speaking, I think that the press has done a remarkable job. But they are only human and susceptible to fatigue and strain, as we all are.

I hope the press will find the physical and mental reserve needed to report the news accurately, lest the people receive a distorted account of what is happening in this House—as they did yesterday concerning my position.

EVIDENCE FOR IMPEACHMENT—THEN AND NOW

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, this is, indeed, an historic day in the House of Representatives and the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Today we begin the actual deliberations on articles of impeachment of the President of the United States.

It has been a long and deliberate process between the introduction of a resolution of impeachment and the actual debate on the articles.

On October 23, 1973, I and 30 cosponsors introduced such a resolution. That action followed the firing on October 20 of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox and the forced resignation of Attorney General Elliott Richardson and Deputy Attorney General William Ruckelshaus by President Nixon.

Immediately after the "Saturday Night Massacre"—taken because Mr. Cox refused to cease his efforts to obtain evidence by court action from the White House, I called the President's action an obstruction of justice—especially the President's apparent refusal to comply with Judge Sirica's court order to turn over nine tape recordings of White House conversation. In fact, the President had allowed the deadline set by the court to pass without complying. He did offer a compromise by which he would release not tapes, but transcripts with verification to be made by Senator JOHN STENNIS. This was not acceptable to Mr. Cox and after he made his views known at a news conference he was summarily dismissed by the President and the President ordered the Office of Special Prosecutor abolished.

Mr. Speaker, after the President's action against Mr. Cox, and the ensuing resignations of Attorney General Elliot Richardson and the Deputy Attorney General, William Ruckelshaus, there was an immediate outcry of protest from all over the Nation. The President capitulated and relinquished subpenaed tapes and agreed to continue the Office of Special Prosecutor.

While this reaction of the President lemmed some of the criticism of the events of October 20, it did not stop entirely the call for an impeachment investigation.

On the day after I introduced the resolution of impeachment I issued a statement indicating that I, and all the cosponsors of the resolution would continue to press for impeachment proceedings. In that statement we explained why we believed it was necessary to continue:

The President's belated action (turning over the tapes) while welcome, removes only one of the grounds on which we sought impeachment, and it occurred only after the even graver attempt to obstruct justice by abolishing the office of the Special Prosecutor was carried out.

Mr. Nixon's belated and angry submission on the tapes issue no way alters the fact that as President he has knowingly and willfully undertaken concerted and systematic action to render all branches of our government incapable of resolving charges and allegations of misconduct and criminal behavior.

The full and solemn discharge of the Constitutional responsibilities imposed upon the House in the face of grave evidence and allegations of willful, wrongful, and prolonged attempts to obstruct justice makes a continuation of proceedings for impeachment an inescapable duty.

Mr. Speaker, looking at that statement in retrospect it is interesting and instructive to review the "grave evidence and allegations" referred to in the statement.

Watergate, of course, was the spark. The allegations of White House and possible presidential involvement first were raised by me in a speech on the floor of the House on Monday, June 19, 1972, the first business day after the break-in at the Watergate offices of the Democratic National Committee.

On that date I said the following:

Mr. Speaker, illegal wiretapping, electronic surveillance, and breaking and entering are despicable activities under all circumstances. They are particularly despicable when used as tools in a political campaign.

It is unbelievably despicable when such activities are engaged in by a national political party as a part of a presidential campaign.

The recent incident involving an attempt to plant electronic devices in the Democratic National Committee headquarters, allegedly master-minded by the chief security officer of the Republican National Committee and the Committee to re-elect the President demands on inquiry by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It may be, as John Mitchell, the former Attorney General and now campaign manager for the re-election of Richard Nixon, states—that James McCord was not authorized to bug the Democratic National Committee headquarters—it may also not be.

Mr. Speaker, I followed that speech with a formal protest that same day to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee charging "representatives of the Republican National Committee and the Committee to Re-Elect the President" with planting illegal electronic listening devices and photographing material in the offices of the Democratic National Committee.

I called this activity clearly outside the Code of Fair Campaign Practice adopted by both major political parties and said that I considered such action to be a "disastrous breach in public confidence in the American political system."

The Fair Campaign Practices Committee forwarded my complaint to the Committee to Re-Elect the President. On July 14, 1972, CRP Counsel Glenn J. Sedam, Jr., responded saying it would be "inappropriate" to comment on my charges because the matter was in the courts, the Democratic National Committee having filed a civil suit—Democratic National Committee and others against James W. McCord and others.

Mr. Speaker, on July 24, 1972, I challenged Mr. Sedam's view and called for an open investigation to "clear the pall of doubt that hangs over this distasteful affair." I said that—

It would be in the best interest of Republicans and Democrats alike to air this matter in an open investigation in an effort to remove present doubts as to the honesty and integrity of our system of free elections.

On February 7, 1973, the Senate voted 70 to 0 to establish a select committee chaired by Senator SAM ERVIN to investigate Watergate and Presidential campaign practices during the 1972 campaign. Even before the select committee opened hearings, other evidence began to be revealed regarding White House involvement. This included the acknowledgement of L. Patrick Gray that he had shown FBI Watergate files to John Dean, the President's counsel.

The public hearings and the testimony at the Senate select committee hearings and the information developed by the Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski compiled more and more evidence of White House and Presidential involvement.

Key developments prior to my introduction of a resolution of impeachment included: James McCord's letter of March 19, 1973, in which he revealed political pressure on the Watergate defendants to plead guilty, that perjury had occurred and that allegations about a CIA role and national security involving the Watergate break-in were not true; the resignation on April 30, 1973, of Ehrlichman, Haldeman, Kleindienst, and Dean; the dismissal in Los Angeles of the Ellsberg-Russo trial after it was revealed the Government participated in an illegal wiretap and that Ehrlichman had offered the directorship of the FBI to the presiding judge in the case while the trial was in progress.

The "cap" was really popped from the "bottle" on July 16, 1973, when Alexander Butterfield revealed to the Senate select committee the existence of a recording system in the President's offices at the White House and the Executive Office Building as well as the White House telephones.

Immediately after that disclosure I raised the question about the availability of the White House tape recordings in the event of impeachment proceedings.

On July 25, I issued a statement suggesting a possible impeachment action by the House of Representatives to secure necessary evidence—including the tapes—in the event the White House would not release them to the select committee or the Special Prosecutor.

In the event that the President's assertion of separation of powers or executive privilege are sustained in the courts, or if the litigation becomes inextricably bogged down over jurisdictional questions . . . it will be abundantly clear that the present procedures are not adequate to resolve the fundamental question of Presidential involvement (in

Watergate) . . . if this situation occurs, I believe the House of Representatives should seriously begin steps necessary for the initiation of an impeachment process as a means of acquiring the documents or tapes in dispute.

Other serious matters involving the President came to light before I introduced the Resolution of Impeachment on October 23. Among these were the charges that improvements had been made on the President's properties at San Clemente and Key Biscayne.

