

cumstances, that he would like for the Senate to be restored to its position before I spoke. So I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 2:02 p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 2:50 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DOMENICI).

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMENICI). The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the

Chair, without objection, directs the clerk to read the motion.

The second assistant legislative clerk read the cloture motion, as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the pending resolution of ratification to the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Executive O. 81-1).

Mike Mansfield, Frank Church, Jacob K. Javits, Alan Cranston, Edward W. Brooke, Abraham Ribicoff, John V. Tunney, William Proxmire, Charles H. Percy, James B. Pearson, Richard S. Schweiker, Hugh Scott, Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Gale W. McGee, Bob Packwood, Robert P. Griffin.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 2:53 p.m., the Senate, in executive session, adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 4, 1974.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, February 1, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Donald B. Easum, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Robert E. Johnson, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years vice Bethel B. Larey, resigned.

Robert D. Olson, Sr., of Alaska, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Alaska for the term of 4 years (reappointment).

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

Jerome W. Van Gorkom, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1975, vice George J. Stigler, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1974:

IN THE COAST GUARD

Coast Guard nominations beginning Herbert A. Johnson, to be captain, and ending James L. Howard, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 23, 1974.

Coast Guard nominations beginning Walter J. Hall, to be captain, and ending Victor J. Zoschak, Jr., to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 28, 1974.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MIDDLE EAST, NORTH AFRICA ABOUND IN CRUDE OIL

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished Dr. Nasrollah Fatemi evaluated the oil situation in an article which appeared on January 14 in the Morning News.

Dr. Fatemi, one of the Nation's leading authorities on the Middle East, was born in Iran in 1917. He came to the United States in 1946, and served in varying capacities as a diplomat at the United Nations. He received his M.A. and Ph. D. degrees from Columbia University and the New School of Social Research, respectively. In 1960, Dr. Fatemi became a naturalized U.S. citizen.

He is an outstanding scholar who has written many books and articles, and at the present time he serves as the Director of the Graduate Institute of International Studies at Fairleigh Dickinson University in New Jersey. Professor Fatemi's reputation and popularity can be gauged by the fact that he always has more students applying to his Graduate Institute than there is space to accommodate them.

The article written by Dr. Fatemi, which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, discusses in a quick, lucid, and cogent fashion the outlook on the world oil situation, and suggestions on how we can solve some of the problems with which we are faced.

The article follows:

MIDDLE EAST, NORTH AFRICA ABOUND IN CRUDE OIL

(By Dr. Nasrollah Fatemi)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Dr. Nasrollah Fatemi is the director of the Institute of International Studies at Fairleigh Dickinson University and distinguished professor of international affairs. He is one of the nation's leading authorities on the Middle East and is listed in "The International Who's Who," and "International Notables." He is the author of several books, among them: Oil Diplomacy, The Dollar Crisis, and The Contemporary Middle East.)

In current estimates the Middle East and North Africa contain about 419,000 million barrels of crude oil, around 65 per cent of the world's proven reserves of 627,000 million barrels. These figures compare with 42,000 million barrels or 6 per cent in the U.S.A. and Alaska; 91,000 million barrels or 15 per cent in the U.S.S.R.; 2,800 million barrels so far discovered in the North Sea; 5 per cent in Africa; 2 per cent in Canada; 2 per cent in Indonesia; 2 per cent in Venezuela, and 3 per cent in Mexico, the Caribbean and other South American countries.

The bulk of the combined Middle Eastern and North African reserves is found around the Persian Gulf and six states—Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait, Iraq, Abu Dhabi and Qatar—possess over half of the known oil reserve of the world. Up until three months ago, the greatest part of the enormous wealth of the black gold was divided among Standard Oil of New Jersey, Shell, Texaco, Standard of California, Mobil, Gulf, British Petroleum and Compagnie Francaise des Petroles.

Of the producing states the best placed is Saudi Arabia with 23 per cent of the world's total and the world's largest oil fields—Al Mazallij, discovered in 1971; Alghawar onshore and Safaniya offshore.

Kuwait, where no official estimates of reserves have been made, is second and Iran is considered third in reserves.

North Africa with 49,000 million barrels

has proved less prolific. Occidental, Marathon, Amerada, and Continental Oil Companies have been responsible for the development of Libya.

In general production costs, up to the end of 1972, both in the Middle East and North Africa were extremely low varying around the Gulf from 6 cents a barrel in Kuwait to 33 cents offshore Dhabl. This compared very well with the United States where costs average \$3.50 a barrel, investment per barrel a day of production capacity in the Middle East is very low—averaging out about \$100 onshore in the Gulf areas, as against \$600 in Nigeria, \$2,500 in the North Sea and \$4,500 in the United States.

