

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 33

DECEMBER 19, 1973 TO DECEMBER 22, 1973

(PAGES 42369 TO 43638)

has become much smaller in the years when he first advocated the two-ocean navy. Today, whether it is half way around the world to the People's Republic of China in Peking, or a third of the way around the world in the Kremlin in Moscow, or wherever we go, we must realize that there cannot be real peace in the world unless there is developed a structure of peace which covers not only the small nations, but particularly the great powers that have the key to peace or to war in their hands and that is what strength is all about.

I know that many think that when the President of the United States or Herman Talmadge, on this platform, or Eddie Hebert out there in this audience, or Phil Landrum, or Carl Vinson, any of us, talk about a strong America, and let's not be number two, there is the thought that that is jingoism.

Who cares whether we are number one in arms? I will tell you who care: People in every small and weak nation in the world, because without America and its strength, no small nation would have a chance to survive today. That is what it is all about.

I am not suggesting that America should be the world's policeman.

I am not suggesting that whenever there is a problem, as there was in Korea and then in Vietnam, that America is the nation that must go to the rescue of these small nations. I am only saying this: that in a world where there is nuclear power, and in a world where there are superpowers, two in existence and one coming along very fast, the People's Republic of China, we must not leave the position of leadership to other nations without having the balance that is needed, so that they will see that their interest will be served by not using that enormous power that they have, either for the purpose of conquest without war, or even with war itself.

I am not suggesting here that Mr. Brezhnev wants war, or that Mr. Mao Tse-tung or Mr. Chou En-lai wants war. I am only saying this: that reading the pages of history when a vacuum is left and when there is a great power with no other power to balance it, then a very dangerous situation develops in terms of a threat to the peace of the world.

And looking at the United States and all of the criticism we have taken for our role in Korea and then in Vietnam, and even in other times, we can be thankful for this: Our young men have gone abroad in four wars. They have fought bravely. They have died. But we have never gone in terms of conquest. We have never gone to seek territory. We have never gone to break the peace. We have always gone to keep the peace. We have never gone to destroy freedom. We have always gone to defend freedom.

Mistakes, yes, we have made; perhaps in the conduct of the wars, perhaps in the conduct of foreign policy before they ever came about. But we can be proud that the United States in this century is a nation that is dedicated to peace, and that the world needs, as a strong, powerful nation, because we do stand for peace and will work for peace whenever the case ever arises.

Looking ahead to the year 2000, and it is very difficult to look much beyond that but I think there is a better chance than there has been since World War II that because the relationships which Carl Vinson has spoken to that we have established with countries with whom we have nothing in common as far as ideology is concerned—in fact, we differ completely with, Chou En-lai, Mao Tse-tung, Mr. Brezhnev, Podgorny and their colleagues—but because of the initiatives we have taken, we may be establishing the pattern which will mean that the great powers will recognize that the risk of war is too great for them to engage in adventurism in any part of the world, and that the benefits of peace, on the other side, are so much

greater that we should use our strength for peace rather than for war.

Let me say just one personal note. I am known as an anti-Communist, and I earned that, and I suppose most of the people in this audience would say, well, I am against the Communists. But let me say, I know the Russian people.

They are strong. They are vigorous. They are fine people. I know the Chinese people, and whether they are on Mainland China or Taiwan or in Bangkok, where there are a couple million of them, or in Manila where there are a million. They are sophisticated, with layer on layer of history behind them, and also with an ability to give much to the world, and I want a world—I want a world for these young people that we have heard outside a few moments ago in which not only they won't have to be drafted, not only they won't have to go to war, but a world in which they can work with their young colleagues in Russia, in China, in Latin America, in Africa, to find the answer to such critical questions as how do we avoid cancer; to find the answer to such critical questions that we are faced with in the field of energy and all of that; the answer to how we can work together to make the world's environment better.

I am not suggesting that it is going to be easy and I am not suggesting that because we settled the Mideast conflict, momentarily at least, that we can expect that people who have hated each other for thousands of years are now going to start to love each other. But I do know this:

With the kind of power that we have, with the kind of power that exists in other nations across this globe, and can exist in others, it is essential, if civilization survives, that America remain strong enough that our voice will be respected so that we can play a peacekeeping role because a war is unthinkable in the present context in which we presently live.

