

duce their marking hours—an option that obliges them to accept half pay for three-fifths of a normal workload, and to forfeit opportunities for professional advancement.

Introducing permanent part-time positions here would mainly require paperwork,

and would be anything but revolutionary—Culver City, Glendale, Palo Alto and dozens of other California school districts now have similar programs in effect. The school board will be remiss if it continues to ignore this proposal as if it were just one more petition

for a new coffee machine in the faculty lounge. Its adoption would be a boon to teachers, to be sure, but also to students and, not least of all, to those whom the public holds accountable for keeping a lid on school costs.

## SENATE—Friday, June 17, 1977

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 18, 1977)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray;

O Lord our God, we thank Thee for the vision of the Founding Fathers of this Republic, for Thy providential care over the Nation from generation to generation, for leaders who arise in our midst to rally the citizens in united purpose, and for the fidelity of common people in obscure places whose daily lives set forward Thy kingdom on Earth. Make us worthy of our great heritage. Give us a solemn sense of national destiny.

We thank Thee for the ministry of pure religion expressed in many forms, creeds, and liturgies shaping the faith and life of the people. May the current renewal of religion help make America great in spirit as she is mighty in power.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. 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., June 17, 1977.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

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

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Thursday, June 16, 1977, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all com-

mittees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alaska desire recognition?

Mr. STEVENS. I was waiting for the majority leader, Mr. President.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there is one nomination on the calendar that is cleared for action. It appears under the Department of Justice. If the distinguished assistant Republican leader is ready to clear that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider that nomination.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nomination.

### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James W. Garvin, Jr., of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware.

Mr. STEVENS. There is no objection to this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I turn back my time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, does the

Senator from Kansas seek part of the minority leader's time?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, Mr. President, if I may have 5 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 5 minutes of the minority leader's time to the Senator from Kansas.

### CARTER SHOULD VETO SUGAR PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, strange as it may seem, President Carter, Secretary of Agriculture, Bob Bergland, and other administration spokesmen are all talking about a possible veto of the Senate-passed farm bill. Despite promises made in the campaign last year, President Carter now says the Senate bill costs too much. We all share the President's concern about fiscal responsibility, but his rhetoric is hard to reconcile with the proposal to spend \$240 million on a sugar program which will be detrimental to both producers and consumers and which will provide a windfall to large grower-processors of millions of dollars.

It would be the suggestion of this Senator that maybe President Carter should veto the sugar program.

### SOUR SUGAR PROGRAM

By any standard, the Carter so-called sugar program does not make sense. It is so failure fulfilling as to almost defy understanding. I predict that those who perpetrated this not-so-sweet error will deny parenthood.

Has anyone on the floor of this body ever before heard of a support price program which does not have a support price? Has anyone ever before heard of a support price which drops as the market price falls? Well, we have now. Let us read from the proposed regulations which just became available:

The level of support in this proposal is not more than 13.5 cents, per pound, raw sugar equivalent, which represents approximately 52 percent of parity as of April 1977. If the average price received from the sale of sugar in the market place is less than 11.5 cents per pound, the level of support will be less than 13.5 cents.

If the price received for raw sugar dropped to 7 cents, then the alleged price support would be 9 cents. I believe the Secretary of Agriculture is misreading the law. A price support means what it says. He is creating a legal fiction about what a price support means.

Has anyone on the floor of this body ever before heard of a program designed, to protect producers as the President said:

I believe that a strong and viable domestic sugar industry is vital to the economic well-being of the American people.

Yet through low prices, will result in the ruination and demise of much of the producers in this industry, especially the sugar beet producer.

Has anyone on the floor of this body ever before heard of a support program which will give producers much less after the announcement of the program than before the program was leaked? The market price for sugar has gone down over 3 cents per pound in response to this program, and the trend is down.

Has anyone on the floor of this body figured out how the President of the United States could use semantics in such a way as to state, "13.5 cents is the estimated average break-even price for domestic sugar growers," and then announce a program which it now appears will give the producer much less than this—much, much less than the cost of production that I heard so much about in the Bicentennial Year.

Were any producers consulted and reported as favorable to this program? The American Farm Bureau Federation came out strongly in opposition. According to

the New Orleans Times Picayune, H. D. Godfrey, vice president of the American Sugar Cane League, said:

Louisiana's growers do not favor subsidy payments, but tariffs and restrictions on the amount of sugar that can be imported.

#### WHAT ABOUT CONSUMERS?

Has anyone on the floor of this body really asked the President regarding the concern about sugar consumers, and then examined the real facts regarding consumer prices for sugar based consumer items?

About 80 percent of the sugar used in the United States is not bought by housewives—but by soft drink manufacturers, confectioners, bakers, restaurants, institutions, et cetera. The following data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that consumer costs for sugar bearing foods and drinks are higher than they were when raw sugar was at the 65 cent peak, compared to less than 11 cents today.

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

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

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Index of Consumer Prices 1967=100

	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	April 1977
Cola drinks.....	128.3	131.7	163.0	200.5	194.2	201.3
Cookies.....	110.2	115.0	145.8	186.1	189.6	197.2
Chocolate bars.....	130.7	135.6	189.8	238.9	233.5	265.2
Grape jelly.....	124.8	134.1	171.5	230.5	221.0	216.2

Mr. DOLE, Secretary of Agriculture Bergland knew that this would happen for, in an interview with the National Journal, he said:

My point is when sugar prices were 65 cents, prices of these manufactured goods went up. Now sugar's nine cents: Has there been any corresponding drop in cake mixes or soda pop or candy? No, of course not. And I'm going to say the consumers have not gotten the benefit of the change in prices.

I think it is fair to ask: Just who are the beneficiaries of this program?

The May 31 issue of USDA's Agricultural Prices states:

The April 1977 consumer price index, at 179.6, rose 0.8 percent from March. The food component increased 1.2 percent. Food purchased in grocery stores increased 1.3 percent. About 3/4 of the increase was attributed to nonalcoholic beverages—coffee, tea, and drinks.

Now, who is the largest soft drink manufacturer—Coca-Cola, based in Atlanta, Ga. This one company, together with its affiliates, uses about 1 million tons of sugar per year. This one firm has now available to it through recently reduced sugar prices below the producer's cost of production, over \$5 million per month in additional gross profits. The large users of sugar are saving about \$45 million per month with precious little passed on to consumers.

President Ford, when faced with the same problem, raised the duty on sugar 1 1/4 cents per pound, and ordered a study

by USITC. This latter body spent 6 months studying the issues, and unanimously recommended import quotas—not Government handouts from unappropriated funds.

#### SUGAR PRODUCERS SACRIFICED

Has anyone recognized that sugar producers have been made the sacrificial quota due to loss of time of implementation? If the USITC recommendation of March 17, 1977, had been quickly implemented, sugar producers would now be receiving much more in the marketplace. They would not have to wait for the 1977 crop to be harvested and marketed before payments could be made. I recommend to all my colleagues that they read the regulations carefully. They will then learn to their dismay that there will be a delay in implementation and just what the words "1977 crop year" mean as it relates to their particular producing area. To my friends in southern California and the lowland area of Arizona, I fear that we will find that this program does not begin until March and April of 1978, respectively.

Representative FINDLEY, of Illinois, recently said as follows:

Estimated payments to just five large grower processors will gobble up over 20 percent of the total funds spent. According to the Congressional Research Service, which used 1974 production data and assumed the maximum 2 cents per pound subsidy, these estimated payments will be as follows:

	Million
1. AMFAC, Inc. (Hawaii).....	\$14.2
2. U.S. Sugar Corp. (Fla.).....	10.8
3. Alexander & Baldwin, Inc. (Hawaii).....	9.6
4. C. Brewer & Co., Ltd. (Hawaii).....	8.8
5. Theo. H. Davis & Co., Ltd. (Hawaii).....	5.7

They also will have a serious anti-competitive effect within the sugar industry by helping to finance the demise of small sugar farms at the hands of the gigantic grower processors.

Based on USDA figures on USDA payments and production, I am convinced that more than 25 sugar growers will be eligible for annual payments in excess of \$1 million.

If the program is ever implemented, these payments will be made despite a significant policy decision in S. 275.

We are talking about doing away with payments to corporations, protecting just producers in this country and not large corporations, suggested, I think, by the distinguished Senators from Iowa (Mr. CULVER and Mr. CLARK).

The Senate has just agreed that no payments for cotton, rice, feed grains, and wheat may be made to any person except:

First. A sole proprietorship farming operation—including any individual operating a farm as a tenant;

Second. A corporation or other entity engaged in a farming operation if a controlling interest in such corporation or other entity is held by individuals engaged primarily in farming;

Third. A small business corporation as defined in section 1371(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

Fourth. A partnership or similar arrangement in which each partner or owner would, if engaged in a farming operation on his own, be eligible for payments under this subsection;

Fifth. Any State, political subdivision, or agency thereof; and

Sixth. Several technical trust arrangements which relate to actual operations by persons of a farm.

Moreover, S. 275 provides:

The Congress hereby specifically reaffirms the historical policy of the United States to foster and encourage the family farm system of agriculture in this country. The Congress firmly believes that the maintenance of the family owned farm system is essential to the social well-being of the Nation and the competitive production of adequate supplies of food and fiber. The Congress further believes that any significant expansion of nonfamily owned large-scale corporate farming enterprises will be detrimental to the national welfare.

Does anyone think these large payments foster and encourage the family farm system of agriculture? Actually, the huge sugar payments will help finance the acceleration of the rate of gobbling up of small farms by huge grower processors—especially in view of the severe economic predicament that the President is placing our sugar producers.

Let the Senate recognize that the President is willing to spend through the backdoor \$240 million on a program on which no hearings have been held, and no appropriation made. Questionable producers benefits, no hearings, no appro-



riation, no consumer benefits: I say No. No. No.

The point the Senator from Kansas will make in conclusion is that we should take a hard, close look at this program that has been implemented by the administration without any hearings, without any appropriations, without any benefit. In fact, it is detrimental to consumers and the sugar producers in America.

It seems to me we ought to take a hard look at the United States International Trade Commission proposal, and really do something for the sugar producers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a press release of the USDA outlining provisions of the sugar program printed in the RECORD.

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

**PROPOSED SUGAR PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM OUTLINED**

WASHINGTON, June 13.—Acting Secretary of Agriculture John C. White today outlined some of the proposed provisions of the sugar price support payments program. The program is being instituted in response to President Carter's May 4 decision concerning sugar.

In the past year sugar prices have fallen sharply to a point less than the cost of production for many U.S. growers. Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland has determined that a program offering payments of up to two cents per pound of sugar should be undertaken to assist producers and processors through the present period of low prices. The objective of the program is to support prices in the marketplace for sugarbeet and sugarcane producers through payments made to sugar processors. The program is authorized by Section 301 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1447).

The support price will not exceed 13.5 cents per pound, raw sugar equivalent. This price was determined to be the level of support necessary to cover the average cost of producing and processing sugarbeets and sugarcane in efficient domestic producing areas. The program takes effect beginning with the 1977 crop. Sugar in inventory from crops prior to 1977 will not be eligible for price support. The maximum price support payment will be two cents per pound.

The proposed program includes the following general provisions:

1. The 1977 crop year will be defined, by area, as sugarbeets and sugarcane generally harvested during the following periods:

Sugar production area and harvesting period:

A. Mainland beet:

All States, excluding California and Arizona, September–November 1977.

California, excluding southern area, June 1977–February 1978.

Southern California, March–August 1978.

Arizona—lowland area, April–June 1978.

Arizona—upland area, September–November 1977.

B. Mainland Cane:

Louisiana, October 1977–January 1978.

Florida, October 1977–May 1978.

Texas, October 1977–May 1978.

C. Hawaii, Calendar Year 1977.

D. Puerto Rico, December 1977–July 1978.

2. Raw cane sugar and refined beet sugar marketed from the 1977 crop on or after May 4, 1977, would be eligible for price support payments.

3. The basis of payment would be the dif-

ference between the U.S. weighted average price, raw sugar equivalent, received by processors each quarter from the sale of sugar in the marketplace and the support price of 13.5 cents per pound.

4. If the national average market price received by processors is less than the support price of 13.5 cents per pound, processors would be paid the difference up to a maximum of 2 cents per pound.

5. If the national average market price received by processors is more than the support price of 13.5 cents per pound, no government payment would be made.

6. Payment would be made on the quantity of sugar marketed by the processor each quarter, except that the initial "payment period" would cover 1977 crop sugar marketed from May 4 through June 30, 1977.

To be eligible for program payments, it is proposed that the processor and producer would have to comply with specified requirements. The proposed program would require that the:

1. Processor and producer have a written contract stipulating the producer's share of proceeds from the sale of sugar in the marketplace and the method of payment.

2. Processor pay producers the full amount of the price support payment after deduction of actual administration expenses incurred in carrying out its obligations under the program.

3. Processor certify the quantity of sugar in inventory at the beginning of the 1977 crop harvesting period.

4. Processor certify and submit a report showing the quantity of sugar marketed from the 1977 crop each quarter and the gross proceeds received therefrom.

5. Processor certify that producers have been or will be paid in accordance with their contractual agreement.

The Department will include the provisions outlined today in a notice of proposed rule making to be published in the June 14 Federal Register. Interested persons will be invited to comment before they are adopted.

**THE IMPOSITION OF U.S. ANTI-TRUST LAWS ON CANADA**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a statement today by Canadian Finance Minister Donald MacDonald from Ottawa in regard to a story in the Washington Post about alleged uranium price fixing by a multinational cartel.

He has indicated that he believes that the United States has behaved improperly in trying to impose American anti-trust laws on Canada.

I raise this matter in connection with the pending issue as to whether or not Alaska's gas should be transported in a pipeline that goes through Canada. There are two such proposals pending before the Canadian Government and the United States Government. The President will make his recommendation to Congress on September 1 as to which of the transportation systems should be used to bring our North Slope gas to market in the South 48.

It is imperative, I believe, that Americans understand that Canada does have an entirely different system of government than ours. They have different government policies than we do.

I do believe that Mr. MacDonald's statement again emphasizes that when American commodities go through Can-

ada, they are going to be subject to a different set of laws than if our gas in particular, is transported solely within the jurisdiction of the United States or on the high seas in U.S. tankers and, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

I am not expressing anti-Canadian points of view. I am trying to say again that those of us in Alaska who live next to Canada and deal with Canada try to understand their system and, therefore, try to respect their point of view.

Those who are planning the pipelines through Canada I feel are not properly informing the United States of the serious risks of delay that will be involved transporting Alaska's gas through Canada, and this is a case in point.

It is clear that Canada does not want the U.S. antitrust policies imposed in Canada. Yet, when our commodities go through Canada, they shall in fact be subject to U.S. laws.

The impact of this would be that many laws of Canada which are different from those of the United States would, in fact, become applicable to a pipeline through Canada and applicable to our gas in transit through Canada in a manner that would be inconsistent with the policies of the United States, particularly those expressed by the Congress of the United States.

I do not mean by this comment to get involved in a controversy as to the Gulf activity related to uranium.

But I do think we ought to take cognizance of the very strong statement made by the Finance Minister, Donald MacDonald, a former energy commissioner of Canada. He has been a friend of the United States, but he is, I think, issuing once again a strong warning to U.S. citizens, and particularly the U.S. Government, not to presume that U.S. laws will be applied to American companies doing business in Canada, or to American commodities as they transit Canada.

The treaty that will come before this body very soon for ratification, the Hydrocarbon Treaty, does not address these issues. I am hopeful we can discuss them when the treaty does come before the Senate.

Mr. President, if I have any further time, I yield it back.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

**AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY**

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, during the course of the 1976 Presidential campaign, candidates Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter met on October 6 in the second of a series of historic debates—this one dealing with American foreign policy. It is generally accepted that foreign policy was one of the critical issues of the campaign, and I believe it is fair

to say that this confrontation had a measurable impact on the decision of the voters in November. To a great extent, the candidates' qualifications in the area of foreign policy may well have been judged by the positions they offered during that October 6 debate.

In presenting his views on foreign policy, candidate Jimmy Carter stated:

This is what it takes to have a sound foreign policy—strong at home, strong defense, permanent commitments—not betray the principles of our country and involve the American people and the Congress in the shaping of our foreign policy. \* \* \* We ought to be a beacon for nations who search for peace and who search for freedom, who search for individual liberty, who search for basic human rights.

He continued to say that when we pursue and achieve treaties in supporting dictatorships, in ignoring human rights, "we are weak and the rest of the world knows it."

President Carter's awareness of the difficulties we have faced in the past and the imminent troubles we face today gave us a hopeful outlook of the future of our foreign policy. His pledge to formulate foreign policy to regain our position of strength is commendable.

In the first 5 months of this administration, the President has been extremely active on a number of foreign policy fronts, and I believe it is not only appropriate but imperative that some of the foreign policy initiatives of the administration now be measured against those earlier pledges of being strong through permanent commitments, of upholding the importance of human rights, of supporting nations who seek peace and freedom. Current among the administration's activities and particularly enlightening in regard to the developing foreign policy is the President's pursuit of "normalized relations" with Cuba.

On June 3 the administration disclosed an agreement for the exchange of diplomats between the United States and Cuba—a development which can only be viewed as the first step toward restoration of full diplomatic relations, and the lifting of the United States trade embargo against Cuba.

I consider it a crude and distressing irony that during the period when Cuban Premier Castro was contemplating this triumph in relations with the United States, he was also monitoring the deployment of Cuban military personnel to a new frontier in Africa. With the arrival of Cuban personnel in Ethiopia, Castro would claim as many as 10 African nations on his "hit list" for Communist revolution.

The U.S. willingness to proceed toward diplomatic recognition must have been a heartening sign to Castro that America no longer objected to the foreign exploits of Cuba. Castro was likely reassured that Ambassador Andrew Young did indeed speak for President Carter when he praised the "stabilizing influence" of Cuban forces, and announced that "a thousand Cubans, or 20,000 Cubans or even 100,000 Cubans anywhere in the world are no threat to the United States."

In fact, after the President's announcement of a diplomatic exchange with Cuba, Castro waited only a day before disclosing that the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola would be halted. Some 10,000 to 15,000 troops remaining after Cuba's successful exploitation of the Angolan civil war would be retained, either to tighten the grasp of the Communist takeover there, or to prepare their next adventure.

The unmistakable implication of President Carter's willingness to proceed toward normalized relations with Cuba is that a new foreign policy is being molded by the administration. It is not at all the policy described by the President only weeks ago when he advised leaders of other nations that "you will find this country, the United States, eager to stand beside those nations which respect human rights and which promote democratic ideals." Instead the President seems most eager to stand beside a nation which openly mocks and ridicules these principles.

Evidence of this glaring contradiction can be seen throughout the administration's posture toward the Third World.

In Vietnam, the victors of a long struggle for Communist dominance of that divided country have succeeded in establishing one of the most brutal and oppressive regimes of all the Third World. And yet, the administration has already scheduled negotiations with Vietnam on the normalization of relations between the two countries.

Presumably, our simple humanitarian request for a full accounting of American soldiers killed or missing in action in Southeast Asia will be considered only after discussion of Vietnam's demands for war reparations and other economic concessions. President Carter has apparently abandoned the concept that America "ought to be a beacon for nations who search for peace and who search for freedom, who search for individual liberty, who search for basic human rights." The President's conduct of foreign policy has instead made us a beacon of economic and political opportunity for those who hold nothing but contempt for these ideals.

The emptiness of another of the President's promises, to "involve the American people and the Congress in the shaping of our foreign policy," can be seen in the ill-conceived proposal for the withdrawal of American ground forces from South Korea. Not only were the American people and the Congress excluded from the formulation of this proposal, but the military community itself appears to have been ignored.

I have found no evidence that the military or intelligence communities were ever consulted in the development of this plan. I am personally unaware of a single knowledgeable military official who supported the President's withdrawal proposal before the President declared it national policy.

One who dared to openly express his reservations about the proposal, Major General Singlaub, the third ranking U.S. Commander in South Korea, was summarily recalled from that command.

In this theatrical overreaction by the President it was made clear that a double standard would be applied to those who disagreed with his official policy—praise for the stabilizing influence of Cuban forces in foreign lands would be excused, comments regarding the stabilizing influence of American forces would not be tolerated.

If these are to be the hallmarks of the foreign policy being shaped by the administration then it is clear the President has forsaken his promises of a sound foreign policy of permanent commitments, and a strong defense, a policy that establishes America as that "beacon for nations, who search for peace and who search for freedom, who search for individual liberty, who search for basic human rights."

It is particularly significant and encouraging that the United States Senate yesterday evidenced its displeasure with these Presidential initiatives and demanded congressional consultation and involvement in the formulation of American foreign policy.

Instead, the policy being pursued by the President seems to be one of opening our arms to the belligerent communist regimes of the third world, and turning our backs on allies of long standing. Such a policy can only serve to the disgrace of the administration and to the detriment of our national security.

#### ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. Is there morning business?

#### DEATH OF DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senators may know that on yesterday a man who had done so much for this country and, indeed, for the world, especially in the field of space technology and exploration, died. That was Wernher von Braun.

Wernher von Braun, I am sorry to say, had a lingering illness for some time and it took him away on yesterday.

He did much, as I say, for this country. He was a great German scientist who was one of the pioneers in rocketry. It was due to his training in rocketry that he was able later to develop the space program.

He came to this country, if I recall, first in 1945. He was one of the officers taken prisoner of war by the Americans and was brought here, placed at Fort Bliss in Texas and later transferred to the Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville, Ala.

He was a wonderful citizen there. A great man, as I say, who did great things.

I knew Wernher von Braun quite well. He was a neighbor of mine.

I bemoan his death. I extend to Maria, his widow, a very gracious lady, and to



their children, the deepest sympathy of both me and Mrs. Sparkman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, Dr. Wernher von Braun, the world's greatest space scientist, is dead, but his achievements in the conquest of space will be a monument to him and his memory as long as the world endures.

He was a great man, a great scientist, a great community builder. He was for a number of years an adopted son of Huntsville, Ala., and the State of Alabama. He was highly regarded in that fine city and our State. He was much beloved.

In fact, the magnificent new civic center in Huntsville is named the Wernher von Braun Civic Center.

Dr. von Braun spent his entire career seeking to unlock the secrets of the universe and he achieved much in that pursuit.

I once read an article by Dr. von Braun that appeared in Reader's Digest and he pointed out that far from there being any conflict between science and religion, any conflict between the achievements in space and one's faith in God, there was no conflict and the more that was achieved in conquering space, the stronger his faith in God became.

So, certainly, we would hope that with that faith in God that he had, the remaining secrets of the universe will have been opened up to him.

He was a pioneer in the movement to establish a space research center at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, a leading advocate of the Alabama Space and Rocket Center, built in Huntsville, which is a great tourist attraction and which contains much of Dr. von Braun's memorabilia.

He took an interest in all things for the betterment and building up of his city and his State and his Nation. He was a great American, even though we all know his background. He became a patriotic American citizen, one of whom the country was proud because of his achievements.

So, joining my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. SPARKMAN, on behalf of Mrs. Allen and myself and on behalf of the people of Alabama, we extend our sincere condolences to Mrs. von Braun, who was a great inspiration to him throughout his career, and to the other members of his family in their loss.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, a few minutes ago my colleague (Mr. ALLEN) and I, as well as other Senators, made remarks regarding the death, the life, and the work of Wernher von Braun.

The Washington Star of today has a front-page article regarding his death. It is continued on another page. It is a rather long article, but a most interesting one. And on behalf of the two of us, Senator ALLEN and myself, I ask unanimous consent that those parts of the article I have marked be printed in the RECORD immediately following the earlier remarks of Senator ALLEN and me.

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

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

MISSILE PIONEER WERNHER VON BRAUN DIES  
(By Timothy Hutchens)

Wernher von Braun, the missile physicist who developed terrifying weaponry for his native Germany and space rockets for his adopted United States, died yesterday in Alexandria Hospital. He was 65.

Von Braun had been hospitalized several times for cancer since having a malignant tumor removed at Johns Hopkins Hospital two years ago.

Von Braun and his wife Maria, to whom he was married in 1947, had three children: Iris, Margrit and Peter. A funeral service yesterday was private.

After retiring five years ago as deputy associate administrator for long-range planning for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, he became corporate vice president for engineering and development at Fairchild Industries, in Germantown, Md.

During the 20 years before he moved into the NASA post here in 1970, he directed rocket development at Huntsville, Ala., first for the Army and later for NASA. Ultimately he was in charge of building the Saturn 5 moon rocket for the Apollo program.

At Huntsville, and earlier at the White Sands Proving Grounds in New Mexico, he worked with more than 100 other German scientists who had helped him develop the V2 rocket at Peenemunde, Germany, during World War II and who surrendered en masse to American forces during 1945.

Square-jawed, strikingly handsome and an outgoing champion of his work, Von Braun got boosts in his career in this country from periodic needs for rocketry—first to develop an intercontinental missile, then to match the Soviet Sputnik triumph, then to put a man on the moon.

In recent years, he had expressed disappointment as public interest and NASA funding declined in the American space effort. Nevertheless, he spoke wishfully from time to time of traveling to the moon, and he foresaw space exploration as a pacifying pursuit.

As early as 1952 he said, "On that future day when our satellite vessels are circling the earth, when men manning an orbital station can view our planet against the star-studded blackness of infinity as but a planet among planets, on that day, I say, fratricidal war will be banished from the star which we live."

Von Braun, who first developed a consuming interest in rocketry as a boy in East Prussia, frequently spoke eloquently of his work in the context of a career that saw him become a scientific leader in a country that would have put a bounty on his head several decades earlier.

At his family's home at Huntsville in 1958, three years after becoming a citizen, he reflected upon the successful launching of the first Explorer satellite into orbit:

"America has really been nice to us, and although we had to sit around and see the U.S. make some of the mistakes we had made long ago in missilery—it was like coming around the same track again—and we did feel frustrated at times, we are awfully lucky to have carried the day. It makes us feel that we paid back part of a debt of gratitude we owed this country."

Von Braun was born March 23, 1912, in Wirsitz, Germany, which is now Wyrzysk, Poland. His father was Baron Magnus von Braun, agriculture minister under President von Hindenburg in the Weimar Republic.

"For my confirmation," he recalled, "I didn't get a watch and my first pair of pants like most Lutheran boys. I got a telescope. My mother thought it would make the best gift."

Just as he was entering his teens, he read an astronomy pamphlet that contained a sketch of a rocket zooming to the moon. The

picture illustrated an article by a pioneer rocket theorist named Hermann Oberth, who was later to be part of Von Braun's Huntsville team.

Oberth had written a book titled, "The Rocket to the Interplanetary Spaces," which the young Von Braun obtained. To his horror, he discovered it was filled with mathematics, a subject he disliked but realized he had to master.

He ended up teaching math and physics to fellow students at a boarding school on an island in the North Sea after the teacher got sick.

Even before going off to college, he was experimenting with rockets in an abandoned ammunition dump in suburban Berlin. (His family moved frequently because his father was reassigned to various parts of Germany.)

The young Von Braun pressurized his first rocket with a bicycle pump, but it never got off the ground.

In 1930, he attended the Institute of Technology in Zurich and continued his experiments. By that summer, he was assisting Oberth in some early experiments with rockets using liquid fuel.

A year later, he returned to Berlin and joined a small group that had launched 85 primitive rockets. There, he also continued his studies, and became an expert in liquid fuel at the German army's rocket station at Kummersdorf.

The army was interested in developing long-range weapons that were not prohibited in Germany by the Versailles Treaty. Von Braun became chief of the experiment station at the age of 20.

In 1933, the year Adolf Hitler came to power, the station produced a rocket stabilized by one large gyroscope in the nose. The next year, Von Braun received his Ph.D. in physics at the University of Berlin.

Hitler became interested in rockets as weapons in 1936 and constructed the vast rocket research center at Peenemunde on the Baltic Sea. Von Braun became its technical director the next year at the age of 25 and was charged with developing a long-range weapon carrying a large warhead.

By 1938, Von Braun had developed the first successful model of a flying bomb that, six years later, would be known as the terrible V2 (*Vergeltungswaffe Zwei*, or Vengeance Weapon No. 2).

The first and second tests of prototypes failed, but the third soared at supersonic speeds to a record height of almost 60 miles.

Hitler became more interested in the work and established impossible production schedules. Meanwhile his subordinates began squabbling for control of the weapon, and in February 1944, Gestapo chief Heinrich Himmler put Von Braun in jail because he would not agree to put Peenemunde under control of the SS instead of the army.

Hitler, however, had Von Braun released after being convinced that the V2 program would otherwise fail.

Peenemunde was bombed, delaying the launching of V2s against the Allies. However, on Sept. 7, 1944, the first one was fired against London.

Von Braun was later to remark, "We felt a genuine regret that our missile, born of idealism . . . had joined in the business of killing. We had designed it to blaze the trail to other planets, not to destroy our own."

Some 3,600 V2s were fired against English cities and Antwerp, killing an estimated 2,700 persons and injuring 6,500 more.

In March 1945, as Russian forces had advanced to within 100 miles of Peenemunde, Von Braun and most of the other top scientists at the project chose to fall into American hands. They moved to Bavaria and waited in resort hotels for their capture.

For the trip to Bavaria, Von Braun fueled the vehicles with rocket alcohol and painted letters on their sides standing for Special

Project Disposition in order to get by road-blocks. It was the kind of ruse that he had frequently used successfully with the German bureaucracy and was later to use with the American bureaucracy in order to get his way.

En route to Bavaria, his driver fell asleep and ran off the road, and Von Braun had to surrender with a broken left arm.

Afterward, he and 120 of the other scientists were sent to the United States and first stationed at Fort Bliss, Tex., to work on some old V2s.

In 1950, spurred by the Korean War, the Army transferred them to its Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville to build a long-range missile that could carry a nuclear payload. As a result the Redstone missile was launched at Cape Canaveral in 1953.

With his eye on outer space, Von Braun found himself competing against development of the Navy Vanguard missile and was ordered to forget about satellite launchings. Instead, he was ordered to work on the Army's Jupiter's intermediate range ballistic missile, which was also competing with the Air Force's Thor.

He developed the so-called Jupiter-C, which had a dummy fourth-stage for a satellite and which was launched successfully in September 1956. But President Dwight D. Eisenhower ruled out using a Redstone missile for space projects because, he said, he did not want military weapons in outer space.

In October of the following year, the Russians orbited their first Sputnik, and the pressure was on American rocket physicists to respond in kind.

A Navy Vanguard exploded on its launch pad two months later, and Von Braun finally got his chance to orbit a satellite in January 1958. He used a modified Redstone that he had kept in waiting to launch Explorer One into orbit.

"All she needed was a good dusting," he said.

Two years later, the group at Huntsville became part of NASA, and Von Braun remained director of the renamed George C. Marshall Space Flight Center. The project's attention turned to manned spaceflight, and in 1961, Alan B. Shepard rode a Redstone to become America's first man in space.

President John F. Kennedy pledged to put a man on the moon and return him safely by 1970, and Von Braun began building the Saturn 5 rocket that did the job in 1969.

When Von Braun came to Washington in 1970 as deputy associate NASA administrator, it was admittedly due to the idea of using the man who had become better known than most astronauts to renew interest and appropriations in the space program, particularly for plans of manned expeditions to Mars.

But Congress was not buying the idea, he said in a Q & A interview with The Washington Star during January 1976.

"At the time," he said, "so many other national problems had crept up that Congress just wasn't in the mood to commit itself to another multibillion dollar space program."

However, he noted, the idea of a space shuttle survived.

He was disappointed in a NASA budget that was halved and inflation that diluted the funding even more.

"This reduced my function in Washington eventually to one of describing programs which I knew could not be funded for the next 10 years anyway," he said.

In 1972, he left 27 years of government service to join Fairchild.

Late last year as he grew more ill, he began crating his papers and shipping them to the rocket center at Huntsville. Nevertheless, visitors to his home in Northern Virginia

said they were amazed at his mental vigor. One described how he still enjoyed working out math problems.

Another visitor last summer remarked how fond he was of recalling travels, such as a hunting expedition to Norway, skin diving in Jamaica, and trekking in Antarctica 10 years ago. Some of his other activities were gliding, sailing and fishing.

He was also head of the board of the National Space Institute, a nonprofit group established to inform the public on benefits of space research.

"There is beauty in space," he once said, almost 20 years ago, "and it is orderly. There is no weather, and there is regularity. It is predictable. Just look at our little Explorer. You can set your clock by it—literally. It is more accurate than your clock. Everything in space obeys the laws of physics. If you know these laws, and obey them, space will treat you kindly. And don't tell me man doesn't belong out there. Man belongs wherever he wants to go—and he'll do plenty well when he gets there."

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senators from Alabama and associate myself with their remarks.

Alabama was the home of one of my very closest professional colleagues, one of my dearest friends, Wernher von Braun.