The United States heads the list with 12 million barrels; Soviet Union, 9 million barrels; Saudi Arabia—until October—8.3 million barrels; Iran, 6.3 million barrels; Kuwait, 3.5 million; Venezuela, 3.4 million; Libya, 2.3 million; Iraq, 2.2 million; Nigeria, 2.2 million; Abu Dhabi, 1.4 million; Indonesia, 1.5 million; Algeria, 1.2 million; Qatar, 600,000 barrels a day.

The total investment of the American oil companies in the petroleum industry in the Middle East and North Africa at the end of 1970 was \$1,466 million, and \$1,916 million respectively. At the same time their income for the same year was \$1,194 million and \$544 million respectively.

In 1972, the Middle Eastern governments' share of oil per barrel was \$1.50. As a result of two devaluations of the dollar and the high rate of inflation in Europe, Japan, and the United States, the share of the governments per barrel has been increased to \$3.00. This new arrangement will produce an income of close to \$12 billion in 1974.

Up until the end of 1972, the United States used very little of the oil of the Middle East. As a matter of fact, because of the pressure of the independent oil companies, the Johnson and the Nixon Administrations imposed a quota system and tariffs on petroleum imported into the United States. At no time

the imports exceeded 20 per cent or three million barrels a day. Most of the imports came from Canada and Latin America.

2. Lack of long-range planning by the United States and the other governments for the development of other sources of energy and their dependence upon the cheap oil of the Middle East. For instance, only four per cent of the energy of the United States is produced from water resources, and less than one per cent from nuclear power, resources, and less than one single new refinery has been built in the United States.

3. The demand of the producing countries for partnership and higher prices.

4. The monopoly nature of the oil industry and the pressure for higher prices and higher profits. The British Petroleum Corporation last week reported a 480 per cent profit. Other oil companies' profits have been up more than 50 per cent.

5. Finally, the war in the Middle East. In the spring of 1972 President Nixon through an emissary of King Faisal of Saudi Arabia promised to pressure Israel to make concessions, provided that: (1) President Sadat got rid of the Soviet forces stationed in Egypt, and (2) that Saudi Arabia increased her oil production to 8 million barrels a day. The Arabs complied with both requests. The Russian forces were expelled from Egypt and Saudi oil production was increased to 8.2 million barrels. The Arabs complained that President Nixon did not fulfill his part of the bargain. When war came the Arab countries, except Iraq and Libya, reduced their production and put an embargo on the crude petroleum to the United States. On the other hand, Iran, Nigeria, and Indonesia increased their production 15 per cent.

The present production in the United States is close to 12.5 million barrels a day. This is 5 per cent more than a year ago this time.

The stocks of distillate oils are higher now than they were last year at this time; 204.9 million barrels Nov. 23, 1973, and 188.4 million at the same time last year.

The stocks of residual fuel oil last week were 55.19 million barrels and production per day was 896,000 barrels. Last year at this time the stocks were 57 million barrels and production was 822,000.

Gasoline production for the week of November 28 totaled 6.29 million barrels a day. Last year at the same time production was 6.4 million barrels. Gasoline stocks are 203.76 million barrels or the same as last year.

Imports from Iran, Nigeria, Canada, and Latin America to the United States can very easily reach 7.5 million barrels a day. Therefore, the maximum falls short close to 700,000 barrels a day which either must be filled by oil from Arab countries or by curtailing consumption.

Up until October the American oil companies have been shipping distillate and heating oil to The Netherlands and Britain. It is not clear whether the shipping continued after October or whether they have stopped it.

The era of the American and British monopolies in the Middle East is over. The oil producing countries are asking a 51 per cent partnership and the oil companies have no other alternative but to agree. Already independent oil companies in Libya have complied, and those which refused their concessions have been nationalized.

Beginning with 1973 an energy shortage was felt throughout the world. What were the causes?

1. Increase in consumption. In the course of seven years oil consumption in Japan and Western Europe has doubled. At present the world demand is rising at the rate of seven per cent a year.

What is the energy situation in the United States? The normal consumption is 16 million barrels a day. Oil supplies 45 per cent of the United States energy needs; natural gas, 32.2 per cent; coal, 17.2 per cent; hydro-

power, 4.1 per cent, and nuclear power, 0.9 per cent. Thus a 10 per cent cut in oil means a reduction of about 5 per cent in the total energy consumption.

