Keep driving your car in the gas-saving ways that were well publicized last summer, when the problem wasn't cold weather but a possible gasoline shortage. Don't leave doors and windows open or ajar in cold weather. Make sure every window has a storm window. Before we're through we'll offer most of the obvious and not so obvious ways to save energy, and fuel bills, just by taking more pains than usual.

But it might also pay you to understand a bit of the science of keeping warm. You can feel warm in a room at 70 degrees and cold in a room at 78 degrees. The reasons why have a bearing on how you can manage to keep the thermostat down with comfort.

Air temperature is only one factor in feeling warm or cold. Radiation plays a bigger role than most of us imagine. Solid objects radiate heat back and forth. If they are the same temperature, the give and take is about equal. If your furniture and walls are warm, you radiate body heat to them, but they only absorb a little of it and bounce some back to you. But if they are cold, they gobble up your radiations and you feel much colder in the same air temperature.

Now if someone jams the thermostat down to about 50 degrees overnight and goes to bed bundled up, this seems like a great fuel saving on the face of it. But what is likely to happen is that next morning, when the air is reheated to about 72 degrees, it feels as cold as ice. Someone is going to force the air temperature up to about 80 and lose the fuel savings of the night before. All solid objects are so cold that they are stealing radiation heat from the humans, who sud-

denly want the air hotter than usual in order to feel comfortable. And it takes hours to reheat the walls and furniture, during all of which time everyone feels cold in 72-degree air.

This human factor, related to radiation, has led fuel experts to suggest that you should turn the thermostat down about five degrees overnight, and no more. Normally, this would mean 72 degrees, in the daytime and 67 at night. However, if we watch our radiation factors around the house, we can probably all be comfortable with the house at 68 or 69 in the daytime and about 64 at night. If we *all* should settle for roomspace that's about three degrees colder than usual this winter, the fuel savings would be enormous. Different experts give different figures, but all are agreed that, if we all voluntarily cut back three degrees of household warmth all winter, it would be like finding a new oil field for the nation. The expert figures are that if you keep your living space one degree cooler than usual all winter, you will cut fuel consumption for heating by from 3% to 5%. Making out on two degrees less will cut consumption by from 4% to 7% or 8%.

Government figures have guesstimated that we absolutely need a 10% fuel saving to make it this winter. Homes aren't the only fuel users; but if every home made out on just three degrees less heat around the clock, it would come close to saving a half of the total national saving which is said to be absolutely necessary. Much more can be saved by policing sheer waste of heat and energy.

It is a pity that there are hardly any clock-regulated thermostats anymore. If you have a clock-controlled thermostat, you can cut the heat back by much more than five degrees about about 11 p.m. and set it to come on at about 65 degrees long about 4:30 a.m. It will then have more time to warm up the cold walls and furniture before people are up and about, and you can raise it to 68 or so on arising. As a clock-thermostat, properly used, is a great fuel saver anytime, smart people in cold climates can't hurt themselves by installing clock thermostats as a matter of long-range principle.

There is no truth at all in the old argument that it takes more fuel to reheat a cold house than to keep it warm all night. It always takes less to reheat it than to keep it warm. The only problem is the human need to want it *warmer* than usual in the morning to combat the radiation loss to cold solids.

Liberal use of drapes as wall hangings reduces the sense of chill by radiation. The radiation loss through glass windows (either single or double) in winter is much greater than it is to cold walls and furniture. Thus you can save a great deal of heat, and make a cool house feel warmer, by managing the drapes over your windows not as drapes but as insulation, and reflectors. General cold weather rule: If the sun isn't hitting the window, keep the drapes drawn. Both the conduction of heat and the radiation of heat through the window will be greatly reduced. But if the sun is hitting the window, open the drapes. Old Sol will radiate heat *into* the room, even in very cold weather.

The direct leakage of warm air (and intrusion of cold air) around small cracks in doors and windows can, in extreme cases, result in the expenditure of from 15% to 30% of your fuel to "heat the whole outdoors," as my mother used to say. Almost any man—and I suspect many women—can easily apply weather-stripping or caulking to such cracks. The initiative needed is to go hunting for these openings that let drafts in and keep after them. A government bulletin says that if a light fog forms on a window on the

downwind side in cold weather, the window is probably draft-free.

A window without a double sheet of glass (thermopane or a storm window) is, on the face of it, "heating the whole outdoors." A river of chilled air whose heat has passed to the outdoors flows down it and across your floor.

Your heating plant will need a lot more fuel to heat your house if its heat-exchangers are dirty, or if the burner is not finely tuned. An annual overhaul and cleaning is nothing to shrug off. It really does keep fuel bills down. In a hot air system, a heating plant's efficiency increases if you make sure to keep the air filters clean.

Insulation in your walls and house-top can save fuel two ways. If your dwelling is well insulated, your walls will not leak as much heat to the outdoors to keep your heating unit working overtime. The interior wall surfaces will also be warmer, so they will not steal as much radiation from your body. Hence a well insulated house not only conserves heat, it lets its occupants feel comfortable at a lower temperature.

Moral, if there is anything you can do on short order to improve the insulation of your dwelling, it will pay for itself many times over in fuel saved.

The experts point out that existing homes may or may not be easy to insulate, or to insulate better, on short notice. The best wall insulation is installed at the time of construction. But since it always pays homeowners to have the best wall insulation—fuel shortage or not—this would be a good time to have a trustworthy insulation man see how good yours is and see what is involved in improving it.