In August I requested permission to inspect the President's property at San Clemente to see for myself if charges that some $700,000 in public funds had been expended for nonsecurity and nonofficial purposes. I was allowed to examine the Federal installation at San Clemente, but denied access to the private grounds. Two days later, however, Congressmen JACK BROOKS and EDWARD ROYBAL were permitted on the grounds. Later Congressman BROOKS' Government Operations Subcommittee issued a report that was most critical of the expense of public funds to improve the President's private residences.

By the time of the President's refusal to surrender the tapes and other evidence and the firing of Cox, several other events occurred which strengthened my own view that impeachment proceedings should be initiated.

There were revelations about illegal political intelligence gathering. The ITT role in the selection of the San Diego Republican convention site and the role of the White House in the ITT antitrust cases came to light. There was a report regarding political campaign contributions and the administration's raising of milk price supports.

There were reports of the President being accused of willful evasion of income taxes. In September I urged the President to make public his income tax returns for the years in question. He did this in December.

In the courts, there were more events which strengthened the allegations that the President and the White House were involved in the Watergate break-in and coverup. Seven persons were indicted in conjunction with the break-in—including E. Howard Hunt, Jr., Gordon Liddy, and James W. McCord, all involved with the White House and the Committee To Re-Elect the President.

John W. Dean III, the President's counsel, plead guilty on October 19, 1973, to conspiracy to violate the civil rights of Daniel Ellsberg. White House staff members Ehrlichman, Liddy, Krogh, and Young were indicted on September 4, 1973, with regard to the Ellsberg case. Frederick C. LaRue, former White House aide and assistant to John Mitchell at CRP plead guilty to obstruction of justice on June 27, 1973. Jeb Magruder plead guilty to obstruction of justice and conspiracy on August 16, 1973. On October 1, 1973, Donald Segretti plead guilty to campaign violations. On October 18, 1973, Egil Krogh plead guilty to two counts of perjury. And, prior to the October 23, 1973 introduction of the resolution of impeachment, three corporations and four corporate executives plead guilty to illegal campaign contributions to the President's reelection effort. That number has since risen to 17 individuals and 13 corporations. The individuals include Herbert Kalmbach, the President's personal attorney.

The record, Mr. Speaker, is replete with evidence, prior to October 23, 1973, that there was every reason to justify the Judiciary Committee's beginning impeachment proceedings.

After I introduced my resolution on that date, I stated that if the President could produce evidence showing his exculpation—then I would vote against impeachment by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the long Judiciary Committee proceedings which I have been privileged to play a part in have not revealed such exculpatory evidence. Rather, more damning evidence has been brought forward, not the least of that being the edited transcripts of White House conversations.

So, today we begin formal debate on the articles of impeachment of President Richard M. Nixon. Today, as was the case on October 23, 1973, I think the evidence warrants a vote for impeachment.

Today's decision by the Supreme Court upholding a lower court decision that the President should make available other tapes though not unexpected, is, nonetheless, welcome. I do not think it will have great impact on the impeachment proceedings because we already have ample evidence to warrant a vote for impeachment.

It is my view that if evidence on those tapes existed that would exonerate the President, it would have been made available long ago.

Any subsequent evidence will only add weight to a case for impeachment that is already overwhelming. I see no reason at all to delay our proceedings awaiting access to these latter tapes and documents.

HON. WAYNE MORSE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a great friend of human rights, peace and self-government for the District of Columbia has died.

Wayne Morse served the State of Oregon and his country with distinction for 24 years in the U.S. Senate. During that tenure, he established a noble reputation for intelligence and independence.

In the 1950's, Senator Morse was a key Republican opponent of Senator Joseph McCarthy's "witch hunts" and a proponent of important civil rights legislation.

As a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, he fought for many years for home rule for the District—a struggle I fully supported this year as a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

But perhaps his most unique and indelible mark on history was made in 1964 when Wayne Morse—with typical foresight—voted against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which was later cited as congressional approval of American action in Vietnam.

This vote against the resolution—a stance he shared with only one other Senator—demonstrated his usual independence. Senator Morse continued to oppose the Vietnam war in the Senate and in speeches across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is grateful for the unique and lasting contributions of Wayne Morse to the causes of peace and social justice.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S THREAT TO VETO CPA IS INSULT TO INFLATION-WEARY AMERICANS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's threat to veto the Consumer Protection Agency legislation which passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming 293 to 94 vote on April 3 and is now pending before the Senate—is an indication of his total alienation from the needs of the American people.

His veto threat is not only an insult to millions of inflation-weary Americans, but it places him in opposition to the advice of his own consumer adviser, Virginia Knauer, and the wishes of a strong bipartisan majority of the Congress. It will prove harmful to the efforts of Mr. Nixon's own political party to throw off its reputation as the party of big business.

Because the establishment of the CPA will have a chilling effect on the sale of Government decisions to the highest corporate bidder, its fate will be as important to our Nation's future well-being as the fate of campaign finance reform legislation.

It is impossible not to conclude that Mr. Nixon's veto threat is directly related to his anti-impeachment strategy. What he is attempting to do is to maintain the loyalty of a big business community angered by high interest rates, a bearish stock market, and a recession-bound economy. He is attempting as well to garner the votes of conservative anti-consumer Senators whose votes he will need during an impeachment trial.

But if these desperation tactics—designed to cover up Mr. Nixon's declining political fortunes and the country's worsening economic situation—are allowed to succeed then the Congress will become an accomplice in the further alienation of the American people from their Government in Washington.

It is my hope and expectation that the Senate, which has been so forthright in approving legislation to reform our political system, will also approve, by a two-third majority if necessary, this equally vital piece of legislation.

State and about their Nation. These are great Americans in the truest sense of that term—and I believe that their sentiments are closer to the real America than all of the liberal press ramblings will ever be. I submit these historic documents for the RECORD:

A RESOLUTION OF AND BY THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT REPUBLICAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE STATE OF INDIANA

Whereas, President Nixon kept his promise of an honorable peace in Viet Nam; and,

Whereas, President Nixon stopped the killing of our American men in Viet Nam and brought home over 543,000 American troops and prisoner's of war; and,

Whereas, President Nixon ended the military draft after a third of a century; and,

Whereas, President Nixon has drastically reduced crime in our cities; and,

Whereas, President Nixon is combating inflation by working toward a balanced budget and supporting the American free enterprise system; and,

Whereas, President Nixon has made far reaching and unprecedented accomplishments in the field of foreign affairs; and,

Whereas, President Nixon has delivered on his promise of peace with prosperity; Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Second Congressional District Republican Central Committee of the State of Indiana that: Richard M. Nixon, be commended for his many accomplishments as President of the United States. Let it further be known that we, pledge our continued support and dedication to this great American President.

JULY 18, 1974.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Congressional District of Indiana has long been considered Republican territory and "Nixon Country".

We further appreciate very much the many good things that have taken place in the Congressional District because of your long standing friendship with our Congressman, Earl Landgrebe. We deeply appreciate your policy of ending the war in Viet Nam and securing a peace with honor. We particularly appreciate your fighting inflation by supporting the free enterprise system and advocating a balanced budget. Also appreciated is the great friendship and loyalty developed between our Congressman and our President.