The Japanese companies are moving with utmost haste into the Middle East, investing heavily in exploration, production, and refining industries. During 1973 the Japanese companies have invested close to one billion dollars in the oil industry. They paid \$780 million to purchase British interests in Abu Dhabi oil concessions. Japan's vigorous efforts to develop reliable sources to meet its large and growing petroleum requirements presage continued significant investment in the Middle East. The French, West German and Italian interests are also filling the vacuum created by the Americans and the British.

The present high price of oil will blunt the growth of the Western world which for 20 years has prospered on the cheap oil of the Middle East. On the other hand, a great economic and financial market for the United States, Western Europe, and Japan would become available in the Middle East and North Africa. Here the industrial world will find 250 million people with close to \$20 billion, eager to buy technology, machinery, and consumer goods.

The United States Government and oil companies have to prepare a long-range plan for investing more money on the exploration and development of the oil industry in the United States and Alaska—speeding the pace of plant construction, research on more advanced nuclear technology and the direct recovery of solar energy, the commercial development of shale oil, and the improvement of mass transportation.

MCPL LETTER CALLING FOR U.S. DRAFT CONVENTION ON CHEMICAL WARFARE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, January 24, a bipartisan group of 25 Senators and Representatives sent a letter to President Nixon urging him to direct appropriate administration officials to develop a Draft Convention on Chemical Warfare. Once developed, the draft convention could be submitted to the United Nations Conference of the Committee on Disarmament—CCD—at Geneva.

The letter was an initiative of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law—MCPL—UN and International Law Committee chaired by Senator CRANSTON of California. The Vice Chairman is Representative MAILLIARD, also of California.

The text of the letter and a list of those who signed it follow:

(File Copy of Letter to President on Chemical Warfare)

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR
PEACE THROUGH LAW,

Washington, D.C., January 24, 1974.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of Congress for Peace through Law, deplore the failure of the United States Government to submit a draft Convention on Chemical Warfare at the United Nations Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) at Geneva.

As you know, since the conclusion of the

agreement on biological weapons in 1971, there has been no significant progress at the CCD meetings on a draft treaty banning chemical weapons. The U.S. delegation has commented at length on features in the draft submitted by the Soviet Union which it finds unacceptable. These revolve primarily around the nature of on-site verification procedures proposed in the Soviet draft. We do not question the legitimacy of these objections.

However, it is our view that until this Government submits its own draft convention, there can be no real progress toward the negotiation of a draft acceptable to the major parties involved. In the interim period, pressures to develop more deadly chemical weapons continue to build, making final resolution of this potential threat to world peace increasingly difficult to achieve.

We believe that the United States has a major responsibility to come forward with its own views if there is to be any forward movement in this area of international disarmament activity. We therefore urge you to direct the appropriate officials in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Department of State and the Department of Defense to develop a draft convention for your consideration and subsequently, that it be submitted to the CCD.

Sincerely,

Alan Cranston, Chairman, United Nations and International Law Committee; Mike Gravel, Frank Moss, and Robert Packwood; U.S. Senators.

William Maillard, Vice Chairman, United Nations and International Law Committee; John Anderson, Herman Badillo, Jonathan Bingham, John Conyers, Jr., Robert Drinan, Don Edwards, Donald Fraser, Bill Frenzel, William Hungate, Paul McCloskey, Jr., Mike McCormack, Charles Mosher, Claude Pepper, Charles Rangel, Edward Roybal, John Seiberling, Louis Stokes, James Symington, and Frank Thompson, Jr.; U.S. Representatives.

AID AND TRADE WITH THE COMMUNISTS—III

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, so far I have inserted two chapters from Eugene Lyons booklet "Operation Suicide: Those Strange Bridges to Communism." Today I would like to insert chapter 3 of this booklet into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues. It points out the utter folly of resting any of our hopes for peace in the world on the "liberalization" of Communist governments, or as it has been called, the "mellowing" of the Communists. The periodic "thaws" in the history of Communist tyranny may correctly be seen as: first, plans to allow the relatively free actions of subjects to stave off complete collapse of the Communist system for a while longer; and second, plans to lure the "economic criminals" out into the open where they can be appropriately dealt with as soon as the "thaw" freezes over. I insert chapter 3 of Mr. Lyons' booklet, entitled "The Bogus 'Liberalization'," to be included in the RECORD at this point:

III. THE BOGUS "LIBERALIZATION"

We come now to the second question. Are changes in the Soviet bloc big and basic enough, their permanence sufficiently as-

sured, to provide a dependable foundation for bridges, detente, and *rapprochement*?