When it comes to the garrets or attics over many homes which are simply airspaces, it is no great trick to see that they are better insulated. The experts say that you should have at least six inches of insulation between ceiling and garret. If you have less, it may be simple to buy some batts and lay them down. Put some over the trapdoor to the garret, too, and make sure the edges of the trapdoor are weatherstripped. The warmest air in your house may be pushing its way through cracks around the trapdoor, if you have gone to an attic airspace. An attic door or trapdoor is the most important to weatherstrip.

There is much more heat lost through poor ceiling insulation than through poor wall insulation, due to the tendency of the warmest air to rise to the ceiling. A quarter of the heat loss of one-family dwellings is said to be lost through the ceiling. Warning: If you do lay down some fiberglass batts in your garret, wear gloves and put some surgical gauze over your mouth and nose to avoid the irritation from fine particles of fiberglass that is common to handlers of this insulation.

If you are in a winter climate, with a garage built into the house, you can save a lot of fuel if you will keep that garage door closed on cold days whenever you are not driving your car in or out. If you let the full blast of winter into your garage, it will needlessly chill every interior wall that borders on the garage and work your heating unit overtime. But with the garage door closed, even a cold garage is a sort of dead-air-space insulator for the rooms that adjoin it.

If you are a homeowner on a fuel oil contract, with automatic delivery, it is just possible that your fuel oil company can give you a general idea if your house is a heatburner, compared to similar homes. In normal times, your fuel oil dealer has given your house a "K factor." This, combined with how cold the weather has been as measured in "degree days," is what has always told him when you have needed a new delivery of oil. The "K factor" reveals, in relative terms, if your house is a heavy fuel user or a light fuel user. Maybe you will drive your dealer crazy if you ask him if your K factor is out of line for a house and family like yours. I didn't ask any

dealers if they would welcome your queries, and the K factor isn't exact. But you may be sure that a dealer who has long given you automatic deliveries knows full well if your house consumes much more fuel than the general average for similar homes and families. If he can spare time in this (for him) hectic winter to tell you, the information will be more accurate than your comparing notes with neighbors on fuel bills. And if your K factor is a real baddie, you ought to take steps to find out why and correct it. Poor insulation or heat-wasting habits in the household are the usual reasons.

Give a think to hot water waste. You burn fuel, remember, to heat water—be it by gas, fuel oil or electricity. A dishwasher will use just as much hot water to clean a few dishes as it will to wash a full load. The same general principle applies to dishpan use of hot water. The experts say: "Save fuel by washing a lot of dishes at once." They counsel the usual household to wash dishes in a dishwasher once a day. The same principle applies to laundry. Don't run small loads through your washer.

A hot water tap that drips is a silent thief. The lost water itself can run up quite a bill if you are on a water meter. But letting hot water drip away is like pouring petroleum down the drain. Fix it! Why heat the sewers?

Need I suggest that all other hot water use should be managed a bit to avoid heat waste, without my cataloguing everything?

Excessively dry air in your home is like radiation heat loss in that it gives a sense of chill to warm air. Maintaining a fair level of wintertime humidity in your home is not only healthful, but makes a cooler home feel more comfortable.

If you feel it is necessary to air out a room in cold weather by opening the windows, just air that room. Close it off from the rest of the house, and especially from the room with the thermostat, so that the furnace doesn't go chugging away pumping heat out that open window. If there are unused rooms in your house, do whatever is necessary to keep them cooler than the other rooms. If you must sleep with a window slightly open, close the bedroom off from the other rooms so that that open window doesn't chill more than your igloo bedroom.

If there is a fireplace in your house, you should keep the chimney damper closed when there's no fire in the fireplace. Warm air in your rooms will make a vertical stream up the chimney to the great outdoors, and rush it up faster the colder the weather. Need I add, do not forget to open the flue if you build a fire in the fireplace?

People whose furnaces and water heaters are already on natural gas have no grounds for feeling smug about their position vis-à-vis those on fuel oil this winter. Many a natural gas supplier has no idea how it will be able to keep its customers supplied with gas this winter. Consider the warning issued in October to gas customers of Public Service Gas and Electric of New Jersey. It starts by advising that the firm will not take on any new gas customers. It then says that it does not know how well it can supply existing gas customers. It then explains what few customers realize—that in the winter it usually has to manufacture up to 25% of its gas from guess what? Chiefly petroleum products, which it isn't sure it can get in adequate amounts. It then goes on to say the federal government may reallocate its gas supply according to national needs, without respect to its existing contracts with customers in New Jersey.

In short, the natural gas supply this winter is on just as much of a thin edge as the fuel oil supply, and nothing will as certainly ease the situation as the customers conserving the existing supply all they can by eliminating every bit of energy waste possible and settling for slightly cooler homes before any real crisis arises.

Except that we are on the thin edge this

winter, nobody really knows how serious the situation may be. An exceptionally warm winter would be a blessing. An exceptionally cold one could put us to real hardship. A cold winter in Europe could divert expected imports of oil from our shores and give us a hard time without a cold winter here. Mideast politics have already started to reduce our petroleum supply from the Persian Gulf area, from which we presently import about 6% of our national supply. Fuel industry, rail or shipping strikes could undermine our winter oil supply—and a major disaster to one of our large refineries could bring on something worse than a mere fuel oil pinch.

Of course homeowners can really make out on far less fuel than usual, just by bundling up and living cold—as most generations of our ancestors did. But there are consequences of a fuel shortage that are more serious than just living like Spartans for a few months. Many industrial plants in this country may be threatened with fuel-shortage shutdowns this winter, which could result in serious unemployment. General Motors has already warned that the possible shutdown of some of its Midwestern suppliers, which haven't yet been able to contract for needed winter fuel, could cause a chain reaction of shutdowns throughout its operations. These are more serious reasons for conserving all the fuel we can than is the prospect of being unusually chilly.