I am sure that the professional loss I feel is shared by everyone who had the benefit of his friendship and the benefit of his professionalism and those of his colleagues he directed, as we literally have evolved as a nation and as a species into space and into the universe.

My first contact with Wernher von Braun was unknown to me. It was as a boy in New Mexico, when I watched the contrails of the V-2's that he and his colleagues were testing for the Army at the White Sands Proving Grounds, which carried on a great tradition for New Mexico in the testing of rockets, the home of the tests that Dr. Goddard performed, near Roswell, N. Mex.

Wernher at that time excited my imagination, as later he excited the imagination of the country, as the Saturn series of rockets was developed, without which our generation would not have had the privilege of establishing this new evolutionary trend for mankind.

Wernher's vision was the vision of youth and always will be. He and all of us who were associated with the space program spent much of their time, and still do, talking with young people about the experiences of space and the meaning of the experience, not only in a scientific, a technical, and a national sense, but also, as Senator ALLEN so aptly pointed out, the philosophical sense. He expressed the reinforcement of religion that comes with an experience in which few of us have had the opportunity to take part directly, but in which all mankind has participated very closely in a vicarious way.

I think that as the people pause and reflect on the career and contributions of Wernher von Braun, they will realize that, in the history of science, he contributed as much or more than any other man to a first order understanding of

the planetary bodies, an understanding which was beyond the hope of mankind just a few decades ago.

In the history of technology, he has contributed as much or more than any other person to advancing and increasing the base of technology from which we now can stand and reach for solutions to a vast number of human problems. Problems which before were just dark tunnels out ahead of our species—ignorance, hunger, natural disaster, poverty, poor health. All these are now realms in which we can reach to find solutions. It was Wernher's vision, his help, and his leadership that have allowed that new technology base to be available to all of us. As we, in the Senate, in Congress, and in the Nation, discuss solutions for our energy problems, we will find that we will draw upon the technology that Wernher and his colleagues helped create.

In the history of our Nation, there is no question that through the Saturn rocket, the monument to Wernher von Braun, this Nation became the first truly space-faring nation in the history of mankind. In connection with this concept, we think of the British, who were a seafaring nation for centuries. Now the United States of America stands alone in history as a truly space-faring nation, with the ability, if it desires to do so, to explore the planets, to live and work in space, any part of space.

As a matter of fact, as a consequence of Wernher's efforts, there are young people today who can anticipate—and very probably will be correct in that anticipation—that they will be the parents of the first Martians, a concept that Wernher talked about many, many times.

However, perhaps most important is the fact that through his efforts and those of his colleagues, mankind has evolved into the universe. With the first orbital flight to the moon, Apollo 8, Wernher and three astronauts broke that fundamental bond that had so far held the species to Earth, the bond of gravity.

They committed themselves to a gravitational field of another planet, from which there was no guarantee those astronauts would return. Obviously, as a result of the work of Wernher and others, we were confident that we would return. But the commitment was made; the bond was broken, even for a very brief period of time; and it demonstrated to mankind, I believe, that if we desire to do so, we now can move into the planets. This civilization can be carried into space and to the planets.

With that new evolutionary status comes the same hope that our ancestors had when they left Europe and other parts of the world to come to our shores, the shores of North America, to replant the seed of individual freedom and the seed of mankind in a new environment from which, in all likelihood—we all hope—it never will disappear.

Once again, I commend the distinguished Senators from Alabama for their remarks. I know that the people of New Mexico as well as the rest of the



people of this country share the sense of loss but also the sense of hope that has come with the life of Wernher von Braun.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his moving and eloquent tribute to Dr. von Braun. Certainly, no one is in a better position to attest to the accomplishments and the greatness of Dr. von Braun than the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. SCHMITT), who was one of the great, courageous astronauts and who would not have been able to make history as he did in conquering space had it not been for the genius of Dr. von Braun.

I appreciate very much the fine remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, this Nation has lost a great man. Dr. Wernher von Braun, who contributed so much to the U.S. space program, has passed away.

At an early age, Wernher von Braun developed a consuming interest in rocketry and space travel. As a young man, he became a leader in these activities in his native country, Germany. Near the end of World War II he, along with other top German scientists who had helped him develop rocketry at Peenemunde, made a conscious decision to surrender to the United States.

On arriving in the United States, he applied his genius, and the genius of those who came with him, to the development of our early military rockets. But Wernher von Braun recognized that in a few short years mankind would have the capability to leave the surface of the Earth and enter outer space. In his own inimitable way, he had his group work on this problem. Although the Government would not give his Army team authority to attempt to launch a vehicle into space, he was ready when the Soviet Union stunned the world with the first sputnik. Because there was a Wernher von Braun, the United States was able to place its first satellite into space less than 4 months later.

But this was not the highlight of Dr. von Braun's remarkable space career.

Wernher von Braun not only knew how to build space launch vehicles; but he knew how to dream. More importantly, he was not afraid to undertake the design and development of a space launcher larger than others could imagine, the remarkable Saturn V which accomplished the manned lunar landings.

No one can look at the huge Saturn V launch vehicle without wondering about the audacity of the man who conceived it, at his courage to undertake its development and at his genius to make it work flawlessly. The Saturn V never failed, yet it was probably the most complicated engineering undertaking of mankind up to that time. Its development was a truly remarkable accomplishment.

The Apollo lunar landings are now history—but we will not soon forget the contribution of Wernher von Braun to that extraordinary achievement.

This unique man also understood the utility of space. Wernher von Braun saw space as a new frontier of enormous usefulness for the benefit of all mankind.

Extraordinary scientist, technologist and manager—Wernher von Braun was all of these. His contribution to this Nation's space program will be an enduring testament of his genius.

I extend my deepest regrets to his wife, Mrs. von Braun and to his children.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Martin Franks, of my office, have the privilege of the floor during the consideration of H.R. 7636 today and votes thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Shore, of the Human Relations Committee, have the privilege of the floor during the consideration of this measure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mary Keogh and Tony Bevinetto, of my staff, have the privilege of the floor during the debate and votes today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Erich Evered, of my staff, have the privilege of the floor during the consideration of the measure today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6655) to amend certain Federal laws pertaining to community development, housing, and related programs; requests a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. STANTON, Mr. ROUSSELOT, and Mr. WYLIE were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 3 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Hackney, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1440. An act for the relief of Eun Kyung Park and Sang Hyuk Park.

H.R. 7606. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit general recreational access and geothermal explorations for six months within a portion of the Bull Run Reserve, Mount Hood National Forest, Oregon.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

#### COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications which were referred as indicated:

EC-1510. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of an Anti-Deficiency Act violation by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1511. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a correction page to be substituted for page 498 in the 63rd Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (1976) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1512. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide improved consumer deposit services; to promote competitive balance among financial institutions; and to enhance the effectiveness of the Federal Reserve (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1513. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act to provide additional financing for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SC-1514. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Cleaning Up the Remains of Nuclear Facilities—A Multibillion Dollar Problem" (EMD-77-46) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1515. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the publication "Principal Electric Facilities, 1977" regional maps (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1516. A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a report on gasoline service station market shares for the month of February 1977 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1517. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for International, Conservation, and Resource Development Programs for the Federal Energy Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of three meetings related to the International Energy Program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1518. A letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh report on abnormal occurrences at licensed nuclear facilities for the fourth quarter of 1976 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1519. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of a report entitled "The Tule Elk in California" (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1520. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The United States and Japan Should Seek a More Equitable Defense Cost-Sharing Arrangement" (ID-77-8) (with an accompanying

report); to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1521. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of proposals on a new system of records, in accordance with the Privacy Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1522. A letter from the Counsel for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Freedom of Information Act during the calendar year 1976; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1523. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1979 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1524. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1979 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1525. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Overseas Private Investment Corporation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a four-year extension of the investment insurance and finance programs operated by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and to make certain changes in its existing programs and policies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1526. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to law, notice that the President of the United States has granted Federal recognition to "Energy Expo '82", a Special Category International Exposition proposed to be held in 1982 in the City of Knoxville (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1527. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of the United States Naval Sea Cadet Corps transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Audit Report of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps for the fiscal year ended 31 March 1977 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions which were referred as indicated:

POM-233. A resolution adopted by the Julian Chamber of Commerce, Julian, Calif., urging prompt congressional action to alleviate the crippling restrictions now imposed on the tuna industry; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

POM-234. A petition from Mr. and Mrs. Lance Roberts, Summersville, W. Va., urging the President and the Congress of the United States to do everything in their power to stop the surrender of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-235. A letter from the Democratic legislative leadership and the legislative black caucus for the State of Connecticut urging the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to grant Dr. King's birthday national recognition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-236. A resolution adopted by the central regional conference, International Personnel Management Association expressing

opposition to H.R. 10 proposed to amend the Hatch Act and requesting that the honorable Members of the United States Senate reject this proposed legislation; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

POM-237. Senate Resolution No. 1977-75 adopted by the Senate of the State of Washington urging to review those portions of the public law which preclude the development of hydroelectric and multipurpose projects in the Middle Snake River; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

[State of Washington]

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 1977-75

"Whereas, Present drought conditions have demonstrated the vital importance of preserving and enhancing the water and hydro-power resources of the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas, Hydroelectric power has been a primary source of low cost, abundant and dependable energy, which has decreased reliance on petroleum, natural gas, coal and nuclear power, freeing these depletable resources for use in other sections of the nation; and

"Whereas, Water impounding projects tend to be self-supporting and provide multiple-use benefits including the promotion of commerce, navigation, municipal and industrial water supply and water for irrigated farming, as well as recreational benefits; and

"Whereas, The principal remaining sites for the development of hydroelectric power in the region lie in the Middle Snake River area, with more than three million acre-feet of water storage available for power generation on-site and with resultant benefits to downstream generating plants, fisheries and flood control aspects of multiple-use development; and

"Whereas, The total cost of construction of the most expensive Middle Snake multipurpose project could be offset in less than two weeks of the equivalent import costs of foreign oil;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington, That the Congress be urged to review those portions of the public law which preclude the development of hydroelectric and multi-purpose projects in the Middle Snake River.

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to The Honorable Jimmy Carter, President of the United States; to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to the members of the delegation in Congress from the State of Washington."

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Without amendment:

S. Res. 199. An original resolution waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of S. 1341. Referred to the Committee on the Budget.

With amendments:

S. 1341. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Energy Research and Development Administration for military programs with potential civilian energy applications, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 95-278).

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Robert Walter Scott, of North Carolina, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that it be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LAXALT:

S. 1711. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that an alien may not qualify for supplemental security income benefits unless he not only is a permanent resident of the United States but has also continuously resided in the United States for at least five years; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BROOKE, and Mr. DOLE):

S. 1712. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to extend certain programs established in such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Human Resources.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1713. A bill to amend section 409 of the Trade Act of 1974 relating to freedom of emigration from Communist countries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DeCONCINI (for himself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. SCHMITT):

S. 1714. A bill relating to the relocation of certain Hopi and Navajo Indians pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1974; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of Manuel Agustin Corpuz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LAXALT:

S. 1711. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that an alien may not qualify for supplemental security income benefits unless he not only is a permanent resident of the United States but has also continuously resided in the United States for at least 5 years; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LAXALT. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation which would amend the Social Security Act in such a way as to deny eligibility for the Supplemental Security Income program to aliens who have not been legal residents of the United States for a 5-year period. This legislation is necessary to rectify a very serious and costly program occasioned by extensive alien participation in the SSI program.

Thousands of aliens are now qualifying for and receiving SSI benefits costing millions of dollars annually. Aliens are now eligible to receive SSI benefits after only 30 days after coming to the United States. They may now claim Supplemental Security Income amounting to approximately \$300 monthly on the average when including medical benefits.



When multiplied by the over 150,000 aliens currently on SSI rolls, the total bill for the American taxpayers comes to \$500 million dollars.

This is unfair to our citizens who have worked long and hard to pay their taxes. Most of the aliens receiving money have made little or no contribution to our society. This situation becomes even more ominous when one considers the administration's possible granting of an amnesty to all illegal aliens now in the United States, who could number between 6 and 8 million.

Our society has long been rightly proud of the refuge we have provided for immigrants from so many other lands who have chosen to settle among us. We have been generous in the past and we should continue to be generous in the future. But the generosity of even our people has to have limits.

My bill would help make those limits clear with respect to the supplemental security income program. It would require that aliens reside in the United States for 5 continuous years before being allowed the opportunity to participate in the supplemental security income program. This necessary safeguard is already present in the Social Security Act in section 1836 which similarly restricts medicare benefits to alien residents. However, my legislation in no way diminishes the traditional American spirit of kindness and compassion because an exception is provided for any alien blinded or disabled after coming to the United States. These aliens would still be eligible for the program.

Mr. President, the essence of welfare reform is to provide adequate benefits for those truly deserving while denying them to those who are not. Newly arrived aliens should have no legitimate claim to our taxpayers' hard earned dollars. Those blinded or disabled after they come to the United States are deserving of our compassion and should be allowed SSI benefits. But the others should be required to be residents for 5 years before qualifying.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

## S. 1711

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1614(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Social Security Act is amended—*

(1) by inserting a comma after "residence"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "who has resided in the United States continuously during the 5 years immediately preceding the month in which he applies for benefits under this title; except that the preceding provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to any individual who is an 'aged, blind, or disabled individual' for purposes of this title by reason of blindness (as determined under subsection (a)(2)) or disability (as determined under subsection (a)(3)), from and after the onset of the impairment involved, if such blindness or disability commenced after the date of such individual's admission to the United States."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first

section of this Act shall apply with respect to supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act (and State supplementary payments under section 1616 of such Act or section 212 of Public Law 93-66) for months after the month in which this Act is enacted. For purposes of such amendments, any alien who is a recipient of supplemental security income benefits (or such State supplementary payments) in the month in which this Act is enacted, and who has resided in the United States continuously during the 5-year period ending with the close of such month, shall be deemed to have resided in the United States continuously during the 5 years immediately preceding the month in which he applied for such benefits (or payments).

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BROOKE, and Mr. DOLE):

S. 1712. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to extend certain programs established in such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Human Resources.

## REHABILITATION EXTENSION AMENDMENTS OF 1977

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am introducing today, with the cosponsorship of several colleagues, the Rehabilitation Extension Amendments of 1977. The extension of this important measure is crucial to this Nation's handicapped citizens.

The measure is a 5-year extension of the programs presently authorized. It is abundantly clear that the funding levels authorized would be well spent. Additional thousands of handicapped Americans will receive the training to permit them to pursue lives of independence and dignity through gainful employment. This Nation will benefit from the increased income and taxes and from reduced welfare payments. This bill contains funding levels which are only slightly higher than presently exist and which are guided by cost of living increases.

It should be noted that the original law, passed in 1973 and which we are proposing to extend today, is the result of several years of careful study by the Subcommittee on the Handicapped, which I have the responsibility to chair. The able Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD) is our ranking minority member.

The subcommittee has been diligent in its responsibility for monitoring an oversight. During the 94th Congress the subcommittee held 8 days of intensive oversight hearings on these programs, to review the development and implementation of the new programs and concepts which were embodied in the new 1973 amendments.

In February and March of this year the subcommittee held further hearings. Many of the witnesses shared with us information regarding the effect of these health, education and welfare programs authorized by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

On Monday, June 20, 1977, the subcommittee will hold its 10th day of hearings during this session of the 95th

Congress to take more testimony on this proposal. In July we have invited administration witnesses to comment on this measure.

I cite this schedule to assure Senators that our subcommittee members have done a thorough job of carefully reviewing the expenditure of funds for these rehabilitation programs. We have concluded that this worthwhile and expanded program has clearly demonstrated that these dollars produce a higher ratio of benefits to costs than most other Federal programs.

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

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

## S. 1712

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Rehabilitation Extension Amendments of 1977".*

Sec. 2. (a)(1) Section 100(b)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 720(b)(1)) is amended by striking out "\$760,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount determined under subsection (c) for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and for each fiscal year thereafter".

(2)(A) Section 100(b)(2) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 720(b)(2)) is amended by striking out "and" after "1976," and by inserting after "1978" the following: ", \$37,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and \$42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, and for each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983".

(B) The first sentence of section 120(a)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 740(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "be entitled to" and inserting in lieu thereof "receive".

(b) Section 100 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 720) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) At the beginning of each calendar year (commencing in 1978), but no later than February 15 of each such calendar year, based upon available necessary data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Secretary and publish in the Federal Register the percentage difference between the price index for the 12 months preceding the beginning of such calendar year and the price index for the base period.

"(2) In determining the amount authorized under subsection (b)(1) for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after receiving a certification from the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (1), derive an amount which is equal to the amount authorized for the fiscal year ending in the year in which such certification is made increased by any percentage increase specified in such certification. Such derived amount shall be the amount authorized for the fiscal year beginning in the calendar year in which such certification is made.

"(3) In any fiscal year in which the Secretary of Labor certifies a percentage decrease in the price index under paragraph (1), the amount authorized for the fiscal year beginning in the calendar year in which such certification is made shall be equal to the amount authorized for the preceding fiscal year.

"(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2), the amount authorized under this subsection for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, may not exceed \$760,000,000.

"(5) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'price index' means the average over a calendar year of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

"(B) the term 'base period' means the calendar year 1976 and each calendar year thereafter which begins 2 years before the calendar year for which a certification is made under paragraph (1)."

(c) Section 112(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 732(a)) is amended by inserting after "1978," the following: "and for each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 201(a)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 761(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "and" after "1976," and by inserting after "1978" the following: ", \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, \$37,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, \$43,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and \$47,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983."

(b) Section 201(a)(2) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 761(a)(2)) is amended by striking out "and" after "1977," and by striking out "the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1978, and 1979, \$32,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, \$34,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, \$36,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and \$38,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983."

Sec. 4. (a)(1) The first sentence of section 301(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 771(a)) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, June 30, 1975, June 30, 1976, September 30, 1977, and September 30, 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983."

(2) The last sentence of section 301(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 771(a)) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1980" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1985."

(b) Section 302(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 772(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 302. (a) For the purpose of making grants and contracts under this section, there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983."

(c) Section 304(a)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 774(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "For the purpose" and all that follows through "September 30, 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "For the purpose of making grants under this section for special projects and demonstrations (and research and evaluation connected therewith), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983."

(d) Section 305(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 775(a)) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal years" and all that follows through "1978" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983."

Sec. 5. (a) Section 403 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 783) is amended by striking out "the fiscal years" and all that

follows through "1978" and inserting in lieu thereof "each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983."

(b) Section 405(d) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 785(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this section \$600,000 for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983."

Sec. 6. Section 502(h) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 792(h)) is amended to read as follows:

"(h) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the duties and functions of the Board under this section \$1,500,000 for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983."

By Mr. DeCONCINI (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. SCHMITT):

S. 1714. A bill relating to the relocation of certain Hopi and Navajo Indians pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1974; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, today Senators ABOUREZK, DOMENICI, and I are introducing legislation which would amend Public Law 93-531, the Navajo-Hopi Settlement Act which was designed to resolve the Hopi-Navajo joint-use area land dispute.

The Navajo-Hopi Settlement Act establishes procedures for the resolution of a century-old dispute between the Hopi and Navajo Tribes over joint-use area lands in Arizona. The act basically provides for a negotiated settlement of the dispute or, failing agreement, a mediated settlement to be approved by the district court. Guidelines for mediation and court settlement are set forth in the act and mechanisms are established for the transition period following a settlement.

Negotiations having failed, the mediator, William Simkin, filed his report to the court on December 12, 1975. The report recommended partition of the lands between the tribes and set out a line of partition. Hearings and filings of briefs were held through 1976. On February 10, 1977, the court issued its Judgment of Partition in which it confirmed the report of the mediator and ordered that the lands be partitioned in the manner set out in the report.

Since the issuance of the partitioning judgment, the Relocation Commission—a three-member panel established by Public Law 93-531 to administer the required relocation of tribal members—has begun to formulate its relocation plan for approximately 3,500 Navajos and 32 Hopis who must move. The Commission has about 1½ years remaining to devise its plan and submit it to the Congress. Thirty days following the plan's submission it becomes effective. According to the law, the Commission must complete the entire relocation plan 5 years after its effective date.

The act directs the Commission to make relocation incentive payments of decreasing values each year after the plan is in effect to households which voluntarily enter into relocation contracts with the Commission. Additionally, payments and programs to make restitution for dwelling and improve-

ments as well as funds for new housing after relocation are authorized.

Mr. President, the intent of this law to resolve a century-old land dispute is admirable. However, implementation problems have arisen which should be considered. The law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transfer, upon the payment of fair market value, up to 250,000 acres of Bureau of Land Management lands to the Navajo Tribe so as to restore a portion of the Navajo land base lost in partitioning. The additional land would be used by those Navajos required to relocate. Although environmental impact studies are taking place at this time, no appropriate land has been found. Bureau of Land Management land in the House Rock Valley-Paria Plateau area of Arizona has been considered for purchase. This action is strongly opposed by ranchers in the area and various environmental and wildlife organizations. Even if this land transaction were consummated, only 10 percent of the Navajo families now living on the Hopi portion of the joint use area would be accommodated.

An alternative suggestion has been to relocate the Navajos in urban areas such as Gallup, Flagstaff, or Albuquerque. Most of these relocatees have no skills that would allow them to become productive members of an urban population and in all probability they would be forced on the welfare rolls if such an alternative were adopted.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in its report which accompanied H.R. 10337, as amended, now Public Law 93-351, recognized the serious impact relocation would have if not handled properly:

The Committee believes it vitally important, that the plan take into account all social, economic, cultural, and other adverse impacts of relocation on persons involved in the relocation and be developed to avoid or minimize, to the extent possible, such impacts. The plan must also identify the sites to which such households are to be relocated and assure that housing and related community facilities are available at the relocation sites. The Committee believes this requirement is particularly important in effecting the purpose of minimizing the adverse impacts of relocation.

In view of the fact that lands have not yet been found for the relocatees, the committee's intent "of minimizing the adverse impacts of relocation" may not be implemented.

Mr. President, not only will relocatees possibly suffer "adverse impacts," but many have lived their entire lives on the joint use area and it is home. I recently received a letter which vividly illustrates the plight of those residing in the joint use area:

We, the McCabes, of Toiani Lake (Area 5-B), would like to express our true feelings about our land...

Our late father, Everett McCabe, Sr., was born on this land that we now live on and he is buried on the land, too. Our father worked on the land so that we can have a home. We were all born on this land and he raised all 12 of us along with our mother until he died in 1956. Now there are 81 of us including all our children and mother. Our grandmother and her family have been moved three times before for the same problems. It



is high time that we, the children and grandchildren, put our foot down and demand our rights. So this is where we all stop and stay for the rest of our lives.

Our father and mother had a grazing permit (350) for this land and they raised sheep, cattle, and horses. They built homes, wells, dikes, fences, and planted trees and corn. To this day we still have all of what they built we still plant corn, and plus fond memories of our childhood and our families. We know every square foot of our land. Our relatives and friends live close by and this is our happiness...

Several legislative alternatives have been studied, all of which would alleviate the relocation problems previously discussed. One of these alternatives, repeal of 94-531 in its entirety, is not viable. When repeal was being studied, I requested and received from the Congressional Research Services an opinion as to the constitutionality of such an action. CRS replied:

The repeal of the Settlement Act in its entirety would result in the undoing of the partition and the diminution of the respective reservations of the tribes by eliminating those lands which became a part of the reservations by operation of the Act. The lands set aside as part of the respective tribe's reservations constitute recognized Indian title and the restrictions of the Fifth Amendment apply to its disposition by the United States... The Fifth Amendment states that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. Since the Settlement Act, by virtue of the final judgment of the court ordering partition, appears to convey trust title to the respective tribes to the lands thus partitioned—title recognized explicitly by statute—the constitutional requirement of compensation would seem to arise if the Act is repealed. The extent of such compensation or the standards which would be applied in assessing the government's liability are not clear.

Due to the questionable constitutionality of repeal, it was decided to use an alternative legislative approach which accomplishes essentially the same end—allowing those Hopis and Navajos residing on the joint use area who are currently required to relocate because of the partitioning to remain if they wish.

This bill would permit those Navajos and Hopis who on the date of the judgment of partition maintained a residence on the joint use area to receive a limited tenure of land in order to avoid the necessity of relocation. Each person receiving such tenure could choose one of two alternatives: First, the right of occupancy for a term not to exceed 25 years; or, second, the right of occupancy for a term ending with the death of the occupant, or the occupant's spouse, whichever is later.

Upon expiration of the limited tenure, the occupant or his heirs would receive: just compensation for the residence and other improvements; and assistance for new housing and moving expenses incurred during relocation.

Further, this proposed legislation provides assistance to dependents residing with heads of households who have chosen a limited tenure. Should a dependent, within the 5-year relocation period, choose to establish his or her own household outside the joint use area, such dependent would receive the incentive payment for which the head of household

would have been eligible had he chosen to relocate, and also financial assistance for new housing. Dependents with one or more minor children choosing to establish a head of household outside the joint use area after the 5-year relocation period would be eligible to receive financial assistance to obtain sufficient housing. Thus, this bill gives dependents of those who choose a limited tenure flexibility and financial assistance if they desire to move out of the joint use area and start their own households.

Each tribe would be compensated for any losses or expenses incurred by reason of enactment of this bill.

Mr. President, this bill, if enacted would require no one to relocate over the next few years, nor would it require those currently residing on the joint use area to remain. Some may opt for relocation because of the incentive payments and housing assistance available. This bill simply gives those residing on the joint use area who have maintained a residence freedom of choice. The elderly, those most adversely affected by relocation, will be allowed to live out their remaining years on their traditional homelands. Of course, ultimately there will have to be relocation for those remaining after their limited tenure expires. However, by that time the adverse impact of relocation should have been softened. Hopefully, by then, land areas will have been obtained so that those requiring relocation will know well in advance where their new homes will be.

If enacted, this bill would accomplish relocation in a more humane manner over a longer span of time, thereby alleviating the "adverse impact" of relocation which the law as it now stands would impose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### S. 1714

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) nothing in the Act of December 22, 1974, or the Judgment of Partition of the United States District Court for the District of Arizona shall, during the sixty month period following the effective date of the relocation plan pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1974, be construed as requiring the relocation, from any area partitioned pursuant to such Act or judgment, of any Navajo or Hopi individual.*

*(b) In any case in which a Navajo or Hopi individual believes that he or she can qualify as an eligible applicant, such individual is authorized, within the sixty month period following the effective date of the relocation plan pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1974, to file an application with the Secretary of the Interior requesting that he or she be granted a tenure in land in accordance with this Act. Such application shall be submitted in such manner, and contain such information, as the Secretary shall prescribe.*

*(c) If the Secretary determines, on the basis of such application, that the applicant is an eligible applicant, the Secretary shall make available to such applicant a limited tenure of such land as the Secretary determines necessary in order to avoid the necessity of relocating such applicant. Such tenure shall, at the election of the applicant, con-*

*sist of the right of use and occupancy of such land for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the applicant, or the death of the applicant's spouse, whichever is the later. In no case shall the spouse or any dependent of such applicant be required, during any such tenure so elected and while residing with such applicant, to relocate from any area so partitioned.*

*Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to receive, consider, and pay any claim received by him from the Navajo Tribe or Hopi Tribe for compensation for any losses or other expenses incurred by such tribe by reason of the enactment of this Act. Such claims shall be submitted at such time, in such manner, and contain such information, as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe.*

*(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall compensate the head of each household, who receives a limited tenure of land under an application submitted pursuant to this Act, for the fair market value of the habitation and other improvements owned by such head of a household within the area from which he, but for such tenure, was required to relocate. Such compensation shall be based on the fair market value of such habitation and improvements as of the time of the expiration of such tenure, and shall not be payable until such time. The Secretary shall, upon such expiration, further provide assistance to such head comparable to that set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 15 of the Act of December 22, 1974. Any such compensation or assistance owing to any such head who elects a life tenure under this Act shall be paid and distributed in accordance with the last will and testament of such head, or in the event no such valid will and testament is left, such compensation or assistance shall be paid and distributed to his heirs in accordance with the laws of the tribe of which such head is a member.*

*(c) In any case in which any such dependent, residing with the head of a household in connection with a tenure granted under this Act, within such sixty month period referred to in subsection (b) of the first section of this Act, establishes his or her own household outside the joint use area, such dependent shall be deemed a head of a household within the meaning and for the purposes of subsection (b) of section 14, and subsection (d) of section 15, of the Act of December 22, 1974.*

*(d) In any case in which any such dependent, residing with the head of a household in connection with a tenure granted under this Act, on or after such sixty month period but prior to the termination of such tenure, establishes his or her own household outside the joint use area, such dependent shall, if he or she has one or more minor children residing in such household, be eligible to receive financial assistance from the Secretary of the Interior to enable such dependent to obtain sufficient housing. Such assistance shall be in such amount and subject to such conditions as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.*

*Sec. 3. Any such eligible applicant and his or her dependents so living on the Navajo Reservation shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Navajo Tribe and any such eligible applicant and his or her dependents so living on the Hopi Reservation shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Hopi Tribe, except that the land laws of the Navajo Tribe shall not be applicable to any tenure granted to a member of the Hopi Tribe, and the land laws of the Hopi Tribe shall not be applicable to any tenure granted to a member of the Navajo Tribe.*

*Sec. 4. As used in this Act, the term—*

*(1) "eligible applicant" means, with re-*

spect to a Navajo or Hopi individual, an individual who, on the date of the Judgment of Partition of the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, maintained a place of abode in an area within the purview of such Judgment and from such applicant, but for this Act, should be required to relocate; and

(2) "dependent" shall have the same meaning as that provided by section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Sec. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 995

At the request of Mr. WILLIAMS, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 995, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit sex discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 199—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF S. 1341

(Referred to the Committee on the Budget.)

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported the following original resolution:

S. RES. 199

*Resolved*, That pursuant to section 402(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the provisions of Section 402(a) of such Act are waived with respect to the consideration of S. 1341, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Energy Research and Development Administration for military programs with potential civilian energy applications, and for other purposes.

Such waiver is necessary because section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 provides that it shall be in order in either the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or resolution which, directly or indirectly, authorizes the enactment of new budget authority for a fiscal year, unless that bill or resolution is reported in the House or the Senate, as the case may be, on or before May 15 preceding the beginning of such fiscal year.

As a result of S. Res. 4, jurisdiction over most matters relating to the Energy Research and Development Administration was divided between the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Natural Resources. S. 1341 relates to those programs where jurisdiction is shared between the two committees, and the required joint action of two committees made it impossible in the first year of jurisdiction to report by the May 15th deadline.

For the foregoing reasons, pursuant to section 402(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the provisions of section 402(a) of such Act are waived with respect to S. 1341 as reported by the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Natural Resources.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

#### COMPETITIVE BALANCE AMONG FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—S. 1664

AMENDMENT NO. 424

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am today submitting an amendment to S. 1664, a bill to provide increased consumer deposit services; to promote competitive balance among financial institutions; and to enhance the effectiveness of the Federal Reserve System which has been referred to the Senate Banking Committee.

This amendment would require that expenditures of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration and the Federal Reserve System, insofar as these expenditures do not concern the implementation of monetary policy, be made under limitations set forth in yearly authorization acts. The limitation on Federal Reserve Board expenditures would not include foreign exchange transactions or transactions under the direction of the Federal Open Market Committee.

This amendment would not change the method by which any of these agencies acquire their operating funds. But, as in the case of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, annual limits on their expenditures would be set by the Congress. However, under my amendment, the Banking Committees of the Congress would be responsible for recommending the annual expenditure ceiling for the three bank regulatory agencies whereas the Appropriations Committees, under present law, are responsible for recommending an expenditure ceiling for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Last year the Senate Banking Committee reported out provisions not considered by the full Senate which would have applied annual expenditure limitations to the Comptroller, the FDIC, and the NCUA. This year those provisions were again considered by the committee. The committee directed that these provisions be subject to further hearings and that the inclusion of the Federal Reserve be considered.

Hearings will be held next Monday, June 20, on S. 1664. This amendment should be considered in connection with those hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 424

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### TITLE IV—EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS

Sec. 401. (a) Section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 482) is amended by inserting after "The expense of the examinations herein provided for shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency upon national banks in proportion to their assets or resources." the following new sentence: "The expenditures by the Comptroller of the Currency during any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1978, may not exceed such amounts as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law for that year."

(b) Section 10(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820A) is amended by adding after the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: "The expenditures by the Board of Directors in any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1978, except expenditures of the Corporation for loans to, the purchase of assets of, or deposits

in insured banks, or for the payment of insured deposits, may not exceed such amounts of the Congress may hereafter authorize by law for that year."

(c) Section 120(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence:

"The expenditures by the Administration in any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1978, except in connection with its functions as a liquidating agent under section 207 or in payments of insured accounts, may not exceed such amounts as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law for that year."

