

tain to lose. In his column of Feb. 1, 1973, Anderson declared that the "secret estimate" of the Joint Chiefs is that "the communists will gain control of all Vietnam."

So what's the use of helping our side?

Jack Anderson, while not as suave as his mentor, Drew Pearson, has well earned his award.

NEW LAWS REGULATE—OR EVEN BAN—THE SALE OF HANDGUNS

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1975

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues today a newspaper article that appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on June 29. It concerns the efforts of some Chicago suburbs to control the sale of handguns. Ordinances affecting the sale of handguns are on the books in Blue Island in my congressional district as well as in Oak Park, Wheaton, Niles, and Hoffman Estates. I commend these towns for their action and others in the area that are considering such steps.

The issue of reducing violent crime by eliminating trafficking in handguns is not a new one, but it is one that demands immediate attention from the 94th Congress. Unless measures are taken to prevent the easy acquisition of handguns, police officers will continue to fight impossible odds in the battle against crime, and guns will remain the chief instrument of murder.

During my time with the States attorneys office in Illinois, I had the opportunity to work with many law enforcement officials, including local police chiefs and police officers. The overwhelming opinion among them is that we must have some form of gun control legislation. And I am supporting and sponsoring legislation which will ban the manufacture, sale and trafficking of handguns in the United States.

We might take note of these small communities that are, despite the lack of leadership from us, moving to regulate or even ban the sale of handguns.

The article follows:

NEW LAWS REGULATE—OR EVEN BAN—HANDGUN SALES

(By Jerry DeMuth)

Some suburbs have become the handgun market for Chicago.

"You don't find many shops selling handguns in Chicago because of Chicago's ordinances," explained Stephen Schiller, executive director of the Chicago Crime Commission. "So your gun market is outside of the corporate limits, in places like Oak Park, Lincolnwood, Blue Island, Franklin Park. You can buy your handguns across the counter there."

But now, many suburbs are moving to regulate or even ban the sale of handguns.

Last January, Blue Island adopted a law banning the sale of handguns and other short-barreled guns to the public. The law was challenged by one of two local gun shops and the courts, while upholding the city's authority to regulate firearms, struck down certain aspects of the law.

The law has been rewritten and is expected to be readopted July 8.

"We were having a lot of traffic, people coming in here and buying handguns," said Blue Island Police Chief Marvin F. O'Lena. "We wanted to put a stop to it."

Chief O'Lena referred to the number of crimes and deaths related to handguns, including several deaths the last couple of years in our town.

"These handguns are getting out of hand . . . or into the wrong hands," he said.

The Blue Island ordinance, in addition to banning sale to all but such persons as the military police and security guards, also prohibits the display of handguns and requires dealers to keep a record of all sales.

On June 16, Oak Park adopted an ordinance that restricts the carrying of handguns and requires a police permit for acquisition. Character references are needed before a sale can be completed and all handgun transactions, limited to persons over 21 without a criminal record, must be reported to the police.

"Last fall," explained Oak Park Trustee Sandor Loeby, a sponsor of the ordinance, "I heard a couple of Chicago policemen express dissatisfaction with Chicago law because people could walk across to suburbs like Oak Park and buy handguns."

The ordinance was adopted to prevent such an occurrence. A proposal to place an outright ban on handguns was defeated 5 to 2.

Such a ban has been proposed in Wilmette by resident Charlotte Adelman, who is an attorney.

Mrs. Adelman said she saw the need for such a ban when putting up a birdhouse in her backyard recently. "I suddenly heard gunshots," she said. "A youth from the neighborhood was shooting at birds with his parents' handgun. He was only 13 or so and I could have been shot."

"If other arms, such as sawed-off shotguns and metal knuckles, can be banned under state law," she asked, "why can't handguns be banned?"

Her proposed ordinance is presently being discussed by the village's judicial committee.

Several suburbs, like Oak Park, require a police check of handgun purchasers before sales are consummated. This has been the law in Hoffman Estates ever since the village was incorporated in 1959. Permits are then issued by the clerk. Records of all sales of firearms must be submitted to officials by dealers. The recent opening of two gun stores in the northwest suburb have prompted a review of that law.

Addison has a similar law which requires reports of sales and police checks of purchasers.

"It's one of the strongest measures around," said Lt. Chuck Gruba. "A dealer can't sell a gun to someone without first having it cleared by the police department."

The Blue Island ordinance, in many ways one of the strongest in the suburbs, doesn't provide for a police check of purchasers, although it does limit who can purchase a handgun.

"I'd have to have 10 extra men on the force just to check on the backgrounds of everyone who's been coming here to buy handguns," commented Chief O'Lena.

Wheaton law makes it illegal to furnish weapons to persons under 18. The western suburb also licenses dealers, requiring them to keep an inventory of weapons they have and a record of weapons sold.

Similar controls are placed on dealers in north suburban Niles. Sales reports, furnished to the village, are to include the name, age and address of purchasers, date and purpose of the purchase and the purchase price. Niles also has a voluntary gun registration program for gun owners, as do Chicago Heights and Arlington Heights.