There's one thing I don't particularly like about all these suggestions to do this, don't do that, avoid this and that, etc. to save fuel.

We aren't really all that stupid. It isn't really nearly so necessary to tell people by the numbers how to save energy as it is to persuade them that this is a job that they can do and that needs doing. If we, the people, make up our minds that we want to save fuel, starting today, we can probably do a better job than all the editorials and PR releases can tell us to do. We can figure ways that nobody else could have foreseen, while it is obvious that a lot of us cannot follow all the handouts. What can apartment dwellers do about the heating plants and insulation in their buildings? Enormous wastes of energy are engineered into many of the buildings we occupy—from the glass-walled office buildings to houses that were built shy of insulation to keep the initial cost down and hang the upkeep cost to the occupant.

Industry is actually the biggest fuel waster in the land, office buildings are probably next. In both, the waste is so thoroughly engineered into the design that to get it out would take years. A crash program, short range, is almost entirely up to the ingenuity of the people in their homes and in their private lives.

I agree with a Wall Street Journal editorial of Oct. 25, that with less paternalism and fewer "guidelines," but with more challenge to individual initiative, we can really save our fuel this winter. Let the leadership (said the Journal) "appeal to Americans to use their own initiative in finding ways to use less fuel." Amen! I know that, from my typewriter, I may not even be able to guess what ingenious fuel saving you may contrive, based on the circumstances of your own home, life and family.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE
LESLIE ARENDS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that the inexorable passing of time is manifested in many different

ways. Some regard seasonal changes, occurring with such unceasing rapidity, as being the most obvious sign that time is fleeting by. To those of us who serve in the Congress, however, the impending retirement of a beloved colleague who has served long and well is perhaps the most poignant reminder that in time we must all take leave of these history laden halls and colleagues we have learned to love and respect.

It was in this mood that I received the recent announcement of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) that he plans not to seek reelection at the end of his current term—his 20th—in the House of Representatives.

For me, and I am sure for many of my colleagues and for many Americans as well, LES ARENDS' recent announcement of his retirement from public life helped to underscore his four decades of service in this body, during the greater part of which he was also Republican whip.

As a Navy veteran and a senior minority member of the House Committee on Armed Services, LES ARENDS will long be remembered after he leaves these halls, for his deep concern in matters of national security and his considerable expertise in the legislative areas of that committee.

The contribution for which he will probably be remembered best by his colleagues, however, is his probing and questioning attitude, finding expression with telling effect in floor debates and with utter disregard of party lines.

Personally, I shall best remember LES ARENDS for the generous help, despite the difference in our party allegiance, that a senior member gave to a junior colleague. In the legislative arena, I can recall with undiminished pride his support of my title II repeal bill, now Public Law 92-128. Despite heavy demands on his time, LES ARENDS, I found, was never too busy to discuss the problems of a colleague. Not only did he provide invaluable assistance, but once LES ARENDS gave me his word, he kept it.

Mr. Speaker, to LES ARENDS I would like to say "thanks," and to wish him much happiness and continued good health in his well-earned retirement years. May he now find more time to pursue long-postponed pleasurable pursuits.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN, THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 51

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a gruesome case was recently reported in the Boston Globe. An unidentified woman's head was severed from her body, before burial in a Potter's field. While the skull was being prepared for exhibition, a bullet was discovered. Drowning was not the cause of death as originally certified.

The husband of the victim, Mr. Carpi, CXIX—2475—Part 30

has been arrested and charged with the murder.

This macabre chain of events was started by a handgun.

Handgun control legislation is an issue that must not be avoided, and it demands immediate action.

The story from the Boston Globe is included below:

SEVERED HEAD YIELDS BULLET; HUSBAND HELD
NEW YORK.—New York Mayor John V. Lindsay has ordered an immediate investigation into the unusual circumstances surrounding the "case of the severed head."

The macabre case came to light Wednesday when it was revealed that the head of slain Princeton, N.J., socialite Laura Carpi, 37, had been severed before burial and that a bullet was found in the skull.

Colin C. Carpi, 38, a businessman and son of the late Fred Carpi, a vice president and director of the Pennsylvania Railroad, has been charged with the February 1971 slaying of his wife. He has pleaded innocent, been freed on bail and is scheduled to go on trial Jan. 2.

A hearing in Trenton, N.J., on possible suppression of evidence has been postponed until next week.

At first it was believed that Mrs. Carpi had died by drowning. In June 1971, the badly decomposed body of a woman was found in New York's East River.

The body was brought to the office of the city's chief medical examiner, where it remained 20 days. Unidentified and unclaimed, it was buried in a Potter's field.

The medical examiner, Dr. Milton Halpern, said Wednesday that because the murder case is going to court Jan. 2, he could not detail the way his office handled the body that turned out to be Mrs. Carpi's.

But he insisted that while the case was unusual, the procedure followed by his office was not.

The New York Times quoted sources in Halpern's office as saying that before burial, the woman's head was severed and placed in the office's museum for study by pathologists.

A week after the body was buried, it was reported a bullet was found in the skull by a technician cleaning it, and New York police were notified.

The body was exhumed, and an examination of dental records on July 22-23, 1971, revealed the identity. Two days later, Carpi was arrested and charged with murder.

Next Tuesday, Carpi's attorneys will ask a state superior court here for a hearing on circumstances of the burial and severance of the head and whether the Mercer County prosecutor withheld details from defense lawyers.

