

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:41 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 31, 1974, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, May 30, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Gerald L. Parsky, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Jack Franklin Bennett, elevated.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The following-named persons to be Members of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

Harold Melvin Agnew, of New Mexico, vice John J. McCloy, resigned.

Gordon Allott, of Colorado, vice William J. Casey, resigned.

Edward Clark, of Texas, vice Douglas Dillon, resigned.

Lane Kirkland, of Maryland, vice James R. Killian, Jr., resigned.

Carl M. Marcy, of Virginia, vice Lauris Norstad, resigned.

Joseph Martin, Jr., of California, vice Peter G. Peterson, resigned.

John A. McCone, of California, vice J. P. Ruina, resigned.

Gerard C. Smith, of the District of Columbia, vice Cyrus Roberts Vance, resigned.

IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be Lieutenant general

Major Gen. Lee M. Paschall, 524-18-4774FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be Lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Gordon T. Gould, Jr., 419-03-0765FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James William Sutherland, Jr.,

432-01-3212, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

U.S. RAILWAY ASSOCIATION

The following-named persons to be Members of the Board of Directors of the United States Railway Association for the terms indicated: (new positions)

FOR A TERM OF 2 YEARS

Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine.
William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania.

FOR A TERM OF 4 YEARS

Gale B. Aydelott, of Colorado.
James E. Burke, of New Jersey.

FOR A TERM OF 6 YEARS

Frank H. Blatz, Jr., of New Jersey.
Samuel B. Payne, of Massachusetts.
W. K. Smith, of Minnesota.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 30, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Virginia Y. Trotter, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ACTION AGENCY

John L. Ganley, of New Jersey, to be Deputy Director of the ACTION Agency.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CONYERS COALITION

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues, and especially the members of the Judiciary Committee, to a column by Victor Riesel, whose personal courage is exceeded only by his accuracy in reporting. The subject of Mr. Riesel's column is Representative JOHN CONYERS, whose excusal from the Judiciary Committee Watergate investigation I have called for and again call for. Mr. CONYERS, by his words and deeds, has amply shown that he cares not a wit for constitutional due process and the Constitution itself. I urge my colleague Mr. ROBINO to investigate the fitness of Mr. CONYERS for participation in the Judiciary Committee investigation, in view of the chairman's promise of a fair examination of the evidence in the Watergate affair by the Judiciary Committee.

The article follows:

PREFERS COMMUNISTS?—JUDICIARY COMMITTEE'S JOHN CONYERS JOINS COALITION WITH FRIEND ANGELA DAVIS

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—There's nothing flamboyant about the soft-voiced 45-year-old bachelor, Congressman John Conyers, Jr.—except his violent hatred for Dick Nixon and his intense passion for coalition with left-wingers, former Communists and at least one current member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party U.S.A.

Conyers, who would have the House Judi-

ciary Committee, of which he is a member, investigate the U.S. in general and the White House in particular, sets his own rules. If one discusses him, his record, his friends' activities and their Communist records, one is swiftly denounced as a "racist" and oppressor of the working class. To refer to old FBI dossiers on his political ally, Detroit Mayor Coleman Young, is to face the Congressman's full fury, oral brimstone and power.

After carefully perusing Congressman Conyer's recent hell-and-fire speeches, many of which sound brutally chauvinistically anti-white to me, it's evident he would like to impeach President Nixon merely for breathing. Though Conyers is a member of the National Advisory Council of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) he hasn't granted the President of the U.S. an iota of the right to due process which the ACLU has to Nazis, Fascists and Communists.

For years now he has chosen strange alliances—so his pre-conviction of Dick Nixon hardly is surprising. Actually, he's not even very kind to Sens. Hubert Humphrey, Walter Mondale and Ted Kennedy, whom he finds "all confused."

But none of this is as strange as taking the trouble to fly into Detroit May 10 to join a member of the Communist Party U.S.A. Central Committee and others to whip up a typical radical rally. That member is Angela Davis.

Conyers, speaking that day for the National Alliance Against Racism and Political Oppression, called for "a great coalition" against Watergate-ism, racism and oppression.

He averred he would stay the weekend with the coalition leaders to organize a "struggle against the system of racism and repression that spawned Watergate."

Comrade Angela Davis, whose Communist party leaders (Gus Hall et al.) were in Moscow then where they had spent some time conferring with Soviet General Secre-

tary Leonid Brezhnev, did her oratorical thing. She added a filip by calling for a national black mobilization in Raleigh, N.C., on July 4.