(d) The seventh paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 247) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The expenditures by the Board and by the Federal Reserve Banks (including their branches and other facilities) in any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1977 may not exceed such amounts as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law for that year, except that the preceding clause shall not apply to transactions conducted on behalf of foreign central banks and foreign governments or to transactions made under the direction of the Federal Open Market Committee, including transactions of the Federal Reserve System Open Market Account."

#### WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT—S. 1529

AMENDMENT NO. 425

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1529) the Water Resources Development Act of 1977 and the River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1977.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS—H.R. 7553

AMENDMENT NO. 426

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I am submitting today an amendment to the Public Works Appropriations Bill, H.R. 7553, which will increase the total funding of the bill by \$150,000 for the purpose of providing for the continued planning study of Hooker Dam in southwestern New Mexico. The only means we shall have to fully evaluate the environmental and economic impact of New Mexico receiving its allotment—18,000 acre-feet—of water from the Central Arizona project will be through the completion of this planning study. With its completion, a rational final decision on the suitability of the Hooker site can be made.

#### FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1977

AMENDMENT NO. 427

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 717) to promote safety and health in the mining industry, to prevent recurring disasters in the mining industry, and for other purposes.



AMENDMENT NO. 437

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment (in the nature of a substitute) intended to be proposed by him to S. 717, supra.

Services Corporation Act to provide authorization of appropriations for additional fiscal years, and for other purposes.

sell Senate Office Building, with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) chairing.

Further information can be obtained from the committee offices, room 424 Russell Office Building, telephone 224-2130.

CANCELLATION OF HEARING

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the hearing on June 22 by the Select Committee on Small Business on "Late Payments to Contractors by Federal Agencies" has been cancelled. The hearing on this subject to be held on June 21 remains unchanged. It will begin at 10 a.m. in room 424 of the Rus-

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORT

In accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following additional report, concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized during the calendar year 1976 in connection with foreign travel:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT AUTHORIZATIONS—S. 1303

AMENDMENTS NO. 428 THROUGH 436

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. BARTLETT submitted 9 amendments intended to be proposed by him to S. 1303, a bill to amend the Legal

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL, SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE (AMENDED REPORT)

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1976]

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>1</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>1</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>1</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>1</sup>
Amount brought forward			5,515.43		5,908.77		223.00		11,647.20
Ford, Wendell H.:									
Austria	Schilling	2,232	130.15			101.19	5.90	2,333.19	136.05
Israel	Pound	2,109.55	245.30	129	15.00	332.82	38.70	2,571.37	299.00
Egypt	do	61,200	110.16			23,300	41.40	84,530	151.56
Iran	Rial	23,457	332.72	493.50	7.00	1,057.50	15.00	25,088	354.72
England	Pound	85.04	95.95	7.02	8.00	21.45	24.45	113.51	129.40
Subtotal			915.28		30.00		125.45		1,070.73
Stevens, Ted:									
England	Pound	175.79	85.75					179.75	85.75
Germany	Deutsche mark	305.35	119.74	3,985.34	1,562.88			4,290.69	1,682.62
Subtotal			205.49		1,562.88				1,768.37
Total			6,636.20		7,501.65		348.45		14,486.30

<sup>1</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	14,478.20
Appropriated funds	8.10
Total	14,486.30

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

June 16, 1977.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DOWN WITH AMIN

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the action taken by the 33 nations of the British Commonwealth condemning the regime of Idi Amin in Uganda will, I believe, prove helpful in arousing the community of nations to deal promptly and effectively with national leaders who fail to observe the minimum in respect to the human rights of people.

The Washington Post on June 17 carried an editorial which I commend to my colleagues. Certainly this editorial draws on the candid observations made by the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CASE, who in introducing Senate Resolution 175 condemning Uganda, described the situation in that country in great detail.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial and the more detailed account presented by Senator CASE be printed in the RECORD.

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

From the Washington Post, June 17, 1977

DOWN WITH AMIN

The condemnation of Idi Amin's bloody rule in Uganda by the 33 nations of the British Commonwealth is a genuinely stirring and useful development, not to say an unprecedented one. For no condemnation has such moral effect as one delivered, in sorrow as well as anger, by the community to which the accused belongs. In this instance, the indictment is made even more weighty by the participation in it of some of Uganda's fellow black-African nations. Africans' past reluctance to criticize one of their own has seriously undermined their routine denunciations of white racism. Such denunciations, of South Africa, will henceforth have new authority.

To be sure, Idi Amin is not one to shake in his boots easily. In his buffoon's way, he had sought to humiliate the Commonwealth conference at which he was condemned by purveying rumors that he was about to attend it. Thanks to the arms and subsidies given him by the Russians and Libyans, and by his hiring of Palestinian mercenaries, he seems relatively immune to any military challenge from outside. He is almost certainly more vulnerable, however, to an eventual coup from within. "If it is known that the leaders of one billion people are morally opposed to Amin Dada," Australia's prime min-

ister said at the Commonwealth conference, "this could contribute to the toppling of his regime." Amin is the only person ruling a country today whose removal is devoutly and publicly wished by most members of the international community.

And for good reason. Amin has authorized the murder of tens of thousands of his subjects, including many of the natural leaders and the educated classes. Personally he has engaged in cruel acts of extermination. He took one of the more promising economies in post-colonial Africa and has torn it virtually to shreds. He has become an active source of subversion and danger to other African states and a willing tool for the spread of Soviet power in Africa. He lends himself to Libya's sponsorship of international terror. Indeed, he flouts the interests and aspirations of a whole continent. His successor will be a patriot.

WITH RESPECT TO THE RECENT DEATHS IN UGANDA

(By Senator CLIFFORD CASE)

Since coming to power in 1972, Field Marshal and President for Life Idi Amin Dada has ruled Uganda with an iron fist. It is estimated that since coming to power at least 30,000 and perhaps as many as 300,000 in Uganda have been murdered or have disappeared. On taking power in 1972 Amin began

to liquidate members of the secret police who supported the former President of Uganda, Dr. Milton Obote. Some 800 men in the Ugandan Army, mostly from the Langi and Acholi peoples, along with the secret police were rounded up and herded into a remote military prison. There they were systematically murdered, according to a handful of survivors who escaped to Tanzania. On November 12, 1972 the New York Times magazine reported: "The most fortunate," said the New York Times, "had been shot; some had been crammed into a tiny cell which had then been dynamited; others had been carved with knives or had been suffocated with their own dismembered genitals."

In the same year Mr. Justice Benedicto Kiwanuka, the chief justice of Uganda, was murdered. On September 21 according to news accounts, he was taken at gunpoint from his high court chambers by soldiers. He was assaulted in full view of court officials. His body was never found. The Ugandan Government denied that he had been taken by Ugandan Army officials. They said he was arrested "by three unknown persons . . . traveling in a Peugeot 504 . . . and that so far no evidence has come to light as to who arrested the chief justice or where he is." The chief justice was also Uganda's first prime Minister elected during the self-governing period before independence.

In the same year, 1972, President Amin ordered the expulsion of Asians from Uganda. For the first time the process of tribal purges and internal warfare was expanded to racial and religious discrimination, a fact corroborated by a study in 1974 by the International Commission of Jurists. The ICJ summary of findings is instructive in respect to the expulsion of Asians:

The expulsion of the Asians from Uganda in 1972 involved serious violations of human rights:

(a) The expulsion of Asian non-citizens was an act based on an explicit policy of racial discrimination.

(b) The failure to provide adequately for compensating those who had been expropriated was a violation of Article 17 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(c) The sudden and brutal manner in which the mass expulsion of Asian non-citizens took place was a breach of the principles of good neighborliness enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

(d) The denial of Ugandan nationality to many Asians who were entitled to it was a violation of the right of nationality under Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(e) The banishment of all Asians recognized as Ugandan citizens to a remote and unfamiliar rural life was an act of racial discrimination which had the (no doubt) intended effect of driving almost all of them out of the country.

*The effect of these massive and continuing violations of human rights has been to create a reign of terror from which thousands of people from all walks of life, Africans as well as Asians, have sought refuge in voluntary exile. Those remaining are in a constant state of insecurity.*

(May 1974. Emphasis added.)

President Amin's rage has been directed not only at Asians but also at other racial, ethnic and religious groups. In respect to Jews and Israelis, Amin wrote, in a telegram to Dr. Kurt Waldheim and to Mrs. Golda Meir on September 13, 1972:

"Germany is the right place where, when Hitler was the Prime Minister and supreme commander, he burnt over 6 million Jews. This is because Hitler and all German people knew that the Israelis are not people who are working in the interest of the people of the world and that is why they burnt the Israelis

alive with gas in the soil of Germany. The world should remember that the Palestinians, with the assistance of Germany, made that operation [the Munich Massacre] possible in the Olympic village."

Beginning in the same month, September 1972, discriminatory harassment of Christians began in Uganda. It is believed by some experts that this developed not long after a joint declaration was published in Tripoli by Libya and Uganda. Immediately afterward, Radio Uganda announced a process of the Islamization of the army and civilian population. Libya became, at that time, a primary backer of the Ugandan regime, providing military and economic help. These weapons of war have been used for internal suppression and for activities outside of Uganda's territory. Libya provided Amin air support in September 1972, in a conflict between Tanzania and Uganda, according to Radio Tripoli in its broadcast of September 21, 1972.

The linkage is important because Colonel Kaddafi announced a jihad or holy war, against Christians in Africa which is said to continue to this day. On January 24, 1977, not long before the death of Archbishop Luwum, another Kaddafi declaration on Christians in Africa was published and quoted by the British Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

"Christianity brought to Africa by colonialists is not a religion, it is the source of the white man's domination of African peoples. Being African, we do not differentiate between a foreign base, a church and foreign exploitation because all of them are representing colonialists' existence."

Uganda has a total population of 10 million souls. Far less than 1 million are Moslem, about 3 million are Roman Catholic and 2 million are Anglicans. According to reasonably reliable figures, there are 335 African Catholic priests, 500 Western missionaries, 1,700 religious sisters, 13 African Anglican bishops (counting the late Archbishop), and 500 Ugandan Anglican clergy. Of these, in November 1973, when the United States closed its mission in Kampala and asked the Federal Republic of Germany to look after U.S. interests there, about 150 to 175 Americans remained in Uganda against the advice of the U.S. mission. Of these, most were missionaries. The Department of State estimates there are now about 245 Americans in Uganda. The persecution of Christians which began in 1972 was initially directed at Roman Catholic soldiers. One early act was confiscation of property of army brigade commanders who were Christian. Two captains in an army camp were executed summarily because they had arranged guard duties to enable Catholic soldiers to attend mass.

Attacks developed on Christian churches, usually at night. In February 1973, for example, a hand grenade was tossed into a Christian church in Lubiri, a Kampala suburb.

In the same year Amin came into constant conflict with Roman Catholic Archbishop of Kampala, Emmanuel Nsubuga. Details are sparse but it is known that Archbishop Nsubuga was returning from a ceremony at Mumugunga shrine outside of Kampala when an army patrol intercepted the Archbishop in his car. He was never seen again.

In January 1973, Rev. Charles Kiggundu, editor of the Roman Catholic newspaper Munno ("Friend") was found dead in his burnt out car on the edge of a forest about 10 miles from Kampala. A pathologist's report disclosed at the time that Reverend Kiggundu had been strangled and shot before the car he was in was set on fire. The train of events regarding Munno continued after 1973. Another Munno editor, Samuel Mwebe was killed and still another, John Serwaniko, was arrested in August 1976 and

later found dead when still in police custody. In the same month Munno, along with other Catholic newspapers, was closed down on the excuse, reported in the Africa Journal (January 1977) that the newspapers were acting against the government.

Most recent is the death of Anglican Archbishop, Janani Luwum. The New York Times of February 19 reported as follows:

"On Wednesday (President Amin) arrested the Anglican Archbishop of Uganda, Burundi and Rwanda, together with his Minister of Internal Affairs and the Minister of Land and Water Resources. He charged them with plotting his overthrow and paraded them before mob of troops shouting, 'Kill them.' Yesterday he packed them into a car, to be driven a few hundred yards to an interrogation. En route, they were said to have tried to escape, causing the vehicle to collide with another. All three prisoners were killed."

So far no one has believed the story—not the British Government, the Australian Government or the American Government whose officials have spoken out on the death of the archbishop. Only parts of the real story are known and even these come from cloaked sources. According to the Rt. Rev. Leslie Brown, now Bishop of St. Edmundsbury in Ipswich, England, the archbishop's body was seen by someone "absolutely reliable" who reported it had "two bullet wounds in the chest and one in the mouth." The Daily News reported that the archbishop was stripped by soldiers and whipped in front of President Amin and his aides at the Ugandan President's Makasero Lodge. Amin is said to have spoken the following words—that God had empowered him to give the Archbishop "the last warning." The Daily News story went on to report that there "followed very bizarre, sacrilegious and obscene activities, during which Amin pulled out his pistol and shot the archbishop twice on the left side of the chest."

The Government of Uganda said the bodies of the three dead men were flown to their respective home areas and buried, for which the families of the deceased "thanked the government." Moreover the Government has invited commissions of inquiry into the Archbishop's death.

It should be noted there have been commissions of inquiry before, appointed by President Amin. Amnesty International submitted the following to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights concerning Uganda and commissions of inquiry:

Several Commissions of Inquiry have been appointed by President Amin. In July, 1971 Mr. Justice Jeffrey Jones, investigating the disappearance of two Americans, Nicholas Stroh and David Siedle, released his report from Nairobi, where he had fled in fear of his life. He blamed army officers for their deaths and strongly criticized the non-cooperation of the military authorities.

"Amnesty International rejects as unsatisfactory the reports of two internal government commissions of inquiry—the January 1973 report on the disappearance of 85 prominent Ugandans, and the June 1975 report that 308 Ugandans had disappeared since 1971. Following the latter report, some senior security officers were tried by military tribunal in connection with 18 cases of disappearance, but all were acquitted. It is government practice to blame "disappearances" on flight into exile or killing by former President Obote's guerillas. These attempted explanations are rarely convincing, as when President Amin claimed that Chief Justice Kiwanuka had been killed by Obote's guerillas, despite reliable eyewitness accounts to the contrary.

"Another inquiry investigated the fatal shooting by police on March 6, 1976, of a Makerere University student, Paul Sserwanga, and the disappearance on February 13, 1976,



of a Kenyan student, Esther Chesire. The Inquiry chairman, Professor Bryan Langlands, was expelled from Uganda on July 29, 1976. Under a new chairman, the Commission reported on November 12, 1976 that Miss Chesire had left for Kenya (which the Kenyan authorities deny) and claimed that "if university rules had been followed, no one would have been shot." In a statement by Professor Langlands to Amnesty International, the Commission under the Chairmanship had received evidence that Miss Chesire had not been seen since being prevented from joining the airplane at Entebbe airport by Ugandan Government officials. The Commission failed to inquire into the abduction (on March 23, 1976) and murder of Dr. Teresa Mukasa-Bukenya, the Warden of Africa Hall, the day before she was to testify to the Commission about Miss Chesire's disappearance. Those involved with those events have not been brought to justice.

"The Government Inquiry into the military action of Israel on July 4, 1976, suggested that Mrs. Dora Bloch, the British-Israeli hostess, had been returned to join the other hostages before the raid. This is contradicted by eye-witness accounts that she was taken from hospital by security officers, strangled and her body burned. After the raid there were numerous killings, of airport staff and Ugandans who knew or talked about Mrs. Bloch's death, including Jimmy Parma, a Ugandan photographer who reportedly photographed her dead body.

"An Inquiry into the alleged killing at Makerere University on August 3 to 5, 1976 reported that no student was killed. This conflicts with reports of the killing of at least one or two students on the campus, and at least 20 others of the hundreds arrested are still unaccounted for. Very large numbers of students were tortured, both openly on the campus and after arrest.

"The results of these Commissions of Inquiry clearly demonstrate the need for an impartial international investigation into these incidents."

It should be noted that the deaths have not been limited to Ugandans, Israelis, Asians, or the occasional European or American who travels through Uganda. Citizens of other African states have been killed. "Following reports of 245 Kenyans killed after the Israeli raid," according to Amnesty International, "Kenya's Foreign Minister wrote to the UN Security Council charging that hundreds of Kenyans living in Uganda died in 'systematic and indiscriminate massacre' by Ugandan military authorities." Official statements by Kenya on this subject were printed in the Kenyan Daily Nation and on July 12 and 14, 1976.

Nor are Uganda's activities related to individuals only. Activities by Uganda may affect the security of other African and non-African states. In August, 1975 President Amin stated in a conversation with the volunteers of the mechanized soldiers of the Ugandan army that "Arafat had sent to Uganda Palestinian suicide flyers who will be at the service of the Ugandan air force for any mission in order to liberate any place in the African continent."

The hostages at Entebbe airport in July, 1976 well remember the fact that many times each day Ugandan aircraft piloted both by Ugandans and Palestinians buzzed the old terminal building where the Israeli and French and American hostages were held prisoner by Palestinian terrorists and by Ugandan army and police forces. The Voice of Palestine from Cairo on August 15, 1975 confirmed that these flyers were under President Amin's personal supervision, and this was reiterated in the PLO Bulletin, El Al-turo on November 9, 1975. It is estimated that about 4,000 Palestinians are employed in the Ugandan administration in different po-

sitions and Palestinians make up some of President Amin's palace guard, as well as train Ugandan soldiers. In addition, George Habash's Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine has an information office in Kampala which coordinates PFLP operations throughout Africa and was said to be responsible for the Entebbe hijackings. Such operations, conducted in an unstable regime, threaten the security of neighboring African states by providing an important link between Libya, Uganda and Somalia, another base for international terrorist operations.

This resolution before the Senate makes it clear there have been extensive violations of basic human rights in Uganda to the extent that no one is safe in that country. There is an utter lack of security for individuals and there is, too, a threat to neighboring countries brought on by the behavior patterns of the Ugandan regime.

One positive action recommended by the resolution is halting arms deliveries to Uganda. It is clear that halting arms deliveries will not put a stop to the current regime, but it may weaken its support from the army and lead it to a reconsideration of the course it has set out upon. Arms to Uganda are supplied mainly from U.S.S.R., and are paid for by Libya among others. I cannot believe that the Soviets today would regard the Ugandan regime's behavior as in their own interest and I hope the U.S.S.R. will act affirmatively to halt arms shipments to Uganda.

The resolution also calls on the Organization of African States to take concrete action in regard to human rights violations in Uganda. We all know how much the Amin regime is an embarrassment to the new black African states. It is my own hope that, with the backing of the United States and the wider community of nations that it will be possible for the OAU to exercise leadership in this regard.

We have tried, in drafting the resolution, to be sensitive to the dynamics at work in Uganda at the present time. We are aware of the importance to the entire world of a government in Uganda with which it is possible to have normal diplomatic intercourse. There are certain prescriptive rules of behavior that apply to all nations. When the rules are wantonly violated by an utter disregard for human life, the United Nations or its delegate Human Rights Committee has an obligation, we believe, to consider carefully Uganda's status in the community of nations.

#### THE GRADUATION ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. DONN STARRY

MR. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), and the material attached thereto.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Once again an American General of high rank is being called home to explain statements that he made publicly. I have publicly defended General Singlaub on the basis that he was not speaking on an announced Presidential policy because the President has not yet at this late time made any official announcement that troop withdrawal from Korea is a policy of the United States.

Now we have a new one. Lt. General Donn Starry who simply told some young Americans in a high school in Frankfurt that the chances of their seeing war between the Soviet Union and Red China were very good. Now what is wrong with this? I am a mem-

ber of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, a retired Major General in the Air Force Reserve and I have said the same thing many, many times. Now it would be a different story if our President had made an announcement in his campaign or before a press conference that there wouldn't be a war between these two countries, but having failed to bring this up, I can't see where General Starry is out of order. If our Generals are slowly silenced to the point that they cannot discuss with young people matters that do not come under announced policy of the Commander-in-Chief, then we are in for real trouble.

I would much rather take the judgment of a man like General Starry than the starry-eyed judgment of some of our people here in Washington whose decisions have four times in this century brought this country to war. I hope that some day this administration will learn that no group of people in this country of ours has a higher respect for the separation of power between the civilian and military than the man in uniform. I have even known high ranking General friends of mine to abandon principles and beliefs that they know are wrong just to stay in step with the Commander-in-Chief.

I have attached the speech delivered by General Starry so that my colleagues might judge whether or not in their opinion this General was out of bounds.

The attachment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

GRADUATION ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. DONN STARRY, FRANKFURT AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL, JUNE 10, 1977

I thought perhaps we could spend these few minutes considering several things that seem to me to trouble your generation. You might not put them in the order that I do; you might not label them the way I do; but I think you'll recognize them for what they are—I'd call them peace, truth, God, and you.

Peace because a lot is being said about it. A lot of things are being done in its name, but it is and will remain an elusive vision through your lifetime, and so a perspective about peace is important to you.

Truth because no one seems to be telling it much any more. There is loss of confidence in the truthfulness of our government, in the integrity of elected officials, which is having an effect on our society; it will continue to do so through your lifetime. So a perspective on the truth is important to you.

God, because although the liberals tried to bury God several years ago, the basic values of our society are still those of our Christian heritage. You will live the problem of the decline of these values through your lifetime, and so perspective on God is important to you.

And you because this is your day. A day to pause a moment to consider who you are, where you are heading, and what you might carry along with you.

So here we go.

Peace is an illusion. The absence of peace on the world is, always has been, and always will be a fact of life. Conflict of some kind is a natural state of man—not so much war, as competition, competitiveness—in economics, in foreign affairs, in the quest by governments for goals for the governed. Conflict reflects the imperfectness of man in his world, and the perfectness of God in his universe. There will probably be war in your lifetime. The Soviets will continue to encourage and help their Arab friends try to eliminate the state of Israel. Our country may not be willing to go to war over this, but to turn our backs on Israel would be very difficult, and to allow Soviet control of the oil resources of the Middle East would be almost impossible.

The more critical the situation becomes the more likely we are to respond with violence. In your lifetime the Soviets will fight the Chinese, possibly simply continuing their ten year old border conflict, but more probably in a major war. Difficult as it may be to see the United States becoming involved in such a war, it is likely we would do so once it became apparent that one or the other of the antagonists was about to win and gain absolute control over the bulk of the Eurasian land mass. On the other side of the conflict spectrum, intra-national war—that is, war within the borders of a country—will be more likely, as both the Soviets and the Chinese continue to export their brand of revolution. The question of how to intervene in such situations without violating the national sovereignty of smaller states, when and how to meddle in what is essentially someone else's business is not one easy to answer. More nations will have nuclear weapons—just as India has recently. This just increases the chances that a deliberate or irresponsible act by some small nation could trigger a war between larger nations. Could a nuclear attack on Los Angeles arranged by the communist government of Ethiopia be distinguished from a Soviet attack in time to prevent the United States from launching a retaliatory attack on the Soviet Union? No one knows.

And so true peace will not come in your time. The only peace you can expect and the only peace of any value to you is peace of mind; peace that comes with understanding the imperfections of mankind and of having figured out how to cope with this imperfectness. It is a peace that puts you as much at ease as you can expect to be with your fellowman and the imperfections of the world you live in. Ultimately the price of that peace of mind is a willingness to sacrifice something for it; for it is still true that nothing worth having can be had for nothing.

Truth is a fragile commodity. The true state of things is frequently unpleasant. That's why we don't tell the truth more often—to ourselves or to others. It is more convenient not to. Instead we rationalize our own imperfections and those of the world around us. If we work hard enough at those rationalizations, we soon believe them ourselves, and when we do, our grasp of the truth is a little less sure than before. Like peace, truth is perfection; its distortion in our world is a measure of the imperfections of that world, and of the perfectness of God. For us there is no absolute truth; there are versions of what is, bound up in the bias of those who observe and report. In your lifetime the truth will be harder to learn than ever before. The liberal press has adopted the adversary doctrine. They are not interested in the truth, only in the five percent or so of the news that deviates from the norm, which in an imperfect world is the only truth there is.

Presumably they would be willing to muck-rake around over every public administration just to see it fall, without concern for the consequences to the country, or to the quality of public administration. By someone's standards we are all less than perfect. If one wants to make an issue of imperfections, some reason can be made to attack every man who has held or could hold public office. The ensuing turmoil simply feeds into the hands of those who claim our form of government is not viable anyway, and has no right or hope for survival. Being objective is important, being skeptical is necessary, seeking after all the facts you can get is essential, in order to make reasonable judgments about what's going on around you, and what you should do about it. The price of truth is a willingness to ask difficult questions, knowing all the while that if the truth really comes in response, the answers will be equally difficult.

Several years ago the liberals buried God. He wasn't important to them. They found their God in a liturgy which denies that anything—peace, truth, God, even life, is worthy of reverence. And because the Christian ethic is the very basis for our culture, western civilization has been stricken with the cancer of declining morality. Just over a month ago I stood in the Garden of Gethsemane, then walked the long trail across the Valley of the Dead to Golgotha, over the land where seething masses of people have struggled so many thousand years. It struck me that in the time of Christ they had a problem not at all unlike ours. They found peace and destroyed it with war; they found truth and denied with lies; they found God and hung him on a cross. The denial of God will continue in your lifetime; you will be called on to decide about him, who he is, who you are in relation to him. Perhaps its not all that important; many people live their whole lives without solving this problem, but I suggest that your life takes on meaning, that the greatest value of a life is to spend it for something that lives after it, that in the end you become what you are through some cause you have made your own. And if you follow that line of reasoning, deciding about the part God plays in your world is important.

And now what about you? This is your life. We received some unpleasant realities simply to challenge you to think realistically about some hard questions that face you. Thinking seriously about what I've said could make you want to drop out of society. You can't drop out of society and remain a part of it. Three hundred years ago the Bounty mutineers did that and the society they created to replace the one they left came to be filled with all the disillusionments from which they had fled in the first place.

You are young and full of dreams. Your elders say that you'll get older pretty soon, more mature, and then you'll be all right. Well, that's not quite right. Youth is important. It's important that you stay young. Youth is not a time of life, it is a state of mind. Nobody grows old by living years. People grow old by deserting their dreams. Youth is a quality of the imagination, a vigor of emotions, a predominance of courage over timidity, and appetite for adventure opposed to the love of ease. Whatever your years, keep in your heart the dreams, the urge to challenge events, the unfeeling child-like appetite for what's next, and the knowledge that the joy of life is in the living; that when you fail to live it to its fullest you miss all the joy of it. You are as young as your faith, as old as your despair. So long as your heart holds dreams of hope, beauty, courage, so long are you young.

And so tonight you pass this turn in the road of your life, full of hope, full of dreams, full of anticipation for what comes next. I hope you will strive for and achieve great things. But remember, in many ways it's a far higher ideal to live an ordinary life in an extraordinary way, to serve an ideal amid the drab, humdrum surroundings of everyday life, and still retain a vision of the common man as a shadow of God.

And so your world goes out on every side, no wider than your heart is wide, and up above the world your sky no higher than your soul is high.

May the road ahead rise with you to new heights, may the wind be ever at your back, and may God carry you always in the palm of his hand.

#### TAX EXEMPTION FOR UNIFORMED SERVICES HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP STIPEND

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor S. 1698, to exempt the uni-

formed services health professional scholarship stipend from income taxes, that was introduced yesterday by Senator HUBLESTON. I filed an amendment to the Tax Reform Act of 1976 to grant such exemption when that bill was under consideration last year. Objection to outright exemption was expressed by the Treasury Department and the Office of Management and Budget. I was assured that the inequities that would be created by taxation would be resolved without the exemption. As a result, I modified my amendment to exempt individuals in the program only. Thus, those persons who will enter in September of this year are not exempt.

I have written to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget asking that a review of this problem be made. A justification existed for exemption last year and it continues to exist. Adjustments have not been made to resolve the inequities and I have seen no action to indicate that consideration is even being given to the problem.

The scholarship program is the primary means of meeting the health manpower needs for our armed services. The taxation of the stipends without an adjustment to offset taxes has reduced the attractiveness of this program. The incentives to enter it are gone. This factor, in turn, compounds the health manpower shortages in the armed services. This scholarship program is the most efficient means of recruiting medical personnel and it must be maintained.

Mr. President, there is a systemwide shortage of military doctors. The armed services have filled 95 percent of their authorized medical position strength, but, for example, the Army's portion of the missing 5 percent is 500 doctors, a sizable number. This has impacted on my home State of Kentucky by reducing the number of doctors at Fort Knox from 62 to 43 as of July 1, 1977, with the result that thousands of military retirees are left without adequate health care since there is medical personnel sufficient to treat only active duty soldiers and their dependents.

The scholarship program is the only assured pool of doctors the armed services can count on. Given the disparity between civilian and military fees, if the program fails to attract qualified students, prospects for keeping the authorized medical positions at even their reduced strength appear dim indeed.

The scholarship program needs help. Whether that help comes in the form of maintaining its tax exempt status or increasing the stipend matters little in the end. I only urge that a solution be agreed to now.

#### THE BEST APPROACH TO DEBT COLLECTION REFORM

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has recently completed hearings on four proposals to reform the methods by which debt collectors can function. Witnesses from the debt collection industry, Government agencies, public groups, and retail creditors testified over a period of 2 days. Their



testimony was informative to the subcommittee, and it will form the basis of discussion for a markup to be conducted in the full committee at the end of this month.

I was particularly interested in hearing the diversity of opinion on the best approach to reform in this area. Major questions which were addressed included: who should be covered by the pending legislation, which collection practices should be discouraged, whether State or Federal law should prevail on these issues, appropriate methods of enforcement, and the need for civil liability provisions.

In particular, I would like to take note of Senator JAKE GARN's bill, S. 1130, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act of which I am a cosponsor. This bill is a step toward a realistic method of debt collection legislation. However, I should note that there is not unanimous industry support for this bill or any of the other bills introduced thus far, including the compromise bill sent over from the House, H.R. 5294.

Mr. President, my one concern for the legislation which we are about to create is that the Congress does not apply the regulatory overkill which has in recent years been all too frequent in the laws in the area of consumer affairs. Chiefly, I would like to avoid making the process of debt collection so troublesome and costly that it unduly discriminates against the poor who need consumer credit the most. We should not permit the mistakes of a very small number of debtors or debt collectors induce us into unnecessarily raising the cost of credit to those who can afford the cost increase the least.

One study which addressed this issue was conducted by William C. Dunkelberg and Robert H. Smiley and entitled "Subsidies in the Use of Revolving Credit." I quote part of the finding from this research:

Although collection costs are somewhat higher for lower income accounts, the differences by income groups are relatively small for many types of collection activities. However, the frequency of problem accounts in each income group does appear to be quite different, as derived from the income distribution of the sample of account holders in California and the income distribution of problem accounts.

*Probability of becoming a problem account*

Income groups:	
\$5,000 and under	.044
\$5,001 - \$7,500	.175
\$7,501 - \$10,000	.070
\$10,000 - \$15,000	.051
\$15,001 - \$20,000	.012
\$20,000 and over	.008

It is the statistically better risk in higher income groups that leads me to wonder if the availability of credit to the lower income consumer would be restricted should collection costs rise because of burdensome regulatory costs imposed by carelessly designed legislation.

Mr. President, I look forward to a constructive session in the Banking Committee when the debt collection legislation is written, and I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to share my views with them.

### IOWA FARMING TOWN WITH A BIG-CITY FISCAL CRISIS IS SAVED BY VOLUNTEERS

Mr. CULVER. Mr. President, in addition to possessing more than 25 percent of the country's grade A farmland, the State of Iowa is a leader among the States in the number of small rural communities it has. There are about 800 Iowa communities under 2,000 in population and 700 of those are under 1,000.

From time to time, sociologists and economists predict the demise of the small rural communities in our State, but the towns remain remarkably hardy and resistant to such gloomy predictions. I think this may be ascribed primarily to the quality of the people who live there.

A story in today's New York Times about the town of Salix, Iowa—population 420, located 15 miles south of Sioux City—and how its citizens overcame a seemingly insuperable town financial debt by the volunteer money-raising effort of themselves and neighboring communities illustrates the point that self-reliance and initiative have not gone out of style in small towns.

Moreover, the fact that contributions were also received from all over the United States to help the citizens of Salix meet an incredible \$188,662.19 judgment against the town as a result of an ambulance accident, reminds us that Americans everywhere are still willing to lend a helping hand to those in need and are especially responsive to those who do their level best to help themselves.

I would like to share the story of Salix, Iowa, with those of my colleagues who may not have seen it, and I ask unanimous consent for the Times article of June 17, 1977, to be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### IOWA FARMING TOWN WITH A BIG-CITY FISCAL CRISIS IS SAVED BY VOLUNTEERS (By Douglas E. Kneeland)

SALIX, IOWA, June 12.—Every now and then, there is a town that deserves contemplating just because of the troubles it has seen and the way it has dealt with them.

New York City, with its eight million people and chronic fiscal woes, is such a place. So, too, is Salix, a farming village of 420 persons in the rich bottomlands of the Missouri River about 15 miles south of Sioux City.