According to the Times, the prosecution contends that on Feb. 8, 1971, Mrs. Carpi was shot and killed in her Princeton home, where she lived with her four children, and that the body was taken to New York and dropped in the East River.

Mrs. Carpi, a former school teacher who worked as a clerk at the White House in 1965 after graduation from Smith College, had been separated from her husband for about a year, the Times reported.

The Times investigation disclosed that no autopsy was performed on her body when it was brought by police to the medical examiner's office, although autopsies are common in cases where drowning is apparent.

The prosecution has denied any suppression of evidence. The Times investigation found that neither the prosecution nor the defense nor Mrs. Carpi's parents knew of the original burial. Mrs. Carpi's parents, Mr. and Mrs. James R. Miller 2d of Gwynedd Valley, Pa., also said they were unaware that the head had been severed.

WARD L. QUAAL, PRESS VETERAN

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently the Harris poll indicated that the public's appreciation of the free press in the United States has risen substantially, and I am pleased to note that fact in this RECORD. One of the reasons for such improvement is the dedicated work of press representatives who are fair, objective, and impartial in their news reporting. An unusually fine press representative was recently recognized for his contributions in Chicago. I call my colleagues' attention to Ward L. Quaal, president of WGN Continental Broadcasting Co., who was selected as "Chicago Press Veteran of 1973."

Mr. Quaal received the award on October 18 at the 35th annual dinner of the Chicago Press Veterans Association. He is the first representative of electronic journalism ever to be cited by the press vets. Adding to the honor was an official proclamation issued by Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley, declaring October 18 as Chicago Press Veterans Day and citing Mr. Quaal for his contributions to broadcasting and the city of Chicago.

While this is not the first major award that Mr. Quaal has received during his distinguished career, it is a significant one. It comes from an organization comprised of more than 500 men and women who worked for at least 1 year in the editorial departments of Chicago's metropolitan, community, or suburban newspapers, news services, or broadcasting outlets 15 or more years ago. The membership is predominantly from the print media.

Mr. Quaal is also a director of Tribune Co. and a past president of Broadcast Pioneers. He joined WGN the day after he graduated from the University of Michigan on June 8, 1941. Since then, he has been honored many times for achievements and leadership.

Mr. Quaal was recently awarded the Distinguished Service Award, the highest honor of the National Association of Broadcasters, and the award for "Outstanding Achievement in the Field of Communications" from Brandeis University.

Mr. Quaal has received honorary degrees from several colleges and universities, including Mundelein College, Northern Michigan College, Elmhurst and Lincoln Colleges. His own alma mater, the University of Michigan, has given him its Distinguished Alumnus Award.

Other awards include the Chicago Advertising Club's golden medallion as "Advertising Man of the Year" and the "Communicator of the Year" award of the Jewish United Fund.

As the Chicago Press Veterans Association's chairman, Mr. Richard Orr, said in presenting the organization's 1973 award:

Mr. Quaal is a distinguished citizen whose

leadership, not only in broadcasting, but in business and civic affairs as well, has had a significant influence on the life and time of Chicago, our state, and our nation. We honor him tonight for his outstanding contributions to broadcast journalism.

In his acceptance remarks, Mr. Quaal urged members of both the print and the broadcast media to combine their efforts to protect the people's "right to know" against increasing Government and court interference.

He said:

The advent of the Fairness Doctrine first in broadcasting and now being invoked in one state (Florida) against newspapers, has proved to be the latest, the most potent force in stimulating cooperation among the broadcast and print media under the banner of the First Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Daley, in his proclamation, urged all citizens of Chicago "to take cognizance of the event in honor of one of our most distinguished representatives of the broadcasting media." I, in turn, urge my colleagues in the House also to take note of the accomplishment of Mr. Quaal and his contributions to broadcasting the news:

PROCLAMATION:

Whereas, the news media that serve Chicago are widely recognized for their enterprise in gathering and presenting the news; and

Whereas, this reputation is the result of

the talents, experience, and efforts of editors, reporters, news broadcasters, and others, both men and women, who have served in the editorial departments of Chicago newspapers, community and suburban newspapers, foreign language newspapers, wire services, television and radio stations over the years; and

Whereas, those individuals who served for at least one year in editorial departments as long as fifteen years ago or more are entitled to call themselves "Press Vets" as members of the Chicago Press Veterans Association, an organization formed to honor the professional achievements and otherwise serve the mutual interests of its members; and

Whereas, the 35th annual dinner meeting of the Chicago Press Veterans Association will be held October 18, at the Pick-Congress Hotel; and

Whereas, Ward L. Quaal, president of WGN Continental Broadcasting Company, will become the first member of the broadcasting industry to be honored on this occasion as "Press Veteran of 1973"; and

Whereas, Ward L. Quaal is a man of vast talent and accomplishment who, not only has been an outstanding executive of radio and television, but also has always been devoted to Chicago and toward helping the people of this city and the entire Midwest; and

Whereas, Ward L. Quaal, throughout his career, has adhered to the highest standards of civic and broadcasting responsibilities.

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby declare

Thursday, October 18, as Chicago Press Veterans Day, and do urge all citizens to take cognizance of the event in honor of one of our most distinguished representatives of the broadcasting media as well as all other outstanding Chicago newsmen and women now serving or who have served in the past in the best interest of their calling and of our city and nation.

ARAB WHEAT IMPORTS AND OIL EXPORTS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the economic warfare being waged by the Arabs is a weapon that can cut both ways. Given the critical situation in world food production and rising world population growth, it will not be long before the United States will have to become more selective in choosing countries to receive American grain. Certainly, the attitude taken by other countries with respect to their export policies will affect our own thinking.