We have specifically seen this team effort applied to several problems affecting the District, perhaps the most dramatic situation was the proposed C-Selm sewage plan, a project you both opposed and blocked. The latest in a long line of benefits this District has enjoyed from by the Nixon-Landgrebe team is the National Dune Lakeshore completion compromise.

To show our great appreciation for the many things you have done for this Congressional District and this Nation, we wish to honor you by hosting a rally and reception for you and Congressman Landgrebe. Through this rally we wish to show the people of the Second District and the nation the sincere and loyal support you have here in the "Heartland of America". We further feel that your campaign appearance for Congressman Langrebe will assist him in tallying the largest plurality ever accumulated in this Congressional District!

Loyally we remain,

Donald H. Heckard, 2nd District Chairman, Cass County Chairman; Pat Northacker, Tippecanoe Co, Vice Chairman, 2nd District Vice Chairman; E. Dewey Anderson, Starke Co., Chairman; Bill Gee, Marshall Co., Chairman; Helen Johnson, Marshall Co., Vice Chairman; Ed Pratt, Kosciusko Co., Chairman; Pauline Jordan, Kosciusko Co., Vice Chairman.

Annalou Rasborshek, Pulaski Co., Vice Chairman; John Kruger, Pulaski Co., Chairman; Milton D. Storey, Newton Co., Chairman; Lucille Davidson, Newton Co., Vice Chairman; Sandra Culp, Jasper Co., Vice Chairman; Joe A. Vaughn, Benton Co., Chairman; Lillian Goetz, Benton Co., Vice Chairman.

Quentin Blachly, Porter Co., Chairman; Margaret Buchanan, Porter Co., Vice Chairman; Syd Garner, 2nd District Representative, Lake County; Martha Collins, 2nd District Representative, Lake County; William L. Altherr, White Co., Chairman; Leona Wright, White Co., Vice Chairman; Clyde Lewis, Tippecanoe Co., Chairman.

Louise Van Horn, Starke Co., Vice Chairman; James Beaver, Jasper Co., Chairman; Lois Wright, 2nd District Representative, LaPorte Co.; Ray Sheely, 2nd District Representative, LaPorte Co.; Joni Wilson, 2nd District Representative, Cass Co.; Thom Wertenberger, Wabash Co., Chairman; Mrs. Bette Reed, Wabash Co., Vice Chairman.

IMPEACHMENT

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the impeachment issue is getting hotter and hotter every day. Now television coverage has begun and all citizens can observe the Judiciary Committee in its investigation. For the interest of my colleagues, I would like to insert the following articles from the Washington Post and Wall Street Journal respectively:

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 1974]

BROADCASTING THE IMPEACHMENT DEBATES

By approving Rep. Wayne Owens' resolution to permit broadcast coverage of open committee meetings in the House, the House Rules Committee has taken the first important step toward letting the entire nation witness first-hand the momentous impeachment debates which begin next week. The full House must still approve the Owens measure, and then the Judiciary Committee itself must agree to let the cameras in. But both hurdles can be cleared easily if enough members recognize the utility of providing direct, complete nationwide coverage of these historic events.

The key question is how much the nation should be able to learn about congressional deliberations on the impeachment of the President—the committee's actions, the House floor debates and, if the House votes for impeachment, the Senate trial. If tradition prevails and broadcasting is barred, the only direct observers of these proceedings would be the few members of the press and public who can squeeze into the chambers. The rest of the nation would be blacked out. Fortunately, more and more legislators are coming to realize how unwise such restrictions on communications would be. In addition to the Rules Committee's 10–3 vote, Rep. Sidney R. Yates (D.-Ill.) now has at least 87 cosponsors of his resolution to authorize live broadcasting of the House impeachment debates. So far, however, Speaker Carl Albert and Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill have failed to exercise any leadership toward enlarging public understanding of the actions of the House.

There is still some congressional uneasiness about the possible effects of full coverage. Some feel, for instance, that the presence of the cameras is inherently disruptive, but this is not necessarily the case. The major networks, including public broadcasting, have pledged that, if permitted to cover the sessions, they will do so in decorous and unobtrusive ways. This would probably mean continuous coverage without any arbitrary interruptions, using relatively soft lights and fixed cameras. There need not be any reporters cluttering the chamber, any panning of the audience, or any of the other techniques which could create an unseemly convention-like atmosphere.

The next question is whether, no matter how well the broadcasters behave, the fact of being televised would alter the legislators' demeanor. Some suspect that, with the cameras on, some representatives might be tempted to grandstand, to engage in histrionics, or otherwise trifle with the solemn undertakings. That danger always exists. But continuous broadcasting could well be a steadying, restraining force, since all members would know that their constituents are watching how they carry out the most important duty of their political careers.

Another problem of possible distortion has been raised, especially by Republicans such as Rep. Delbert Latta (D-Ohio) who worry that the networks might not be "fair." But this is really an argument for more comprehensive coverage, not less, since the dangers of distortion or over-simplification by the media would be greatest, one would think, when the public is forced to rely entirely on compressed, selective reporting through the printed press and broadcast summaries. The more voluminous the evidence, the more intricate the debate, the more ambiguous a few particulars may be, the more important it becomes for the entire nation to have every opportunity to watch the arguments, to hear the tapes, and to weigh for themselves the presidential conduct which is being judged—and the conduct of the Congress sitting in judgment.

The notion that the nation should be watching these events continues to trouble some, mostly lawyers and mostly outside Congress, who equate impeachment debates with criminal proceedings from which broadcasting has traditionally been barred. That analogy does not stand up. However judicious impeachment ought to be in its procedures and findings, it is not, strictly speaking a judicial process. It is a political process in the most basic constitutional sense, it is the means by which the people's elected representatives assess alleged abuses of the public trust. Public opinion as reflected in the mail or polls should not be the decisive influence on any member's vote. But in the long run popular opinion will provide the ultimate judgments on the outcome and the way in which it is reached. Thus it is in the best interest of everyone for Congress to give the public every opportunity to be fully informed at every stage of the process, by permitting the full, nationwide airing of the debates ahead.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 22, 1974]

IMPEACHMENT POLITICS

Not the least of President Nixon's problems stemming from Watergate is that it has colored his critics' way of looking at just about every move he makes. Everything from trips to the Middle East and Russia to his visit to the Grand Ole Opry is interpreted as largely a bid to stave off impeachment.

The most notable recent example occurred after the House of Representatives killed a land-use bill last month. Sponsor Morris Udall wasted no time denouncing White House withdrawal of promised support for the bill "The President is grandstanding for

the right wing," he declared. "He's giving in to them on every major issue. This was straight impeachment politics."

Almost immediately, commentators echoed the "impeachment politics" theme. Almost no one bothered with the White House explanation that the bill provided too strong a role for the federal government. And none bothered to speculate whether Mr. Udall's pique may have had anything to do with the fact that the bill was killed largely through efforts of Representative Sam Steiger, a fellow Arizonan and a potential Udall rival for higher political office. Interestingly, when Congressman Udall was asked by The New York Times for evidence that impeachment politics led to the death of his bill, he was unable to produce any.