Aside from their recent financial problems, New York and Salix do not have a whole lot in common—except that Salix has three bars, or one for every 140 residents, which, proportionately, must put it right up there with New York.

New York got into fiscal trouble more or less on its own, spending more than it was taking in and borrowing more than it could afford to pay back. Salix, like most small towns, is not that imprudent. But when its ambulance was involved in an accident in 1970 and a subsequent lawsuit brought a judgment of \$188,662.19 against the town, Salix had a budget crisis that it would willingly match against New York's.

#### 742 PERCENT RISE IN PROPERTY TAXES

After all, even in New York's darkest hour, nobody talked about a 742 percent increase in property taxes to pay off its debts. At one point, that is what Salix's 160 property taxpayers were faced with.

"The people on fixed incomes just couldn't make it," said Councilman William J. Danker, "particularly the ones with houses valued at \$20,000 or \$30,000."

Mr. Danker said that a study done by the council had shown that 53 percent of the town's residents were retired persons living on fixed incomes.

The ambulance had carried only \$100,000 insurance; thus, after the insurance company paid its share of the judgment, the town was left with a bill for \$112,000, including interest.

According to Mr. Danker, that would have forced the town to increase its taxes on a \$30,000 home from \$243 to \$1,803, on a \$20,000 home from \$162 to \$1,202 and on a \$10,000 home from \$81 to \$601.

"One retired couple in Salix with a home, valued at \$24,000 receives a total income from Social Security annually of \$2,624," Mr. Danker wrote plaintively to a state legislator early this year.

Declaring that the taxes on the couple's property would have to be increased from \$482.40 to \$1,730.40 to pay the judgment, he added:

"This gives them a net income of \$893.60 to live on for the year. We, the council, do not feel justified in levying a tax so heavy that some will surely be forced to forfeit their homes. Someone has got to come to our aid and find a permanent solution for us."

#### BANKRUPTCY RULED OUT

"You know, New York City was going to declare bankruptcy," Mr. Danker said the other day. "We looked into it, but we found it wouldn't do us any good. The county would just come in and levy the taxes."

New York did not declare bankruptcy either. But it went to the Federal Government for help, and a lot of people around the country criticized it for that. The city also laid off a lot of municipal employees. And it sold off a lot of city bonds to help stay afloat.

Salix, displaying a native rural wariness, stayed away from the Federal Government. And it did not have many municipal employees to lay off. The councilmen get only \$5 a meeting, the fire chief is a volunteer and the town has only one part-time policeman. Furthermore, the councilmen were not sure whether they could properly sell bonds to pay off the judgment.

So the town had to search for some other way out.

First, Salix threatened to take its insurance company, the Western Casualty and Surety Company of Fort Scott, Kan., to court, charging that the company had acted in bad faith.

After the accident, which occurred when Rupert Thorpe, a local grocery store owner and volunteer fire chief, was driving a heart-attack victim to a hospital in Sioux City, the survivors of a lawyer who was killed when his car collided with the ambulance were said to have agreed to settle out of court for \$95,000.

That would have been covered by the town's \$100,000 policy. But Western decided to fight the case in court, since the ambulance was on an emergency run with its lights flashing and siren screaming, even though it was crossing an intersection against a red light when the accident occurred.

However, after the coroner testified that the man in the ambulance had died before the crash, the judge found Salix at fault, apparently on the ground that, if the heart-attack victim was dead, there was no longer an emergency that justified running the light.

Even now, Mr. Thorpe cannot readily accept that decision.

"We didn't have any doctors in the ambulance," he said. "So how could we officially declare him dead?"

Western, no longer representing Salix, which has since bought a \$1 million policy from another company, agreed last March to settle out of court for \$60,000.

#### A CALL FOR VOLUNTEERS

So, after seven years of trials and appeals and other delays, the town found itself still faced with the need to raise \$52,000 to pay off the rest of the judgment. That is better than \$112,000, but it still is a lot of money in a town that normally collects only about \$16,000 a year in property taxes, enough to more than triple the tax rate.

What Salix did was call a meeting and ask for volunteers to raise money to save the town. Maybe it would not have worked for New York City, but it surely did here.

The committee of seven, headed by Tim Bottaro, an articulate 18-year-old high school senior, has raised \$42,000 so far and expects to pick up about \$5,000 more, leaving the town's debt at \$4,000, which will be covered by a slight increase in taxes.

"There was a time when the ax fell that we were pretty low," said Paul Ozburn, a committee member. "We thought we'd have to declare bankruptcy, but we decided to put our shoulders to the wheel and fight."

"There were two extremes," Mr. Bottaro said. "There were those who thought we'd get \$5,000 to \$10,000, and those who thought we'd also pave the streets."

Salix has only two paved streets, Tipton and Poplar. And worse, its water tower, with the town's name printed boldly high above the corner soybean fields, is rusting out and needs to be replaced.

#### SMILES RETURN TO SALIX

The town probably will not have enough extra money to pave the streets and replace the water tower, but Mr. Bottaro and Prudence Hubert, a sprightly 78-year-old, and the other volunteers have raised enough to bring some smiles back to Salix.

They collected merchandise from Sioux City store owners and held an auction that brought in \$2,200. They have also held a barbecue. And Nan McDermott, who owns Nan's Hideaway Restaurant here, has collected more than \$1,000 in donations in a can on the counter.

Fire departments and veterans' organizations in surrounding towns, such as Sergeant Bluff, Hornick, Sloan, Blencoe and Climbing Hill in Iowa, Jefferson in southeastern South Dakota and Walthill, Dakota City and South Sioux City in Nebraska, have held fund-raising events and chipped in to bail out their neighbors in Salix.

"I think we've had donations all the way from California to Delaware," said Mr. Thorpe, who is still the fire chief. "We've had them from all over the United States."

"Everyone in town feels a lot better because of the last six months, I tell you," said Mr. Ozburn, in what must qualify as understatement even in quiet Salix.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EXEMPTION FROM MARYLAND STATE INCOME TAX

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed a bill exempting Members of Congress from paying Maryland State income tax. I object to the passage of this bill for two reasons: The substance of the bill appears to be a flagrant abuse of congressional privilege, and secondly, I object to the manner in which this bill was passed.

On the merits of the bill I object to its passage because it demonstrates Congress extraordinary hubris. Congress sets itself apart from the law and infringes on the legitimate rights of States to determine how and who to tax. Although

the revenue involved is small compared to total tax collections, there is a matter of principle involved: State tax collections should be left to the State government rather than usurped by the National Government. This bill is a particularly offensive bill since it benefits a few dozen persons, who are in a position of being able to pass laws. If these persons are willing to live in and use the services of the State of Maryland, they ought to abide by Maryland's laws. They are certainly free to locate elsewhere.

I also object to the manner in which the bill was passed. The bill was considered under a procedural maneuver when most Senators had left for the evening. It was never referred to the Judiciary Committee after it had passed the House this year. Although hearings were held on the matter last year, I was never able to raise my voice in protest during committee consideration. Most objectionable was the fact that this measure never appeared on the Senate calendar of bills to be considered, and we had no way of knowing that this measure was going to be called up. If the leadership in the Senate wishes to maintain credibility with some of the freshmen members, I would hope that we are kept more adequately informed on these matters.

#### CARTER'S SIGNING OF THE AMERICAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS REMINDS US OF THE UNRATIFIED GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the growing international concern for human rights was evidenced again earlier this month when President Jimmy Carter, in an historic and unprecedented step, committed the United States to the quest of guaranteeing the protection of human rights throughout the Americas.

Mr. Carter, as part of his dedication to the promotion and defense of those principles, personally went to the Organization of American States to sign on behalf of his Nation the American Convention on Human Rights, also known as the Pact of San Jose, adopted in November, 1969. This marks the first time in the 29-year history of the OAS that a President of the United States has personally visited the General Secretariat with the sole purpose of signing such an agreement.

Carter told the packed audience of Latin American diplomats and media representatives who crowded the office of the Secretary that—

No one nation can shape the attitudes of the world and that is why it is so important to join with our friends and neighbors . . . to pursue as a unified group this noble commitment and endeavor.

The President's comments point out not only the importance of the American Convention on Human Rights, but also the value of the Genocide Convention—another important human rights document which has still not been ratified by the Senate. The Senate's 28-year failure to ratify the Genocide treaty can only be an embarrassment to a nation whose President acknowledged before his Latin

American audience that among almost all of the leaders of the 150 nations of the world "this year there is a preoccupation with and a concern about basic human rights."

"This blank space on the page has been here for a long time," Carter said just prior to signing the document in Latin America, "and it is with a great deal of pleasure that I am signing on behalf of the United States this convention on human rights, which will spell out in clear terms our own belief in the proper relationship between free human beings and governments chosen by them."

Mr. President, now is the time for the Senate to fill in the blank space that has been its responsibility since 1949: we must add the name of this country to the list of states that have ratified the Genocide Convention.

#### WALTER CAIN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I recently had the pleasure of meeting a young man from Florence, S.C., by the name of Walter Cain. Walter had come to Washington with his father, Rev. Benson Cain, to attend the annual meeting of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped. Earlier in the year, Walter had won first place in the 1977 "Ability Counts" essay contest sponsored by the Governor's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped. One of his prizes was the trip to Washington. Another is a 4-year college scholarship.

Walter is an outstanding young citizen, and his essay, of which he sent me a copy, reflects a maturity of expression and understanding far beyond his years. He has early in life grasped a truth which many people never learn—that the main obstacle that the handicapped have to overcome is usually not their particular disability, but the view which other people have of that disability. The handicapped, as a rule, can do pretty much whatever they set their minds to, provided employers will give them a chance. This is the theme of Walter's essay, and it is well stated and well documented.

I wish my colleagues, too, to have the benefit of reading this essay, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HANDICAPPED PEOPLE AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

"If you can't compete, you can't win,"<sup>1</sup> one handicapped individual has said. By law, the affirmative action clause has given qualified handicapped persons the opportunity to compete on the same level as other applicants for job openings. This law affects many major United States industries and institutions that employ over one third of the national work force. But what affirmative action is being taken?

Industries with substantial government contracts are required under the law to "take affirmative action to employ and advance in employment qualified handicapped persons."<sup>2</sup> Many industries now legally obligated

<sup>1</sup> Dudley Cox, Production Technician, personal interview, Dec. 30, 1976.

<sup>2</sup> Rehabilitation Act of 1973, sec. 503(a)



to give fair treatment to the handicapped did so before the affirmative action law was passed. "We have had handicapped people working for us since our plant opened," said Al Stiefel, a Union Carbide employer.

Since the affirmative action law was passed, many employers have become more aware that handicapped people can perform on the job and should be given an equal opportunity. "People have talents that have no relation to their physical condition," stated Carol Ramella of General Electric.

"It's qualifications, not handicaps that count. We have been so impressed that we have asked the Vocational Rehabilitation Department to refer qualified handicapped job seekers to us," Mrs. Ramella added. For this reason, employers who have hired the handicapped and seen them perform seem not to mind the cost of building ramps and other revisions to make their buildings accessible.

Accessibility, however, is not a matter of choice for the employer. State laws require that public buildings, including those where the physically handicapped might be employed, be made accessible to them. An affirmative action program is also required by law if an industry is under a substantial government contract. Qualified handicapped persons may file complaints with the Department of Labor if violations of this law are cited. It is interesting to note that half the people employed so far to enforce this act are handicapped.<sup>3</sup>

"I like to see the handicapped judged equally with others," stated Dudley Coxe, a General Electric employee. Mr. Coxe, a polio victim who relies on crutches to help him walk, said he was hired because he had the training and experience necessary for his job. "We don't want special favors, just a fair chance," he added. Because he was given a chance, Mr. Coxe has been able to prove that he and others like him can perform as well as or better than anyone else.

"Handicapped people are often better workers than other employees," stated David Egerton, a counselor who has worked closely with many handicapped people. "They often have almost perfect attendance records," he added. Labor officials have agreed that the handicapped can be superior workers because they are anxious to prove themselves. Employers who take affirmative action by giving the handicapped a chance can find this out for themselves.

Prospective handicapped employees are sometimes hired on a trial basis so that employers can be sure they can perform on a job. Such individuals are almost always hired. One specific case is that of Ricky Rogers, a young paraplegic who worked in a jewelry store for a reduced wage to see if he could handle an eight hour day. After several months he was hired by a local industry because of his outstanding work record. He is now supporting himself and is happy with his work situation.

In conclusion, affirmative action laws have made employers aware of the abilities of the handicapped and made industries face up to their responsibilities in considering the handicapped for jobs. Qualified handicapped persons have been employed and have proven themselves on the job. The handicapped have been given the chance to compete, the chance to win.

#### JOHN HUME SPEAKS ON THE CRISIS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last month, in the course of a significant visit to the United States, Mr. John Hume, deputy leader of the Social Democratic and Labor Party in Northern Ireland, was

interviewed on the television program "Panorama" and by the Washington Star about the crisis in his country.

The "Panorama" interview was conducted by Ms. Pat Mitchell and Ms. Bonnie Angelo, and the Washington Star interview was conducted by Mr. Denis Horgan. In both discussions, Mr. Hume spoke eloquently and effectively about the roots of the crisis and the paths along which the search for peace is being conducted.

During the 8 tragic years of the violence in Northern Ireland, Mr. Hume has been a remarkably effective and perceptive leader of his party, which has broad support in the Catholic community in Northern Ireland. He is one of the principal architects of the concept of partnership in government between the Protestant and Catholic communities, which is widely accepted as the key to an eventual peaceful resolution of the present conflict.

Mr. President, I believe that these two interviews will be of interest to all of us who desire the earliest possible end to the violence in Northern Ireland, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW WITH JOHN HUME ON "PANORAMA," MAY 24, 1977, TELEVISION STATION WTIG-TV WASHINGTON, D.C.

Ms. MITCHELL. For hundreds of years, the British and the Irish have been struggling with what has been called the Irish question. Now in a shrinking world, Americans are increasingly being drawn into Irish troubles, because wherever there are Americans of Irish extraction—and there are 20 million such Irish Americans—there are drives for funds to help the Irish.

Some of these funds, however, are being used to buy arms, which in the end are being used to shed the blood of Irishmen, both Catholic and Protestant. That continues to stain the soil of the northern part of the Emerald Isle. And with us today to discuss that is our guest, John Hume, Deputy Leader of the Social Democratic Labor Party, a party that is 40 years old, started as an independent in 1972, formed the Social Democratic Labor Party. That party, by the way, was one of the architects of the sharing power experiment in 1972. Mr. Hume, that experiment failed along with many others. Is it your opinion, at this point that there can be a settlement of any kind?

Mr. HUME. Well, the situation on the ground at the moment is that there is a political stalemate between both sections of the community. We would believe, and I represent the minority community in Northern Ireland, we would believe that in a deeply divided society, such as we have in the North of Ireland, one cannot solve the problem on the basis of victory for any one section of the community. One cannot have government by any one section of the community. And therefore the answer to the depth of division, of hatred, of suspicion, of prejudice is to have a partnership between both sections of the community in government to share responsibility for the administration of Northern Ireland. And through that sharing, the experience of that sharing, to gradually erode the prejudices and hatreds and to develop instead a trust and understanding between the two sections of the community leading to a new situation. That is our view; that's a view which is endorsed by the British Government; it's endorsed by the Irish Government to the South; it is supported almost by the entire Catholic

minority. It is supported by a section of the Protestant majority, but is opposed by a majority of the Protestant majority, and that is where the stalemate rests at the moment.

Ms. MITCHELL. Your party has both Protestant and Catholic membership?

Mr. HUME. Yes.

Ms. ANGELO. What is the percentage of Catholic to Protestant membership?

Mr. HUME. We don't ask people what their religion is when they join our party and we don't keep a record of the religious beliefs of any of our members. But as an indication, in a recent election, we had 17 people elected, of which two were not Catholics and the rest were. We have a minority, to be honest, of Protestant membership in our group, but we don't consider religion as the factor in that sense. We propose policies which we believe are designed to heal the divide between the two cultural traditions in Ireland.

Ms. ANGELO. I would like to ask just one thing that Americans ask often, when they speak of this terrible situation that has gone on so long now in Northern Ireland. They don't understand the very idea at this time of our history of Catholics fighting against Protestants; it sounds like something out of the Middle Ages. Is this not actually the same as the have and the have nots?

Mr. HUME. Well, there's an element in that of course. I think that it is not a religious war. The difference is not about the theology. It so happens that the religious beliefs of both sections of the community coincide with separate national identities. The colonization of Ireland occurred in the 17th century. Those who came were largely Protestants, and therefore their difference in nationality and the bitterness arising out of that colonization originally also coincided with the religious divide.

And therefore that makes it a lot worse. The other side of that, of course, is that the use of power—over the years since Northern Ireland was established—by the majority of the Unionist, or Protestant, majority was used to discriminate against the minority and therefore the have and have not situation developed into it. One of the responses to that has been, of course, a violent response, to try and solve the problem by violence. But we would hold very strongly that in a divided society, violence only deepens the divide. And in that regard, statements recently by leading American politicians like Senator Kennedy, like Governor Carey, like Senator Moynihan, and the Speaker of Congress whom I met yesterday, Tip O'Neill, these have been widely applauded in Ireland and very warmly received, because they made very, very clear that they, too, from their knowledge—and they take a constructive interest in Ireland—from their knowledge of the situation that violence in Ireland is wrong, and that those in the United States who help to support that violence are wrong as well.

Ms. MITCHELL. What can you do about these people who give money and give their prestige to buy guns?

Mr. HUME. Well, I think the first thing to stress is, of course, that it is a minority and a small minority of Irish Americans who are engaged in this and even amongst them, some of them—

Ms. ANGELO. But who stirs them up?

Mr. HUME. Some of them genuinely believe they are doing the right thing, largely due to ignorance of the situation on the ground in Ireland, and that is why recent statements from the Irish American political leaders have been of such value. Because not only are they saying that violence is wrong, but they have been pointing the way to a new direction and a new way forward. And I think that this has been valuable, not only in encouraging the people in Ireland who are working for peace and reconciliation between the two sections of the community,

<sup>3</sup> "What Affirmative Action Means to You," *Accent on Living*, Fall, 1976, p. 54.

but it's also been valuable in educating and making Irish Americans stop and think that there is another view of the Irish situation, rather than the simplistic one that has been handed down from generation to generation with a flag wrapped around it.

Ms. MITCHELL. Mr. Hume, when the Irish Americans are called on to contribute to their country, there certainly is a great deal of patriotism and concern for the country. Are they aware of these massive fund raising efforts that I'm familiar with—largely from the Boston Irish community, which is a very large one—are they aware that the money that is gathered in those situations actually does go to the IRA, or does go to buy ammunition?

Mr. HUME. Well, I think many of them are not. And that is why I think that these statements of such leaders are very valuable. Mind you, there are fund raising efforts in the United States which are for positive and constructive—

Ms. MITCHELL. But how does one know?

Mr. HUME. Well, some of them have only started recently. In fact, the reason I'm in the United States was that I spoke with Senator Kennedy in New York on Wednesday night last, in favor and in support of one such fund. The Ireland Fund, which is for peace, culture, and charity in Ireland, and which is supported here by many leading Irish Americans. And there again, it's a drive to promote positive and constructive things in Ireland, rather than destructive things.

Ms. ANGELO. So the most important thing is to ask if the funds are earmarked in some way or to have a clear understanding of who is controlling the funds that are given and where it's going.

Mr. HUME. Yes.

Ms. ANGELO. Because I was told in England, actually it was the first time I had heard this charge made, and later checked it out here and found it's quite true, that there are some funds that are labeled in such appealing manners to help the Irish children, and to help all the children, and that sort of thing—the money from which actually is going to buy arms. Now how do you know?

Mr. HUME. Well, I think that the organization which we believe is providing the financial assistance to the IRA is Irish Northern Aid. That's the name of it. There are other organizations here which are doing a good job, like The Ireland Fund I mentioned, or like the fund which is based in Washington, itself, Ireland's Children.

Ms. ANGELO. And that one you say is O.K.?

Mr. HUME. That's very very positive, constructive, very definitely so.

Ms. ANGELO. But you have to tell the people.

Ms. MITCHELL. You really do.

Mr. HUME. Here is one of the great contradictions: many of the Irish Americans who support violence would say that they are doing it in the name of the Irish people and they would believe that the IRA is the only voice of the Catholic minority in the North. But it's myself and my party who are overwhelmingly elected time out of number for the Catholic minority in the North, and we take a very, very strong stand against the use of violence. For example, in the election just completed in my own district, in Derry, which is supposed to be a stronghold of the violent men, the people, when they come out in the privacy of the ballot box, have overwhelmingly voted for myself and my party. And they've done that time out of number. And in spite of the difficulties of the situation, we take that strong stand. So the real true voice of the people who have been subjected to injustices in the past is, we don't see those being resolved by violence, we see our lives being made worse by violence, because when a policeman or a soldier is murdered, a Catholic is murdered tomorrow night in retaliation. Five thousand

bombs have gone off in Northern Ireland in five years; 1,700 people have been killed; thousands have been injured, and remember, in a population of a million and a half.

Ms. MITCHELL. The problem is that many of these Americans of Irish extraction really, maybe they haven't been there in a while, or they have in some sense lost track of the kind of figures that you're giving and the kind of violence leading to other kinds of violence. An education process is needed, which you mentioned, and they need to understand that to contribute to more violence isn't helpful. And, of course, big statements by people such as Senator Kennedy and Senator Moynihan that you mentioned. But what other—are there other Americans who are speaking out and therefore perpetuating this contribution to the IRA?

Mr. HUME. Oh, yes, there are some members of Congress that actually lend their names to supporting these types of organizations. I don't know whether they do so out of ignorance or not.

Ms. ANGELO. Members of Congress? Let's name them.

Mr. HUME. They're in New York, Congressmen like Congressman Giaggi, there is a lady called Abzug; and they have given support to organizations here. I don't know whether they know the reality or not, but I would like them to know the reality.

Ms. ANGELO. And there's a writer such as Mr. Breslin who writes a great deal about Ireland.

Mr. HUME. All I say to all of them is, look, you may be genuinely wishing to help in the Irish situation. But you should do what Senator Kennedy does, what Governor Carey does, what Speaker O'Neill does, they find out what the reality is. They talk to the people whom the people that live on the ground elect. In other words, they uphold the democratic process. They don't undermine it by adding their voice to help in a violent situation.

Ms. ANGELO. You're not saying, don't help; you're just saying, help the right way.

Mr. HUME. I'm saying that yes, exactly, that there is a positive and constructive way forward. In fact, President Carter said during his campaign that he himself spoke out against the use of violence in Ireland and suggested what most people regard as a sensible approach, that the way forward had to be between both section of the community and that was reiterated by Secretary of State Vance on St. Patrick's Day in a further statement on the Irish situation.

Ms. MITCHELL. Thank you, Mr. Hume, we're very happy that you came today, and, I think, helped educate us and hopefully some others who were listening as to ways in which the Irish question can be solved and that we can be constructive in that regard.

[From the Washington Star, May 31, 1977]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS: NEGOTIATIONS, NOT VIOLENCE FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

(John Hume, deputy leader of Northern Ireland's Social Democratic and Labor party, was interviewed by Washington Star Staff Writer Denis E. Horgan.)

Question. The latest phase of violence in Northern Ireland has been going on at a consistently high level for a decade now. Is there no political solution that can put it to an end?

HUME. Violence itself is being used as a political weapon in Ireland. But it can only make the situation worse. Apart altogether from the terrible tragedies, the death, the destruction it causes it also deepens the division between the two section of the community. An end can come only when there is an agreement between both factions. My view is that agreement must not be based on victory by either side because victory by either point of view in a divided society is no solution. It must mean a period of part-

nership, the institutions of government should be shared, there should be an agreement. By working together over the years this would produce a steady erosion of prejudice and a development of understanding to eliminate that which separates the people at the moment.

Q. But how is that to be brought about? Various plans have been tried and failed.

A. It can only come by political negotiation. In any situation such as that, agreement can only be brought about by those people who are freely elected to represent the different points of view. Indeed, that is exactly what we are pursuing in Northern Ireland. It has to be frankly admitted that this is no easy task and the violence is making it much more difficult because it is deepening the differences. However, there have been some hopeful signs of late and one hopes that the intransigence that does exist, particularly on the part of the Loyalist coalition, can be dissipated.

Q. What are these hopeful signs?

A. Recently there was a blatant attempt led by Ian Paisley to restore sectarian domination to Northern Ireland. That was not defeated by anyone other than the ordinary people. In other words, on this occasion the leadership was given not by the leaders but by the led. The ordinary people, very courageously and sometimes with their lives, resisted all forms of intimidation and coercion to force them into a general strike and defeated it. Now that defeat effectively puts Paisley's position very very clear—to be out to restore, by any method, sectarian domination. The division between himself and the rest of the Unionist community has emerged from it. Our hope would be that this would be the first step in a new concept of leadership that would emphasize togetherness rather than domination as the means of solving the problem.

Q. Do you think the failure of the strike reflects something positive or rather a sense of weariness of this having gone on so long?

A. I think, to be fair, there is a great deal of weariness in the entire community. There's also a great deal of revulsion against violence and violent methods. There is a weariness. There is also rising out of the whole experience a greater politicization of the people. It is not so easy for politicians there to use the old war cries and beat the old drums to draw people to their flags. People are much more politicized because people realize now that in a small community of 1.5 million people there have been 5,000 bombs in five years, there have been over 1,700 people killed. Today Catholic is separated from Protestant by lines of British soldiers, by barbed wire. If that doesn't show people more graphically than anything else that past approaches to the problem must be challenged, then nothing ever will. We have almost 2,000 graves to stand as silent but eloquent testimony of the failure of past approaches.

Q. How much of a political factor—rather than as a military factor—is the presence of the British troops?

A. It is a major factor, of course, both politically and militarily. No one wants troops on their streets. There is nobody in any community anywhere that wants their law and order to be enforced by soldiers. Armies are very blunt instruments of law and order. We would believe that the right approach is that in conjunction with a political settlement the army would be withdrawn. I emphasize in conjunction with the political settlement, so there is a system of law and order left behind that has the consent of both sides.

Q. There is an argument that if the British were to go, then things would be forced to move toward solution.

A. This is based on the misconception that the British presence of itself is the Irish problem. Those who say that the British presence should be dealt with first will admit, if pressed, that for Britain to withdraw first



leaves the risk of serious conflict between both sections of the community and therefore a permanent problem—rather like you have in Cyprus. On the other hand, if both sections of the community are reconciled then the British presence is not an important factor. Britain today, we believe, doesn't have much interest in staying in Northern Ireland. The withdrawal of the troops should be done but definitely in the context of a political solution.

Q. Last year a great deal of attention was given to the Women's March for Peace. Has that collapsed?

A. The peace movement was a very spontaneous reaction to peoples' revulsion to violence in Northern Ireland and was supported by almost the entire community. But since it wasn't proposing political solutions, it couldn't do much more than that and it is not as widespread today in its support or its activities as it was at the beginning.

Q. The activity of the government of the Republic of Ireland has been criticized in some quarters as undercutting the support needed by the Catholics in the north. Is that valid?

A. It's an argument that's put forward very often by people on this side of the Atlantic who actually support violent organizations in the south of Ireland. These organizations, it ought to be remembered, are seeking the overthrow of the government and state in the south as well as in the north. So they have a very strong motive for putting forth that kind of argument. One has to understand that any government in the south always has a difficult problem because if it ever escalates its support of the minority in the north then it can be accused of provocation of the Protestant majority and if it does nothing it will receive the criticism of the minority for not coming to its aid.

Q. Is the concept of a reunited Ireland still meaningful?

A. One of the tragedies for Ireland is that people talked about a united Ireland when it was only a slogan. Very few ever spelled out how it was to be done or what they meant by it. And, when analyzing what they meant, they were generally talking about a piece of territory. Of late, people in Ireland have been forced to face those realities. The reality is that the divide in Ireland is not simply the line dividing the territory, the Irish border. The real divide is the mental divide between the two sections of the one people. Once one accepts and realizes that, the approach to Irish unity is an entirely different matter. You cannot unite people at the point of a gun. Neither can you unite people by dismembering them. It becomes clear that real unity means agreement by both factions of the Irish people as to how they are to be governed. That is what people who really work for the unity of the country should be trying to achieve.

Q. Given the long history of division, what is there to convince one that negotiations can in fact work—or will the violence not come and go as it has in the past?

A. Well, our history has been that violence has come and gone. It's against that backdrop that people stand today. But the violence today is among the worst violence that the Irish people have ever seen. One of the achievements of the bombers has been to explode their own myths. And, again, one result is that the people are much more politicized today. It's not so easy to hand down the patriotic message of wrapping the green flag around you and dying for Ireland. Most people realize that true patriotism means spilling your sweat, not your blood, living for your country, not dying for it. The basis for this whole transformation to me provides the basis for the way forward which must be based on gradual evolution. It has never been totally accepted in Ireland that evolution and politics are the road to

peace and lasting stability. We face the reality that we have a divided people, we cannot unite people by conquest. In that regard, the recent comments of Americans such as Sens. Kennedy and Moynihan, Speaker O'Neill and Gov. Carey of New York have been very, very helpful. They have been very widely applauded by all sections of the community and have made a major contribution to educating the American people in particular that violence is not an answer in Ireland.

Q. How much effect do you think they have, though?

A. I would think that respected political leaders are listened to. The strength and the clarity of what they have to say are bound to have an effect on Irish-Americans. My view is that many Irish-Americans are sincere in their desire to help out and that those that are helping the wrong causes, the violent causes, do so out of a lack of knowledge. When the Irish-American leaders speak out clearly against the use of violence, then people begin to take their lead from them. I think it is also valuable in Ireland itself when there is so much publicity to the amount of money given for arms in the United States. When the Irish-American community as a whole, through its leaders, is opposed to this, it becomes an important factor to the gunman on the ground. He feels moral support because he is supported by money from the United States and this clear enunciation of the actual position of the Irish-American leadership wipes away that moral support. The actual amount of contributions has been reduced substantially over the recent years.

#### OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

Mr. McCLURE, Mr. President, on June 7, in an impressive ceremony in the Russell Senate Office Building, Congressman STEVE SYMMS of Idaho was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation.

This prestigious award was given in recognition of an article written by Representative SYMMS entitled, "Our Constitutional Right To Keep and Bear Arms." In the article he defended the right of citizens to keep and bear arms by discussing the second amendment of the Constitution.

Quoting from his article—

The Second Amendment . . . was written to secure the citizenry against the maladministration of the government. The right to keep and bear arms was regarded as an essential safeguard against the creation of a military dictatorship in America. This safeguard is as necessary today as any time in our history!

The article causes us to look beyond the surface of the gun control issue, regardless of our point of view, and to examine our constitutional liberties, which are the backbone of this great Republic. It should be pointed out that Congressman SYMMS won the award by defending a position on which the people of Idaho are almost universally united. I am personally pleased because STEVE SYMMS so ably represents the seat I once held in the House of Representatives.

On behalf of the State of Idaho, we salute you, STEVE. I ask unanimous consent that his article, as it originally appeared in American Patriot, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

(By the Honorable STEVEN D. SYMMS)

It is becoming increasingly apparent that most advocates of private gun ownership are not emphasizing the Constitutional rights question nearly as much as its fundamental importance deserves! In almost all of the arguments against federal gun control, the Constitutional issue is either passed over lightly or is skirted entirely. We are told that gun controls don't work, that they would cost the taxpayers billions of dollars, that they would interfere with the rights of hunters and collectors, and would violate our privacy and our right to self defense.

However, to rely on these objections alone is a serious mistake. The bulwark of defense against federal firearms control must rest in the knowledge that gun ownership is an absolute right with which government cannot tamper, no matter how expedient or politically popular that tampering may seem. It is a right guaranteed to the individual by the Constitution of the United States and cannot be changed except by amendment to the Constitution.

The Second Amendment reads: "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

#### FOUNDING FATHERS PROTECTED PEOPLE'S RIGHTS

It is evident that our Founding Fathers were trying to tell us something there—and in no uncertain terms! In contrast to other portions of the Constitution, there were no qualifiers in this Amendment, no "buts" or "excepts", just a straight-forward statement regarding the people's right to possess firearms. Gun control proponents always use this time-worn argument in attempting to dismiss our Constitutional right: Dwelling on the word "militia", they claim that the right to bear arms is a collective rather than individual right, and that the purpose of the Second Amendment was to create a standing army or national guard. Too often, pro-gun people shrink back when confronted with this argument, not knowing how to answer it effectively.

This perception of the Second Amendment's meaning and the original reason for its inclusion in the Bill of Rights is totally inaccurate. To begin with, the term "militia" historically has referred to the people at large, armed and ready to defend their homeland and their freedom. Title 10, Section 311 of the U.S. Code states: "The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least 17 years of age . . ." The National Guard wasn't even created until the 20th Century!