And that brings me now to Carl Vinson again. He was for strength always in his life, and America can be thankful that because of what he stood for we were strong enough to have handled World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, with military strength that was necessary; to have handled the recent airlift which avoided what could have been a very difficult situation in the Mideast and helped to avoid an American involvement in the Middle East. All of these things he contributed to.

And a monument must be built to this man, must be left to him. We built part of it today with this ceremony when we honor him and the great law school, the Walter George Law School.

He would not want a monument built for himself to be there in Washington. I don't know, I have never seen him on a horse, I don't know how he would look on that kind of a monument. (Laughter)

But next to his country, and next to his State of Georgia, Carl Vinson loved the Navy most, and so I have an announcement to make today. I have discussed with Chairman John Stennis of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and Congressman Ed Hébert, the Congressman from Louisiana, the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, and their counterparts, a proposal, and they have given me permission, because we must do this thing jointly, to make this announcement today.

As you know, we have just begun to develop nuclear carriers. The first one was named the Eisenhower, the second one was named the Nimitz, the great Naval Commander of World War II. The third is just beginning, and it will be named the Carl M. Vinson.

like to call to the attention of my colleagues a moving and thoughtful letter written by a 25-year-old Israeli soldier after he arrived home from the most recent Arab-Israeli war.

In poignant, personal terms he is able to describe the terrible tragedy of war.

He writes:

It is difficult for me to believe that I have passed through four wars since my birth, 24 years ago. Four wars in 25 years— isn't it too much for a young man?

Four wars is indeed too much and I hope that the Geneva negotiations will result in a lasting peace settlement achieved by the Israelis and Arabs themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOVEMBER 5, 1973.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Shalom! How are you and your family? I was planning to answer your letter a long time ago. But, all of a sudden a war broke out in my country . . . I was called to the Army and unable to write during those "hard days". Today is the first time I have come home for a few hours since the war started. Although I am very tired I feel like I must write to you.

First of all I want to thank you for the warm letter you sent me on the occasion of my wedding. My wife and I appreciated it very much and we were very sorry you left Israel a few days before our wedding.

The second and more important thing which brings me to write is my desire to express my deep appreciation and thanks to your country. We will never forget all that your people have done for us during one of the most dangerous periods in the history of our nation! I want you also to know that your personal initiative and support for helping Israel and for saving the Jews in Russia, were widely reported and welcomed by the Israeli newspapers—and especially by my paper—"Maariv". They added the fact that you were in Israel a few weeks before the war broke out.

I am sure that now, after you have visited our country, met our leaders and seen our society, you understand us more deeply than before. I remember you telling me (on the way to your hotel) that you have found here a true desire for peace, and a will for negotiations with our neighbors. Therefore, I am sure you know we did not want that war, and we did not start it. The war came to us like thunder on a clear day—and we paid a very heavy price for it. It is terrible; relatives and friends whom I knew for a long time and enjoyed being with, were suddenly gone. They will not be with us any more. Mothers were bereaved of their only sons. Young wives were left alone with no husbands. Thousands of people are crippled for the rest of their lives.

So sad—so painful.

Why?

Why—we are all asking.

It is difficult for me to believe that I have passed through four wars since my birth, 25 years ago. Four wars in 25 years— isn't it too much for a young man?

I was born during the Independence War, so I don't remember it. But I do remember the 1956 War and, of course, the 2 wars I took part in. The Six Day War and the October 1973 War. There is no doubt, and I felt it, that during this last war we were fighting for the existence of our small nation. For the integrity of our country. We all want to see this war as the last one.

#### THE ARAB-ISRAELI WAR

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would

"Enough", "No more", "We have suffered so much"—people say everywhere in Israel . . . and on the other hand, the Arabs are threatening a new war, and you can never know . . .

That's the way it is! Maybe it is our destiny to live with a situation such as this, but I believe we shall overcome. I personally hope that it won't be far away for Isaiah's prediction to come true—as he said in Chapter II, 4: "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

I am looking forward to seeing you soon in Israel in more peaceful days. They will come. They must come! It's time now!

Best wishes and peace.

Sincerely,

RAZI GUTERMAN.

### ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee on endangered species, I am happy to support S. 1983, the Endangered Species Act of 1973. This is a vital piece of legislation that must be accepted if additional endangered or threatened species of wildlife are not to be destroyed and eventually become extinct.

The goal of this legislation is to use conservation procedures as are necessary to protect any endangered or threatened species. These procedures can include scientific resource management which means research, census law enforcement, habitat acquisition and maintenance, propagation, live trapping, and transplantation techniques. Regulated taking of certain endangered animals is possible where absolutely necessary.