As a matter of fact, the Times survey turned up almost no one who could cite evidence that President Nixon has been tailoring legislative tactics and dealings with individual Congressmen to win support against impeachment. Neither the Democratic leadership nor rank-and-file congressional critics could cite any examples of impeachment lobbying, although some—apparently through intuition—continue to insist that Mr. Nixon is playing impeachment politics for all it's worth.

In a very general sense, of course, the claim is not without plausibility. Politicians are playing some sort of politics almost all of the time and "impeachment politics" is as good a description as any of the President's efforts to mend fences in Congress. There would be some cause to worry over a politician who wasn't trying to prevent himself from being impeached.

But it is something else to contend that the President is reversing his own positions and violating his own principles to buy votes in Congress and save his skin. A decision to leave land use to the states is not exactly contrary to the principles of a President who has made a motto of "The New Federalism." Unless the President's critics can come up with more plausible evidence, someone might get the idea that it is they, not the President, who are more involved in impeachment politics.

A CHICAGO POLICEMAN'S VIEWS ON HANDGUNS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1974

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a basic freedom of the citizens of the United States should be the right to enjoy public streets, parks, and transportation facilities without the constant fear of bodily harm. In recent years this freedom has been increasingly threatened by the unlimited supply of handguns. I have in this Congress again introduced my bill, H.R. 3167, which would sharply curtail the availability of handguns by banning their importation, manufacture, sale, or transportation with a few minor exceptions.

An article appeared in the June 23, 1974, Chicago Tribune written by Richard Rae, a lieutenant in the Chicago Police Department that, in my opinion, reinforces the need for handgun legislation. I hope that the reading of Lieutenant Rae's article will help to convince my colleagues that further delay on this matter can only deepen the fears of those of us who are living in a handgun dominated urban society.

The text of Lieutenant Rae's article is as follows:

THE REAL VILLAIN IN URBAN CRIME: GUNS

(By Richard Rae)

It was just a small article in the back pages of one our major newspapers. It described the arrest of two men who had been charged with murdering a 24-year-old man as an outgrowth of a dispute. The victim had been shot down by a .22-caliber automatic pistol.

Fortunately, the police were able to take the alleged offenders into custody. The "front line infantry" had comported itself effectively and even valorously. It could take credit for success in what would have to be, in the broad overview of criminality and its containment, a "minor" skirmish.

Meanwhile, the County Morgue had garnered another "statistic" and our public laws which permit dangerous psychotics, drug addicts, juveniles, alcoholics, terrorists and assassins, to acquire handguns with relative ease—or complete ease, depending upon which part of the country one is in—had remained absolutely unchanged.

The gun-lobby continues to dictate policy to the American people rather than the other way around.

After 22 years of active police service, most of this time spent in the city's highest crime rate areas. I can state flatly and unequivocally that the mere availability of firearms, and especially handguns, is a crucially significant factor in the genesis of most of the gore and terror that has stained our city and has made mere urban existence a nightmare for millions of innocent people.

I've been there as have thousands of other police officers:

The 13-year-old with the "Saturday Night Special."

The woman whose face was blown away by a shotgun fired by her irate lover.

The shopkeeper gunned down by the nervous stickup man.

The homeowner who shoots down his next door neighbor because he was a "burglar." He wasn't. Only drunk.

Sorry about that. We Americans do have the "right to keep and bear arms" don't we?

What the guns-or-everybody crowd carefully refrains from mentioning is that the Constitution *does not* contain a legal guarantee to "keep and bear arms." The Supreme Court has already ruled that this "right" refers merely to the authority granted to the states to maintain armed militia organizations. What connection is there between the Illinois National Guard and a couple of street gangs having a wild shootout on some street corner, with innocent bystanders cut down in the process? It eludes me.

A great many gun owners will never use their weapons unlawfully. But their mere presence can escalate a verbal dispute into a murder indictment. It is true that we shall probably never be able to completely disarm the professional "hit" men and other hardened criminals.

But most gun-related violence is caused by hotheads and amateurs. Not the experienced, hardened pros.

I am totally convinced that the handgun must be abolished altogether. No more stalling. No more grovelling before National Rifle Association manipulators. No more buck passing. The expungement of the handgun from American life is an idea whose time has come.

The supreme paradox of the American experience is that we carved a great nation out of the wilderness, educated the immigrants and their sons and daughters by the millions, provided the many with unparalled abundance and astonished a skeptical world with our scientific and artistic accomplishments. Nor did we do so poorly in the justice department. After all, we did fashion a Bill of Rights, free the slaves, initiate social reforms and pass compassionate civil right laws.

In spite of all this, we are still not civilized enough to demand an end to handgun pollution that compels scores of millions of people in this country to live in dread. Time and time again public figures such as Mayor Daley have spoken out against this gun insanity that threatens the very mental balance of our country.

Superintendent Rochford, an experienced field commander, denounces this madness with equal intensity. More recently, First Deputy Superintendent Spiotto had expressed the hope, that ultimately, the police themselves will someday be unarmed as they are in England and a number of other foreign countries.

I urge all citizens and police officers who also feel that the anarchy of uncontrolled possession, sale, and manufacturing of handguns should now come to an end to contact the Committee for Handgun Control, 111 E. Wacker Dr., Chicago, Ill. 60601.

The committee was organized in September, 1973, and is registered in the state of Illinois as a not-for-profit corporation and as a lobbyist body with Congress.

We must act now. We dare not delay this desperately needed reform by even one unnecessary day.

WILLIS EMERSON STONE

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Willis Emerson Stone is a man who believes that the supreme law of the land is the Constitution of the United States. In the finest tradition of American greatness, he has dedicated his life to this great cause.

Willis E. Stone was born in Denver, Colo., on July 20, 1899. He served in the U.S. Army during World War I. After the war, he helped organize the first American Legion post in Colorado.

This great patriot enjoyed meteoric business success until the great depression. Mr. Stone, however, is a man who cannot be kept down for long. He soon became prosperous again.

Willis Stone had been irked with the manipulations of money by the Federal Reserve System, which he felt had triggered the depression. He also was concerned with the increasing power and scope of the Federal Government.

When this great American heard Attorney General Francis Biddle remark that "The Government can do anything not specifically prohibited by the Constitution," he launched into action. Stone knew that the language, philosophy, and intent of the Constitution were exactly the opposite.

Willis Stone knew that something had to be done to stop the increase of Federal power. After years of research study and sacrifice, he came up with the Liberty amendment.

But Willis Stone's deep love for his country precluded him from being content with merely suggesting an idea, he has persevered in the effort to seek acceptance of this concept.

The amendment was introduced in Congress in the 1950's. Today, it is in Congress as House Joint Resolution 23.

power project. This very serious question was also addressed by Representative ROY TAYLOR, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, when he said:

It is worth mentioning also that much of the 40,000 acres which would be flooded by construction of the dams is productive agricultural land. Our needs for power are currently a subject of much discussion. I wonder if our needs for food may someday be even more critical.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert the text of a letter I have received from Mr. B. C. Mangum, president of the North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation:

NORTH CAROLINA
FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Raleigh, N.C., July 25, 1974.