I attach herewith data concerning wheat imports by the Arab countries since 1967:

WHEAT IMPORTS BY ARAB COUNTRIES, 1967-SEPTEMBER 1973 (BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN)

Country	Year—						January-September 1973
	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	
1. Tonnage (1,000 metric tons):							
United States.....	945	981	671	1,015	1,104	986	1,766
U.S.S.R.....	1,200	298	301	234	200
Australia.....	571	497	243	445	2,336	2,570
Canada.....	16	150	42	1,058	1,233	560
France.....	604	1,140	1,147	256	40	593
Total wheat imports from all sources.....	4,578	4,065	2,705	3,645	6,275	5,768	7,380
2. By percentage:							
Approximate share of wheat imports from:							
United States.....	20.6	24.1	24.8	27.8	17.6	17.1	23.9
U.S.S.R.....	26.2	7.3	11.1	6.4	3.2
Australia.....	12.5	12.2	9.0	12.2	37.2	44.6
Canada.....	.3	3.7	1.6	29.0	19.6	9.7
France.....	13.2	28.0	42.0	7.0	.6	10.3

¹ Countries included are: Jordan, Qatar, Bahrain, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Aden, Yemen Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Algeria, and Tunisia. Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the experience with the Occupational Safety and Health Act has revealed many harmful effects on business. Many instances have been reported where drastic structural changes and other adjustments ordered by OSHA have resulted in extreme hardships. A good many business firms, with perfect safety and health records going back for years, have been forced to close because they insisted they were not financially able to comply with OSHA-imposed standards.

I would hope the Committee on Education and Labor will address itself to this problem. Why not hold good faith hear-

ings and allow all segments of business and labor to come in and express their views, based upon experience with this law, whether their views be positive or negative? Small business is suffering the most because they do not have lawyers and engineers on their regular payrolls and can ill afford the expense of hiring the advisers and experts they would need if they should challenge the propriety or validity of an OSHA directive.

One way to alleviate this problem would be an amendment to exempt the firms with no more than 25 employees and all nonmanufacturing enterprises—in those States that have health and safety laws. I introduced a bill to that effect, with some 25 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared a series of three articles on OSHA in the Texas Tribune, written by a research specialist, R. D. Patrick Mahoney. These comments are timely and should be read by every Member of Congress. The first

of the articles, dated October 17, 1973, follows:

OSHA

(By R. D. Patrick Mahoney)

On December 17, 1970, another Pandora's box was opened by the House of Representatives which, eager to adjourn for the Christmas holidays, passed the Occupational Safety & Health Act (OSHA). President Nixon signed this bill on December 29, and OSHA immediately became Public Law 91-493.

As written, OSHA covers more than 4 million businesses and 57 million employers in the United States. The legality of this law, which is spuriously based on the Commerce Clause of the Constitution, gives OSHA jurisdiction over every employer in the country.

Furthermore, a new office of the Department of Labor was created to deal exclusively with the governing of this law—the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health. Under the provisions of OSHA, this new assistant is empowered with investigative, enforcement and punitive powers unequalled in the history of the Republic.

This law, which would purportedly guarantee every employee in America a place to work "free from recognized hazards that are causing or are likely to cause death or serious physical harm," carries the stipulation that employers must comply with standards set by the Secretary of Labor. However, only employers are subject to punitive action as a result of violation of these standards—employees are subject to no punitive action.

Another section of OSHA decrees that states may submit their own safety plans, but that these plans must meet federal standards in order to be accepted. They are also subject to continual governmental "monitoring." This "monitoring" is in consonance with President Nixon's statement of January 5, 1971, that there are certain powers "that can't be returned to the people."

If a state-submitted plan is accepted by the federal government, that state becomes eligible for up to 90% subsidization to help finance these changes. But federal money is inevitably accompanied by its unshakable shadow, federal control. Thus, the bureaucracy controls, through the power generated by the use of funds confiscated from those controlled—a very vicious, self-perpetuating circle indeed.

Still another provision of OSHA calls for a review commission composed of three commissioners to be appointed by the President, each for a staggering six-year term. The employer is provided with an "impartial" board to which he may appeal, but we suspect that this "impartial" board will merely be a rubber stamp for the Secretary of Labor.

Finally, OSHA calls for mandatory record-keeping by the employer, the creation of the National Institute of Occupational Safety & Health (NIOSH), and includes a costly provision which specifies that the businessmen of America can secure federal loans (with interest, of course) to pay the high cost of complying with OSHA standards—that is, if they voluntarily meet these standards.

The Nixon Administration, in two separate requests for funds (March 15 and March 23, 1971), asked for \$16 million to administer the Occupational Safety & Health Act and to finance its review commission. Despite objections by Senator Jacob Javits (R) of New York, Congress appropriated only \$11 million to launch OSHA. The review commission, which would be headed by Robert D. Moran, received \$400,000. Moran, who acted as Western Massachusetts chairman of the United Citizens for Nixon-Agnew in 1968, became Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor the following year. In 1970-71, Moran acted as Administrator of Workplace Standards (Department of Labor). His Deputy Administrator was George C. Guenter, who has now become Assistant Secretary for OSHA at a salary of \$38,000 per annum. Ironically, Moran later testified before a House committee that his review commission was a "truly independent adjudicatory body which in no respect can be considered to be a rubber stamp for the safety and health administration."

As soon as the OSHA program began to roll, compliance enforcement officers were promptly found in every corner of the United States, with salaries providing ample stimulus for efficiency in their jobs; i.e. to guarantee that the employers of America complied with the 248 pages of safety regulations already written. (Seven of these pages deal exclusively with that all-important subject, step-ladders!)