#### CONSTITUTION GUARDS AGAINST ABUSES

Moreover, historical records, including Constitutional Convention debates and the Federalist Papers, clearly indicate that the purpose of the Second Amendment was not to create a standing army, but to guard against the dangers of a standing army. The framers of our Constitution were most fearful of the abuses which could be perpetrated against the people by any professional armed body under control of government.

#### RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS A SAFEGUARD

Thus, a serious study of the Constitution and of the stated intentions of its framers reveals that the Second Amendment, like the Bill of Rights in general, was an individual, not a collective right, and was written to secure the citizenry against the maladministration of the government. The right to keep and bear arms was regarded as an essential safeguard against the creation of a military dictatorship in America. This safeguard is just as necessary today as any time in our history!

There will, of course, always be those who say that the Constitution is an antiquated

document and that modern day realities make it necessary to ignore certain sections or to significantly modify their original interpretations. Such a philosophy, in my view, leads to an erosion of the entire concept of Constitutional law, and ultimately, to the tyranny of unbridled popular rule. It is quite proper to advocate changes in the Constitution through normal Amendment procedures. But when you flout the orderly processes of the law and condone the practice of substituting your own intentions for those of the Constitution's framers, you reflect the principle of Constitutional Government. You endorse a rule of men, not of laws!

#### MRS. DOROTHY W. STEVENS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, earlier in the spring, I called the attention of my colleagues to the Distinguished Service Award which the New York Chapter of the Association of the United States Army had presented to Mr. Robert T. Stevens. Mr. Stevens, of course, is one of this country's most distinguished citizens, the former chairman of the Board of J. P. Stevens Co. and Secretary of the Army under President Eisenhower. He is also, I am proud to say, my good friend.

Mr. Stevens' remarks on receiving his award seemed to me so eloquent and so timely that I had them placed in the RECORD where others might have easy access to them. Now I have discovered that Mr. Stevens is not the only accomplished writer in his family. His lovely and gracious wife Dorothy has an equally impressive facility with words, which is exemplified in an account she wrote of the Fourth of July in our Bicentennial Year in Harlowtown, Mont.

Of course, this famous anniversary of this famous day deserves to be remembered by all who were fortunate enough to participate in it. To assist our memories, many writers have recorded their thoughts, feelings, and experiences in connection with the big celebration. Dorothy Stevens' account is a worthy contribution to this growing body of literature. In order to give her patriotic message the broader exposure it deserves, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN FORK RANCH,  
Two Dot, Mont.,

ON THE FOURTH OF JULY, 1976

It was July the Fourth 1976 and here at our ranch in Montana we first watched a part of our Country's bicentennial celebration on TV and spectacular and very well done we thought it. Later, we were fortunate in participating locally in this special celebration. It was thrilling! "Oh say does that Star Spangled Banner yet wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?" It does, as evidenced on this Fourth and it seemed to me like a day of returning to the family home—with the best of the past and present represented—all in one day!

On this memorable day of 1976 everywhere in the U.S.A. were those who, "Stopped, looked, listened." It was a time to think of our great heritage, the enduring values of our past history—always with hope for the future (in spite of difficulties, past and present).

Remember, when growing up, there were special foods we particularly liked? Some we still hunger for today, as well as the

basic needs of family togetherness, sharing with others the simple pleasures of life—having fun! "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"—a part of the past, today and prayerfully tomorrow—and for our children, their children, we wish a good life.

With hard work and the cooperation of many there have been in recent years great strides in all fields of endeavor and benefits only dreamed of yesterday have become realities today. We have so much more than our parents, grandparents, that it seems to me we must not only be appreciative today, but also discerning, discriminating—hopefully, too, preserving the best for future generations.

Our schools, many of them, are bigger today and with the most modern equipment, but are they better? In these bigger schools, large universities, with their wider, more varied courses of study, there should be advantages and untold opportunities for all. But is it also possible to give the individual training and encouragement that a good teacher in a smaller school gives to each child and young person?

It is from these small schools, mostly in the country, that have come many of the leaders of this great Country—in industry, farming, education, medicine, government and the Churches. Also, for those self-educated, with an incentive, integrity, hard work, anything is possible in a free country like ours.

Big Timber, a town thirty miles to the south of us, recently had in its paper, the Big Timber Pioneer, some pictures and articles about their schools, all very interesting and pertinent today.

Making the most of opportunities here, some years ago now, there came to Montana from Sweden a young man who was riding a freight train. He was discovered and told to get off. Ever since he has wished he knew who put him off the train—somewhere in Montana—to thank him. He worked hard, did well here and, in appreciation of what this Country and State had done for him, he later ran for and became governor, hoping to return in some measure what his adopted Country had done for him. He is our friend, Hugo Aronson, and he served eight years in that high office. There are many, many others, who could tell this type of story.

One other example—a young man came from Scotland, his first job here digging ditches. Later he became the widely known and inspiring minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C. (formerly Lincoln's Church) and then Chaplain of the United States Senate—our Dr. Peter Marshall.

We are the oldest democracy today and still from other countries come those who hope for and look forward to opportunities here—a great number giving the "Pledge of Allegiance" and becoming new citizens recently and they will not forget taking part in this pledge on our glorious Fourth of July just past.

We have many fine traditions in our Country and at the completion of two centuries of history we have just witnessed our finest celebration ever.

I would now like to tell you a little about Independence Day 1976 in the little town of Harlowtown, Montana, thirty miles to the north of our American Fork Ranch, and of the privilege of being a spectator there, one of many lining the main street.

It was a great day for the children sitting along the curbs and fun for those who took part in the parade and, for all there, it will be a lasting memory. In preparation for this day there were many who worked hard and long hours to make it the success it was, contributing memories in different ways.

The street was lined with flags. In the window of Bain's department store could be

seen a very beautiful quilt made by the Harlowtown Women's Club. All the stores had special decorations. Unfortunately, not long before the Fourth, on the corner opposite the bank a big building burned to the ground. Thankfully, the local volunteer fire department did a good job in containing it, keeping it from spreading. Of course it left a great deal of debris, but most of it was cleared away in short order, making it as presentable as possible for this day.

The population of Harlowtown is between 1,400 and 1,500. Long before the Fourth every available overnight space was spoken for by those planning to be in town for the two parades and rodeos. All classes of the High School, graduated over the years, planned reunions, looking forward to being there again, renewing acquaintances and visiting with friends.

At the rodeo in Chief Joseph Park the stands were sold out for each day. There were about 3,000 at a catered barbeque at the Youth Center and McQuitty Field during the weekend and it was a big success.

Most meaningful of all on this historical occasion was the bell ringing and then the colorful parade on the Fourth. There were two marching bands and thirty-one floats!

If you have a good idea, someone else has very likely thought of it, too, and there were two Liberty Bells in the parade, each different and appropriate. Now I would like to tell you about our bell.

Some twenty years ago my husband, Bob Stevens, was asked if he would like to have at his ranch a bell from the top of a textile plant at Piedmont, S.C., as the plant was being remodeled. He said he would like very much to have the bell here and after it arrived by freight in Harlowtown it was finally moved to the ranch. As it weighed 1,600 pounds we never expected to move it again. We had a picture of it on our Christmas card, more than once, I think, one time a close-up with the caption—"Ringing In the New Year."

In this Centennial Year it was decreed that all bells should be rung at the same time on July Fourth—all across the country—heralding a new Third Century of our U.S.A.! Therefore, it seemed particularly fitting that our bell, made in Boston, Mass. in 1888 (by G. T. Robinson & Co., formerly W. M. Blake & Co.) should become a part of this ceremony.

The bell was carefully moved at the ranch by our son, Tom, and a number of interested helpers onto a big truck, then taken to town where it was both well and beautifully decorated with red, white and blue and ready to take part on the Fourth. Jim Bain, wearing his uniform of the Minutemen, also of red, white and blue, and part of the American Marching Squad, rang our bell.

At noon, along the street cleared for the parade, we waited in anticipation of the bell ringing and the parade. First we heard the church bells ringing, one at a time (the bell in the Catholic Church being repaired for this occasion). Then the school bells and then, in the distance, at the top of the street we heard the sound of our bell, becoming more distinct as it drew nearer. It has a lovely and carrying tone.

As I listened to this bell ringing, knowing that it was taking place at the same time across the length and breadth of our Country (at noon at Montana—mountain time) and hearing our bell, made in New England, transported to the South and then to the West, I was thrilled—and my heart stood still in wonder and thanksgiving for this special and historical day.

This celebration taking place in the small town of Harlowtown was truly American—and America at its best. It was good to be there on Harlowtown's main street!

D. W. S.

JULY 1976.



#### HOUSE TAX COMMITTEE REMOVES HOMEOWNER EQUITY PART OF CARTER ENERGY PACKAGE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the action taken by the House Ways and Means Committee on June 15 in rejecting President Carter's proposed energy tax rebate to families who heat their home with oil is of particular concern to me. I believe that the House committee in striking this feature of the President's energy program did not fully understand the enormous burden which will be placed on homeowners throughout the country, but particularly on those families living in the northern regions of the United States.

This rebate, in my opinion, represents an essential equitable feature in the tax part of the President's energy package. When Mr. Carter first announced his energy program on April 18 he listed 10 principles which guided him and his administration in the development of his energy policy. The fifth principle was that the program must be fair. He stated and I quote:

Our solutions must ask equal sacrifices from every region, every class of people, and every interest group.

In his statement before a joint session of the Congress, the President reiterated his concern for equity by stating and again I quote:

Our guiding principal as we develop this plan was above all it must be fair. None of our people must make an unfair sacrifice. None should reap an unfair benefit. The desire for equity is reflected throughout our plan—in a dollar for dollar refund of the wellhead tax as it affects home heating oil, particularly in the Northeast.

The majority of the Ways and Means Committee in voting to delete the President's heating oil tax rebate based their decision apparently on the belief that the homeowners' rebate was a special relief section aimed primarily at the Northeast and was inconsistent with President Carter's general effort to induce energy conservation by making energy more costly.

The President and Congress share a responsibility in shaping a national energy program that must consider its ultimate impact on the various users of energy. The home heating oil rebate, far from being a special exemption for a favored vested interest group, is an equitable effort to cushion the impact of higher prices on those homeowners who must rely on heating oil as the basic home fuel. During the House Ways and Means Committee is consideration of the President's heating oil rebate, various cost figures were discussed as to the true impact on homeowners using home heating oil. I must state that this cost feature of the rebate will obviously vary among different regions of the country. We in New England are not the only users of distillate fuel, but we in New England are clearly the predominant users of this fuel source for home heating. We in New England are also exposed to some of the most severe winter weather experienced in this country. In my State of New Hampshire, and in my home town of Laconia, winter means substantial snow

fall, bone chilling winds, and temperatures as low as 20 below zero.

Historically, the New England region of our country has developed a basic reliance of oil for our energy needs. Most homes are equipped to burn as a furnace fuel distillate fuel oil. This is not an option on the homeowner's part, for in most cases the heating plant is in the house when purchased. To a citizen in the northern part of New Hampshire—which we refer to as the "North Country"—increased prices for heating oil without the President's proposed rebate will cost some homeowners additional hundreds of dollars a year. While distillate fuel is used throughout the country as a home heating source, the severity of winter weather determines the amount of heating fuel needed. The deletion of this rebate will create not only an unjust price situation to homeowners above the frost line, but one that will be intolerable. By striking the rebate feature, the Ways and Means Committee does not provide any alternative for millions of homeowners across the northern tier of our country. What type of action would the majority of the Ways and Means Committee recommend to a homeowner in North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Missouri, Ohio, or New England. Many homeowners will be unable to pay the full cost of OPEC prices for the single most important necessity during the winter months, heat. We do not have the ability in the next 36 months to retrofit and convert all heating oil users' homes to alternative energy sources. In fact, for the short term in New England there is no alternative but to pay the price, whatever the cost. There is a limit to conservation.

The deletion of the home heating oil rebate not only is unfair but it creates an anomaly. The President's proposal not only recommended rebates for home heating oil users, it would also rebate costs to farmers for their use of distillate in their business. A substantial number of farms not only use distillate as a tractor fuel but they use the same basic fuel in heating their homes. How can Congress justify and explain to a farmer that it will cost him more to heat his home than to drive a tractor. The fuel is the same. Both purposes are essential. But the cost will be different. I believe any farmer in his right mind would take his tractor fuel in the winter and put it in his home heating furnace. But a homeowner in a small town would have no such option. Furthermore, by removing the rebate to homeowners using distillate fuel and allowing the full cost of the wellhead tax to be passed forward to the ultimate consumer—the homeowner—we will have a national policy in which gasoline may well be cheaper than home heating oil. Mr. President, let me quote some figures to substantiate that statement. In the Commodity Section of today's Wall Street Journal, Friday, June 17, on page 24, cash prices are quoted for mid continent gasoline and fuel oil. Today's quote is 37 cents a gallon for 92 octane gasoline and 34½ cents for No. 2 fuel oil. This represents a price difference on these two commodities of 2½ cents a

gallon. At the same time a year ago Mr. President, this price difference was 4¾ cents and historically the price difference has been even greater. Explain to me and to the homeowners of this country how we can justify an energy policy that could well cost you more per gallon to heat your home than to run your car. What type of conservation program is this? And what do we tell the citizens of the country who will not be able to afford to meet their heating oil bills? Will we tell them to move into their car? Or to hook their gasoline engine up to their furnace? What the House Ways and Means Committee action represents in simple terms is a tilt away from gasoline conservation and a passing of the buck to the homeowner using distillate fuel.

Mr. President, if we are to achieve President Carter's goal of equity, I believe we must consider the entire issue of how the products refined from a barrel of crude oil are to be used. Are we trying to encourage gasoline consumption or are we trying to discourage home ownership? The citizens of New Hampshire who must use heating oil for their homes will be required without the rebate to spend more of their limited income on heating their home and less on other essential needs. This burden will be so great that I am sure that many of the elderly and those on fixed income will have to face the sad alternative of either selling their home or doing without other essentials.

I believe that home heating oil is a much more essential commodity than gasoline and there is no justification for treating the two on a similar basis. Certainly there is much more conservation to be attained in the gasoline part of a barrel of oil than in the home heating oil part. Moreover, Mr. President, I believe we should look at the entire distillate part of a barrel of crude oil. Gasoline has a single use, that is to power automobiles. Middle distillates on the other hand are used not only for heating and tractor fuel, this commodity is a primary energy source for mass transit. Buses, trucks, trains, airplanes and other mass transit modes are powered by distillate fuel. A national energy policy would indicate to me that the price mechanism should not be used to deny homeowners' heat, farmers' tractor fuel, or to discourage mass transportation.

Mr. President, I believe that we have a responsibility to determine the ultimate impact of the decision by the House Ways and Means Committee to delete the President's proposed heating oil rebate. I also believe that we should examine the entire question of how distillate fuel should be treated. I am, therefore, scheduling hearings by the Subcommittee on Government Regulation of the Senate Small Business Committee to determine the impact of denying home heating oil rebates to the American people.

This issue affects the subject matter of several committees, including the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, the Commerce Committee, the Energy Committee, and certainly the Finance Committee. Since this will

be an investigational hearing, however, I do believe that the historic role of the Small Business Committee makes it an appropriate forum. I would hope that the subcommittee can tentatively schedule the first day of hearings on June 28, to receive testimony from suppliers and users of home heating oil. I would also hope that a second day can be scheduled for June 30, to receive testimony from the administration. The committee will, however, formally announce the hearing dates in the next few days. Mr. President, in conclusion I ask unanimous consent that an article which appears in the June 16, 1977, New York Times and a press release I issued be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1977]  
HOUSE PANEL REJECTS HEATING-OIL REBATE  
(By Edward Cowan)

WASHINGTON, June 15.—The House Ways and Means Committee decisively rejected today the special energy tax rebate proposed by President Carter for families that heat with oil.

The rebate would have come to \$60 to \$85 a year. Its rejection, on a vote of 20 to 4, was regarded as less of a setback for Mr. Carter than for the Speaker of the House, Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., Democrat of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'Neill and other members of the delegation from New England, where oil is the predominant home-heating fuel, are expected to try to restore the rebate when the bill reaches the House floor.

The Ways and Means Committee put off until next week any decision on Mr. Carter's more general proposal to turn back to consumers \$14 billion a year from a tax on domestic crude oil. The committee approved the tax yesterday and is likely to approve some rebate mechanism, but many members plainly were unsure of the best method, timing and amount.

Meanwhile, the House Banking subcommittee on housing approved, 21 to 0, a package of grants, indirect Government loans and interest rate subsidies for "weatherization" of houses. Administration officials said the package went substantially beyond Mr. Carter's proposals.

The bill would authorize grants to low-income families of up to \$800 for materials and \$100 for incidental repairs. Existing law sets a limit of \$400. The work would be done by persons employed by the Government under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act.

The \$585 million authorized in the bill would permit insulation of 1.2 million houses, according to the subcommittee staff.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Housing to subsidize interest rates on energy-conservation loans by private institutions to middle-income borrowers.

#### FEDERAL CONSOLIDATION OF LOANS

It would also authorize Federal agencies to spend up to \$5 billion to buy up energy-conservation home improvement loans from private lenders, thereby replenishing the funds available to make new loans. The Federal agencies would bundle these small loans into large packages and resell them to big lenders, such as insurance companies, that normally do not deal in home loans of a few hundred or few thousand dollars.

In response to requests from New York apartment house landlords, the bill included authority for Federal insurance on loans for the installation of individual electric and natural gas meters in apartment buildings that now have master metering. It is widely believed that tenants in such buildings

would use less energy if they paid monthly utility bills directly.

The bill now goes to the full Banking Committee. Like other parts of the Carter energy program, it would then go to an ad hoc energy committee whose mission is to fashion a coherent whole from the various pieces of energy legislation being drafted in the House's standing committees. Ultimately, conflicts between legislative committees would be resolved on the House floor.

#### REGIONAL CONCERNS ON OIL REBATE

The decision by the Ways and Means Committee against a special debate for users of home heating oil reflected regional considerations and a desire to refrain from riddling the Internal Revenue Code with new special-treatment provisions.

The proposal was viewed as special relief for the Northeast that would be inconsistent with the general tendency of the Carter energy program to induce energy conservation by making energy more costly.

"We would be appropriating taxpayers' money to pay for home heating oil," said James C. Corman, Democrat of California, where nearly all home heating is by natural gas or electricity.

Mr. Corman sponsored the motion to knock out the heating-oil rebate.

The Administration's representatives at the committee appeared to be unperturbed by loss of the heating-oil rebate, which they said had been put into the bill for "equity" reasons.

#### THREE PLUS ONE

Of the four members who voted for the rebate, three came from the Northeast: James A. Burke of Massachusetts and William R. Cotter of Connecticut, Democrats, and Richard T. Schulze, Republican of Pennsylvania. The fourth was Jim Guy Tucker, a freshman Democrat from Arkansas. He hoped to establish a precedent for a rebate for users of propane, the principal heating fuel in many rural areas.

Al Ullman, the chairman, said he was voting against the heating-oil rebate to avoid just such proliferation. "The tax code will get so complicated," he said.

Simplifying the tax code also figured in a lively and inconclusive debate on recycling the \$14 billion a year that would be raised by the crude oil equalization tax approved yesterday. The tax is intended to bring the cost of price-controlled domestic oil up to the cost of imported oil without giving windfall profits to producers.

The tax would be passed on to consumers in higher prices for gasoline and other crude oil derivatives. To avoid a drag on the economy, said Laurence N. Woodworth, an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, "our concern is that it go back to consumers and go back quickly."

But Charles A. Vanik, Democrat of Ohio, thought that rather than rebate the tax through a small reduction in regular withholding, Congress should provide for a "visible" and "substantial" lump-sum refund once a year. "If you're going to dribble it to the taxpayer through withholding, he'll never be aware of getting anything back," Mr. Vanik declared.

The committee took under advisement a proposal by Mr. Corman to change the rebate formula from the per capita basis proposed by the Administration to a taxpayer basis. Mr. Corman argued, and Mr. Woodworth disagreed, that this would reduce the possibility that some people would collect more than one rebate.

#### COMPARISON OF REBATES

In a per capita basis, the rebates for each person in a family would be approximately \$18 in 1978, \$35 in 1979 and \$55 in 1980.

That would give a family of two adults and three children a rebate of \$275 in 1980.

Mr. Corman proposed rebates on a taxpayers basis. The staff estimates were \$28 per taxpayer in 1978, \$55 in 1979 and \$85 in 1980. Heads of households, married couples filing joint returns and adults who qualify for aid to families with dependent children would be eligible for twice these amounts.

The five-person family would get \$170 in 1980, or \$105 less than under the Administration proposal. Individuals and small families would get more.

Whatever method Congress adopted, the rebates would be a few dollars larger than if part of the tax revenue were earmarked for heating-oil rebates. That was a consideration in defeat of the proposal.

[From the Office of U.S. Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, Washington, D.C., June 16, 1977]

#### PRESS RELEASE

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Senator Thomas J. McIntyre (D-N.H.) charged today that the action by a House Committee to drop President Carter's home heating oil rebates jeopardizes the President's promise that all regions of the country will receive fair treatment.

McIntyre said Wednesday's action by the House Ways and Means Committee has prompted him to call hearings of the Senate Small Business Committee to determine the impact to residential heating oil consumers. Hearing dates will be announced shortly.

"The House Ways and Means Committee removed from President Carter's Energy plan a provision to rebate to residential heating oil consumers increases in price resulting from another part of the legislation calling for wellhead taxes on domestically produced crude oil," McIntyre said.

"This action by the House Committee could result in additional heating oil costs of close to \$200 a year to numerous New England households heated by oil." President Carter's Energy Program was designed to provide equitable treatment to all regions of the country, every class of people, and every interest group. In order to accomplish the President's goal of fairness he proposed a dollar-for-dollar refund of his proposed wellhead crude oil tax to each residential user of heating oil.

In explaining this energy program at an April 22, 1977 press conference, President Carter said: "For those who use fuel to heat their homes—oil—at the time they pay their fuel bills, that increase in price will be part of that settlement and they won't have to pay the higher price for fuel as it relates to home heating."

"This is particularly important in the New England states. If we do refund, however, all the wellhead tax which goes on one step at a time for three years, this will bring in enough money to give a credit, a tax credit, by 1980 of about \$188 per family."

McIntyre warned that "without the President's proposed heating oil tax credit homeowners will be forced to pay OPEC cartel prices to heat their homes. This will put New England homeowners in a disastrous situation and will place an unfair burden on the Northeast and Midwest regions of the country. "Over time this action by the House Committee will mean that New England homeowners may pay hundreds of dollars a year and would depress our entire regional economy. We in New England are not blessed with indigenous sources of fossil fuel and our only presently available heating fuel source is oil, which must be imported from producing areas of the U.S. or from foreign sources.

"If the House Ways and Means Committee decision is not reversed, then New England is placed in an unfair and inequitable position."



McIntyre, chairman of the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Government Regulation, said the hearings are intended "to determine the impact of this alteration of the President's energy program on homeowners and small fuel oil retailers."

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, in the wake of recent setbacks in strategic arms limitation talks, there has been a lot of talk that our offer was rejected, because President Carter had said too much about the question of "human rights" in the Soviet Union. I would like to be clearly on record that I, for one, do not believe that. Certainly President Carter's attention to human rights made the Soviets mad, but there is precious little evidence that they have acted any different this time than they always act. The difference has been in our reaction. For once we did not cave in and start offering a weaker position. Nor has President Carter said that he will stop speaking out on the mistreatment of dissidents within the Soviet Union. I commend him for his stand, and hope that he will maintain it.

Beyond that, there are some questions about human rights that I would like to try to answer for myself, in my own mind. I do not suggest that others will come up with the same answers, but I feel some obligation to explain how I develop my own position.

For instance, I am often asked, "How can you condemn the violation of human rights in the Soviet Union, or Red China, and condone it in Chile or South Africa?"

That answer is that I do not condone violations of human rights anywhere. But I do make distinctions, and direct my political energies in terms of those distinctions.

One distinction is that made between regimes which are clearly engaged in exporting revolution and those which are not. For example, Communist Cuba under Fidel Castro is clearly engaged in fomenting rebellion in countries in other parts of the world. The presence of Cuban troops in Angola and Zaire is a clear indication. So also is the Cuban agitation in our own Puerto Rico. Violations of human rights in Cuba must be more seriously protested, it seems to me, than violations of human rights in Argentina, which, whatever it is doing is doing it at home, and not in neighboring countries.

Another distinction that has to be made is between countries which are subject to terrorist-oriented dissent groups, either totally indigenous or encouraged by outside intervention. Anyone who claimed that the Soviet Government is threatened by a band of terrorist Jews, for example, would be laughed to scorn. On the other hand, the Tupomaros in Uruguay clearly can pose a threat to the stability of the nation, and the Government of Uruguay is clearly justified in using more force to maintain order than the Soviet Union is.

A third kind of distinction that must be made is between those countries that limit all freedoms, and those that limit only political freedom. During the years of Franco's rule in Spain, for example, the Communist Party was outlawed, and

restrictions were placed on expression of public views in sympathy with that party. However, no attempt was made to restrict speech in other respects, individuals were free to work at whatever jobs they chose, wherever they chose, and whenever they chose. Movement was not limited, and the country was clearly "free." Other countries restrict all freedoms, and not just political freedom. Such a country is North Korea, which is perhaps the most totalitarian regime in the entire world.

These distinctions, Mr. President, are useful to me in making decisions about foreign aid and international relations, and in deciding which object of "persecution" is worthy of what support I can lend. It seems to me that no policy on human rights is going to be entirely consistent, but I think these distinctions are a surer guide to action than the principles of strategic importance enunciated by President Carter. I will be glad to join with other Senators in supporting them.

#### BANKING, BUSINESS, LABOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS ISSUES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, banking, business, labor, and the Nation's economic vitality are directly affected by the changing international communications and information scene. It has been said that we are in the "Information Age."

To examine the international implications of that "Age" the Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on International Operations conducted three hearings last week in which we sought to determine the basic underlying international communications and information issues and problems.

The witnesses' testimony offered several insights which I believe will be of interest to Congress as a whole. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the opening statement and the prepared statements from the Friday, June 10, hearing be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE McGOVERN

Today we conclude a series of three hearings on the foreign relations implications of international communications and information issues.

So far, we have heard nine witnesses discuss the current and future situation in regards to media, national security, human rights, governmental actions—or as some said—inactions, and what this somewhat new set of issues means to the individual.

Today we will hear key witnesses from the fields of banking, business and labor tell what the so-called "Information Age" means to them and the organizations they represent.

These hearings have been designed to take a broad overview of very complex issues—possibly the first time that an attempt has been made to show the interrelationships of several topics which previously have been considered separate subjects.

We have been told several times during the past two days that the U.S. not only does not have an overall international communications or information policy, at the moment

there is no drive to develop one. How healthy a situation is this for our economy and for the world's financial system?

With billions of dollars involved here and abroad—millions of jobs—new forms of legislation which affect the banking, business and labor communities—and new technologies and knowledge being created and available for sale or transfer abroad—what are the implications for us? What should we be doing? Where should we go from here?

We have asked our panel of expert witnesses to give us some directions.

They are:

John F. Magee, president of the international consulting firm Arthur D. Little, Incorporated who will give us an overview.

Glenn Watts, president of the Communications Workers of America and one of the nation's most thoughtful labor leaders.

Robert B. White, executive vice president of Citibank, a leading international bank, whose presentation will cover Citibank's viewpoint as well as several issues that are common to all the international banking community.

And finally Stanley Gewirtz, vice president for Pan American World Airways, who will discuss the issues from the vantage point of a communications dependent worldwide corporation.

Each witness will present a short oral statement. At the conclusion of all four presentations we will open the questioning.

#### STATEMENT OF JOHN F. MAGEE, PRESIDENT OF ARTHUR D. LITTLE, INC.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your invitation to appear before this subcommittee and to present my views on the implications of international telecommunications development for business.

This is a matter of deep interest not only to companies in the telecommunications industry, but to all businesses and governments with a need for rapid access to dependable information.

International communications is a field where we have the opportunity—and the need—for positive government policies and attitudes:

To foster international telecommunications development, and

To promote the role of the United States telecommunications industry.

In the interests of progress in developing countries, economic efficiency worldwide, and jobs at home.

I believe there are three basic issues to be addressed in considering Federal policy toward international communications development:

First, can telecommunications projects in developing countries be considered high priority investments?

Second, what are the direct and indirect benefits to the United States inherent in establishing a stronger presence in the world telecommunications market?

Third, how can the appropriate branches of government help United States manufacturers and suppliers broaden their telecommunications role?

The issues are interrelated. They cannot be considered separately. Let me cite an example. Arthur D. Little was engaged by an American communications company to investigate the financial and economic feasibility of an earth station for satellite communications in Chad. The term, "earth station," refers to a ground antenna system, to be used in this case for the sending and receiving of international messages via a satellite owned and operated by an international corporation. The antenna itself would be owned and operated by the Ministry of Posts and Telegraphs (the national Chad telephone company), and its cost was estimated at \$2.2 million.

Even this relatively small sum was be-

yond Chad's means. The World Bank, which is the international agency perhaps the most favorable to funding telecommunications, considered earth stations to be high technology projects that are low on the priority list.

Private banks considered Chad a poor credit risk, as did Eximbank.

USAID has limited allocation of funds to Chad, which it concentrates on agricultural and rural development.

The real question was: "What does a poor and technically backward sub-Saharan country, twice the size of Texas, with a population of under 4 million and an income per capita of less than \$100 a year—what does this country want with a system as sophisticated as an earth station?"

It should be added that less than 10 percent of the population is literate, there is no television, and only 5,400 telephones—4,700 of them in the capital. Apart from the justification for advanced telecommunications, what were Chad's projects of operating with a favorable cash flow?

Our two-man team, consisting of a telecommunications engineer and a development economist, made a two-week, on-site study. They found a combination of potentially favorable factors—agriculture, tourism, and mineral resources among them—that could be enhanced by the proposed telecommunications system.

Financially, the earth station would generate enough revenues to pay for itself in five years. Moreover, the Chad ministry of posts and telegraphs was technically and administratively qualified to manage the station.

Why a satellite earth station? Because it would be prohibitively expensive to install land lines for telephone, Telex, radio and television transmissions when a technology that had leap frogged into space during long years of under-development was available.

As a specific instance of direct benefit from an International Telecommunications System for Chad, let me describe briefly the significance for oil exploration activities.

The country's mineral resources include petroleum, which had interested Continental Oil Company sufficiently to send a 30-member exploration team. The virtual isolation of the area meant a delay of many days, sometimes weeks, before geological data sent out of the country could be processed and returned. In the meantime, valuable people and equipment were tied up, pushing costs almost beyond the point where the company can economically continue its activities there. A satellite system would, of course, mean an almost instantaneous relay of data between field and home office, and uninterrupted operation.

I wish that the American initiative in proposing the Chad Earth Station had resulted in an American commercial success. It did not.

The communications company made our findings known to the World Bank, Eximbank, and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. But while these potential sources of funds deliberated, asked for more information, and postponed a decision, the issue was taken out of their hands.

France—which has enjoyed a special relationship with Chad since the days when it was the largest part of French Equatorial Africa—stepped in to finance the project and is building the Earth Station. For very little money, therefore, France is maintaining its influence in this part of Africa, closing the door at least part way on the United States.

I have gone into this much detail on Chad because it typifies the divergent thinking on whether telecommunications can be considered a high priority investment for developing countries—and of the

potential benefits to the United States in establishing a telecommunications presence in a developing country.

A similar situation exists right now in Sierra Leone, where a contract for an Earth Station is being held up by difficulties in obtaining financing.

Traditionally, telecommunications has been viewed as an outgrowth of a solidly established industrialized society whose vitality generates an increasing need for messages between and among businesses and individuals. There was some justification for this assertion in the past. By this measure, however, Third World nations would be largely excluded from the ranks of those that should be putting priority on building their telecommunications capabilities much beyond their current levels. For, by the traditional yardstick, telecommunications follows industrial development, rather than precedes it.

This is now an outmoded thesis. It has been rejected by the less-developed, as well as the developed, nations. There is growing recognition today of telecommunications more as a precondition than a consequence of industrial and social development.

Low per-capita telephone density traditionally has been regarded as a symptom of low economic development, but now, many of us believe the symptom has become ingrained and should be counted as one of the major causes of underdevelopment. Telecommunications technology provides a key element in building the infrastructure essential to the development of a viable economy.

Our government, in its policies and its practices, appears to hold to the traditional attitude. USAID, for example, believes it is more important to build ports, a highway system, promote agriculture—all of which are essential and desirable. The agency does not help fund high-technology telecommunications projects in developing nations. Others, and this is a view I strongly share, believe that in today's world, telecommunications is an essential in building an infrastructure. We believe also that telecommunications investments provide more reach per dollar than other investments in bringing people up to the last quarter of the 20th century. A telecommunications system makes it possible for a developing nation to establish connections with the outside world. In our information-oriented world, this is essential. Without such connections, many poorer nations have little chance of developing viable economies able to compete in the world marketplace.