Hon. WILMER MIZELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WILMER: This is to voice our support for your efforts to have the New River in Ashe and Alleghany counties added to the Scenic River System. This is important legislation for landowners of this particular section of the state.

You are no doubt aware of the vigorous support that we gave to legislation in the General Assembly (H. 1433) that would add New River to the North Carolina Scenic River System. This legislation was strongly supported by the Ashe and Alleghany County Farm Bureaus and was enacted by an overwhelming majority. That intense effort and support indicates our interest in this matter.

We congratulate you for your action and offer our assistance in any way you deem helpful in achieving a successful conclusion.

Warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

B. C. MANGUM,
President.

THE MILITARY OBLIGATION—IS 6 YEARS TOO LONG?

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, Congress decided last year to establish the military forces of this country on a voluntary basis and abolished the involuntary draft. The Marines, the Navy, and the Air Force were expected to be able to meet their manpower requirements, and, in fact, have done so. The Army was considered the most likely branch of the services to have difficulty in meeting its quotas.

Secretary of the Army Callaway has reported the Volunteer Army is doing its job.

But it is time to deal with another question raised by the abolition of the draft.

I refer to the present 6-year military obligation.

To rectify this situation I have introduced legislation to reduce the military obligation of armed service members from 6 to 3 years, unless they have voluntarily agreed to serve a longer period on active duty to repay the services for specialized training or for other considerations.

The National Guard should benefit especially from this bill, since it is becoming harder and harder to interest Americans in attending drills and training duty for a 6-year period. To ask an 18-year-old to commit a period of time longer than college, and amounting to a third of his age, is asking more than many devoted and patriotic young Americans feel they can commit. In a sense, a 6-year obligation asks for a long-term commitment without experience, without testing.

Our military forces should be dedicated enough, interesting enough, and good enough to attract young Americans without demanding a long-term commitment—sight unseen.

In addition, a shorter obligation could attract volunteers who are not willing to commit to a 6-year enlistment but who might change their mind after becoming members of the Armed Forces.

For these reasons, among others, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation.

ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be interesting to my colleagues to include in the RECORD my opening remarks in the House Committee on the Judiciary on the subject of impeachment of the President.

My statement follows:

REMARKS OF HON. DAVID W. DENNIS ON IMPEACHMENT DELIBERATIONS

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues of the Committee:

All of us are agreed that this is the most important vote any one of us is likely ever to cast as a member of the Congress. Only a vote on a declaration of war, I suppose, might be considered as of equal gravity. All of us, I think—while keenly aware of immediate political implications—would like, on this vote, to be right; to do right; and to be recorded as having been right in the long light of history.

This is an emotional matter we have before us, loaded with political overtones, and replete with both individual and national tragedy; yet I suggest that we will judge it best and most fairly, and with the most chance of arriving at our goal of being right, if we approach it dispassionately, and analyze it professionally as lawyers who are engaged in the preparation and in the assessment of a case.

In doing this, of course, we cannot approach or decide this important matter on the basis of whether we like or dislike President Nixon, whether we do or do not in general support his policies, or on the basis of whether we either in 1972 did, or now in 1974 would, vote for him for high office.

The question, rather, is whether or not proof exists—convincing proof of adequate weight and evidentiary competence—to establish that the President of the United States has been guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors within the meaning of the Constitution, so as to justify the radical action of his impeachment and removal in disgrace from the high office to which he was elected by the American people, and which he now holds by virtue of their vote.

Although many charges and allegations have been levied against the President before our Committee, and it has been difficult even to this late hour to determine exactly what Articles of Impeachment will finally be proposed, it is my understanding that the principal charges against the President with which we have to deal are divided into three general categories, and it is to these that I shall chiefly address my remarks in the brief time which is allotted.

These general categories are:

1. The obstruction of justice in the so-called Watergate cover-up;
2. Alleged abuse of Executive Power;
3. The failure of the President to comply with the subpoenas of this Committee.

All of these categories have sub-headings, and specific items of evidence, to which I shall address myself in the course of these remarks.

It is my judgment, for reasons which I hope, at least in part, to indicate, that only the first of these categories—the so-called Watergate cover-up—presents us with any really serious problem for our decision; I shall therefore address myself to the second and third categories—alleged abuse of power and non-compliance with subpoenas—in the first instance, and rather briefly, and shall use the balance of my time in a slightly more extensive analysis of the alleged Watergate cover-up—following, thereafter, with my conclusions as to the merits of the case.

Turning first to the matter of failure to observe or to comply with the subpoenas of the Committee on the Judiciary:

We have, of course, had a landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States just yesterday which has decided, for the first time, that a generalized and unlimited executive privilege cannot be exercised to over-ride specific subpoenas issued by a Special Prosecuting Attorney in furtherance of the prosecution of a criminal case.

This decision does not bear directly on nor, as a matter of law, does it enhance the power of this Committee to issue subpoenas in these impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States, because, very unfortunately, as I believe, this Committee has declined and refused to test and to determine its Constitutional powers in the Courts of this country, despite the well-known statement of Chief Justice Marshall in *Marbury* v. *Madison* that "It is emphatically the province and duty of the Judicial Department to say what the law is."

I believe, however, that the power of this Committee in respect to the issuance of subpoenas in impeachment proceedings is at least equal to—and is, in all probability, the superior of—the power of the Special Prosecuting Attorney.

This decision, therefore, although we are not a party to the litigation, and derive no actual rights therefrom, very well may—and, in my judgment in all probability will—result in the furnishing to this Committee of additional relevant and highly material evidence which, up to this time, we do not have.

It is my judgment that should it appear that such evidence will be available to us within a reasonably short period of time, then it will become our positive duty to delay a final vote in these important proceedings until we have examined this additional evidence.

In assessing the President's past treatment of the subpoenas of this Committee, however, we have no right whatever to consider yesterday's decision of the United States Supreme Court because, in addition to the fact that we are not a party to the cause, this decision, of course had not been handed down when our subpoenas were served, or when the President took his stand in respect thereto.

At that point the President simply asserted what he stoutly maintained to be a Constitutional right—and which he is, in fact, still legally free to assert to be a Constitutional right so far as this Committee is con-

cerned; and we, on the contrary, asserted a Constitutional right in opposition to the Presidential claim.

Such a conflict is properly one for resolution by the Courts, and absent a binding and definitive decision between the parties by the Judicial branch, it escapes me on what ground it can properly be asserted that a claim of Constitutional right is, in any sense, an abuse of power.

II. ALLEGED ABUSE OF POWER

Turning to further alleged abuses of power, I look to the proposed articles which we have before us.

In proposed Article II these abuses of power are alleged to be:

1. *Illegal Surveillance,* but the 17 wire-taps chiefly complained of under this heading were all instituted before the *Keith* decision, and were not only presumptively legal at that time, but are probably legal in large part also today since many, if not all of them, had international aspects, a situation in which the need for a court order was specifically not passed upon in the *Keith* decision.