At last count, Region VI (Dallas with adjunct offices in Houston and Lubbock) supported three GS-14s, six GS-13s, twelve GS-12s, nine GS-11s, and three GS-9s who were earning per annum salaries (respectively) of \$23,168; \$22,328; \$18,906; and \$13,162. We think that a total of \$621,570 for salaries in Region VI alone is a rather steep price to pay these agents of the federal bureaucracy, especially when one notes that

14 of these 33 agents have no degrees and, of those who do have degrees, we cannot find a single one with expertise in system safety analysis (a prerequisite for any beginning safety engineer).

Under the provisions of OSHA, no advance warnings were to be given to employers before inspection visits by compliance enforcement agents, nor were any preinspection visits to be made. This "no-knock" provision is so strict that anyone giving an employer advance notice of an inspection visit is subject to a strict penalty. Senator Clifford P. Hansen (R) of Wyoming has described this inspection system as a "gestapo" technique, underscoring the word "gestapo" by stating emphatically, "That is exactly what it is."

Liberal members of Congress have consistently protested the validity of the law enforcement's method of obtaining evidence by "hot pursuit." But a Watergate-conscious Congress—which is rightfully upset over the numerous wire tapings, break-ins and muzzings of well known public figures—has said little about the OSHA inspection procedures which allow government agents to enter business establishments with neither a warning nor a warrant.

A year after the passage of OSHA in 1970, complaints began pouring in from all over the nation and Congressmen began to realize what they had done to the businessmen of America. Two Congressional committees studied 1,410 pages of testimony and related documents concerning this repressive legislation.

The complaints began with the testimony of Rep. O. C. Fisher (D) of San Angelo, Texas, and McNeill Stokes, general counsel of the American Subcontractors Association, who spoke before a hearing of the Select Committee on Small Business. This hearing had been called for the express purpose of airing OSHA complaints. Congressman Fisher, who voted against the bill, stated that he had already seen more than 100 pounds of intricate and complicated OSHA regulations and that the unfortunate businessmen—the victims of OSHA inspectors—could not afford to procure attorneys who could determine whether their businesses complied with federal regulations.

Fisher stated, "Under this law, each of them (the businessmen) is a potential victim of a bureaucracy which is given authority to act as investigator, prosecutor and judge."

Counsel Stokes gave expert testimony based on his background as both an attorney and a graduate chemical engineer:

"The roles of the Secretary of Labor and his inspectors under the act are analogous to all-powerful federal policemen who are given the authority to make the laws by regulations and to enforce those laws without search warrants. . . . The citizen's only recourse is to appeal to the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, which is essentially a police commission sitting in Washington, D.C. Seminars and training sessions are held throughout the country by the Department of Labor to inform employees and representatives of employees of their rights to report employers under the act, but to my knowledge no seminars or training programs have been held to aid or inform employers on how to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Incidentally, the OSHA Review Commission has taken the position that if you chose to appeal, they have the authority to increase your penalty, which also has a chilling effect on administrative procedures; and they have done so in several cases."

Chilling indeed. In fact, we haven't heard anything quite so chilling this side of the Iron Curtain.

Stokes related the case of John Beall, of the Beall Construction Company in Lincoln, Nebraska, who was fined \$244 for an alleged violation. Because Beall could not afford to contest the charges, he was forced to pay this fine. But he protested this practice, which he considered unjust, to his Sen-

ator in Washington. That Senator, Carl Curtis (R), followed the usual procedure and forwarded the complaint to the respective agency for an answer. Stokes related the results:

"Approximately three days later, federal agents reinspected the work site, and alleged that Beall had not corrected the safety violations. Beall was fined \$750 for each day that the safety violations had not been corrected. The total fine amounted to \$31,744—a high price to pay for exercising a citizen's right to communicate with his elected representatives. Mr. Beall must take the offensive to prove himself innocent and contest the daily penalties, which he, as a small businessman, finds economically depressing since the fine is double his annual income."

Afred Harres, of Harres Welding Service in Worland, Wyoming, wrote to his Congressman, Teno Roncallo (D), who in turn testified before the committee as follows:

"I am satisfied that not one of those legislators voting for this bill took the time to read it, or if he did so, took the time to reason its impact on business in general and on small business in particular. I paged through this mess of insanity and picked at random parts that would apply directly to my business, and found that some of the regulations, if applied to the letter of the law, could be a greater hazard and danger than the way we now do various things."

An anonymous spokesman, of B & B Homes in Casper, Wyoming, wrote: "Despite our cooperation and compliance with their directives, penalties of \$200 are being filed against us. In our estimation, it is un-American and we don't intend to pay."

It is no wonder that the Governor of Wyoming, Stanley K. Hathaway, stated to Congressman Roncallo that "the techniques used by the Department of Labor are gestapo tactics."

Perhaps even more revealing is the incredibly honest admission made before the Committee on Small Business by Congressman Charles Thone (R) of Nebraska:

"Chairman Hungate and members of the committee: They tell the story about why Congressmen run so hard for re-election. It seems that most of them couldn't make a living back home under the laws they passed when they were back here in Congress. I think OSHA might be Exhibit A in that regard."

What started as a lie has become a nightmare.

AGNES DODSON AND JAMES E. REYNOLDS: TWO DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANTS

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I find myself marveling at the broad range of challenges which face our ex-servicemen and at the numerous contributions they have made to our society. As a veteran myself, I know there are myriad rules and regulations that still influence our lives, and that often the bureaucracy can weave a web of redtape so fast and so tight that a veteran may suffer and be powerless to help himself.