Now Conyers is far too sophisticated to have overlooked the clear implications of what he was saying and of the import of Angela Davis' presence. Conyers is an old trade-union hand. He knows all about infighting between what are called "the commies" inside labor and the anti-Communists. He sure knows the "C.P." record in Detroit and what they tried to do (and did for a while) to the big United Auto Workers.

What, then, are the Congressman's standards? This question cannot be answered by any vituperative reports from his corner. He has demanded the President's impeachment for such varied reasons as Dick Nixon's opposition to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the bombing of Cambodia.

Yet he joins with a member of the American Communist Party Central Committee—a party locked into Moscow, a party which approved the Soviet military invasion of Czechoslovakia, a party which has denounced American aid to the allies during the years of Nazi assault on Europe and during the Hitlerian blitz of London.

Conyers has been attacking American multinational corporations. But he strides to the same speaker's platform with Angela Davis, whose party is a section of the most brutal multinational operation the world has known and which joined with the Nazis in the very early '40s.

And there is another, equally grave issue. It seems to me John Conyers, who as a member of the House of Representatives should be speaking for all the people, is using Watergate to whip up racial hatred.

He has a safe seat in Michigan's First Congressional District. He could use his soft voice, his place in the Black Caucus to bring the races together. Yet here he is using the Watergate tragedy as a tool for prying white and black people apart.

He has gone before many black groups with his cookie-cutter cliché attacks on racism. He is using this to push himself in his Democratic party. He has his eye on a Senate seat. He pokes into the United Auto Workers internal politics.

He wants Dick Nixon not only impeached but imprisoned. That's extreme. But one need only note the friends he keeps and the enemies he chooses to understand why.

What this nation needs is an appeal to reason, more unity, not more divisiveness. And certainly less reverse racism.

VENEZUELA DEBATE

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to further informed and enlightened debate on the amendment that will be offered when the U.S. Sugar Act reaches the floor to suspend Venezuela's sugar quota until fair oil prices are restored, I would like to share with my colleagues some thoughtful objections to my amendment raised by a distinguished minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

While obviously I have a different perspective on this matter than does my distinguished colleague, I believe it is not too early to begin debating the merits of the amendment I propose.

Therefore, I am reprinting at this point in the Record the text of a thoughtful letter I received from Mr. THOMSON and my own response thereto concerning the Venezuela amendment for the purpose of encouraging broader attention to the basic issues at stake and hopefully promoting similar dialog among my colleagues on an equally thoughtful, concerned, and responsible level.

The texts of the letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1974.

HON. BILL GUNTER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I have before me a copy of your May 23rd "Dear Colleague" letter entitled, "A Message to Venezuela." While I share your frustration over the high price of imported oil and its implications for the American people, I would urge you to reconsider any efforts you may be planning to strike Venezuela's quota from the United States Sugar Act.

Venezuela is one of the few genuine democracies in Latin America. Despite the historical experiencing of a century and a half of one military strongman followed by another, the country has successfully struggled for more than fifteen years to overcome its political past. Today, Venezuela stands as a shining example of the democratic process at work in a Third World setting.

The Congress recognized Venezuela's significant accomplishment by inviting President Rafael Caldera to address us in 1972. That event was our way of recognizing a nation that has furthered the cause of democracy in the Americas and the world. There probably is not a handful of other Third World nations that merit similar treatment.

Venezuela has been vigorously anti-communist and friendly toward the United States. Due to the predisposition of its leadership and the vicious covert efforts of Fidel Castro's Cuba, this democracy has developed

strongly anti-communist tendencies. It has verbally chastised the excesses of Fidelismo and offered an alternative course to her Latin American neighbors. In addition, Venezuela was the complainant in a series of events culminating with the isolation of Cuba from most of the hemisphere.

Caracas and Washington have agreed on many of the larger world issues. Yet, Venezuela has never hesitated to express a divergent view or adopt a divergent policy. When differences have arisen, they have not been advertised in newspaper headlines, but discussed in an atmosphere of mutual amity and understanding.

Venezuela has treated American investment fairly. There have been no nationalizations reminiscent of Bolivia in 1952 or Chile in 1972; reasonable, if not generous, returns on invested capital have been permitted. American ownership of Venezuelan oil is now being phased out and while I cannot agree with that policy, it is being conducted over a reasonable period and after the investment has been returned. American interests are now mining large quantities of iron ore and bauxite south of the Orinoco River. As with oil, these investments have been treated in a business-like fashion.