There has been a relaxation in police terror, though not remotely to the extent that some would like us to believe. Limited experiments are under way with parodies on free-market methods. More latitude of expression has been allowed in science and the arts, within strict limits set by the authorities and guarded by their thought-police.

The people are grateful even for small favors—but not so grateful as to pretend that they add up to "liberalization," an approach to free enterprise and open societies. This is a myth spread only in the outside world by statesmen and pundits strangely determined to believe the best at any risk.

Testimony on this subject came recently from an unexpected and sensational source: Svetlana Alliluyeva, daughter of Joseph Stalin. Though she obviously had to pull her punches to protect her two children in Soviet Russia, she managed to refute the fantasy that her native land had gone "liberal." She decided to defect to the West, she said, to find freedom—freedom of expression and freedom of religion. In her first interview she declared quietly: "I can say that I lost hopes which I had before . . . that we are going to become more liberal somehow."

For the "horrible things" that have happened, she blamed the entire Communist Party, "the regime and the ideology as a whole," pointing out that her father's closest collaborators still rule the country. As to that "convergence," Svetlana Stalin was convinced, she said, that communism and democracy were incompatible. *The New York Times* called her interview "the most devastating critique of communism and the Soviet system heard since the denunciation of Stalin and Stalinism."

The irony of it is that the Fulbrights, Lippmanns, Kennans and Rostows, unlike Stalin's daughter, apparently have not lost those hopes. Their seeming insistence that the "liberalization" is real and vast surpasses understanding. It is an *idée fixe* that seems to thrive on proof to the contrary. Stepped-up arrests, more drastic death decrees, increased persecution of religion, do not make a dent in their consoling assumptions.

The Red governments themselves make few of the claims made for them by over-excited outsiders. They detest liberalism and denounce the implication that they are edging up to capitalism—a notion "so naive that it borders on the grotesque," as the Slovak *Pravda* put it. They have not confirmed the relaxations and reforms by law, or pledged even in words any program of continuing moderation. The changes have all been gifts from above, subject to withdrawal without notice.

In fact, some are being withdrawn. In Soviet Russia, Hungary, and Poland especially, the movement in more recent years has been toward more repression, more arrests, more capital punishments. In the entire block at present, there is a new emphasis on Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy. Ideology is being firmed up, with "liberation wars" as its primary expression on a world scale.

The actual changes have been exaggerated in the free world to the point of dangerous self-deception. The phenomenon of runaway optimism about evolution in Russia is not new. It springs from the anxiety for a return to normalcy that will magically relieve the West of the need to defend itself against an unpleasant and costly challenge.

A similar orgy of optimism developed in the mid-thirties, during Stalin's own brief "thaw." It appeared again during the wartime alliance with democracies forced upon the Kremlin by the Nazi invasion, then in the intoxicating years of the Spirit of Yalta, the Spirit of Geneva, the Spirit of Camp David. Despite the painful hangovers, the old euphoria today grips our world once more.

The simple, ascertainable fact is that the

communist nations are still totalitarian of their unhappy subjects, even if the Kremlin offered it.

Colonial satraps have always wanted more local maneuverability. Even Vidkun Quisling, Hitler's creature in Norway, pressed Berlin for some independence of action. Seeming gestures of "defiance" by Romania and other East European states are understood, and doubtless sanctioned, by the Soviet overlords as useful in placating their deeply anti-Russian citizenry. It is being said that these states are no longer a "monolithic" unit. But they never were. There have always been ethnic, frontier and economic conflicts among them, precisely as there were among various colonies within the British empire. Talk of "liberalization" is especially strong in Czechoslovakia; yet the liberal American columnists, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, attested in a recent dispatch from Prague that "Czechoslovakia remains in foreign policy an undeviating satellite of the Soviet Union."

To people in East-Central Europe, independence means not only the removal of the Russian yoke but of the communist harness. The politically conscious Romanians, Hungarians, etc., crave autonomy as a prelude to ridding themselves of their communist quislings. The Red regimes thus have a plain life-and-death stake in avoiding genuine independence. Renunciation of Soviet military support against their own intellectuals and the masses would amount to suicide.

Faced, like the U.S.S.R. itself, by decay of their planned economies, the puppet governments naturally reach out for Western technology and credits. In this, we may be sure, they have the blessings of Moscow, since it invigorates the entire Red bloc. Satellite business with the non-communist world has been growing, but no faster than Soviet trade with that world. It is a common policy geared to common needs. There is little excuse for reading into it a struggle for independence.