In the Second District of Texas, though, veterans who have such problems do have a place to turn for help. County veterans' service officers stand ready to

unravel the bureaucratic web and help the veteran through his problems.

Two such officers in particular—Agnes Dodson and James E. Reynolds—have been brought to my attention time and time again for their dedication and willingness to do "a little extra" for those who come to them for help.

Agnes Dodson, Liberty County's Veterans' Service officer, is a rare woman. Neither a veteran nor a close relative of one, she became interested in the work of the veterans' service office because of her belief that "without the veterans who have served this country, we would not have an America like it is today."

She expressed her interest in this field when she became secretary to Frank Speer, the veterans service officer until 1964. When he retired, Mrs. Dodson, known throughout the county for her dedication to the office, was appointed to fill the vacancy.

While her duties in the veterans service office require constant attention, Mrs. Dodson finds time to serve as executive secretary for the Liberty County Chapter of the Red Cross. She is also responsible for reactivating the American Legion Post in Liberty which had been inactive for more than 15 years. She has also received numerous citations for her work in the recruiting programs of the Army, Navy, Air Force and the Marines.

James Reynolds, known by his friends in Montgomery County as "Red," is a veteran of World War II. He was taken prisoner by the Japanese when the U.S.S. *Houston* sank in the Java Sea early in the war. During 4 years in prison camps—from Singapore to Saigon to Japan—Red kept hidden notes in a small diary that would have meant death if found by his captors. After his release in 1946, Reynolds married, and 3 years later he moved to Conroe, Tex. to work for Humble Oil & Refining Co.

When he retired from Humble in 1971, he took over the post of Montgomery County Veterans Service Officer. Since taking office, Reynolds has become active in service organizations such as the American Legion and the VFW. But his interest in the welfare of his fellow veterans has not lessened his interest in his community. For example, he was chosen to serve on the Governors Committee for the Aging—of which he was the director, the local alcoholic council, the Salvation Army, and the local civil defense agency.

These two service officers are every day demonstrating to their neighbors the true meaning of a public servant. They both work long, hard hours to help—not only at their offices, but in their outside activities as well. They are dedicated to helping the veterans who have given so much to this country.

UNITED STATES EXPORTS OIL TO THE NETHERLANDS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans who have been badgered into

economic retrogression by the emotional rhetoric of the grave national energy crisis, have been shocked to learn that our Government has continued to export petroleum to our allies in the Far East and the Middle East. It now announces diplomatic decisions to supply oil to the Netherlands.

It could be that our State Department feels that the American people have an obligation to the Dutch because of their pro-Israeli stance during the recent Middle East war. Or it could be that the decision weighs heavily on the fact that His Highness Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands is the President of the Bilderberg meetings.

As Americans continue to do without and be forced to turn back their accustomed style of life and comfort, more and more will be wondering why our national leaders continue to get involved in international decisions under which Americans are expected to do without, while foreigners continue to benefit.

I insert the following related newsclipping:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1973]

UNITED STATES SETS OIL SUPPLY FOR DUTCH

The United States has agreed to supply oil to the Netherlands should that country find itself unable to obtain its minimum fuel needs because of the Arab oil embargo, administration sources said yesterday.

The sources said the promise was passed quietly to the Dutch government through diplomatic channels a few days ago. They said there was no immediate need for such shipments, however, and expressed hope the Dutch would be able to obtain adequate petroleum supplies from other sources.

The State Department said Friday that its energy specialist, Under Secretary William Donaldson, would visit the Netherlands within a few weeks for talks with Dutch officials on "contingency" plans to deal with the oil shortages.

Donaldson will accompany Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger when he attends a meeting of the NATO foreign ministers in Brussels in mid-December and then confer with Dutch authorities at the Hague. Kissinger is expected to make a return trip to the Mideast after the NATO foreign ministers meeting.

The Netherlands, like the United States, was completely cut off from Arab oil supplies as a result of its support of Israel. Other European nations have refused to supply the Netherlands with oil for fear they, too, would be hit by the Arab oil embargo.

"The Dutch were among the very few who stood tall, so far as we are concerned, during the Middle East crisis," one source said. "Now their friends and close neighbors are acting in anything but a neighborly fashion. We can't stand by and let them down."

The sources said there was no need for the Netherlands to ask for U.S. oil at this time because Holland was still receiving some petroleum shipments from Indonesia and because the Dutch led the way in imposing energy conservation measures as the fuel crisis deepened.

For the future, sources said, the Dutch may have a means of persuading other European nations to quietly resume shipments of petroleum products. The Netherlands has long been a leading producer of Western Europe's natural gas and the Dutch may threaten to shut off their natural gas pipelines unless they receive fuel in return, sources said.

"They've got some leverage there, and maybe we won't be asked to do much," one source said. "If we do have to supply them oil, the quantity will be small."

Officially, State Department spokesman George Vest said that the United States

is prepared "in principle" to help Holland in an energy emergency.

EMERGENCY SECURITY ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION FOR ISRAEL

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 3, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 7, the House of Representatives will consider H.R. 11088, the Emergency Security Assistance Authorization for Israel. I have the hope that the Congress will enact and that the President will sign this authorization during this month.

I would like to share with my colleagues the testimony which I submitted today to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in support of this legislation:

H.R. 11088, TO PROVIDE EMERGENCY SECURITY ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR ISRAEL

The fundamental purpose of H.R. 11088 is to give a signal to the Soviet Union and to the Arab states that the United States will continue to abide by its commitment to protect Israel and its territorial integrity from all of the enemies that surround this small nation.