The Secretary of the Interior lists some 109 species as endangered in the United States. Over 300 species are on the foreign list. Because it is impossible to restore a species following extinction it is absolutely necessary that proper methods be established now to prevent the possibility of additional species becoming extinct.

This legislation provides a means to such prevention. It allows an adequate time for each State to implement necessary machinery to carry out the provisions of this act. However, where States fail to protect its endangered or threatened species, the Federal Government has the necessary authority under this act to do so.

S. 1983 gives added impetus to the authority which the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Interior have under the Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970 to determine endangered species or threatened species.

Adequate penalties are levied by this legislation against those who knowingly or for commercial purposes destroy endangered or threatened species. However, an exemption is provided for the Alaskan Natives who may utilize certain threatened species for subsistence reasons. Such an exemption is legitimate.

This legislation authorizes \$22 million for the Department of the Interior over a 3-year period and \$5.5 million for the Department of Commerce to carry out the provisions of this act. This is an acceptable amount to implement the provisions of the act.

Mr. President, the conferees have worked hard on this legislation. Several differences existed between the House

and Senate versions of this legislation. Amicable relations between House and Senate conferees made this legislation possible. I wish to commend those who have been conferees with me for their work.

I ask that my colleagues in the Senate support S. 1983 as it has come from the conference. Legislation in this area is long overdue. This legislation provides means by which our endangered and threatened species can be given necessary protection for future generations to enjoy.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SELF-GOVERNMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the conference report on S. 1435, which the clerk will please state by title.

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1435) to provide an elected Mayor and City Council for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 6, 1973, at pp. 39900-39913.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time for debate on the report is limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the manager of the conference report, the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), and the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS).

Who yields time?

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the Senate passed the home rule bill on July 10, 1973, by a vote of 69 to 17. That bill would have delegated to the District government power over all legislation including appropriations and over court appointments. The home rule bill which passed the House gave the District control over all legislation except for appropriations, which continued to be vested in the Congress. In addition, the House bill continued the present system of appointment for judges and provided for nonpartisan elections. Both bills contained specific restrictions on the powers of the Council, such as the imposition of any tax on the property of the United States, enactment of any law which con-

cerned the function of property of the United States, or the imposition of a commuter tax.

The conference report provides for an elected Mayor and a 13-member City Council, of which 5 shall be elected at large and 8 from wards, with guaranteed minority party representation of 2 at-large members of that Council. The Mayor will possess all the usual executive functions of a mayor; the Council will possess all of the usual legislative functions except for the power to appropriate funds. That power, as is presently true, will rest in Congress, and the District of Columbia budget will be submitted to the Congress by the President through the Office of Management and Budget.

All acts of the Council must lie before the Congress for 30 days for review before they go into effect and if both Houses by concurrent resolution agree that such legislation shall not go into effect it is vetoed. Furthermore, the home rule charter itself may be amended only by act of Council followed by a referendum of the citizens of the District of Columbia, and if they approve the change, it then must be affirmatively approved by both Houses of Congress before it will take effect. Finally, any changes enacted by the Council in the criminal laws would not go into effect if either House disapproves such change.

Judges will be appointed in accordance with the Missouri plan. The President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, will pick a nominee from a list of three names submitted for each appointment by a Judicial Nominating Commission. The 15-year term of judges is continued. However, if the Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure finds a judge to be well qualified or exceptionally well qualified he will receive automatic reappointment to a new term, subject only to the retirement age of 70.

I think that this short summary is sufficient to give the Members a fair idea of what the bill contains. I am very pleased that we have been able to reach agreement with the House on this step forward after the Senate has tried so many times to obtain such legislation, and I commend the House conferees and especially Chairman DIGGS on their efforts to reach an accommodation of views.

This bill does not give the District of Columbia what I would call true home rule. The citizens do not have the power of the purse. However, I do view it as an important step forward; it is one of a series of steps which we have taken in the past few years. We began with the 22d amendment which allowed the citizens of the District for the first time to vote in Presidential elections. Then we passed legislation allowing the election of a nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives from the District. And now we have before us a bill which would for the first time in over 100 years allow the citizens of the District to elect a Mayor and Council which would be both responsible and responsive to them in the first instance.

I am confident that the new powers which Congress is delegating to the citizens of the District will be used wisely; that the review procedures which have been set up will be unnecessary, and that another step will take place in the future