The population of Soviet forced-labor camps and colonies must still be reckoned in hundreds of thousands—in millions according to some Western analysts. More assorted political "crimes have been made subject to the death penalty than in the Stalin era. Trying to leave the country without permission is still punishable by death." Millions of young people, in vigilante formations reminiscent of China's Red Guards, spy on the personal and political morals of their neighbors, with authority to "try" and punish sinners.

Most important, the ideology, the immorality and political system which made Stalinism at its worst possible, remain unchanged. The regime zealously safeguards its monopoly of political power. All alleged reforms stop dead at the point where they might affect that monopoly. Economists, for instance, may analyze economic ailments and suggest remedies—but they dare not question the Marxist-Leninist theory or the basic doctrine of national planning. Poets may again sing of love, the soul, truth—provided they acknowledge the eternal verities of communism and raise no doubts about the rights of the dictatorship to rule. Beyond these limits, scientists and writers alike face punishment, or in some cases, confinement in lunatic asylums.

These are the realities which the bridge-builders equate with liberalization, democracy, an open society—surely they must have a low opinion of such concepts!—and they base foreign policies on the fantastic equation. Robert Conquest, a British poet who is also a seasoned student of Soviet affairs, writing in 1962 in the scholarly American journal, *Problems of Communism*, put the facts in focus: "If Khrushchev's Russia were judged by any standards operating before the rise of Hitler and Stalin, it would be thought a revoltingly oppressive dictatorship."

Nothing has happened since 1962 to discredit that judgment. Attacks on Stalin and "rehabilitation" of his victims have stopped. He is increasingly hailed as a "great communist leader." In this respect, the process now under way amounts to *re-Stalinization*.

The notion that the satellite regimes are seeking "national independence" is pure mythology. Not one of them could survive if it were not shielded by Moscow against its restive people. They would reject true independence, leaving them naked at the mercy

INVENTOR DREAMS OF HARNESSING MAGNETISM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 1, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the letter below, dated January 23, is submitted for inclusion in the RECORD as a matter of interest to those who have observed the efforts of my constituent, Mr. John W. Ecklin, to present his idea of harnessing magnetism:

ARLINGTON, VA., January 24, 1974.
Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a 23 Jan 74 letter to the editor of the Washington Post which I would like to see printed in the Congressional Record.

I make this request because I think it is very important that children learn this very simple concept and the world of science will just not move and correct their past oversights.

Enclosed also is the Jan 10, 1974 story from the Post and I circled the paragraph in red that refers to you.

Could you please advise whether your office has had any activity from either the story in the Post or your entry in the Congressional Record.

I ask people who call whether they know this very simple fact and not but about one in a hundred does. This just doesn't seem quite right.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. ECKLIN.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
January 23, 1974.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Since "Arlington Inventor Dreams of Harnessing Magnetism" was printed in the Panorama section of the Jan. 10, 1974 *Washington Post* I have received over 200 calls and letters. A very penetrating question was asked—"How could such a simple device have been overlooked for so long?"

My answer—we teach kids like magnetic poles repel and unlike poles attract but we DO NOT teach magnets repel much further than they attract. It is this difference in speed and distance of repulsion compared to attraction that the 25-cent device harnesses as useful energy.

If kids had been taught this basic fact in beginning science then when they got in high school and college and studied momentum and energy many of them would have arrived at this same simple solution decades ago.

I hope anyone concerned with the teaching of science will begin to teach this simple basic fact and get it incorporated in textbooks. Get two like magnets, hold like poles tightly together and release one magnet. You can measure the difference in distance for yourself.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. ECKLIN.

ARLINGTON INVENTOR DREAMS OF HARNESSING
MAGNETISM

(By Thomas Grubisich)

Diet Smith has competition. He is John Ecklin, an Arlington computer technician who, like Dick Tracy's industrialist-inventor, thinks magnetism is an overlooked but potentially rich and clean source of energy.

Unlike Diet Smith, who speeds around in a space coupe and does other wonderful things with magnetic power, Ecklin isn't having too much success putting his ideas to work.

Engineers and scientists tell him he's trying, impossibly, to rewrite the first law of thermodynamics. They say it's impossible to get energy from a machine without putting an equal amount of energy into it. All perpetual motion machines failed because of this immutable law, they say, and so will a ma-

chine trying to tap magnetism instead of gravity.