2. Use of the executive power to unlawfully establish a special investigative unit "—to engage in unlawful covert activities—". But it was not unlawful, so far as I am advised, to establish the plumbers' unit; and I suggest that proof is lacking that the President intended for it to, or authorized it to, engage in unlawful covert activities. In like manner it is certainly not established as a fact that the purpose of the Fielding burglary was "to obtain information to be used by Richard M. Nixon in public defamation of Daniel Ellsberg", nor is there any substantial evidence that the President knew of or authorized this burglary before it took place. In fact when Dean told the President about the Fielding break-in on March 17, 1973, the President said, "What in the world—what in the name of God was Ehrlichman having—in the Ellsberg. . . . This is the first I ever heard of this."

3. *Alleged Abuse of the IRS.* Without going into detail I suggest that the evidence here—so far as the President is concerned—is one of talk only, and not of action; that the independent attempted actions of Dean, Haldeman, and Ehrlichman were unsuccessful and ineffective; and that the only direct evidence of an alleged Presidential order (in the Wallace case) is a hearsay statement of Clark Mollenhoff that Mr. Haldeman said to him that the President requested him to obtain a report—which is, of course, not competent proof of anything.

Other allegations of alleged misuse and abuse of the FBI and the CIA can, in the interests of time, be best considered under the heading of alleged obstruction of justice; and the matter of refusing to honor Judiciary Committee subpoenas has already been discussed.

III. ALLEGED OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

The first specific action listed here, as implementing the President's alleged "policy", is "Making false and misleading statements to lawfully authorized investigative officers". It would be interesting to have the authors and backers of this allegation particularly plead and prove to whom, and when, the President was guilty of making such false statements; and it would be relevant to inquire whether these false statements, if any, were in fact made to an investigative officer when and while he was engaged in his investigative function.

If the President was guilty of "counseling witnesses to give false statements", again some specificity in pleading and proof are much to be desired. I do recall that he had everybody go up to the Senate and testify without immunity, and that he counseled John Dean (not very effectively it would appear) to always tell the truth—pointing out that Alger Hiss would never have gone to jail if he had done so.

Whether the President had a design to, or attempted to, interefere with or obstruct the Watergate investigation conducted by the FBI, by a phony attempt to enlist the possibility of CIA involvement, or whether he genuinely believed—due to the personnel concerned, the Mexican connection, and other circumstances—that there might well be a CIA or national security involvement, appears to me to be a debatable proposition; and, in any case, the CIA disavowed involvement and the delay caused by this episode was for a few days only.

I predict that the allegations respecting alleged corrupt offers or suggestions of executive clemency will, on the record of our hearings to date, fall far short in proof; and I believe that the testimony before us of Henry Petersen himself very adequately answers the allegation of wrongfully disseminating information received from the Department of Justice to subjects of the investigation.

The matter of the payment to E. Howard Hunt of $75,000, apparently on the evening of March 21, 1973, is probably the most dangerous single incident so far as the President is concerned, because there is no doubt that in the conversation of March 21, 1973 the President more than once stated, and in dramatic fashion, that in order to buy time, in the short run, a payment to Hunt was apparently necessary.

But in the same conversation the following exchange took place:

The President says: "But in the end, we are going to be bled to death. And in the end, it is all going to come out anyway. Then you get the worst of both worlds. We are going to lose, and people are going to—."

H. "And look like dopes!"

P: "And in effect, look like a cover-up. So that we can't do."

And John Dean told the Senators, "The money things was left hanging—nothing was resolved".

More importantly, the March 21 payment to Hunt was the last in a long series of such payments, engineered by Mitchell, Haldeman, Dean and Kleindienst, and later on LaRue, all so far as appears, without the President's knowledge or complicity. And as to the payment of March 21 the evidence appears to establish that it was set up and arranged for by conversations between Dean and LaRue and LaRue and Mitchell, before Dean talked to the President on the morning of the 21st of March So that even if the President was willing, and even had he ordered it (as to which the proof falls short) it would appear that this payment was in train and would have gone forward, had Dean never talked to the President on March 21 at all. We need to remember, moreover, that despite my insistence and repeated request our Committee never bothered to call Howard Hunt, the reputed blackmailer, and a central figure in this case, at all.

And where cover-up is considered we need to remember that, after all, the President became fully aware and took charge on March 21 and by April 30 Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Dean had all left the government for good, and now are dealing as they should with the strictures of the criminal law.

IV. CONCLUSION

Time does not permit a further analysis of the great mass of evidence involved. But, in conclusion, I would like to leave with you a few thoughts—the first again legal, and finally a more general word.

First, if we bring this case and carry it through the House and into the Senate we will have to prove it. We will have to prove it by competent evidence. The managers on the part of the House will have to make the case. At that point hearsay will not do. Inference upon inference will not do. *Ex parte* affidavits will not do. Memoranda will not do. Prior recorder testimony in other legal proceedings to which the President was not a party will not serve the purpose. The witnesses never called in our investigation—some of them never interviewed—will have to be called, and will have to be relied on. Someone will have to present this case in the cold light of a judicial day.

Unless the legally provable case is clearly there, we ought not to attempt it; we ought not to bring on this trauma, in justice to the President, in fairness to ourselves, and in consideration of the welfare of the country.

These, I submit, are serious reasons against the bringing of a probably unsuccessful prosecution.

For any prosecution will divide this country. It will tear asunder the Republican Party for many years to come—and this is bad for the country, which depends for its political health on a strong two-party system. And impeachment is radical surgery on the tip of a cancer which needs therapy at the roots.

I am as shocked as anyone by the misdeeds of Watergate. Richard Nixon has much to answer for, and he has even more to answer for to me—as a conservative Republican—than he does to my liberal-lining friends on the other side of the aisle. But I join in no political lynching where the hard proof fails as to this, or as to any other President; and I suggest this:

What is needed is moral and political reform in America. The Nixon administration is not the first to be guilty of shoddy practices which, if not established as grounds for impeachment, are nonetheless inconsistent with the better spirit of America.

Neither the catharsis of impeachment nor the trauma of a political trial will cure this illness of the spirit. We are all too likely to pass through this crisis and then forget reform for another 20 years. Our business here in the Congress is basically a legislative and not a judicial function. Lacking as we do a clear and convincing legal case which all reasonable Americans must and will accept, we would do better to retain the President we, in our judgment, elected to the office, for the balance of his term; and, in the meantime, place our energy and spend our time on such pressing matters as:

1. Real campaign reform;
2. A sound financial policy to control and contain inflation;
3. Energy and the environment;
4. War and peace;
5. Honesty throughout government;
6. The personal and economic rights and liberties of the individual citizen as against private agglomerations of power and the monolithic state.

There will be another Presidential election in 1976, and the United States of America can enter her 200th year without having discharged our collective frustrations and purged our individual sins by the political execution of the imperfect individual whom we put in office and who, in both his strength and in his weakness, perhaps represents us all too well.

HON. WAYNE MORSE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I join hundreds of my colleagues and millions of my fellow Americans in paying tribute to the late Wayne Morse:

A man who placed personal principles above petty, partisan politics.

A politician who refused to become part of the pack. From farm legislation to civil rights to his historic vote on the

that I call my colleagues' attention to the fact that this morning's presentation of the "Today" show marked the first day on the job for Jim Hartz in his new role as anchorman and cohost of the highly touted news program.