No matter what the intent of striking Venezuela from the Sugar Act, Caracas and probably the rest of Latin America would consider this step a direct slap at Venezuelan independence and pride. Aside from the enmity created, the challenge could not go unmatched. The obvious response would be an embargo on oil which would only exacerbate the American consumers' problem. It is a fact the United States needs to buy oil, iron ore, and bauxite far more than Venezuela needs to sell sugar. Striking the country from the quota system, therefore, is not a credible threat.

Action against Venezuela in the Sugar Act would unquestionably send a message to Caracas. But I fear that it would be read in translation: "Do not ever act against our interests or we will slap you down."

Please consider these thoughts. Thank you for your attention.

With best regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

VERNON W. THOMSON, M.C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., May 30, 1974.

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VERNON: I appreciate your taking the time to express your views on the Venezuela amendment to the Sugar Act which I and others will be offering on the floor. Unfortunately, I cannot share your views with respect to the appropriate response by the United States in this instance, and hope that you might consider some of the reasons with the same thought and care I hope I have exercised in reflecting on your good letter.

To begin with, it is perhaps useful to emphasize once again, as I have in my recent statements, that the amendment represents a response to a general economic situation which I am persuaded can no longer be ignored—and that it is not a gratuitous singling out of Venezuela per se for condemnation. Indeed, I join in being encouraged by the progress demonstrated by Venezuela toward democratic government over the past fifteen years and applaud their vigorous resistance to attempted communist inroads, particularly by the communist dictatorship in Cuba. My amendment is not intended, nor in all sobriety do I believe there is any evidence to suggest it would have the effect of altering the basic posture of the country of Venezuela in this regard. For I believe that posture is formulated not as some corollary to the state of Venezuela's relations with the United States at any given moment on a single economic matter, but on their own recognition of self-interest, self-dependence,

spirit of nationalist pride and feeling, and philosophical maturity.

If, in fact, that posture of anti-communism rests on maintaining in any given instance the ability to wreak economic havoc in the United States without response from us, then that posture is weak and fragile indeed and Venezuela would seem not to merit the laudatory regard I join in extending to it for its accomplishments and progress the past 15 years after all. I happen to believe, and I think the evidence indicates when viewed dispassionately, that the basic posture of Venezuela viz a viz the communist world rests on stronger bases than you perhaps extend credit to it for so resting.

I also join, quite obviously, in welcoming such signs of friendship towards the United States as have been exhibited on some occasions. In the instance at hand, however, the people of my own State of Florida, particularly those on small fixed incomes, who are confronted with skyrocketing fuel bills because of Venezuela's wholly unjustified and rapacious pricing policies may perhaps be forgiven for feeling that with friends like that, we may not need enemies.

With respect to the mutual amity and understanding you feel has characterized discussions between Venezuela and the United States over differences where they exist, that mutual amity has not served in the past year to relieve the enormous burden placed on American consumers, nor has the State Department yet been able to furnish me any reason for hope that such discussions show any sign of relieving the burden any time in the foreseeable future. Nor have they been able to provide such assurances with respect to the other OPEC countries. Mutual amity and understanding in this instance therefore, I fear, is dependent upon the continued willingness of our country to allow Venezuela to proceed with the rape of American consumers undisturbed. I do not believe it is the responsibility of our government or of the Congress, however, to continue to leave that situation undisturbed. The economic consequences not only to our own country but to all of the world—and most particularly to the poorer nations of the Third World for which Venezuela asserts such concern at the same time it creates such economic havoc—are now too serious in my judgment to permit our continued indifference.

With respect to the posture of reasonableness you indicate Venezuela has generally taken toward foreign business investments compared to some other Latin American countries, my response I'm afraid must be that I am less concerned at the moment with the gentle treatment accorded to multinational oil conglomerates than I am with the genuine and serious hardship being worked on the average-income citizens of my State of Florida, some of whom now experience electric utility bills almost doubled in size over last year at this time.

Venezuela, of course, would have to determine its own response in the event the message my amendment contemplates is sent to it, and indirectly sent to all OPEC countries. But should Venezuela choose to take the route you suggest, I think it is clear that as the only real world agricultural power, the United States is scarcely the helpless and pitiful giant our absent response toward oil price gouging and boycott of the past year has suggested. I earnestly believe it is time to make that abundantly clear to the oil producing nations of the world. I believe we can applaud the achievements of Venezuela long and loudly without feeding the interests of our own deprived consumers and the requirements of our own minimum economic health to the insatiable appetite of Venezuelan foreign economic policy for greater and greater oil profits at our expense.

With respect to the credibility of the threat, which is not a word I have employed, that might attend the suspension of a sugar quota for Venezuela to retain their quota would appear to indicate that action with