A similar registration program, which is designed to help owners in case of loss or theft, did exist in Oak Lawn.

"It was discontinued because it took too much of our time and wasn't effective," explained Asst. Police Chief George Kummer. "Gun owners would sell their guns and not inform the police department."

Arlington Heights police recommended an ordinance last fall that would have licensed gun dealers, banned gun display in exterior windows and required that guns be stored in a locked place. "We wanted to make sure dealers have their guns under proper control," said Chief L. W. Calderwood.

The ordinance has never been acted upon. Similarly, south suburban Palos Hills has not acted on an ordinance to regulate sale of weapons which was introduced in March. Larry Frang, of the Illinois Municipal League, which surveyed suburbs on gun control laws for The Sun-Times, said he has found growing interest in suburbs adopting local gun controls.

"A lot of suburbs are now considering such laws," he said.

ESSAY—"WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME"

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I submit to you and to my colleagues the winning essay entitled, "What Democracy Means to Me," written by Christine Ipolyi. All Brentwood elementary schools, St. Anne's and St. Joseph's school were participants from the Second Congressional District in New York. These were fifth grade students and there was one winner from each school and one overall winner. Ms. Ipolyi was the overall winner and received a trophy and also a savings bond.

Ms. Ipolyi's essay exemplifies the kind of education that the Brentwood public schools attempts to instill in America's future leaders and I am proud to submit it into the RECORD.

I am sure that everyone who reads her essay will enjoy the spirit in which it was written and will find words to remember. Ms. Ipolyi's essay follows:

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

Democracy is more than a form of government. It is a way of life in the home, in the school, and in your community. The word democracy means, government by the people.

Through the centuries men have tried to come out from the shadow of slavery into the sunlight of freedom. Freedom did not come overnight. It has taken hundreds of years and the work of millions of people to find ways to make a democracy work.

As the centuries rolled by, men discovered that "Government by the people" is the perfect form of government for the benefit of all people. Democracy has a definite purpose. The goal is to see that everyone lives like a decent human being.

Democracy gives the right for men to choose their own occupation and no one could say you do this, you do that work. At times you hear people say, why doesn't the government do something about it? Those people don't stop to think or maybe even know that they are the government, they can improve or do something about it.

You should be glad with your freedoms for some people who live in slums and poverty cannot enjoy these freedoms. They lose faith in the government. But what are your free-

doms? You have the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom to criticize, freedom to vote in secret, the right to petition, freedom to work at any job. And this is what they mean to me.

Freedom of speech: That means I have the power to say what I please to any person, but I can't say anything against someone enough to injure his name. I may use this freedom when I don't agree with the government. But I can't use it to destroy freedom.

Freedom of the press: Means that I can, at anytime in anyplace, set up a printing press and issue a newspaper, or magazine, or a book. I have the freedom to read anything I want.

Freedom of religion: Means I have the right to worship God in any way I want and I could go to the church I wish to.

Freedom to criticize: When you think the government or something is doing poorly you have the right to criticize just like freedom of speech.

Freedom to vote in secret: When I get older I can vote for whom I think is the best leader and when I vote I have the right to vote in private booths.

Right to petition: That means if I don't agree on something I can stick up and request a change on what I don't like.

Freedom to work at any job: When ever I want I can start a business at any job I want and no one can tell me what to work at. I simply take the job that I enjoy.

Because democracy is a living thing, there will be problems to be met and changes to be made all the time. Democracy belongs to everyone, to all the people who recognize that every person should be respected as a human being. I am proud and glad to be living in a democracy.

the "black gold" in Texas, and all that real gold in Fort Knox, Kentucky.

Somebody explained to me that Kentucky didn't own the gold; that you were just "caretakers" of the nation's wealth. At the time, I thought I'd like to take care of some of it myself.

Well I'm not Secretary of the Treasury so the gold is safe. But the 1970's are changing the definition of "black gold". It's no longer oil, but also coal, and in that sense, our Fort Knox of energy has shifted from Texas to Kentucky.

In practical terms, the coal here in this state—which accounts for almost a quarter of the country's production—will be more valuable to us over the next decade than the gold in Fort Knox. So now you are the caretaker of the nation's financial foundation and a large part of its energy future as well.

And you have shown that that future is in good and responsible hands with some of the most far-reaching and effective energy planning that has been done so far in the United States.

You have shared your resources with the rest of us. You have managed your own local energy crisis with the coal severance tax—refunded in part to the counties; with a State Department of Energy, with an energy Research and Development Center to administer a \$50 million dollar trust fund that you set up; and with a plan to pool natural gas for industry to meet last winter's curtailments and the shortages of the coming heating season.

That is cooperation. That is support for national needs, and effective concern for local problems. That is federalism in practical and productive terms.

And it is also an example to the rest of the country—an example of realism, of seeing the situation as it is and not as we wish it were, of facing the truth about ourselves, about our economy, about our lifestyles, and about the future.

That is what I would like to speak to you about tonight—reality, not just as we wish to see it, but as it is, and truth, not just as we wish it to be, but as it is.