Developing countries see the need for modern communications and the impact is dramatically evident. Whenever I visit the Middle East, for example, I am impressed by the enormous social and political impact of telecommunications in that part of the world. It seems as though every Arab has a transistor radio. And Riyadh, which once seemed so remote, now is just a phone call away. The telephone, Telex, and ultimately television, exchange between here and Saudi Arabia is creating an entirely different climate for international understanding, cooperation, and trade.

Saudi Arabia has recognized telecommunications as a key building block in creating a sound infrastructure for economic growth. Its second five-year plan calls for a 30 percent per annum growth in telecommunications, and six billion dollars has been budgeted for the purpose over the next several years. The best and most suitable of telecommunications technology is available to that nation, and it is planning to install a combination of both proven and advanced systems.

An important element in the system will be Saudi's contribution to the construction of a regional satellite system—Arabsat. The design of Arabsat will cover every Arab nation and more than 95 percent of the population. The system is considered especially important because it will help bridge the shortage of

instructors to train workers in skills that are in great demand throughout the developing Arab world. Arabsat also will help alleviate the shortages of qualified physicians and medical specialists which plague all developing countries by putting medical personnel in two-visual and voice communication with community centers and clinics.

Other developing countries do not have the current wealth of Saudi Arabia. Nevertheless, they see the immediate need for communications for their long-term benefit.

In southeast Asia, for example, five non-Communist countries represent a combined population of some 245 million and a gross national product of 80 billion dollars. These are Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, and the Philippines.

Their assets include vast natural resources, excellent labor draw, relatively stable governments, favorable attitudes toward the United States and foreign investment, and the strategic location for entry into the potentially enormous market of mainland China.

Malaysia has already articulated telecommunications plans of an immediate nature, and Indonesia and the Philippines for the longer term.

Unlike Saudi Arabia, most of these nations cannot finance their telecommunications developments in conventional ways. They require special financial packages, that is loan agreements, usually with delayed payment terms that provide time to get their communications systems—and their economies—on a paying basis. The price of the equipment and the interest on the loans—items we are accustomed to looking at in estimating costs—are only secondary considerations. The perceived manageability of the financial package is the overriding factor.

The Japanese government recognizes this. So do the governments of West Germany, Sweden, and other European nations where telecommunications suppliers compete aggressively with American companies for world markets.

This point brings me to my second issue: Is it in our national interest to foster international telecommunications development?

For a number of decades Arthur D. Little, Inc., has performed professional consulting, research, and development services for clients throughout the world.

Last year, our staff worked in some 49 countries on six continents. We know at first hand how fast the world is shrinking, and how the interdependence between nations increases. Like it or not, the world economy is more integrated than it once seemed. We depend on each other for resources—minerals, metals, machinery, and labor. We depend also on easy, rapid access to data about available resources and shipping capacity to move those resources. Without such data, the productivity and well-being of our people and of the economy are severely hampered. This nation's own economic health is dependent not only upon that of other nations, but also on our ability to communicate with them.

Besides the indirect economic benefits of telecommunications improvement, the production and sale of communications equipment as a major export business we may let slip away.

The United States leads the world in telecommunications technology. There is available today an incredibly rich mixture of telecommunications hardware and software options developed by U.S. industry and government agencies. Satellite technology enables us to bridge vast distances and overcome difficult environments to bring remote corners of the world in touch with urban centers. The growing fiber optics technology already has demonstrated exciting potential. These and other developments could lead to additional expansion of person-to-person



communications, business-to-business communications, communications between business and individuals, between governments and individuals, or between government agencies.

Yet U.S. suppliers operate under extreme competitive disadvantages in marketing their telecommunications products abroad. Our share of the total export market for telecommunications equipment declined from 25.6 percent in 1939 to 19.7 percent in 1974. And the decline continues.

American manufacturers, for the most part, offer lower prices than their counterparts in Europe and Japan. There is, however, no telecommunications product manufactured in the United States that industrialized countries elsewhere cannot duplicate.

European and Japanese suppliers are attacking our lead in the design and manufacture of telecommunications products. Some countries learned in and from the United States and then barred us effectively from doing business within their own spheres. Other governments are actively supporting their telecommunications industry's marketing efforts.

These governments recognize that the marketing of telecommunications differs from other export efforts. The nature of the equipment and systems is such that an initial sale almost inevitably assures large follow-on sales, so that access to the market is effectively limited for manufacturers from other countries. The marketing of telecommunications equipment abroad is unique also in that sales are nearly always made to governmental agencies and entail, in addition to the capital products, the training of native personnel, who thereby become familiar with the supplier nation's products and culture.

Let me give you some examples of the government support foreign telecommunications manufacturers get when competing for contracts. The Japanese Government prepares special loan agreements for its manufacturers to present along with their proposals to sell equipment to a developing country. In effect, the Japanese supplier walks in with both a bid and a means for paying for the equipment over a very long term. If the purchasing nation has strong potential and continues to buy Japanese goods, the interest rates are low. In some cases, the purchaser is given several years grace before any payments are expected.

A fairly common practice among western European companies is to go into developing countries and set up telephone production plants for them. The deal is quite simple. The company goes in, sets up the production lines, provides all the plans, techniques, and know-how for producing basic equipment such as telephone instruments, cables and switches, and sets up a local company. The European parent company makes an arrangement whereby it will own that company for a short period of time and gradually turn it over to the government of the developing country. For these efforts, the government agrees that all telecommunications equipment purchased in their country must be purchased through the company set up by the western European manufacturer. In addition, should any equipment be needed which is not made by the factory, the company will have the opportunity to place an order through its "founder" in the western European nation. The government of the western European nation then agrees to make annual loans to the government of the developing country on a long-term, preferred loan basis. These loans are to be used specifically for purchasing telecommunications equipment. That type of competition is very hard to beat.

Low interest rates and extended terms are

part of the export packages German, Swedish, Japanese, and even South Korean telecommunications equipment manufacturers can offer, but which American suppliers cannot. Those nations' policies look to the longer term, when the very systems and products they sell today under such favorable conditions, help generate the future cash flow to pay for themselves.

Contrast these aggressive programs with our own passive, or even antagonistic, policies and attitudes.

Not only is there no direct financial and promotional support, but our telecommunications export business also is forced to work in the face of other indirect barriers—barriers that suggest antipathy or downright antagonism toward export development. As just one example, consider our personal income tax laws. For a telecommunications engineer resident in a developing country, living conditions are not only difficult but expensive. Whether the engineer is American or from another country, his employer frequently must provide allowances to cover housing and extra costs of living, tuition for children where there are no western schools, and travel home.

Under U.S. tax laws, these essential allowances are treated as income and must be "grossed up," effectively doubled; other countries permit their citizens to treat these allowances as cost reimbursements. This makes the cost of an American engineer resident abroad substantially higher than that of comparable personnel from other competing nations. As a result, American engineers and advisors working abroad are being displaced by other nationals. The American competitive position in developing countries is being eroded because engineers and advisors tend to favor equipment and systems with which they are most familiar—which most of the time means from their native country.

It seems to me, the time has come to review long-held biases and to bring our telecommunications export policies in line with the current realities of the world market.

Every foreign sale of American high-technology or heavy-industrial systems lays the foundation for add-on business in the same or associated areas.

Every group of American technicians overseas trains a generation of foreign technicians. This is a kind of technology transfer that creates a continuing demand for more of the same systems, or their successors.

For every such sale we lose to another country, and for every American technician who does not serve as a technological ambassador, our base of foreign trade is eroded, jobs at home are wiped out, and an opportunity to impart understanding and respect for American culture is lost.

#### STATEMENT OF GLENN E. WATTS

Mr. Chairman, my name is Glenn E. Watts and I am President of the Communications Workers of America, an AFL-CIO union which represents more than 600,000 working people in collective bargaining. More than 90 per cent of CWA's membership is directly involved in our nation's telecommunications industry.

I would like to commend your initiative in holding these hearings as they reflect the Subcommittee's awareness that the global reach of communications technology is playing an increasingly vital role in our interdependent world.

As the United States embarks upon the third century of its experience as a democracy, we should take pride in the fact that such technological innovations as the telegraph, the telephone, the phonograph, the radio and television, all of which have contributed to making our planet a "global village", are the products of American ingenuity.

The late 20th century poet Ezra Pound once called artists "the antennae of the race". In a similar way, our communications media are mirrors of our national consciousness.

Mr. Chairman, I know that your special concern today is to explore the implications of international communications for American foreign policy.

The essential underpinning of an international communications policy should be a commitment to the proposition that the world should be an open marketplace in which information and ideas can be freely exchanged, unrestricted by international censorship. The only exceptions which should be countenanced apply to publications or messages advocating treason or insurrection against a government and urging the taking of a life or threatening harm against an individual.

The glaring reality of present-day international communications, however, is that the governance of the flow of ideas has become highly politicized, especially between the Western nations and the Communist orbit and between the West and the emerging countries of the Third World. Nevertheless, we must avoid the pitfall of applying a "double standard" in the exchange of information. That is, we must not champion an open communications policy for domestic consumption in the United States and simultaneously acquiesce in efforts to stifle the exchange of information in the international arena.

Moreover, because of our objection to broad-based censorship, we reject the new concept of "information sovereignty" which is now being promulgated by some Third World nations. Indeed, this idea flies directly in the face of President Carter's emphasis on human rights as the cornerstone of our foreign policy. As a general principle, the right to exchange information should be available to people throughout the world regardless of their nationality, faith or political belief.

Similarly, as communications workers and as Americans, we disagree with the charge of "cultural imperialism" leveled by the Soviet Union against the United States.

The Soviet Union voted in the affirmative when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted unanimously by the United Nations in 1948. Article 19 of that document proclaims:

"Everyone has the right of freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information through all media and regardless of frontiers."

Yet from personal experience, Mr. Chairman, I know that the Soviets make it difficult for Russian Jews to communicate freely over the telephone.

Two years ago, I placed a telephone call to Vladimir Slepak, a Jewish radio engineer who had been harassed by the KGB because he desired to leave the Soviet Union. Although I had made arrangements with Mr. Slepak well in advance to receive my telephone call, I was able to speak with him only after vigorous insistence on my part, and even then our conversation was frequently interrupted at the Soviet end of the call.

Perhaps as no other incident in recent years, that call to Mr. Slepak drove home to me that when communications are silenced, censored or threatened, the door is opened to discrimination, repression and tyranny.

Because of the kind of interference illustrated in the Slepak case, it is vital that just as we maintain a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow to deal with government-level "emergencies", we should also maintain what direct communication lines we can to the people of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, since this portion of my

testimony focuses on international communications as a fundamental human right, and because of your special commitment to civil liberties, I would like to call to your attention here today that at least 283 trade unionists in 21 countries around the world are imprisoned or have disappeared because they dared to speak out freely against the oppressive regimes in their native lands.

Among these are three brave leaders of telecommunications unions. The three imprisoned telecommunications union leaders are:

—Henry Martinez Lopez, national leader of the Federation of Telephone Workers of Cuba, who is serving a 20-year sentence.

—Mrs. Sri Widjajanti, a member of the Postal and Telecommunications Workers' Union of Indonesia, who has spent the last nine years in prison.

—And Mrs. Satijah, a 30-year-old member of the same Indonesian union, who has been in prison for the last eight years.

Mr. Chairman, because the plight of trade unionists who are imprisoned around the world has received scant attention, I ask your permission to submit as an addendum to my statement a recent study illuminating this issue, compiled by Amnesty International.

I wish to turn now from human rights to a different aspect of international communications, the rapid growth and development of new technology. This rapid expansion has important implications for American trade policy.

Specifically, I would like to alert you today and warn the Congress that the increasing flow of telecommunication imports into the United States imperils the jobs of members of the Communications Workers of America.

I wish that I could give you and the Subcommittee a detailed, statistical analysis of the amount of foreign telecommunication equipment, coming from Japan and European countries, that has entered the United States in recent years. We have tried to get information from the United States International Trade Commission on this matter, but some of it is classified as confidential, although we do not understand why this should be regarded as an official secret.

Besides the secrecy label on some of the data, the information which is available is so difficult to interpret that a crying need now exists for improved U.S. statistics on these imports. It would appear that at present neither the U.S. Government nor interested unions such as ourselves can obtain adequate statistics in sufficient detail on the scope of this importation.

A comprehensive but clear, concise system of reporting on these imports is imperative.

Moreover, we are not even sure that the International Trade Commission defines "import" properly. The Oki, Hitachi and Nippon Electric Companies of Japan have plants in the United States which assemble parts that are imported into our country. The assembled units then become "domestic production" and escape the scrutiny of the International Trade Commission on "imports". The ITC claims that 50 per cent of the worth of the products is "value added" in the assembly process in our country and that therefore these are not imports.

This strikes us as a perverse form of "new math" which postulates the unusual hypothesis that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

Mr. Chairman, the CWA feels so strongly about the need to probe the murky area of telecommunications imports that the Union may initiate a Freedom of Information lawsuit to obtain a picture of the scope of this activity.

By contrast to these foreign manufacturers, the Western Electric Company, America's largest domestic telecommunica-

tions producer, has been reluctant to enter the international telecommunications equipment market. We think Western Electric should offer its goods outside the country.

I want to emphasize that I am an internationalist, not a Hawley-Smoot protectionist. Because of this orientation, I believe that the solution to this part of the problem may be for the United States to provide for parity of treatment at the point of entry.

European nations and Japan do erect tariff and non-tariff barriers to protect their domestic industries from competition from outside sources of supply. Why shouldn't such treatment be reciprocal?

In the slack economy of recent years, we have experienced unprecedented layoffs in our industry. "Job retraining" is not the answer to the displacement of jobs of America's telecommunication workers.

Perhaps it would be in the national interest for one of the committees of the Congress to assert jurisdiction over this subject matter. At present, the taxation committees of Congress are concerned only with the revenue implications of import duties. The commerce committees are concerned with the flow of goods in the marketplace. The labor committees do not have the jurisdiction because of the international scope of this problem.

I hope that your Subcommittee will give this proposal serious consideration.

The need for a clear assignment of jurisdiction in Congress on this matter is paralleled in the Executive Branch. We do not have a specific government agency responsible for formulating American policy on international communications.

Reminiscent of the "shotgun" approach to energy policy in recent years, the management of international communications policy is divided in a crazyquilt, piecemeal manner among the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of State, the Office of Telecommunications Policy in the Executive Office of the President and the Office of Telecommunications in the Department of Commerce.

Although the FCC is not authorized under its enabling mandate, granted by Congress, to negotiate with representatives of foreign nations, its decisions with respect to the authorization of satellite and submarine cable construction and use can have a profound effect on American foreign policy.

Similarly, the State Department is charged with the responsibility for engaging in negotiations with other nations concerning a wide range of communications issues such as those arising in the World Administrative Radio Conference and the proposed international maritime satellite organization (INMARSTAD). State also instructs COMSAT on positions to be taken in INTELSAT meetings as the result of a delegation of authority granted by the Congress under Section 201(a)(4) of the Communications Satellite Act.

The State Department is placed in a regulatory straightjacket, however, when it comes to authority over international carriers of telecommunication facilities.

Moreover, on Pennsylvania Avenue nearly equidistant from the State Department and the FCC, the Office of Telecommunications Policy located in the Executive Office of the President was given the responsibility under Executive Order 11556 for coordinating interdepartmental activities in the area of international communications. OTP, however, unlike the FCC or the State Department, is simply serving as a "traffic cop", lacking any authority to negotiate on its own on behalf of the United States.

We need to take a serious look at ways of establishing a coordinated approach on the part of the various entities involved in overseeing international communications policy.

Mr. Chairman, as a final thought, I believe

we should never forget that a strong relationship exists between a nation's value structure and the way it perceives the uses of communications technology. For as the technological extension of man, communications media can serve as a conveyor belt of tremendous evil as well as a transmission system for the public welfare.

During the Nuremberg Trials following World War II, former Nazi Armaments Minister Albert Speer spoke on how the Hitler government had effectively employed the nation's communications media to shape life in Germany. Said Speer:

"The telephone, the teleprinter and the wireless made it possible for orders from the highest levels to be given directly to the lowest levels where, on account of the absolute authority behind them, they were carried out uncritically."

As we leave our bicentennial era, we are also approaching the year 1984. Whether the world arrives seven years from now at the doorstep of the Orwellian nightmare or emerges into the light of a genuinely free international order may, in part, depend on our adherence to free and open international communications as a means of frustrating that dark dream of tomorrow.

#### STATEMENT OF ROBERT B. WHITE

My name is Robert B. White. I am an executive vice president of Citibank, N.A. in charge of the services management group. Citibank is an international financial services company with more than 200 branches overseas. The group I manage provides cash management, funds transfer, and securities processing services for Citibank's corporate customers—including all overseas transactions that come through New York. It manages the institution's administrative, management information and accounting services, and plans and develops the communications systems that link our offices and branches throughout the world.

I am pleased to appear before this subcommittee, and I hope my testimony will be of help to you in establishing your priorities for further research and discussion.

This morning I would like to give you some idea why the development of communications technology and the free flow of information across national borders are important to Citibank and other financial institutions engaged in international business. I will describe the conditions which would be most conducive to the fast and reliable transmission of financial instructions and data throughout the world, and raise a few issues that are of concern to financial institutions.

There is no easy way to describe to you the magnitude of the money transactions that banks transmit around the world every day. Perhaps it is sufficient to say that we are living in an increasingly interdependent world, and the growth in international trades testifies to that. Global exports in 1976 were \$980 billion, which is 12.6% higher than the year before. A large part of that total was financed through trade credits arranged by banks, and all of it triggered some kind of international financial transaction which depended on the world's communication media.

The essential role of banking in the world economy is to help individuals, businesses and governments obtain credit and move funds in support of worldwide trade and commerce. In addition to lending the money that is required to expand economic activity throughout the world, Citibank and other banks provide a variety of transaction services. One of them is:

International money transfer—the transfer of funds from an account in one country to an account in another country, or the movement of foreign-owned funds within a country.



Other services include:  
Foreign exchange transactions;  
Letters of credit—which banks provide to assure exporters that the importers' credit is good;

And international collections services—in which we help overseas parties collect funds on drafts, notes or checks drawn on U.S. banks, or help U.S. customers collect funds from a foreign bank.

Today, Citibank provides these and other services in over 100 countries. Our operations have taken on a geographic dimension that was not present a couple of decades ago, when foreign trade was just a fraction of what it is today.

Today's high transaction volumes and geographic spread have introduced communication problems that demand sophisticated technological solutions. Not too long ago, our international business was transacted mainly by mail—with some use of telegraphic services to initiate funds transfers.

But the complexity of international business today places a premium on speed and accuracy. Exchange rates and commodity prices fluctuate rapidly. Competitive bids are made for short supplies. Our customers often need credits or transfers completed and advice issued in a matter of hours, not days.

Consider a representative transaction. A South American company bids on a contract to purchase Middle East oil. They ask a U.S.-based international bank to issue a performance guarantee on their behalf, assuring the availability of the funds. The entire transaction, from the South American company's initial request to the delivery of the guarantee in the Middle East, might have to occur in less than a day's time.

This is why we are primarily dependent on electronic media for international communication, both in providing services to our customers and in administrative communication between our branches. Today, we are using automated systems that rely on cable, telex, and telephone networks. Without them, the timely and accurate execution of our business transactions would be difficult.

Banks needing to communicate between countries depend on various international common carriers for their telephone, cable, and telex services. These include ROA, ITT, and the British firm, Cable and Wireless, Ltd., among others.

For communications within countries, of course, banks rely on the communication companies and the postal, telephone and telegraph administrations within each country.

However, not every country possesses the financial and technical resources to establish the modern telecommunications facilities that are available in the industrialized nations. Internationally, there is wide variation in the nature and availability of communication facilities.

To make sure we could provide fast, uniform, and dependable service to customers around the world, we leased lines to form a private, automated global communication network. We refer to it as Globecom.

Globecom has four switching points tying the system together. The main switching center is in New York, through which most of the East-West traffic passes. In addition, lines radiate from New York to key cities in Latin America and Africa, as well as to major U.S. locations. The other switches are in London, for our European locations; in Manama, Bahrain, for the Middle East; and in Hong Kong, for the far east.

The backbone of Globecom is a series of leased circuits (including satellite transmission) that circles the Earth, and carries telephone as well as cable and teletype communications.

The lines interconnect about 80 of our overseas branches in some 65 countries. We use the leased lines for telegraphic transmissions, in support of the services I mentioned earlier. About 20 of the 80 overseas branches

on the network are interconnected by private telephone lines, in addition to the telegraphic capabilities.

Today, Globecom handles about 325,000 transmissions per month. We estimate that 90 percent of our telegraphic traffic and 63 percent of our telephone traffic flows entirely or partly over the system. An advantage of the system, in addition to improving speed and accuracy of customer service, is the relatively constant cost of leasing lines versus paying a per-transmission charge. We plan to reduce our international communication costs and stabilize them.

Citibank is also planning to link to another privately leased international network known as Swift. Swift stands for the society for worldwide interbank financial telecommunications. Its members include about 500 European, Canadian, and U.S. banks in 15 countries.

Briefly, Swift was conceived in 1971 by a consortium of 68 banks from North America and Europe. These banks commissioned a study to explore the feasibility of establishing a private communications network for the transmission of international payments and related messages. The study concluded that such a network was both technically and economically feasible, and the consortium gave the go-ahead for implementation. Swift was thus organized to implement and operate the system on behalf of its membership.

Swift was established as a "not-for-profit" cooperative society under Belgian law in April, 1973, and is wholly owned by the member banks. Shares are distributed according to each bank's anticipated use of the system, but each member bank owns at least one share. Citibank is a charter member of Swift. Swift is a message-switching system with two computer centers—one in Amsterdam and one in Brussels. The system offers a general improvement in convenience and reliability over Telex and mail. It is expected that cost reductions in handling and processing messages will result from standardization and resource sharing.

These background comments have described our participation in international communications.

Now I'd like to briefly mention a few points that we believe are important to effective international communication. First, it would be helpful if the countries of the world would review their policies, laws, regulations, and proposals to eliminate inconsistencies. In particular, we would not like to see requirements by one nation that would make it impossible to comply with those of another nation, and make it difficult for banks to serve their customers anywhere in the world.

Second, we would like to see regulation generally kept to the necessary minimum. As you know, excessive regulation can be a costly business for governments and businesses alike, and it should be focused on the really critical issues.

Third, we believe that international communications will develop best in an environment that encourages the rapid development and adoption of new technology.

There are three specific areas which concern us, where the need for consistent, minimum regulation and new technological development come into play: Communication equipment, communication tariffs, and the privacy of the information being communicated.

When we set up our global communications network at Citibank, we discovered considerable differences from one country to another in the kinds of equipment that are approved for local use, and the transmission speed capabilities of local lines. We have had to use equipment overseas that is incompatible with equipment we use here. The result is nearly always additional cost—and occasionally some technical difficulty—

in adapting our systems to complete the overseas link.

The differences in equipment standards between countries today are perfectly understandable. Very few countries have the wide technical choices that are available in the U.S., and few can permit unrestricted technological competition from abroad without endangering their own developing industries. Thus, we have adjusted to these differences, and we will continue to do so.

Nevertheless, we would encourage any international efforts that would eliminate barriers and increase flexibility in selecting telecommunications equipment and transmission technologies. We would like to see agreement on compatible equipment standards, and reciprocal certification among those countries that adopt compatible standards. That would cut down on the long lead times that are sometimes required today for equipment approval by local communications authorities.

I hasten to add that when I say compatible standards, I do not mean standardization. Standardization, because it implies complex and detailed technical conformance, tends to freeze technology in place and discourages further innovation. Rather, what we suggest is the minimum level of equipment quality and systems interface that will allow reliable and cost-efficient international communication.

The question of tariffs imposed on communication services centers on whether actual operating costs, or national policy or other considerations, are the basis for charges levied. For example, one of the intended advantages of Swift is the reduced and stable cost of leasing a shared private line. However, new tariff regulations have been agreed upon by various European communications authorities that would subject shared systems to cost schedules based not on the cost of the line, but on a volume-sensitive per-message basis. These regulations may adversely affect the projected economies of the Swift network.

We are in favor of allowing the ability to maintain leased-line, private-circuit networks. And we are concerned that possible moves to price all traffic on a per-message basis may discourage the development of these networks.

Our final point involves the question of who controls all the data that is being transmitted. Who has access—and who should have access—to the information that customers have entrusted to financial service institutions?

One of the keys to the viability of any financial service institution is its willingness to meet the expectation of its customers—individual, corporate and governmental—that the confidentiality of their affairs will be maintained. Confidentiality is a cornerstone of banking throughout the world, and Citibank's internal policy for all of its 165 years has given clear protection to our customers' inherent right to privacy. It is, and will continue to be, Citibank's policy to hold the affairs of its clients in strictest confidence, and not to release information except with the consent of the customer or pursuant to valid legal process.

I might add that in some countries, the policy is mandated by law. Accordingly, we are concerned that any access to the flow of financial information may compromise a bank's ability to adhere to its own privacy policy and to privacy law—in other parts of the world.

There are a couple of practical issues, however, that stem from various countries' legislative efforts to ensure confidentiality. Laws that demand confidentiality are in the public interest. The difficulty with such laws arises when different jurisdictions do more than establish policy, but also dictate operating standards and procedures. Several coun-

tries in the world have already passed, or are in the process of passing legislation to ensure confidentiality.

From the viewpoint of an international organization like Citibank it may be unavoidable that we will be subject to conflicting requirements in our international operations because of differences in the laws of those countries in which we do business.

Some countries, for example, may shortly require full-line encryption of all transactions not only within their borders, but originating within their country and going outside—or coming from outside the country to an account within the country. The country on the other end of the transaction, however, may insist that there be no coding of messages. Obviously, it is difficult to satisfy the laws of both jurisdictions. We hope that any policy the federal government adopts in international communications will encourage the minimization or elimination of conflicting privacy requirements.

I think we can all agree that unimpeded international communication is essential to world trade and economic development. The nations of the world, large and small, developed or emerging, are becoming more economically interdependent every day. Financial service institutions have become heavily involved in cooperative international development, and advancements in communications technology have helped them move financial resources when and where they are needed.

I would like to conclude my comments by stating the principles that guide Citibank's business dealings in the international market:

We must never lose sight of the fact that we are guests in foreign countries. We must conduct ourselves accordingly. We recognize the rights of governments to pass local legislation, and our obligation to conform.

Under these circumstances, we also recognize that we can survive only if we are successful in demonstrating to the local authorities that our presence is beneficial.

We believe that every country must find its own way politically and economically. Sometimes we feel that local policies are wise; sometimes we do not. However, irrespective of our views, we try to function as best we can under prevailing conditions.

Finally, we have always felt free to discuss with local governments matters directly affecting our interests, but we recognize that they have final regulatory authority.

Within these guidelines, we will do all we can to encourage international agreements that will facilitate the development of effective communication throughout the world.

I thank you for inviting me here to participate in these important discussions.

#### INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

(By Stanley Gewirtz)

The perception of the U.S. international air transport system as a national communications asset provides several interesting observations:

- (1) An insight into the complexity and function of an international route structure.
- (2) An appreciation of the commercial, culture and political interchange of a worldwide transportation system.
- (3) A realization of the way foreign nations view U.S. commercial enterprise.
- (4) A recognition of the vulnerability of private enterprise as the flag transport system operator.
- (5) A new awareness of the need for a revitalized national air transport policy with a focus on priorities and objectives.

A route structure 50 years old—at least in origins—is a rare vintage asset. The U.S. scheduled flag structure's lines cross virtually every continent in the world, except Antarctica and Greenland for the moment. Pan

Am is a true multi-national corporation and it provides some unique opportunities for commercial and cultural interchange. The obvious travel product moves goods and people in a constant flow virtually the world round. But the corporate system that produces this transportation miracle is itself a major communications asset. I'm not speaking of the thousands of miles of communications lines, the world-wide net that was the backbone of the U.S. military effort in World War II. Nor do I refer to the international investment colossus that spawned the Pan Am system. The house that Juan Trippe built is well enough known by now.

Every day 6,000 foreign nationals, more than 20% of our total workforce, go to work in their own homelands. As full fledged employees of a private corporation, we are employing on local payrolls people in the Soviet Union, Poland, South Africa and Kenya, in Hong Kong, Djakarta, Sydney and Soho. They train and travel in each others' countries as well as the U.S. They speak each others languages, as well as English; their identity with the Company is well established and their loyalty and performance during the financial crisis of the past few years has welded even firmer bonds across frontiers, oceans, races and ideologies.

The system links Black Africa with its antagonists in white South Africa—a tremendous link albeit, but the produce and manufactures of Cape Town and Pretoria can be bought in the shops of Kinshasa, Abidjan and Nairobi. We link the black cities of French speaking West Africa with the former English colonies in the East and we have given technical assistance—at one time or another—to new-born flag carriers in Guinea, Liberia and Zaire.

The "North-South" dialogue began at Pan Am in 1927 and that was the axis upon which the Company's commercial success was first made. Latin America, like Africa, remains a key element in the flag system.

"East-West" links from Moscow, Prague, Budapest, Bucharest and Belgrade have placed non-subsidized U.S. private enterprise behind the Iron Curtain. The Internal German Service links occupied Berlin with the other capitals of Europe as well as West Germany.

Yet through the system U.S. carriers compete against subsidized and protected foreign carriers. There is precious little in the way of overt U.S. government support. Abusive user charges for airways and airports, schedule restrictions, arbitrary capacity limitations and unscrupulous rebate practices are daily events. The Fair Competitive Practices Act was passed in 1974 to counter these unfair competitive disadvantages but the act is woefully lacking in enforcement procedures. Our defense in extreme cases where traffic is already thin is *suspension* and that is tantamount to the failure of the system. Subsidy is the last resort but, were it available, it is still not the answer. The burden of routes with commercial potential not fully matured is a routine business overhead, assuming a financially healthy carrier in a fair competitive environment. The proper scenario—in the manner of Arthur D. Little—features independent private enterprise supported by an enlightened U.S. international aviation administration whose sole function is to police the process. The carriers are obliged to provide safe, dependable, convenient air transport at a fair price with reasonable expectations that the calculated risk of their investment will yield sufficient traffic to provide a reasonable rate of return.

There is a U.S. International Transport Policy which needs further definition. Its basic ingredients are:

- (1) Recognition of the basic differences between domestic and international air transport. The need for increased domestic

competition cannot be translated to the international arena where something akin to economic warfare between flags often flourishes.

(2) Optimum utilization of the scheduled system and the wide body technology. The arbitrary distinctions between service classes and certificate authorities frustrate the demand for operational economies. Charter transfer and domestic fill-up rights will utilize unused capacity.

(3) Enforcement of fair competitive standards by reciprocal action, if necessary.

#### SUMMARY

A strong U.S. flag system is a major element in the U.S. communications link to the world.

Tourism, trade, business travel and investment are only the more obvious products.

Jobs, export of U.S. business and management techniques, the interchange of employees in a common U.S. company and significant U.S. investment are communication instruments themselves.

The presence of Americans and American business institutions abroad constitute a major line of communications.

The U.S. international route structure is a major national asset even though it was built and is operated by private corporations. Timely action is necessary to preserve its integrity unless we are to lose all but the commercial value of the most lucrative routes.

Pan Am considers Senator McGovern's call for a comprehensive international communications policy to include the air transport network. We can do no better than to echo his question: "Must there be an international crisis to get the U.S. to act on information resources?" That crisis is looming now as the U.K. denunciation of the original Bermuda air service agreement reflects the weakened position of the flag system that built international air service.

#### CONCERNING SOVIET INCORPORATION OF BALTIC STATES

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, the month of June marks the anniversary of two tragic events for the states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. During a 3-day period in 1940—specifically on June 15, 16, and 17—the Soviet Union invaded these three Baltic Republics and forcibly annexed them into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. One year later, again in June, the Soviet regime began the first mass deportation of the Baltic peoples to Siberia.

#### SOVIET INCORPORATION NOT RECOGNIZED

The United States has remained steadfast in its refusal to recognize the Soviet incorporation of the Baltic States, a position which was reaffirmed by the U.S. Senate as recently as 1976 when Senate Resolution 319 was unanimously passed by this legislative body.

#### SOVIET VIOLATIONS

Today, however, as the U.S. delegation at Belgrade sits at the conference table with the signatory nations of the Helsinki Final Act, it is important that we remember these infamous acts of aggression and inform the Soviet Union that their actions, both past and present, are the only criteria upon which they shall be judged. Our delegation should not be fooled by rhetoric.