Jim is following another outstanding Oklahoman, the late Frank McGee, who cohosted the "Today" show prior to his untimely death this past April.

My pleasure in seeing Jim ascend to this new position is based partially on our long personal friendship, and also because Jim's start in broadcasting came with radio station KRMG in Tulsa, Okla. He later became news director for KOTV television in Tulsa.

In 1964 Jim Hartz became affiliated with WNBC in New York. During the past 10 years Jim has covered every major space shot since the Apollo program began.

I wish to extend congratulations to Jim's father, Rev. Martin D. Hartz, and his two brothers Herbert Hartz, assistant chief of police of Tulsa, and Leon Hartz, financial director of Oral Roberts University in Tulsa.

Jim has demonstrated a great ability in the field of broadcast journalism, and I believe his addition to the "Today" show will mark an even higher level of excellence in reporting which the viewing public has come to expect from this news program. I want to wish Jim and his family the very best of success in this new endeavor.

REPRESENTATIVE HOGAN STATES HIS POSITION ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the House Committee on the Judiciary has entered the final phase of its consideration of articles of impeachment against President Nixon.

General debate on these articles began last Wednesday night before a national television and radio audience, and continued through Thursday evening before the committee began a more specific discussion of the language in which the articles were to be proposed, and whether or not these articles would be reported to the House for its consideration.

The opening remarks under general debate were intended to convey the historic importance of the decision the committee was asked to make, and to display in some detail the evidence.

For the benefit of my colleagues, who must soon make a similar decision, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the text of the remarks delivered by the gentlemen from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN). His statement was a scholarly presentation of his position on this historic question. Members of the House, who must vote on the Judiciary Committee's recommendations, will benefit from a review of the following statement:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND

More than a century ago, in a time of great national trial, Abraham Lincoln told a troubled and bitterly divided nation, "We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this Administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation."

Today, we are again faced with a national trial. The American people are troubled and divided again, and my colleagues on this Committee know full well that we cannot escape history, that the decision we must jointly make will itself be tested and tried by our fellow citizens and by history itself.

The magnitude of our mission is awesome. There is no way to understate its importance, nor to mistake its meaning. We have unsheathed the strongest weapon in the arsenal of congressional power; we personally, members of this Committee, have felt its weight, and have perceived its dangers.

The framers of the Constitution, fearing an Executive too strong to be constrained from injustice or subject to reproof, arrayed the Congress with the power to bring the Executive into account, and into peril of removal, for acts of "treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors." Now, the first responsibility facing Members of this Committee was to try to define what impeachable offense is. The Constitution does not define it. The precedents, which are sparse, do not give us any real guidance as to what constitutes an impeachable offense. So each of us in our own conscience, in our own mind, in our own heart, after much study, had to decide for ourselves what constitutes an impeachable offense. Obviously, it must be something so grievous that it warrants the removal of the President of the United States from office. I do not agree with those that say impeachable offense is anything that Congress wants it to be and I do not agree with those who say that it must be an indictable criminal offense. But somewhere in between is the standard against which we must measure the President's conduct.

There are some who say that he should be impeached for the wrongdoing of his aides and associates. I do not concur in that. I think we must find personal wrongdoing on his part if we are going to justify his impeachment.

The President was elected by an overwhelming mandate from the American people to serve as their President for four years and we obviously must be very, very cautious as we attempt to overturn this mandate that is itself of historic proportions. After a Member decided what, to his mind, constitutes an impeachable offense he then had to decide what standard of proof he would use in trying to determine whether or not the President of the United States had committed an impeachable offense. Now, some have said that we are analogous to a grand jury, and a grand juror only need find probable cause that a criminal defendant had committed an offense in order to send the matter to trial. But because of the vast ramifications of this impeachment, I think we need to insist on a much higher standard. Our counsel recommended clear and convincing proof. That is really the standard for civil liability, that or a preponderance of the evidence, and I think we need a higher standard than that when the question is removing the President of the United States from office.

So I came down myself to the position that we can have no less a standard of proof than we insist on when a criminal trial is involved, where to deny an individual of his liberty we insist that the case against him be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. And I say that we can insist on no less when the matter is of such overriding import as this impeachment proceeding.

I started out with a presumption of innocence for the President because every citizen of this country is entitled to a presumption of innocence, and my fight for fairness on this Committee is obvious to my 37 friends and colleagues who I think will corroborate that I was as outspoken as any Member of this Committee in calling our very fine staff to task when I thought they were demonstrating bias against the President, when I thought they were leaving from the record parts of the evidence which were exonerating of the President. I fought with the Chairman and the Majority, with some of my colleagues on this side, insisting that every element of fairness be given to the President, that his counsel should sit in on deliberations and offer arguments and evidence and call witnesses and my friend from Alabama, Mr. Flowers, mentioned that earlier. But he will also have to confess that most of these concessions to fairness were made only after partisan dispute and debate, which is what our whole legislative process is about in the Congress.

So I do not concede to anyone on this Committee any position of fighting harder and stronger that the President get a fair hearing on the evidence and while I do have some individual specific objections to isolated incidents of unfairness, I think on the whole the proceeding has been fair.

Now, I am a Republican. But party loyalty and personal affection and precedents of the past must fall, I think, before the supreme arbiter of men's action, the law itself. No man, not even the President of the United States, is above the law. For our system of justice and our system of Government to survive, we must pledge our highest allegiance to the strength of the law and not to the common frailties of men.

Now, a few days ago, after having heard and read all the evidence and all the witnesses and the arguments by our own staff and the President's lawyer, I came to a conclusion, and I felt that the debates which we began last night were more or less pro forma and I think they have so far indicated that. I feel that most of my colleagues before this debate began had made up their minds on the evidence, and I did, so I saw no reason to wait before announcing the way I felt and how I was going to vote.

I read and reread and sifted and tested the mass of information and then I came to my conclusion, that Richard Nixon has beyond a reasonable doubt committed impeachable offenses which, in my judgment, are of sufficient magnitude that he should be removed from office.

Now, that announcement was met with a great deal of criticism from friends, from Government officials, from colleagues in Congress. I was accused of making a political decision. If I had decided to vote against impeachment, I venture to say that I would also have been criticized for making a political decision. One of the unfortunate things about being in politics is that everything you do is given evil or political motives. My friend from Alabama, Mr. Flowers, said that the decision that we make is one that we are going to have to live with the rest of our lives. And for anyone to think that this decision could be made on a political basis with so much at stake is something that I personally resent.

It is not easy for me to align myself against the President, to whom I gave my enthusiastic support in three Presidential campaigns, on whose side I have stood in many a legislative battle, whose accomplishments in foreign and domestic affairs I have consistently applauded.

But it is impossible for me to condone or ignore the long train of abuses to which he has subjected the Presidency and the people of this country. The Constitution and my own oath of office demand that I "bear true faith and allegiance" to the principles of law and justice upon which this nation was founded, and I cannot, in good conscience, turn away from the evidence of evil that is to me so clear and compelling.