And the first truth we had better face is that the United States, in terms of oil is not the country it once was. In 1949, in 1956, and again in 1967, shipments of Mideast crude oil to the United States were curtailed because of political motives. No one even noticed it then because the United States had surplus capacity in its oil fields.

But unfortunately, few people noticed when that surplus began to dwindle and decline, few people, that is, until 1973 when some producers did the same thing that they had done three times before. Then everybody took notice.

From secure supplies, under our own control we had begun to lean on insecure sources for 35 percent of our consumption. We went from independence to dependence in one decade—a dependence that grows each year, in the absence of a national policy—a dependence which now amounts to 38 percent of our consumption.

That is a fact—unpleasant but true. But that dependence also has other implications. If others produce the oil we consume, the price we pay to satisfy our demand is in their hands.

And in the twenty minutes, or so, that I speak to you, those hands will have pocketed a million American dollars for imported oil. That is almost \$3 million every hour, more than \$70 million dollars every day.

Compared to \$3 billion in 1970, in 1974, those same hands collected 25 billion U.S. dollars for their oil—more than \$400 for every American family. In 1977 alone, they will collect \$32 billion even if there is no price increase by the cartel.

There is another reality behind those figures—American jobs, American payrolls, and American workers. The money we spent for

oil imports in 1974 could have paid the salaries of a million, six hundred thousand American workers or built more than 600,000 brand new homes. But it did not pay any salaries, at least not here, and it did not build anything, at least not for us.

That is reality—unpleasant but true. And, if we continue to do nothing, reality will become harsher because the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) will not disappear.

It's in business—a very profitable business—and they are in it to stay. They have the market—us—cornered and they intend to keep us there.

Like any monopoly, they intend to maximize their profits. Anyone who thinks they won't, anyone who ignores reality and dreams of the day when the cartel will disappear might as well resign himself to remaining cornered—economically and politically.

The only way to take back our own independence—to get out of that corner—is to establish a tough, hard program that will reduce our reliance on their product.

But we will never take even the first step out of the corner if we refuse to see reality, if we keep dreaming that nothing has changed and that somehow oil will again sell for three dollars a barrel and that the price of energy will come down.

That amounts to building castles in the air, and then trying to live in them. And anyone who promises a return to cheap energy is simply trying to help us furnish those impossible dreams.

Even if we try to live in those castles, we won't escape from reality for very long. We can keep our domestic oil relatively cheap, for example, by maintaining price controls on more than half of it.

But in the real world that means less domestic production to satisfy growing consumption. That demand will be filled by insecure, foreign sources of oil. Our consumption of imported oil will grow, and there is no way the Federal Government can control the price of oil produced in another country.

More and more exorbitantly priced oil will flow into this country. So it is not a question of whether the price of oil will go up, but when, and under whose control.

In effect, the oil producing countries of the world will decontrol our prices for us, and you can be sure that they won't offer to return the money to low and middle income Americans as the Administration has proposed.

This is reality. And if we still possess the pragmatic, pioneering courage and guts of those who settled Kentucky and the rest of the country, we will face reality and plan for the future on the facts as they are. We will stop constructing those castles in the air, and build a tough, realistic, effective policy to reduce our consumption, increase our domestic energy production from all sources, and make this country even more invulnerable than it once was.

But the key to effective action is recognizing reality: energy is scarce and that means that energy is valuable. The only successful means our society has yet developed for measuring the value of a commodity is its real price.

Simply stated, if we allow price to reflect the economic facts of energy—that it is a scarce and valuable commodity—then consumers, and I mean both industry and individuals, will begin to react to reality. They will begin to use energy efficiently in the home, in the factory, and on the road.

I have enough faith in the common sense of the American homeowner to know that he can tell a good deal when he sees one. Faced with the real value of energy, he will put up storm windows, add to his insulation, and take all of those other prudent steps required to make home use of energy more effective.

Faced with that same reality, a factory

CONGRESS CONTINUES TO DEBATE ON WHAT COURSE TO TAKE ON ENERGY PROBLEMS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1975

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as we here in the Congress continue to debate which course the United States should follow in dealing with our energy problems, it would do us well to remember the basic reality of the situation: the United States has become dangerously dependent on imported petroleum supplies and we must develop our domestic resources, particularly coal, to supply our energy needs.

The situation is that simple, but sometimes it appears we lose sight of this reality. In light of this, a recent address by Mr. Frank G. Zarb, Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration, is particularly critical because it points out the realities which we must face and with which we must contend. Representing, as I do, a major coal-bearing section of Kentucky, I found his comments about the great and growing importance of coal especially noteworthy.

I am pleased to offer for the careful consideration of my esteemed colleagues, Mr. Zarb's speech before the Kentucky Economic Development Commission's Economic Growth Conference in Louisville August 27:

HON. FRANK G. ZARB SPEAKS BEFORE THE KENTUCKY ECONOMIC GROWTH CONFERENCE

When I was a kid in Brooklyn, we used to think of the South in terms of two things—