Ecklin's answer to his critics is a hand-made demonstration project that he claims shows how magnetic force can be converted into energy. The project consists of two dime-size magnets, a steel ball bearing, a piece of tin can sandwiched between two pieces of cardboard and two strips of Scotch tape holding his magnets to a piece of cardboard. Total cost: less than 25 cents.

When the cardboard-enclosed piece of tin can (actually a piece of steel) is placed between the ball bearing and one magnet, the bearing is attracted to the other magnet. When the shield is placed between that magnet and the bearing, the bearing is attracted to the other magnet.

Ecklin says the back and forth motion of the bearing can be captured and converted into usable energy. Three pairs of 15-pound magnets with proportionately-sized ball bearings, he claims, could power a car. Smaller ones could be used to provide household electrical power, he says, and larger ones could be used for industrial purposes.

When asked how he reconciles his device with the first law of thermodynamics, Ecklin points to his little piece of tin can wrapped in cardboard. "This shield," he says, "solves the problem."

The shield, Ecklin explains, interrupts one magnetic field so the ball bearing can be attracted to another field. But where will the energy come from to move shields through the magnetic fields? Won't that energy requirement cancel out the energy gained from the movement of the bearing?

No, says Ecklin. He explains: The shield moves at a right angle through the magnetic field. Moving laterally, it requires only a fraction of the force it would need if moved in a parallel motion.

Ecklin says this fractional energy need could be supplied by the energy extracted from the movement of the bearing.

In a larger, more sophisticated assembly, Ecklin would mount his shields on a shaft that would be turned by power supplied by the reciprocating bearing. Furthermore the bearing, when it was attracted to one magnetic field, would compress a powerful spring that would push it toward the other magnetic field. But right now Ecklin would like to see thousands of people construct their own 25-cent demonstration project, then,

having convinced themselves it works, write their congressmen about the untapped power of magnetism.

Ecklin's 10-year-old son built a model and mailed it to President Nixon. Rep. Joel T. Brodyhill (R.-Va.) has inserted Ecklin's explanation of his scheme (with sketches) in the Congressional Record, with this comment: ". . . I believe Mr. Ecklin's theory will be of interest to many who are now engaged in attempts to solve the problem of power shortages."

So far, Ecklin has been greeted by more skepticism than enthusiasm. "The universities won't talk to me," he says. "A professor of physics would throw my idea into the wastebasket. He'd say it isn't in the books. But you know, according to the laws of aerodynamics, the bumblebee isn't supposed to be able to fly, but he does."

Ecklin doesn't have the money, or the mechanical expertise, to build a model that would work entirely under its own power. He says the Environmental Protection Agency told him it wasn't interested in such experiments because "we are trying to improve on known technology." Inquiries to foundations and other sources failed.

Ecklin is an amateur expert on magnetism. He learned his first facts about the subject from a book he bought for his boy, called "The How and Why Wonder Book of Magnets and Magnetism."

Magnetic power, he says, would not only be clean, it would be inexhaustible. If a magnet becomes weak, it can be repowered by another magnet.

If magnetism is harnessed, Ecklin says, the implications would go far beyond the energy crisis. "It would put unlimited power in the hands of individuals. They wouldn't be dependent on the energy companies. That would mean they couldn't be controlled."

Diet Smith's creator, Chester Gould, has often used his Dick Tracy comic strip to illustrate the potential power of magnetism. One of his ideas is "atomically energized magnets that amplify the pull of gravity a billion times, if need be, to climb in space, or to brake speed by reversing the poles of the magnets."

Gould, who conceived the two-way wrist radio and other scientific and electronic marvels that proved feasible, concluded: "I have great faith in our ability to harness magnetism."

SENATE—Monday, February 4, 1974

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, JR., a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, as our fathers created a nation under Thy guidance and we have pledged to keep it "one nation under God," so wilt Thou continue to rule over us. Deliver us from moral paralysis and from spiritual impotence. Renew us in our understanding of and commitment to divine law and encompass us with Thy love and grace.

Our Father, be graciously near to the President. Open his heart and his mind to wise counselors. Give him sound judgment, clear direction, and courage to act for the welfare of the whole Nation. To all leaders in government, impart Thy higher wisdom and the grace of compassion, conciliation, and cooperation.

Let Thy spirit so indwell all the people of this land that through these difficult days our common life may be shaped according to the pattern of Thy kingdom.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, JR., a Senator from the State of Louisiana to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSTON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSTON) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with its accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:
The Federal budget must be both a consistent statement of our national objectives and a responsible plan for