Israel has suffered severe losses in the war which began on October 6. Israel purchased nearly one billion dollars of equipment from the United States since the beginning of the war on Yom Kippur. Israel will need very substantial amounts of currency in addition to this one billion dollars in order to replace her losses and to counter-balance the heavy flow of extraordinary sophisticated Soviet weapons which are still being delivered to Arab armies.

Hopefully Israel will be able to negotiate with confidence and with success. She cannot do so however until she is assured that the military equipment which this country needs will not force Israel into bankruptcy. It is for this reason that it is essential that the Congress of the United States authorize the entire 2.2 billion at this time rather than a part of it now with an additional authorization to come at some time in the future.

I have the hope that the Congress will enact and that the President will sign this authorization prior to the end of December, 1973. If the United States does act in this forthright way this nation will indicate to the entire world that the United States will not ease out of its commitments as the nations of the Common Market in Europe have attempted to do.

The sum of 2.2 billion is the best estimate which officials of the State and Defense Departments have been able to arrive at as the essential amount of support which Israel needs at this time for its recovery from a disastrous war and its provision against any future threat from its Arab neighbors armed with Russian military equipment.

In the happy event that present negotiations result in a situation where both the Soviet Union and the Arab nations will recognize that it is impossible to conquer Israel a part of the 2.2 billion dollars authorized under H.R. 11088 can be "used to reimburse current applicable appropriations, funds, and accounts of the Department of Defense for the value of such defense articles and defense services."

If the Congress enacts H.R. 11088 it will be the first time in the entire history of Israel that the United States has ever extended a substantial sum to Israel for military purposes. It is astonishing indeed that

between 1946 and 1972, according to the Agency for International Development—the United States provided to foreign nations grants and military assistance totalling approximately 55 billion dollars. Not a single dollar of this enormous sum ever went to Israel!

It would appear to be relevant here to review the commendable manner in which the United States in the recent conflict fulfilled its longstanding commitment to Israel. Shortly after hostilities broke out on October 6 it was clear to the United States that all attempts to bring about a cease fire and to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union were unsuccessful. Within 72 hours after the decision was reached that it was impossible to negotiate with Russia an American airlift had attained an average daily lift level of about 1,000 tons of critically needed weapons, ammunition, medical supplies and equipment. Without understanding in any

way the military resourcefulness and tremendous courage of Israel it seems fair to state that the United States' assistance to Israel prevented a disastrous shift in the balance of military power to the Arab side.

At the outbreak of hostilities on October 6 Israel owed to the United States government about 1.2 billion in repayment of credits extended to Israel for the acquisition of military equipment. Most of these credit repayments were scheduled to be made over the next 10 years. In addition to this sum of 1.2 billion the Israeli government owed to the United States approximately 500 million dollars for cash sales executed prior to the beginning of the Yom Kippur war.

Because of the disastrous military losses on the two fronts of the three weeks' war Israel has estimated its requirements for military equipment at a sum of almost 3 billion dollars. The compromise figure arrived at by the State and Defense Departments of 2.2

billion will allow Israel to purchase military equipment necessary and indispensable for its present defense and also allow Israel to pay off those short-term debts the payment of which cannot be postponed.

It seems to be self-evident that the Arab nations would never have initiated the October War if they did not have Soviet support and encouragement. Indeed it is the Soviets who have provided the weapons, the aircraft and to some extent the incentive for the tragic war which came to a hopefully permanent cease fire on October 22, 1973.

Since 1970 the Soviet Union has engaged in the Middle East in one of the largest military buildups in the entire history of Russia. The grant of 2.2 billion to be authorized under H.R. 11088 is designed to make Israel militarily invulnerable. This grant in other words is intended to make the Day of Atonement War of 1973 the last and final war that will ever be waged in the Middle East.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, December 4, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Turn not aside from following the Lord, but serve the Lord with all your heart.—I Samuel 12: 20.

As we present ourselves before the throne of Thy glory, O Lord, we come to praise Thee, to thank Thee, and to pray for the peace which the world cannot give and which the world cannot take away.

We do not ask for wealth, nor length of days, nor greater honor among our brethren, nor that we may always have our way; but we do pray that Thou wilt grant unto us Thy peace which passes human understanding, and in that true peace may we find rest for our souls, strength for our days, and an outreaching concern for the needs of others.

Bless Thou our Nation and lead us in the paths of righteousness and good will. Grant unto our people a lofty level of patriotism, with greater nobility of character and an increasing emphasis on the high virtues of truth and love.

In the spirit of Him whose life is love we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 974. An act designating the Texarkana Dam and Reservoir on the Sulphur River as the "Wright Patman Dam and Lake."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8245. An act to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1973.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce to the House that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, December 3, 1973, he did on that day sign an enrolled bill of the House, as follows:

H.R. 11104, an act to provide for a temporary increase of \$10,700,000,000 in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary limit applies to June 30, 1974.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2535) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COL. JOHN H. SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2633) for the relief of Col. John H. Sherman.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF THE LATE RICHARD BURTON, SERGEANT FIRST CLASS, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3533) for the relief of the estate of the late Richard Burton, sergeant first class, U.S. Army, retired.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2508) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MURRAY SWARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6411) for the relief of Murray Swartz.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTELLE M. FASS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 362) to refer the bill (H.R. 7209) for the relief of Estelle M. Fass to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RITA SWANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1342) for the relief of Rita Swann.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LUIGI SANTANIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1466) for the relief of Luigi Santaniello.