My friend from Iowa, Mr. Mayne, detailed some of the allegations against prior Administrations and I do not in any way question that. I agree with him that there was wrongdoing on the part of previous Presidents, maybe all Presidents, but I was not in a position where I had to take a stand, where I approve or disapprove of blatant wrongdoing. I am in such a position now.

My friend from New Jersey, Mr. Sandman, said last night he wants to see direct proof and some of my other friends on this side of the aisle have said the same thing, but I submit that what they are looking for is an arrow to the heart and we do not find in the evidence an arrow to the heart. We find a virus that is—that creeps up on you slowly and gradually until its obviousness is so overwhelming to you.

Now, he has asked for direct proof. I think it is a mistake for any of us to begin looking for one sentence or one word or one document which compels us to vote for or against impeachment. It is like looking at a mosaic and going down and focusing in on one single tile in the mosaic and saying I see nothing wrong in that one little piece of this mosaic. We have to step back and we have to look at the whole picture and when you look at the whole mosaic of the evidence that has come before us, to me it is overwhelming beyond a reasonable doubt.

Let us look at the President's own words. He uses the words "cover-up" and "cap on the bottle" and "the plan" and "containment" and he is concerned about what witnesses have said and what they will say. He is concerned about where the investigation is going.

Now, let us focus in on the thing that everybody talked about, the Hunt payment. Let us look at this as reasonable and prudent men. What did Mr. Hunt intend? His payments and demands had been relayed through his wife before her death. After his wife he had to make them directly. So what did he do? He called Colson to make demands and we have a transcript of what he said and I want to quote: 'This is a long haul thing and the stakes are very, very high and I thought that you would want to know that this thing must not break apart for foolish reasons. We are protecting the guys who are really responsible but at the same time, this is a two-way street, and as I said before, we think that now is the time when a move should be made and surely the cheapest commodity available is money."

And then he went and he talked to Colson's lawyer, Bittman, and to Bittman he told him the same thing, that commitments were made and he would blow the lid off the whole thing unless the money was paid to him.

And then he went and saw O'Brien, the attorney for the Committee to Re-Elect the President, and he said to him that he had to have $60,000 for legal fees and $75,000 for family support. He said if he did not get it, he would reveal a number of seamy things that he had done for the White House and if things did not happen soon, he would have to review his options.

The man that was making those demands had over $200,000 in the bank that he had collected from his wife's insurance. So I ask my colleagues on the Committee, what would the reasonable and prudent man assume that he had in mind? It is obvious. He intended to blackmail the White House.

Well, now, let us go inside the White House and let us see what they say. They talk about this. Can we raise a million dollars? You know, is this the way to go? Will there be other demands from him? How were the payments made in the past? These are the President's own words. He says, well, can we handle it through the Cuban Committee the way we handled it before, indicating he already knew about the previous payments made. These are his own words. And then he says wasn't that handled through the Cuban Committee and John Dean says, well, no, not exactly. That is not the way it was. And the President says, well, that is the way it is going to have to be.

Is this an urging to conceal the truth or is it not? So the payment was made to Hunt and it doesn't matter to me whether the President approved it before it was made. A conspirator, as all we lawyers know, can get in on a conspiracy at any point, even after the fact, so it is immaterial whether or not at the point in time he said whether or not I approve it, you pay it. The fact is and the thing that is so appalling to me is that the President when this whole idea was suggested to him didn't in righteous indignation rise up and say get out here. You are in the office of the President of the United States. How can you talk about blackmail and bribery and keeping witnesses silent. This is the Presidency of the United States, and throw them out of his office and pick up the phone and call the Department of Justice and tell them there is obstruction of justice going on. Someone is trying to buy the silence of a witness.

But my President didn't do that. He sat there and he worked and worked to try to cover this thing up so it wouldn't come to light.

And the FBI is conducting an investigation. He says publicly, I want to cooperate with the investigation and the prosecution but privately all his words compel the contrary conclusion. He didn't cooperate with the investigation or the prosecution. And it has already been said by some that Henry Petersen called and the President said, initially in the conversation, something to the effect:

"Well, it is not going to go any further. I know I have got to keep it secret." He no sooner hung up phone than he was telling the defendants about whom this damaging information was made what they could do to counteract the case that the prosecution had against them.

Well, I could go on and on and on. I am surprised that some of my colleagues—the telephone call from Pat Gray. Pat Gray was a man who did many things wrong. He was loyal to his leader. But at some point his conscience bothered him and he wanted to tell the President of the United States that his aides were destroying the Presidency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. I will give the gentleman an opportunity to finish his sentence and his thought.

Mr. HOGAN. I appreciate the chairman.

Pat Gray called the President to tell him that his aides were destroying the Presidency and instead of the President saying, well, give me more information about this, I want to know if my aides are doing anything wrong, I want to know, and Pat Gray says in his testimony there was a perceptible pause and the President said, "Pat, you just continue to conduct your aggressive and thorough investigation."

He didn't have to know because he already knew and he consistently tried to cover up the evidence and obstruct justice and as much as it pains me to say it, he should be impeached and removed from office.

THINKING ABOUT DEPRESSION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the worries of another economic depression are before us again. According to Mr. Herman Kahn, there is one chance in three that we will suffer from a depression before 1980. I wish to insert the following article from the Wall Street Journal for the information of my colleagues:

THINKING ABOUT DEPRESSION

Up to a year ago, the idea that President Nixon would be removed from office through impeachment proceedings was an "unthinkable" one. Now it is not. So too, it is now no longer beyond the realm of possibility that the United States might soon have to endure a severe economic depression.

Herman Kahn, the physicist and thinker who runs the Hudson Institute, believes there is one chance in six of a depression in 1974–75, and if it doesn't occur in this period, one chance in six that it will occur in 1976–80. In other words, he sees one chance in three that in this decade we will experience depression, by which he means a 10% unemployment rate lasting at least 18 months. There are those who believe Mr. Kahn is being a pessimist; there also are some we talk to who think the chances are higher.

Those who dismiss such talk as being unrealistic generally do so by arguing that "the government will not permit it to happen." During the past quarter-century of global prosperity, the idea has taken root that governments know enough about the manipulation of monetary and fiscal policies to prevent serious economic disruptions of the kind experienced in the 1930s. Certainly, as Paul McCracken explains nearby, they know more now than they did then.

This thought is comforting, but not that comforting if it merely means that the Federal Reserve will gun the money supply to counter every conceivable deflationary pressure that might be arrayed against it. For what Mr. Kahn imagines, a short piece down the road, is a U.S. government faced with choosing between a depression of his definition, and an annual inflation rate of 30% or 40%. At some point, he argues, a government will have to pick the depression.

We see no reason why a future U.S. government has to be faced with that kind of choice. With a nation as educated and, at least at the grass roots, as sensible as ours, there still should be will enough to make the corrections before the collapse, and thus avoid it. The key to this is for policy-makers to recognize, as Mr. Kahn does so clearly, that the current fears and risks of depression tomorrow are created by the inflation today. Depression will come only if inflation and inflationary expectations are so high they can be cured in no other way.

In other words, the way to head off depression is to get inflation under control. This in turn means slowing monetary growth. And realistically this cannot be done until monetary policy is freed of the burden of government borrowing and government deficits. So