We must remind the Soviet Union of the plight of the Baltic States and the exploitation, Russification, and suppression of human rights and national freedoms which the people of Estonia, Latvia,



and Lithuania have had to endure. We must not forget that in committing these acts, the Soviets have violated not only the humanitarian principles contained in the Helsinki Final Act, but other international agreements which they have signed including the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

#### A COURAGEOUS PEOPLE

We share with the Baltic people their passion for liberty. Who among us cannot sympathize with those who, against overwhelming odds, have courageously maintained their ethno-national integrity. Even after 40 years of ruthless domination, the citizens of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania still strive for independence and a release from the Soviet yoke. Their just aspirations will never die. They will pass them on to their children, and, if necessary, to their grandchildren, until someday they too will celebrate their freedom.

Let us pray that their day of deliverance comes soon.

#### LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT REGARDING BELGRADE CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on June 13, I, along with 40 of my colleagues in the Senate and 53 Members of the House of Representatives, wrote to President Carter to express our support for the administration's efforts to raise the subject of human rights in the Soviet Union at the current Belgrade Conference. We urged the administration to do everything possible to insure that all signatories to the Helsinki Final Act abide by its provisions, and we expressed particular concern over the increased intimidation of Andrei Sakharov and over the cases of Anatoly Scharansky, Yuri Orlov, Aleksandr Ginzburg, Oleska Tykhy, Mikola Rudenko, and other Soviet dissidents who have come under increasing pressures in the U.S.S.R. because of their attempts to monitor Soviet compliance with the Helsinki agreement.

I would like to note for the record that Senators DICK CLARK, MIKE GRAVEL, MARK HATFIELD, and TED STEVENS wished to sign the letter. Unfortunately, when their notification was received in my office, the letter had already been delivered to the President.

#### S. 790—THE ENERGY ISSUE

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, during discussion of S. 790, the Senate may hear considerable talk on the relation between waterway user charges and energy use. It may be argued—inaccurately—that user charges are against the national interests because they "penalize" the most fuel efficient mode of transportation.

In its recent examination of this question, the Congressional Budget Office concluded:

In the eleven reports surveyed by CBO, estimates of energy use for domestic water transportation generally fell in the range

of 500 to 700 BTUs per ton-mile, while the usual range for rail freight was 300 to 700 BTUs and 400-500 for oil pipelines.

The Committee on Environment and Public Works received considerable testimony that movements of commodities by rail and pipeline is more energy efficient than barge service. Therefore, if the sole interest of the Congress is to promote energy efficient transportation, it appears as if we should close the waterways entirely. That, of course, is not the purpose of S. 790. Its purpose is to be evenhanded, to encourage balanced competitive growth in the transportation industry.

In a study entitled "Energy Intensity of Barge and Rail Freight Hauling," the Center for Advanced Computation at the University of Illinois found that "rail is 10 to 23 percent less energy intensive than barge." This was based on average train movements involving a few carloads, not necessarily moving in the most direct route. Another study showed that in shipments by a unit train of 100 cars, moving from a single point of origin to a single destination, require 226 Btu's per ton-mile, about twice as fuel efficient as any truck-barge shipment. These studies may not be definitive, but I believe they cast legitimate doubt on any argument on the so-called energy efficiency of barge traffic.

A final point that must be made in relation to all of these studies is the error of making any "ton-mile" comparison. That is a highly unrealistic basis for a review of this issue. Rivers meander. A barge trip between two points, even when the terminals lie along the same river, is invariably far longer in miles than the rail trip between those same points. Differences are far greater for cities located on different waterways, such as from Cincinnati to Chicago.

To give my colleagues an idea of some of these differences that must be taken into consideration when talking we talk of "ton-miles", I ask unanimous consent that a list of several typical river trips, with the rail and barge miles, be included at this point in the RECORD.

Trip	Barge miles	Rail miles
New Orleans to Baton Rouge	140	77
New Orleans to Mobile.....	166	101
Houston to Pittsburgh.....	2,104	1,425
Houston to Chicago.....	1,709	1,205
Baton Rouge to Birmingham	639	355
Chicago to St. Louis.....	327	284

#### PONDERING THE HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it is difficult to challenge the notion that the United States should champion the cause of human rights both at home and abroad. But to undertake such a challenge places a very heavy burden on us to honor human rights consistently and in good faith.

We certainly failed to recognize even the most basic human rights in our long, brutal, and bloody involvement in the affairs of the Indochinese people. We

did not recognize human rights when our secret intelligence operatives were trying to assassinate the leaders of Cuba. We have not advanced human rights when we have given military equipment and training to some of the most brutal regimes in the world.

Beyond these considerations which call for a measure of humility in our efforts to press human rights considerations on other governments, we need to act with prudence in recognizing that we are limited in the extent to which we can determine internal policies in other countries. Heavy-handed, highly publicized, politically motivated efforts in the name of human rights can actually set back the cause of human rights.

Mr. David Broder, the thoughtful columnist and commentator, has dealt with some of these concerns in a perceptive article in the Washington Post of June 15, 1977. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Broder's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### PUSHING HUMAN RIGHTS: TO WHAT CONSEQUENCE?

(By David S. Broder)

According to Andrew Young, "the commitment and determination President Carter feels" on the human-rights issue "came as quite a surprise to me." The U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, who is full of surprises himself, makes plain in his Playboy interview that he approves of Carter's making human rights the centerpiece of American foreign policy. But he insists that "the human-rights emphasis by this administration was never really set down, thought out and planned."

If that is so—and there is no reason to doubt it—then such a process is overdue. For, as this week's discussions at the Belgrade conference indicate, the evidence is all too clear that the Soviets have responded to the human-rights offensive by a severe crackdown on their own dissidents.

While American spokesmen are rightly arraigning the Communists for their actions, we cannot escape the duty to ask ourselves whether our government is prudent to treat this issue as it has.

A round table on this subject last week, sponsored here by the National Democratic Forum, suggested to this reporter that the answer is by no means as clear as the administration would make it seem.

Patt Derian, the admirable Mississippi civil-rights activist who has become coordinator for human rights in the State Department, insisted that the United States is obligated by its moral code, by international agreement and by act of Congress to seek worldwide observation of human rights and "we are not going to back down on it." With her customary forcefulness, she argued that the Soviet dissidents "don't expect an army to come, but they need to hear an echo from somewhere" to sustain their own courage.

Derian was supported by Norman Podhoretz, editor of Commentary magazine. He described the human-rights offensive, not just as a humanitarian response to the plight of Soviet dissidents, but as a major weapon in what he called "an ideological confrontation" with the Communists.

By describing it in those terms, Podhoretz illuminated one of the paradoxes in Carter's position. While the editor clearly sees human rights as "a weapon" against the Soviets, Carter himself has publicly proclaimed the

end of reflexive "cold war" anti-communism and has promised a new foreign policy with a different premise. If Podhoretz is right, then Carter may be guilty of reviving the very thing he has sought to bury.

Morton H. Halperin, the former National Security Council staff member wretapped by the Nixon White House, jumped on this paradox. He declared that "to say we'll press human-rights issues is to declare ideological war on their regime, and to my mind, that means much more repression in the Soviet Union, not much less."

The reason why that may be the case was explained by Jerry Hough, a Duke University scholar on Soviet affairs. His views, I think, are worth considering.

First, he said, there is no question that the United States has the right to champion the cause of the Soviet dissidents.

Russia propagandizes in behalf of American Communists and radicals all the time. And its "whining" about our support for the Soviet dissidents "is very unbecoming for a great power," Hough said.

What we must ask, Hough said, is whether it is wise for us to emulate the Soviets. The Russians champion American dissidents and publicize their supposed "oppression," not in the naive hope of bringing them to power in the United States, "but simply for reasons of internal propaganda... to convince their people there is no better alternative to the present system [in Russia]."

"It may be," Hough said, "that our policies are to be understood in the same terms," i.e., as domestic propaganda aimed at "making the American people feel good about their government," and "developing support" for the Carter administration. That rationale is understandable, he said, but not particularly moral.

But, he said, "if, unlike the Soviets," we really want to influence developments in their country, "perhaps we should not emulate the policy the Soviets pursue for other purposes."

Hough said there are two reasons to believe Carter's spotlighted human-rights offensive will be counterproductive, in terms of its effect on Soviet behavior.

First, he said, "we should consider the probability that the more closely the Soviet dissidents and the cause of democratization become identified with the United States, the more effectively the Soviet Union will be able to treat these causes as alien, even treasonable, elements." Of course, just that has happened in the case of Anatoly Scharsansky and others.

Second, he said, because the Soviets are likely to perceive the human-rights offensive, not as an expression of America's moral values, but as a power move designed to stir up trouble inside their empire, it is likely to provoke a highly nationalistic and negative response.

His conclusion, worth pondering, was this: If the goal is increased freedom and democracy inside the Soviet bloc, "the crucial thing for the long term is the diffusion of ideological conflict, not ideological war. If we are talking about defense of human rights, we are not playing ego games. We must ask: What are the responsible consequences of our actions?"

#### S. 1276—TAX STATUS OF POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT

Mr. HEINZ, Mr. President, in April of this year, I introduced S. 1276 to provide for a deduction of qualified pollution control expenditures in place of the current 5-year amortization provisions in the Internal Revenue Code.

The cost of pollution control, worthwhile though it is, is extremely high.

One current survey estimates that the total cost of bringing all of U.S. businesses' existing facilities up to present pollution control standards is \$29.2 billion. Unfortunately, this kind of investment is not "productive" in the traditional sense of investment that increases productive capacity, reduces product cost, or otherwise contributes to the economic growth of the company making the expenditure. The 1976 annual report of the Council on Environmental Quality notes that the industries most severely impacted by pollution control requirements tend to be capital intensive, energy intensive, basic industries which have been hard hit by increases in energy costs, and high interest rates. The same study also notes that within an industry, smaller firms are the hardest hit since their average abatement cost is higher than that for larger firms due in part to their inability to achieve economies of scale.

The purpose of S. 1276 is to provide an incentive to install needed pollution control equipment while at the same time ensuring that these kinds of expenditures will not result in disruption to our economic recovery and growth.

I noted with great interest the fact that the Carter administration is looking into a proposal which is very similar to S. 1276. An article which appeared in the June 16, 1977 Washington Star states that a measure to provide for same year expensing of investments in pollution control equipment is under "serious consideration" by the administration. I am most pleased to learn that this is the case, since this is a measure which I believe has great merit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### LARGE TAX BREAK EYED FOR BUSINESS

(By Lee M. Cohn)

The Carter administration is considering a big new tax break to help business pay for antipollution equipment and other investments required by federal laws.

When the government compels a company to spend money for such "nonproductive" purposes, perhaps the company should be allowed to write off the outlays against taxable profits immediately, two key officials said yesterday.

Bert Lance, director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Laurence N. Woodworth, assistant secretary of the Treasury for tax policy, told the Senate Finance Committee's subcommittee on taxation that the idea is being studied seriously in connection with the administration's preparation of a tax reform program. They avoided any commitment on this and other tax issues.

When a company builds a new plant or buys new machinery and equipment, it normally is not allowed to deduct the costs from taxable earnings right away. Instead, it must spread the deductions over a number of years supposedly related to the useful life of the plant, machinery and equipment. This is called depreciation.

By contrast, purchases of goods that are used up quickly, such as fuel, are "expensed"—deducted from income in the year of the outlay.

Existing law permits rapid depreciation or amortization of some kinds of investments, generally as an incentive. For example, outlays for antipollution equipment in many cases can be written off in five years.

Fast writeoffs defer taxes and often reduce taxes permanently.

Woodworth and Lance were asked at yesterday's hearing whether it would make sense to permit faster depreciation or even same-year expensing of investments "mandated" by the government, such as antipollution and safety equipment. They said the idea is under serious consideration.

This kind of investment is "nonproductive," in the sense that antipollution equipment does not increase the output of a factory or reduce production costs, Lance said. Furthermore, he said, these investments cut into the pool of capital available to expand and modernize plants.

Fast depreciation or immediate expensing would reduce the net cost of the outlays, and would help to offset the drain on capital by allowing companies to retain more after-tax cash for productive investment.

Emil Sunley, Woodworth's deputy, estimated that immediate expensing of capital outlays mandated by the federal government might cut business taxes by \$2 billion to \$5 billion in the first year.

Woodworth listed some of the other tax incentives for business investment that are being considered by the administration, but he did not indicate which ones President Carter may recommend. No decisions have been made, he and Lance emphasized.

#### VERMONT'S "TOOTH FAIRY"

Mr. LEAHY, Mr. President, with health care costs rising at an almost geometric rate, it is always heartening to see innovative delivery programs develop and flourish that do not require massive amounts of money but do reach out to large numbers of people.

Vermont's "Tooth Fairy" program is such a success story. The project was designed to improve the oral health of Vermont's schoolchildren, only 50 percent of whom had seen a dentist by their 15th birthday. Thanks to the passage of comprehensive children's dental health legislation to fund the program, the State now helps to pay the dental bills of even nonwelfare children who need financial help. Onsite visits by dental hygienists to schools and day clinics are gradually helping to overcome psychological and other obstacles to good dental care.

The State can point to this program with pride as an outstanding example of what private citizens, State government, government agencies, health care professionals, and private organizations think we in the Federal Government can learn from their example.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from Dental Products Report describing this innovative program be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### PREVENTIVE DENTISTRY TODAY

VERMONT—A STATE TO LOOK TO FOR BETTER DENTAL CARE

If you still think of Vermont as a bastion of rock-ribbed conservatism and Yankee resistance to change, it's time to revise that image. For Vermont has forged far ahead of any other state in the nation and is offer-



ing a dental care program that reaches out to all its children.

Dubbed the "Tooth Fairy" program, this progressive and intelligently planned project was designed with one thought in mind—to improve the oral health of Vermont's youngsters. According to studies done in the early 1970's, only 50 percent of Vermont's school children had seen a dentist by their 15th birthday. Ignorance, apathy, fear, and financial strain—bugaboos all dentists are familiar with—had to be attacked, one by one, before the situation could improve.

First, the most tangible barrier to good dental care—financial hardship—was met head on by the passage of comprehensive children's dental health legislation funding the Tooth Fairy program: the state now helps to pay the dental bills of even non-welfare children who need financial assistance. Other obstacles to dental treatment also are gradually being overcome as hygienists go into every school to screen children needing treatment, teach basic dental routines, and dispel fear and apathy. They also visit day-clinics, where contact with children and their families is being established.

#### *Tooth Fairy—a cooperative venture*

This progressive program, of course, did not develop overnight, nor singlehandedly. The Tooth Fairy program is a too-rare instance of private citizens, government agencies, state government, professionals, and private organizations meshing their expertise for the common good. Perhaps the most "magical" feature of this almost fairy-tale enterprise is that there's an on-going happy ending for all concerned.

The program's beginnings date back to 1968 when Dr. John Long became Dental Division Director of the Vermont State Health Department. He admits he was "appalled" at the number and the severity of unmet dental needs among Vermont's child population. Immediately he began collecting, collating, and publishing data to bring the problem to the attention of the communities and the government. He found that 40 percent of the school children urgently needed dental care, and that 50 percent had some form of periodontal disease. "All this was discovered by just a visual screening," Dr. Long explained, "without x-rays or thorough examinations."

Jay Breines, then a Health Affairs Specialist with the Vermont Public Interest Research Group, elaborated: "Vermont has a low per-capita income, and the expense involved in dental care is a major impediment to those seeking treatment. Many 'low-middle' income families had come to think of a visit to the dentist as a luxury."

#### *From 1968 study to 1974 action*

Building on Dr. Long's information, Breines was able to document the urgent need for a statewide dental program—and the stage was set for implementation by the Vermont Public Interest Research Group. This student-funded organization originally formed as a result of a talk Ralph Nader gave in 1969 at the University of Vermont. The Group adopted the Long/Breines studies as a basis for action and presented a fully-developed plan to the State Legislature. Brian Burns, then a member of the State House of Representatives and later Lieutenant-Governor, enthusiastically endorsed the proposals. With his support, The Children's Comprehensive Dental Health Program, authored by Breines, was passed in late 1973, and on January 1, 1974, the Tooth Fairy came into being.

Under the bill's provisions, eligibility for the program was established on a realistic sliding scale, as was state funding. Children of families with an annual adjusted income of under \$8,750 are eligible, with a \$750 deduction for each dependent. Thus, a family of four with an income of approximately

\$10,000 could receive help from the Tooth Fairy—and about 60 percent of their children's dental bills would be paid by the state.

At Dr. Long's request, funding also was provided for a school dental hygiene and referral program, and he was able to double his staff to its present number of eight registered hygienists.

#### *'Red tape' is bypassed and dentists support the program*

One of the Tooth Fairy program's most enlightened features is its method of outreach. Bypassing the bureaucratic maze of Medicaid, Vermont residents are simply mailed an application for eligibility along with their State Income Tax Form, thus insuring a uniformly wide distribution.

Such a lack of red tape characterizes the program in all its workings. In spite of "set fee" and "prior approval" requirements, the Tooth Fairy program has the enthusiastic support of more than 95 percent of the state's dentists. Indeed, as the architects of the program planned, the Tooth Fairy has "acted as a magnet" to draw more and more dentists to Vermont. In the six years since 1970, 141 additional practitioners have been licensed in Vermont; during pre-Tooth Fairy years 1950-1970, an average of only 10 new dentists per year opened a practice in the state.

The program has brought other "ripple effect" benefits to dental care in Vermont. Thanks to the new financial stability provided by the Tooth Fairy's funding, a privately sponsored, non-profit Vermont Dental Care Program has been able to expand and open dental clinics in the more remote areas. The two programs complement one another as Vermont Dental Care, for example, trains "outreach" personnel to carry the Tooth Fairy in-school program directly into the home. In rural and isolated areas, this "whole family" approach has proved particularly valuable.

Medicaid utilization also has increased, and Breines attributes this in part to news media coverage of the Tooth Fairy program, which has resulted in a heightened awareness of dental needs. It is easier now for low-income families to accept Medicaid, knowing that middle-income families are enrolling their children in the Tooth Fairy program," he added.

#### *The goal—reach all under 18*

Today, with both Federal and private dental programs blossoming, with dental education reaching every school and many homes, and with treatment being made available to a whole new population—the children of the "working poor"—the Tooth Fairy might well feel satisfied, and willing to "freeze" the situation. But such is not the case.

Originally, the Tooth Fairy visited kindergartners through sixth graders, but the program has been enlarged yearly. Now aid is available to youngsters from birth through the ninth grade. "And eventually we hope to reach everyone under 18," states the indefatigable Dr. Long.

This projected increase in coverage will be yet another example of the program's highly visible success. Since the Tooth Fairy's arrival in 1974, there has been a 44 percent decrease in children's unmet dental needs. Referrals from schools have been cut in half, and the percentage of treated teeth has increased by 52 percent. In 1975 alone, 300 cases of malocclusion were treated, and currently 20,000 children are enrolled in the program. In addition, under Dr. Long's direction, more than half of Vermont's population now enjoys the benefits of fluoridated water.

As each year passes more and more children are enjoying the many blessings of this "tooth fairy godmother." Who can say that hard work, thoughtful planning and idealism are not the "secret ingredients" of

magic and wonder-working?—Jeanne Carr, Staff Writer

#### **BISHOP JOHN NEUMANN—AMERICA'S FIRST MALE SAINT**

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Bishop John Nepomucene Neumann, the first male saint from the United States, will be canonized by Pope Paul this Sunday. His parishioners called him "the little priest." He stood only 5 feet, 4 inches tall. He was a shy immigrant from Bohemia, but his quiet accomplishments made him a giant of a man.

Father Neumann went on to become the fourth bishop of Philadelphia. He was a tireless man who traveled by buckboard throughout his vast diocese. He was, most of all, a true friend of the poor and the sick.

Mr. President, an article in yesterday's Catholic Standard outlines the extraordinary life and achievements of Bishop Neumann for the working people of this Nation. I would like to bring this article to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Catholic Standard, June 16, 1977]

#### **FIRST U.S. MALE SAINT: A MISSIONARY AND BISHOP**

(By Fr. James J. Galvin, C.S.S.R.)

(On Sunday Pope Paul will canonize the United States' first male saint, Bishop John Neumann. The following article highlights one aspect of the life of this remarkable man who began his priestly service as a missionary and went on to become—reluctantly—the fourth Bishop of Philadelphia.)

On a windy January afternoon in 1860 a man slumped to his knees on residential Vine Street in Philadelphia, a few blocks from Logan Square and the new cathedral. Passers-by rushed to his aid. Gently they carried him into the nearest house, not knowing who he was. The dark clothing indicated that he might be a cleric. Someone summoned a priest. Before the priest reached the scene, the man was dead. The man was the Bishop of Philadelphia, John Nepomucene Neumann, C.S.S.R.

All in all, it had been a long journey—the 48 years of this unassuming little man in the frayed black suit and worn shoes. All his life he had literally been on the go. All his life he had been in a hurry; he had made a private vow never to waste a moment. All his life, too, he had wanted to be a scholar, but he had little time to read.

As Bishop of Eastern Pennsylvania, with Delaware and some of Jersey included—such was the Diocese of Philadelphia in the year 1852—John Neumann spent half his days traveling by buckboard, coach and canal-boat, on the pastoral visitation of his sprawling diocese—lush farmlands, grimy coal towns, seaside and mountain places.

The visitations were, for all practical purposes, strenuous four-day missions. The Bishop taught catechism to the children. He sat hearing confessions till the last had gone home. He preached to the adults. After that, he went out to visit the sick—going on foot.

In Philadelphia he walked from Moyamensing to Northern Liberties, walked Market and Mulberry Streets, and down to the Delaware docks. He was walking on Vine Street on his way home to Logan Square, the afternoon he died. Not that he was averse to horse-cars!

But poor men used shoe leather and at heart he was still a religious with a vow of poverty. John Neumann had been an obscure Redemptorist until the March morning of 1852 when they put the crozier into his reluctant hand.

Parts of his story ring like a plot from Horatio Alger. A poor Bohemian immigrant, he arrived in New York with a dollar in his pocket and a dream in his heart. The dream was to work as a missionary in North America. When he landed at Staten Island in 1836, he was not even a priest. The previous year he had completed his studies at Budweis and Prague.

A month after his arrival he knelt before Bishop John Dubois in Old St. Patrick's Cathedral on Mott Street for ordination. A week later, he was pastor of a piece of Western New York as big as his native land. After four years of pioneering along the Niagara frontier, hiking through the dark woods around Buffalo, the call of a religious vocation summoned him elsewhere.

Down to Pittsburgh he went to commence his life as a Redemptorist in the first monastery of that religious order in America. The first "Sons of St. Alphonsus" had traversed the Great Lakes area for seven busy missionary years. Then, in 1839, a Redemptorist community was permanently established at St. Philomena's parish in downtown Pittsburgh. But instead of the quiet, ascetical respite from pastoral activity which he anticipated as a novice, Father Neumann found himself constantly on the move because of the need for zealous priests.

Take a pencil and trace it on a map. Set your point on the Great Lakes near Buffalo. Draw a circle to Pittsburgh, to Baltimore, to New York's East Side, to Rochester, to Buffalo, back again to Rochester, then up to the forests of northwestern Ohio, a town called Peru; down to Steubenville and Wheeling, then back along the National Pike to Baltimore, to complete the circle. This was the "solitude" of John Neumann's Redemptorist novitiate—an apostolic journey of some three thousand miles.

Father John Neumann, C.S.S.R., was professed in Baltimore at the Church of St. James on Jan. 16, 1842. Once he had made his vows as a Redemptorist, travel became part of his order of the day, on frequent missionary trips to the German settlements of Virginia and Maryland and Pennsylvania.

He knew Harper's Ferry a decade and a half before John Brown. He roamed the Shenandoah Valley; he said Mass in Frederick long before Barbara Fritchle challenged Stonewall Jackson's "Boys in Gray." Baltimore's new cathedral of Mary the Queen commemorates in stained glass the labors of Father Neumann among the Germans of that Archdiocese.

After two years as a Redemptorist in Baltimore, the Redemptorists chose him Superior of their parish in Pittsburgh. He built a large stone church there in Bayardstown at the base of what is today the Golden Triangle. The task was not an easy one, for his people were, for the most part, poor German immigrants unable to give little more than the work of their hands. His health cracked under the strain. Summarily he was recalled to provincial headquarters in Baltimore, relieved of his pastorate.

But two weeks later, a letter unexpectedly arrived from Europe appointing Father John Neumann Superior of all Redemptorists working in the United States. That was in 1847. Because of his position and because of the vehemence of Nativists, the following year Neumann became a citizen of the United States. His duties entailed more travel. And after he was consecrated Bishop of Philadelphia, in March, 1852, his travels became more frequent than ever and continued incessantly till the eve of the Twelfth Night in 1860 when he dropped dead.

There is nothing exceptional in a man's traveling all his life. Only that by nature John Neumann was the sort who preferred to stay put. By nature he was a scholar. He enjoyed reading in any of eight languages. In natural sciences he was far from an amateur. As a theologian he surprised his colleagues at the Provincial Council at Baltimore. By nature he was a bookworm, but by necessity a gadabout.

The afternoon Venerable John Neumann died on Vine Street they found in his coat pocket a brass key, a freight receipt for a package shipped that day to Bellefonte, Pa., a rosary and some peppermint candy. The items make a good index to the man.

The key for his house was a superfluous article. The Bishop's house on Race St. was never locked. The door was always open to transient priest or hungry immigrant. Inside there was lodging for the priest, and for the poor there was clothing or money.

The freight-receipt is another sidelight on John Neumann. Up in Bellefonte a priest needed a chalice for his little church in the mountains. Any underling could have taken care of the matter, but Neumann made it a personal errand. Ailing as he was, the last afternoon of his life, the Bishop walked to the Reading freight depot on Callowhill Street with the package and made sure that it got off to its destination.

The rosary! Like any lover of Our Lady, Neumann had it ever in his hands. He had been in Rome on the glorious morning of 1854 when Pius IX declared the Immaculate Conception a dogma of the Catholic Faith. Tradition has it that on that occasion he held the book from which the Vicar of Christ read the epic pronouncement in St. Peter's. One year later, at the Eighth Provincial Council in Baltimore, it was he who first proposed that Dec. 8 should be a holyday of obligation in the United States.

But what about the candy? The peppermints were something he always carried. He loved children. For them he wrote catechisms and a Bible history. For them he built schools from Williamsville, N.Y., in 1836 to Philadelphia where he established the first system of parochial schools in America in 1852.

For the children he invited a number of teaching orders of nuns and Brothers to the diocese. Children never feared to clutch his hand as he walked the streets of Philadelphia. With the guileless guile of childhood they knew that if they could prattle their prayers and their catechism, there were peppermints for them in his pocket.

Something else was found on John Neumann's person as he lay in death—a belt of pointed wires imbedded in his waist. But that was no surprise to anyone who knew Bishop Neumann intimately. To their way of thinking he was a very holy man.

credited to this account and will remain available until appropriated. The measure will also provide the Secretary with new authority intended to work with the increased authorization levels to help ensure, and in some cases expedite, the protection of various federal recreation lands.

Congress adopted amendments to H.R. 5306 the first of which deleted the statement expressing the intent of Congress is that the remaining land acquisition program for the existing units of the national park system be completed within 3 complete fiscal years following the enactment of H.R. 5306.

By adopting this amendment Congress felt that the change in land acquisition policies may be too abrupt and perhaps could not be implemented due to personnel constraints, insufficient appropriations and former commitments.

However, it is the intent of Congress to eventually acquire all inholdings located in the national park system. The opportunity purchase program is presently being used successfully for all of the inholding areas of the system. This program is designed to acquire land from willing sellers or condemn land threatened by adverse development. This policy has widespread support.

The additional authorized funding gives the Federal agencies the necessary means to acquire newly authorized but unacquired areas in the systems and to vigorously pursue the opportunity inholding program.

Is the Senator's understanding that the opportunity purchase program particularly with respect to improved lands within the exterior boundaries of park units as it applies to inholdings is unaffected by H.R. 5306 as amended? That is to say does the distinguished Senator from Washington agree that H.R. 5306 neither added to nor diminished the land acquisition authorities presently held by the National Park Service and the agreements with the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. It is my understanding that H.R. 5306 does not affect the present situation with regard to these acquisition programs and authorities.

Mr. HANSEN. I ask the distinguished Chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee if he agrees that the national park service is still required to provide the appropriate committees with advanced notice in filing declarations of taking?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. I think my colleague is quite correct in this regard. As you know, had the Congress retained the language expressing the intent of Congress that all these lands be acquired within three years it might have been necessary to seek a modification of the present notification procedures. However, since this language was deleted, I see no reason to alter the existing situation.

#### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, if I may, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of Senator JACKSON, who cannot be here, that a colloquy between himself and me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FORD). Without objection, it is ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, Congress has recently passed legislation which amends the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. President Carter has signed the bill, H.R. 5306, as amended. The purpose of H.R. 5306 as amended, is to establish a special account in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to be used to acquire the backlog of lands previously authorized for inclusion in the national park system and certain similar federal areas. Over the next two fiscal years, \$450 million will be authorized to be

#### CARL ROWAN ON THE ANITA BRYANT ISSUE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the distinguished columnist, Mr. Carl Rowan, has written an interesting commentary on the crusade of Anita Bryant against homosexuals. In view of the widespread interest generated by this controversy, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rowan's article appearing in the June 15, 1977, issue of the Washington Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### ANITA'S THE REAL THREAT, NOT THE GAY COMMUNITY

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Of all the appeals to bigotry still virulent in America, the one that shames me most



is the newest: Anita Bryant's crusade against homosexuals.

She quotes her version of the Bible to tell us that homosexuals will "have no place in the Kingdom of God," and in doing so the lady gives religion a bad name.

Yes, as she roams the country, fresh from her triumph over the gays in Miami, the media are glued to her. Television pumps her into our homes at dinnertime, weeping because she feels homosexuals don't understand that she wants them to be "washed and clean."

Because she has become a fanatic, it will never occur to Anita Bryant that murderers have rights under the Eighth Amendment; peddlers of smut have rights under the First Amendment; assorted crooks have rights under the Fifth Amendment; drunks and drug addicts have rights under HEW guidelines—thus only a morbid, stone-age bigotry would embrace the notion that homosexuals do not have basic rights.

Anita Bryant exploits the deepest hopes and fears of parents. Dad wants son to be a lady-killing stud; it would devastate Dad to have the word go out that son prefers other males.

Mom has dreamed for years of a gala wedding where she weeps as daughter races off in the arms of a rich and handsome Prince Charming. Mother would be shattered to learn that daughter is a psychological wreck in a bedroom with a man, but a warm, glowing person with a woman.

It has been drilled into human psyches for a millenium that God created only two types of people: males who lust for women, and females who crave men. Anything in between is supposed to be a "freak," a "queer," a "fruit" and dozens of other meanly pejorative names.

There are an estimated 15 million homosexuals in the United States alone. Does Anita Bryant think God so fallible that all these gay Americans are just grotesque slips of His hand?

I've never argued with anyone about whether being homosexual is merely "sexual preference" or is a physical or emotional handicap, like being born with a cleft palate. All that matters to me is that the same Creator who put me on this planet also put a lot of homosexuals here, and I have no reason to believe that our Maker endowed me with any moral superiority.

Anita Bryant quotes the Bible to justify her vilification of homosexuals. I can quote Leviticus to prove that people who eat pork are sinners. Several passages in the Old Testament can be used to justify the oppression of women. Racists quote the Bible as proof that black people were "cursed" by God to eternal inferiority. There is something in the Bible to justify every prejudice imaginable.

For those who don't swallow the line that God hates homosexuals, Bryant has another emotional approach. She wants to keep gays out of jobs as teachers, librarians, etc., so as to protect our children from homosexual advances.

None of us wants gays abusing our children, emotionally or in any other way. We've passed laws against it. But are Bryant and her disciples aware of the terrible number of incidents in which heterosexuals ("normal" people) molest children, introduce them to drugs, otherwise debase them?

It has become easy to attack homosexuals, to deprive them of basic rights, because they are now visible; they have walked out of the shadows. But the heterosexual rapists, molesters and other child defilers go on enjoying all the constitutional and legislative rights because they can hide in Anita Bryant's world of self-righteous heterosexuals.

I watch and hear this woman, and I know

that the greater threat to this society, which struggles toward justice for all, is not the ordinary homosexual; it is the Anita Bryants who catch up so many gullible and unsophisticated Americans in their messianic madness.

#### REMARKS BY THE AMBASSADOR OF IRAN TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, His Excellency Ardeshir Zahedi, Ambassador of Iran to the United States, recently addressed the Fourth Annual Conference on International Trade, concerning the serious problems facing the world today. Both his opening statement and his remarks are worthy of study by all who seek solutions to the crisis of energy, economics, and hunger. As he so accurately stated:

Until the day when our society can make the transition from traditional sources to new sources of energy, each nation, whether developed or developing, must carry on a dedicated and sustained effort not only to develop alternative sources of energy but above all to conserve present supplies.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues may have the advantage of studying Ambassador Zahedi's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that both his opening statement and his remarks at the May 25, 1977, Conference of the Center for International Business at Southern Methodist University be printed in the RECORD.

In addition, His Excellency spoke on May 7, 1977, at Westminster College in Fulton, Mo. Again, he described the need for action on the critical questions affecting all nations. Of particular interest to the Senate was his statement that:

As a major producer and exporter of oil, it is a matter of Iran's national policy never to use oil as a political weapon. As my sovereign has said, oil, like water and bread, is indispensable and no one should be denied its use. Not only did we not participate in the oil embargoes of 1967 and 1973 but we were against them. We have never participated in any embargo in the past and we will never, under any circumstances whatsoever, participate in one in the future.

Mr. President, I will not go into great detail at this time, but instead I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Ambassador's remarks on May 7, 1977, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OPENING STATEMENT OF HIS EXCELLENCY ARDESHIR ZAHEDI AT THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS, FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

##### OVERVIEW

As most of you probably know, in the past three decades, oil has become the single largest internationally traded commodity. Today, oil supplies more than half of the world's energy requirements. In 1973, the share of oil and natural gas in total energy consumption in the free world was 57 percent and 20 percent respectively. Coal, the predominant source of energy in the 1950's, was responsible for nearly 20 percent.

Oil reserves and the demand for oil are not evenly distributed among nations. Nearly 70 percent of known non-Communist oil reserves are now located among the OPEC nations—but mostly in the Persian Gulf area. The rest is chiefly owned by the United States,

6 percent. On the demand side, the un-evenness is equally striking.

With 6 percent of the world population, the United States consumes 32 percent of world energy and one third of the global oil production, while producing only 15 percent of the world's crude oil.

In 1976, the EEC members' demand for oil approached 17 million barrels a day, while domestic production did not exceed 900,000 barrels a day. These figures are estimated to increase to 18 million barrels a day, and 5 million barrels a day, respectively, by 1985.

Japan produces virtually no oil, yet imports close to 5 million barrels a day. By 1985, Japan's demand for crude oil will reach an estimated 9 million barrels a day. By 1985, the United States will consume nearly 26 million barrels a day, while domestic production will reach only 11 million barrels a day.

It is now estimated that between now and 1985, the energy demand may double in the non-Communist world, reaching 142 million barrels a day of oil equivalent. Therefore, the crucial question is how this projected increase in energy demand in general and oil demand in particular can be met?

These are four alternatives:

1. To raise the supply of conventional sources, such as crude oil, natural gas, and hydroelectricity.
2. To increase the share of nuclear energy.
3. To develop synthetic fuels (oil shale, tar sands, etc.)
4. To develop exotic energy sources (geothermal, solar, tidal waves, and hydrogen fusion.)

Although there are many energy sources, the share of total energy supplied by one fuel will change slowly, in the next decade or so. This is due to the massive size of the energy economies of the industrialized nations. And the long lead times required to develop new sources of energy.

Therefore, until new sources of conventional and un-conventional energy are discovered and developed, the volume of world energy supply will depend on handling of the resources already known. Reasonable predictions point out that 70 percent of energy requirements will be met by hydrocarbons, that is 16 percent by gas, and 54 percent by oil.

Therefore, oil will continue to be the largest supplier of world energy demand, and OPEC will continue to balance the demand and supply for oil. However, OPEC nations must also develop reserves not yet discovered, since production in their mature fields will begin to decline by the early or mid-1980s.

Until the day when our society can make the transition from traditional sources to new sources of energy, each nation, whether developed or developing, must carry on a dedicated and sustained effort not only to develop alternative sources of energy but above all to conserve present supplies.

In 1973, Iran embarked upon an intensive policy of conservation and development of alternative sources of energy. But Iran, on its own, can achieve little.

The United States, as the world's largest consumer, and one that has the means and the resources to develop alternative sources of energy supply, must make a major contribution if the world energy situation is to be improved.

If the United States fails to take strong and positive measures to increase energy output and economize on energy usage, the rest of the free world, especially the industrialized nations, are not likely to succeed.

We must understand that the market for energy is an international market. No one nation in this market, whether producer or consumer, can act independently without affecting the whole.

Let us start building the bridges that will carry us into the 21st century through cooperation and the sharing of responsibilities.

REMARKS OF HIS EXCELLENCY ARDESHIR ZAHEDI  
AT THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE  
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

The English poet, John Donne, wrote: "No man is an island, entire of itself . . . any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls: it tolls for thee."

Since the 17th century when it was written, to the present day, this thought has been used to comment on various facets of the human condition. Today, I find this an appropriate theme for the subject, international economic relations, that I would like to discuss with you, distinguished leaders of the business community. I think it would be appropriate here to recall the concern for others which your great country has always demonstrated.

Almost three decades ago, the United States developed the Marshall plan. This program of aid and assistance was offered to a world recovering from the most far-reaching man-made destruction in history. It was this program which significantly aided in the economic recovery of Western Europe and Japan. But your concern for others did not stop there. Only a few years later, President Truman initiated the point four program and the seeds of industrialization and development were planted among many other nations.

Perhaps if you had left the world in the state which it was, it could have become your exclusive market place. But you did not, and the world owes you thanks for this. However, by helping other nations you were also creating your own economic competitors as well as markets. For nations who desire to have more than a primitive standard of living are of necessity drawn into economic relations with others. The continuing development of new technology and its transfer to other countries has enabled them to specialize in the production of goods and services which they can then exchange for others. Much of this technology flowed outwards from the United States and thus enabled others to become viable participants in world trade. For most nations of the world, specialization in production has enabled them to obtain those resources or products which they cannot produce, or produce only at very high costs.

For many countries, international trade is literally a matter of life and death. Western Europe, with some 300 million people inhabiting a comparatively small land area with limited physical resources, depends on international trade for its daily needs.

However, for you in the United States, with your abundant human and natural resources, trade has not been an essential part of your economic life. Its contribution to your GNP has been quite small and so you have had a tendency to ignore it.

Recently, however, you have become concerned. The threat of unemployment in some of your own industries is leading your producers to ask for protection from "cheap" imports. From the Japanese, the Italians, the Germans, the South Koreans—all nations which you helped to build up industrially. Trade and policy is now becoming important even for you.

It is not only here that you face this kind of competition. Iran is the largest single market for American goods in the Middle East. The signing of a five year economic protocol between Iran and the United States in August of 1976, made you our number one supplier of goods and services—well ahead of your main competitors, Japan and West Germany. The terms of this agreement call for Iran to import \$52 billion worth of goods and services over the next five years.

This will be divided between the following major areas:

1. Trade

2. Investment
3. Technical cooperation
4. Energy
5. Housing
6. Agriculture
7. Transportation
8. Science, technology and education

We value our trade relations with you but here I feel I must be frank and candid. You should not take the market in Iran for granted. You should still be energetic in your efforts to learn what we need and want, and to provide us with your best. If you do not, your competitors will and you may lose a valuable opportunity.

The protocol is an indication of the high regard and friendship we hold for America and its industry—it is a door which has been opened for you. But it is a door through which others may pass as well, if you leave the way open.

The traditional justification for international trade has been that it can bring about the most efficient pattern of production both within and among nations. Thus, trade can allow nations to have higher standards of living and access to a greater variety of goods than they could otherwise enjoy.

International trade, however, has not had the same positive effects on all nations. A few have grown into economic powers, while the majority have sunk deeper and deeper into poverty.

There are today approximately 1.2 billion people in the world who suffer from malnutrition, disease and ignorance.

We live in an era where our world is divided in two by an economic boundary—rich and poor, or north and south. The north-south conflict now represents a more urgent problem than the ideological dispute between east and west. Even in the absence of war, there still can be violence and international crises.

Of course, poverty, disease and other human miseries are not the products of our modern age. They existed in societies before. However, the dimensions of these problems today are unique in complexity and magnitude. Before human problems were local. But, today, we speak of them as world problems. The world poverty problem, the population problem, the environmental problem and so forth.

We must actively realize that mankind shares the same planet, together with its life support systems which link nations together. If one suffers, others will suffer too.

If we are to have a future at all as a community of nations, then we must strive to eliminate these problems.

Although no man or nation is an island of itself, all men and nations are individuals, and all great events, break-through, discoveries, have come about through the efforts of individuals.

My country, while ever hopeful of international action to help in solving the problems of the world's lesser developed and poorer nations, has not been content to wait. We have taken steps to improve the well being of our own people through the readjustment of the price for our most valuable and developed natural resource—oil.

But we are conscious of the fact that our actions have an effect on the well being of the rest of the world. We know that, along with the wealth and power come obligations and we have not forgotten our less fortunate brothers.

In 1976, Iran allocated and distributed 6.1 percent of its GNP to other nations in the form of aid, to Egypt, to India, to the nations of the Sahel, to Pakistan, to Afghanistan, to Sri Lanka. Compare this 6.1 percent with the percentage of GNP given by other nations. Sweden 0.82 percent, France, 0.62 percent, West Germany, 0.40 percent, the United States 0.26 percent.

But, as I mentioned earlier, the problems

facing all of us are of such magnitude that no single nation can provide a solution to them.

The time has come for global cooperation through a sense of community directed towards narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor. We must narrow this gap if the quality of life everywhere is to improve rather than deteriorate. This can only be achieved in the context of a new global economic system—or a new world economic order. If this system is to flourish, it must rest on the firm foundation of security, fairness, and opportunity for all who wish to participate. It must embrace the interests of all, if it is to be supported by all.

"Trade, not aid" has long been the slogan of the poor. Trade can be an instrument of progress, not just for a few but for all nations.

The poor nations must be given the opportunity to actively and freely participate in international trade. Not only must their commodity prices be protected, but they must also be encouraged to develop indigenous industries by allowing their manufacturers access to markets long dominated by the industrialized giants.

The first major step in this direction requires a serious effort on the part of the developed nations—and then the willingness of the developing countries to achieve their potential.

All of this brings me back to my original theme, the need for cooperative solutions to these global problems.

Our response can very well determine the future of peace and progress in this world.

A great challenge faces us all.

As your friend and your ally, let me say that the challenge particularly faces you. It is you who have the know-how, the capacity, and the will to lead the rest of us in this effort. And we must respond. Because if we are not successful in meeting this challenge, we will not have to send to know for whom the bell tolls: it will be tolling for us.

REMARKS OF HIS EXCELLENCY ARDESHIR  
ZAHEDI AT WESTMINSTER COLLEGE

I am deeply moved by the warmth of your reception. I have often said over the years that America is my second home. I have spent so much time here, first as a student and now as an Ambassador. Your kindness today further strengthens this relationship.

I am especially pleased to come again to the home state of an American whom I admire so much, Harry Truman, who brought a special kind of leadership and integrity to this remarkable democracy. I feel greatly honoured by your invitation to speak in this most distinguished lecture series. And I am quite humbled to stand here where so many important speeches have been given by world leaders. I know I cannot match the style and eloquence of a Winston Churchill or a President Truman but I will try to follow the high standards of sincerity and truth which these men showed.

My message today will be quite different. Our world in the last three decades has undergone some dramatic changes. Since World War II, we have known the continual threat of even great disaster in another conflict and we seem unable to reduce this threat.

But there is also another war we must fight. Poverty, starvation, ignorance and injustice must also be eliminated, if we as a world want to have a future at all.

There can be no real interdependence as long as nations are divided by wealth and poverty. Our world must not be divided. Humanity recognizes no borders. After all, one-half of the world cannot be happy or secure, while the other half is miserable and poor.

No one can really question the great contribution of the western countries, espe-



cially the United States to the betterment of human conditions. I recall, for example, the great hope inspired by President Truman's announcement of Point IV in 1949, a program which I was privileged to initiate and help to direct in Iran. Today, however, the dimensions of these problems are such that we can only solve them together.

Consequently, this is not a time for iron curtains or gun-boat diplomacy or cold wars. This is a time for cooperation. Our world today is a family of nations. If one fails, the others will suffer. Therefore, each nation must be able to help itself, before it can contribute to this total effort.

Today, I will if I may, take advantage of the opportunity you have given me, to describe the goals we, as a nation, have set for ourselves and the steps we have taken, to achieve them.

Iran may seem very far from Fulton, Missouri, and what happens in my country may appear remote to your present and future interests. However, our two nations have much in common for, I submit, that the Iranian experience of the last few decades is an outstanding example of modern economic and social development. It is an example of what can be achieved in the Third World in a short time. It is a source of pride for us, for we have begun to build a prosperous and safe Iran. But it should also be a source of hope for you in the long run.

Iran, the cradle of civilization, is a land of Aryans. We have a population of 34 million. And our country is about one-fifth the size of the United States. This might surprise you, that after China, we have the second longest border, 1,300 miles, with the Soviet Union. In the old days, we used to serve as a bridge between east and west being part of the silk route between China and Europe. During the Tehran Conference in 1944, Iran was described as the "Bridge of Victory" by President Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill. And we must remember that, traditionally, Persia has been a center of scholarship, science and culture. The writings of such Iranian scholars as Avicenna and Biruni are well known to the west.

I will have to focus your attention on what we call our "Shah and People's Revolution." I know that few among you would think of Iran as a country in the midst of a revolution. We all too often think of a revolution as a violent uprising, a brutal and total upset of the whole society. I am willing to concede that history sometimes has shown us the necessity of such a revolution. We had ours and you had yours. But whatever the benefits, the costs in human terms were enormous. Nowadays, we must think of revolution in terms of the most effective and humane utilization of all the means at our disposal to ensure the welfare of our countries in a just and peaceful manner. We must recognize above all the purpose of the revolution. And no one has defined the purpose of our revolution better than my beloved sovereign.

This is what he wrote in 1963, and I quote, "I looked at Iranian society, recognizing its weaknesses, needs, and potentialities. I studied the structure of other societies, and saw how they had progressed. The realization came to me that Iran needed a deep and fundamental revolution, which could, at the same time, put an end to all factors that caused injustice, tyranny and exploitation and to all aspects of reaction, which impeded progress, and kept our society backward."

Our basic aim and concern has been, and remains, human dignity and social justice. The concept of human rights is not new to Iran. As a matter of fact, as we know from the Bible, more than 2,500 years ago, Cyrus, the great Persian King, freed Daniel and decreed that those who threw Jews into the mouths of lions shall be thrown back into

the mouths of lions. He established once and for all, the freedom of religion and worship in Iran. Our constitution provides for that same essential freedom of religion.

Both at home and abroad we have tried to practice what we preach. At home, we know that the welfare and dignity of our people depend, above all, on education and its availability to the masses. We have therefore declared war on ignorance.

We have created the Literacy Corps, consisting of men and women of military draft age. They have been chosen to serve their country in this constructive manner, and to bring their knowledge and dedication to all who need it. This program has been so effective that the rate of illiteracy has decreased from 90 per cent in 1950, to 50 per cent last year. We expect illiteracy to be wiped out in the next decade. For a campaign against illiteracy. His Majesty urged, at the UNESCO meeting in Tehran in 1964, that countries contribute the equivalent of one day's military expenditure. Unfortunately, this was the first time that the big powers agreed to disagree and so nothing was done. Iran however did fulfill its promise.

Furthermore, in June 1968, in a speech at Harvard University, His Majesty called for the creation of a universal welfare legion, in which individuals of any country, class, race, or religion, would devote a part of their lives to the service of mankind.

We have established the right of every Iranian to a free education through the elementary level and are even providing free lunches for every student. To make this a reality, we have invested large sums of money. In 1950, we had only one major university. Today, we have 21 universities, and 142 colleges, and institutions of higher learning, with a total enrollment of 184,000 students. In 1950, we had 800 students abroad 390 of whom were studying in the United States. Today that number has increased to 58 thousand, out of whom 23,600 are studying in the United States. Perhaps even more impressive is the fact that in 1950, there were only 350 thousand students in Iran. This past fall, however, when the school bell rang, over eight million and five hundred thousand students took their places, across the nation. That constitutes nearly one fourth of our entire population.

In recent years, we have completely changed the role of women in our society. In the 1950s, they did not even have the right to vote. Today, in contrast, they not only have this right, but they also hold prominent places in Parliament and the Cabinet.

In the field of agriculture, we have carried out an extensive land reform program. We have done away with the feudal system of ownership. Peasants have now become landowners. Although the standard of living has greatly increased, the rate of agricultural production has not kept up with the other areas of our economy. Therefore, we have given priority to investment in agriculture and related research.

In the industrial field, the Shah has introduced a far reaching profit sharing law. The factory workers have the first right to buy 49 per cent of the shares in privately owned companies. Furthermore, the workers are entitled to 20 per cent of net corporate earnings. In the public sector, the workers are allowed to purchase 99 per cent of the government owned industries by 1978, with the assistance of government loans, at very low rates. This transfer of property will be achieved to ensure Iranian workers full participation in their national development.

These domestic programs which I have described are all designed to give the Iranian people a fair and equal opportunity to develop themselves to the very best of their potential. All this of course depends upon the growth and expansion of our economy.

In 1953, our per capita GNP was less than 100 dollars. By the end of this year, I am happy to tell you that it will be close to 2,000 dollars. The projected figure for GNP in the year 2000 is 441 billion dollars. The impressive growth of the Iranian economy is so well known that I do not have to quote any further facts or figures. However, I am going to say a few words about oil because it is so obviously a subject of world wide interest today.

His Imperial Majesty has said repeatedly that oil, with its 70,000 odd by-products is too precious to be used as fuel. Actually, he called it a "noble commodity." And he made the decision to replace this finite resource as a fuel long before the 1973 oil price increases. During 1973 and 1974, Iran took the lead among the oil producing countries in developing alternative sources of energy such as nuclear, geo-thermal and solar. For example, by 1993, nuclear energy will provide over fifty per cent of Iran's total capacity of 66,000 megawatts. The oil and gas saved from the use of such alternatives, plus an increasing amount of our oil and gas production, will be used in the production of petrochemicals. We must think of our children and the future when we burn this precious resource which took millions of years to create.

It is important, particularly in a free enterprise society such as yours, that every effort be made to develop alternative sources of energy. You have the means and the resources to do so. And you, the largest consumer of oil in the world, have the important responsibility not to allow oil to be used unnecessarily as a fuel, when there are other possible sources. I am happy to note that the United States is finally coming to realize the importance of conserving oil. Your country is a great nation. You are the most powerful nation in the world, economically, militarily, and politically. You have responsibilities not only to yourselves but to your allies and friends as well. This is why you should become self sufficient in the field of energy, in order to maintain your strength.

As a major producer and exporter of oil, it is a matter of Iran's national policy never to use oil as a political weapon. As my sovereign has said, oil, like water and bread, is indispensable and no one should be denied its use. Not only did we not participate in the oil embargoes of 1967 and 1973 but we were against them. We have never participated in any embargo in the past and we will never, under any circumstances whatsoever, participate in one in the future.

Even more important than oil is food. We can always adjust to the heat or cold by a few degrees but we cannot adjust to starvation. Approximately 1.2 billion people in the world suffer from hunger, disease and the effects of drought. This gap is growing larger every day. We should be deeply concerned about the injustice and inequality of society. We should also recognize, even if only from selfish self interest, that unless we answer these important questions, there is certain to come a serious explosion and perhaps even war among the rich and the poor.

The foreign policy of Iran can be stated quite simply. We believe in an independent national foreign policy which permits us to deal with any nation, no matter what its ideology, as long as there is true respect for the rights and sovereignty of other nations. The cornerstone of our policy is the desire for peace and stability which will permit us to achieve our national goals. In this spirit, we have contributed to the maintenance of international peace and stability, in the world in general and in the Middle East in particular. We have settled various disputes, some of them age-old, that have burned between us and our neighbors. Indeed, we have had to expand and strengthen our military forces in the last few years for several reasons.

First, history has taught us that because of our strategic location and resources, we can become targets of aggression. At times of military weakness, as even in World War II, neutral Iran was invaded. Second, Iran is not only situated in a turbulent region of the world, but in an area of the largest oil concentration. If it had not been for our leadership, and our concern for security and stability in the Persian Gulf, the security of this vital area would be in jeopardy. Third, we must be constantly aware of our long border with the Soviet Union and the danger of infiltration of our weaker nations by communist inspired elements. Fourth, let me explain the strategic importance of the Straits of Hormuz. More than twenty million barrels of oil pass daily through this narrow waterway, providing 90 per cent of Japan's oil requirements, 70 per cent of western Europe's and 20 per cent of your country's. Any drastic change in this area might close this lifeline.

As in every sovereign state, I am sure you will understand that we would be remiss in our duty to our people if we were not concerned with their well-being and safety. At the same time, I must stress that we would welcome the day when we would not have to spend a penny on defense but until that day comes, we must safeguard our well-being.

At the same time, we are doing all possible to help build a new world, based on justice and fairness. Peace and prosperity for all is not just a cliché or resounding slogan. It is our only alternative and to this end, Iran has taken many initiatives.

We have signed and ratified the treaty for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. For seven years, my beloved sovereign has proposed that the Middle East and the Indian Ocean be declared, in terms of armaments, a nuclear free zone.

In regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict, we believe this conflict can be brought to a peaceful resolution by the implementation of the United Nations Security Council's resolutions 242 and 338. We recognize the right of Israel to exist, but condemn the occupation of other nation's territory through force. Let me be frank and state that if we are not able to solve the problem of Palestine there will never be peace in the Middle East.

At the close of World War II, and through the 50s, Iran was almost totally dependent upon foreign aid. Throughout the 60s, Iran was able to lessen its economic dependence through borrowing from international institutions. We are grateful for the assistance that the United States gave to Iran, when we needed it most. And your generosity has not been forgotten.

Now, I am proud to say, that we have, over the last few years, extended direct financial aid and long-term loans to many developing countries. In 1975, West Germany, the most industrialized country in Europe, provided only 0.4 per cent of its GNP for foreign aid. In the same year, Sweden allocated 0.82 per cent, and Switzerland 0.18 per cent of their GNP for foreign aid. I hope you will understand when I point out, simply as a matter of information, and in full recognition of your long history of generosity to others, that American foreign aid still remains about 0.3 per cent of its GNP. I think you probably do not know that in this same time period, Iran's foreign aid represented more than 6 per cent of its GNP, a figure unmatched in the industrial world.

In line with our commitment to foreign aid, we have embarked on massive programs, of both bilateral and multilateral assistance.

In 1974, His Majesty proposed the creation of a neutral development fund, involving the 12 oil producers, 12 industrial countries, and 12 less developed countries, to which oil producers and industrial countries would each

donate 150 million dollars. The Shah suggested the creation of a special fund of 5 billion dollars for five years, supported by contributions from OPEC members of 10 cents per barrel of oil, and designated to make outright grants to needy countries.

We are participating in a special OPEC fund of 800 million dollars, of which our share is 232 million dollars, with a special grant of 400 million dollars, to an international fund for agricultural development. During the last OPEC Conference in Doha, the decision was made to add another 800 million dollars to this special OPEC fund.

Finally, we have also set aside one billion dollars for the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. So, in a number of ways, we have tried to use our resources, with which we have been blessed, to help our less fortunate Fourth World neighbours.

Again, as a friend let me say to you that you can contribute so much in know-how and technology, which is most important to the development of those countries which have few or no resources of their own. In this way, perhaps, we can help resolve the question of international justice and fairness, by assisting the more than 1.2 billion people who are struggling for survival.

In a political world that often views statecraft as the art of the possible and peace as the maintenance of the status quo, we have chosen vision and the courage to dare, for we know that each stone unturned may well be a step backwards. Both at home and abroad, we are actively carrying out a revolution of our thoughts and of our age-old ways, a fundamental change that we hope will bring men closer together in the common knowledge of a common destiny.

And we should understand that we should not worry if we do not pray to the same God, believe in the same tenets, share the same traditions, or speak the same language, for it is in this very variety that lie our hope and our strength.

An essential characteristic of your great nation has been its unusual ability to blend into a creative and exciting whole—ideas, experiences and traditions from all areas of the globe. These different elements in American society did not have to give up their cultural identity or forsake their originality to become a viable part of the whole. We can do the same in the world at large, and frankly, I see no reason why, if we show the same determination allied with the same wisdom, we cannot be as successful internationally in this regard as you have been nationally.

All of this brings me back to my original theme—the absolute necessity of interdependence and cooperation if our world is to survive. I can leave no more important message with you today than this. We cannot continue to live in a society where a few are rich and the rest are poor. Surely, we can leave no more brilliant heritage than the knowledge that we saw the need of our fellow man and worked to save him from disease, poverty and starvation.

Saadi, the great Persian poet said, "To serve humanity is an ultimate goal of worship." Like the human organism, if one part of mankind is in want, or diseased, all of humanity is affected and thereby suffers. If I can leave this thought with you, I will have achieved my mission.

A great opportunity and a great challenge faces us all. As your friend and ally, let me say the challenge particularly faces you. It is you who have the experience, the capacity, the know-how, and I believe, the will to lead us in this war against want. You have demonstrated your good will in the past, and I see no reason why you cannot do it now. We, in the rest of the world, can help, but we cannot do it without you. With you, I feel that the world will succeed. Again, as your friend and your admirer, let me say,

"You have done so much for the world, be proud of it: lead us again."

Certainly, there is no more appropriate setting to begin a new effort than here, in the tradition of this honoured place. A great American lady, Eleanor Roosevelt, once inspired my generation and indeed the world when she said: "It is better to light one little candle than to stumble about in darkness." Let us together light that candle today.

#### NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Jerome Bullock, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia for the term of 4 years vice George K. McKinney, resigning

Lee A. Limbs, Jr., of Arizona, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years vice J. Pat Madrid, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, June 24, 1977, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

(This concludes additional statements submitted today.)

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1978

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 7636, which will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7636) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time for debate on this bill is limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between and controlled by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Alaska, with 30 minutes on any amendment and 20 minutes on any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendments as original text; and, provided, that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by agreeing to this request.



The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the fiscal 1978 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies that the committee has reported is the result of 3 months of agency budget hearings and nearly a full week of hearings for non-Government witnesses. It is not one of the bigger money bills, but it is a complex one. As Senators know, it deals with the major funding of programs for the management and protection of the Federal land, water, and energy resources. It also finances the principal nonnuclear energy research, development and management programs and supports activities benefiting the health, education, and welfare of native Americans. Finally, the bill funds major cultural programs including historic preservation, the arts and humanities, and the Smithsonian Institution.

A great deal of work has gone into the preparation of the committee recommendations, and I wish to express my gratitude to those members of the Interior subcommittee who have helped with the long and often tiring budget hearings.

My thanks especially go to the distinguished assistant Republican leader, who is the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Subcommittee, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS). Despite the responsibilities he has assumed as minority whip, the Senator from Alaska has continued to shoulder a very heavy burden of chairing many of the hearings when my own responsibilities have kept me on the floor of the Senate, and where other Members of my party were tied up in matters and engagements and hearings which prevented them from doing so.

I also want to thank the very able staff director of my subcommittee, Dwight Dyer, for his usual dedicated and able services to the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the other members of the committee.

I also wish to commend John Gnoriski and Penelope Barrick of the subcommittee staff for the long hours of able and dedicated work. Linda Richardson of the minority staff also deserve our gratitude for the services she provided over and above her own direct responsibilities.

Mr. President, the bill before us carries \$10.3 billion in new appropriations

for the programs I have just touched on. This is an increase of nearly \$190 million over the budget estimates and it is \$676 million above the House allowance. More significantly, that total represents a \$3.3 billion growth over appropriations for the current fiscal year.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

This is not the kind of spending increase the committee would normally support, but it should be stressed that the major part of funding growth relates to the strategic petroleum reserve. This reserve represents the national commitment to store 500 million barrels of oil as a buffer against the severe dislocations that could result from any renewal of the fuel shortages that hit the Nation a few years ago. Based on an acceleration of the accelerated reserve plan submitted by President Carter, the funding for this program alone exceeds \$3 billion.

The committee has recommended the full budget estimate, restoring the \$710 million reduction approved by the House. The House properly questioned whether this \$2.5 billion leap in funding for the reserve could be effectively obligated in fiscal 1978. We share that concern, but the committee also believes that it is essential that Congress demonstrate full and unqualified support for the reserve goals. This is not just a financial decision but a policy commitment that tells other nations of the world that the United States is not wavering in its determination to provide significant energy reserves for the future.

MAJOR PROVISIONS IN THE BILL

In all, Mr. President, the bill provides more than \$4.3 billion to the Federal Energy Administration, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and the Naval Petroleum Reserves. The committee has recommended a services of program increases for ERDA, I might add, reflecting congressional priorities being established in that agency's authorization bill on which the Senate acted earlier this week.

In the Department of Interior, budget increases exceeding \$63 million are recommended for land, water, energy, and minerals programs—much of it for the environmentally safe development of the vast Federal energy resources both onshore and on the outer continental shelf. But we are not totally preoccupied with

energy, for we have also recommended substantial increases in the management and conservation of the Nation's renewable resources—forest, range, and wildlife.

The recommendation for fish and wildlife and parks within the Interior Department tops \$1.4 billion. This is \$104 million above the budget.

Programs benefiting the Indian people have been enlarged by more than \$59 million for a total now beginning to approach \$1.5 billion. Increases have been directed mainly at education, health, and natural resource management programs.

Perhaps the single most important program expansion recommended in the bill is for the Forest Service. This agency's budget is increased more than \$213 million to a total in excess of \$1.1 billion. These recommendations are based on an analysis of the management and conservation goals developed under the Range and Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974. We have generally agreed with the major thrusts of the House increases but with selected changes that achieve a \$52 million reduction in the House allowance.

Well over \$440 million is recommended for cultural programs, which is some \$104 million over current spending.

Finally, I should observe that every effort has been made to accommodate the individual priorities of Senators. It is impossible to fund all requests, as you know. There are literally hundreds of them.

Many of the requests that have come to our committee have been generated from the other side of the Hill. The Members of the House have come to our subcommittee asking that we fund projects and programs which they consider to be priorities for one reason or another, and were not included in the House-passed bill. We think we have been fully responsive to all Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table comparing appropriations recommended in the bill with those of fiscal 1977 and with the fiscal 1978 budget estimates and House allowances.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1978

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1977 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommenda- tion	Increase (+) or decrease (-) compared with—		
					1977 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>							
<b>LAND AND WATER RESOURCES</b>							
<b>Bureau of Land Management</b>							
Management of lands and resources	272,977,000	238,466,000	250,289,000	245,808,000	-27,169,000	+7,342,000	-4,481,000
Acquisition, construction, and maintenance	10,760,000	17,558,000	16,827,000	18,707,000	+7,947,000	+1,149,000	+1,880,000
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(5,000,000)	(1,924,000)	(1,924,000)	(1,924,000)	(-3,076,000)		
Payments in lieu of taxes	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000			
Rescission of contract authority (Roads and trails)	(-13,900,000)				(+13,900,000)		
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriate of receipts)	41,250,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	+3,750,000		
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	7,370,000	8,750,000	8,750,000	8,750,000	+1,380,000		

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1978—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1977 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommen- dation	Increase (+) or decrease (-) compared with—		
					1977 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued</b>							
<b>LAND AND WATER RESOURCES—Continued</b>							
<b>Bureau of Land Management—Continued</b>							
Recreation development and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000			
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite, special fund).....		11,250,000	11,250,000	11,250,000	+11,250,000		
Working capital fund.....		2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000		
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite).....		100,000	100,000	100,000	+100,000		
<b>Total, Bureau of Land Management.....</b>	<b>432,657,000</b>	<b>423,424,000</b>	<b>434,516,000</b>	<b>431,915,000</b>	<b>-742,000</b>	<b>+8,491,000</b>	<b>-2,601,000</b>
<b>Office of Water Research and Technology</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	19,024,000	21,112,000	26,409,000	24,427,000	+5,403,000	+3,315,000	-1,982,000
<b>Total, Land and Water Resources.....</b>	<b>451,681,000</b>	<b>444,536,000</b>	<b>460,925,000</b>	<b>456,342,000</b>	<b>+4,661,000</b>	<b>+11,806,000</b>	<b>-4,583,000</b>
<b>FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS</b>							
<b>Bureau of Outdoor Recreation</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	6,977,000	6,857,000	11,719,000	12,499,000	+5,522,000	+5,642,000	+780,000
<b>Land and Water Conservation Fund</b>							
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite).....	537,799,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	+62,201,000		
<b>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</b>							
Resource management.....	148,506,000	168,628,000	172,796,000	165,434,000	+16,928,000	-3,194,000	-7,362,000
Construction and anadromous fish.....	24,211,000	42,692,000	62,903,000	52,694,000	+28,483,000	+10,002,000	-10,209,000
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance).....	14,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-4,000,000		
Development and operation of recreation facilities.....		150,000	150,000	150,000	+150,000		
<b>Total, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....</b>	<b>186,717,000</b>	<b>221,470,000</b>	<b>245,849,000</b>	<b>228,278,000</b>	<b>+41,561,000</b>	<b>+6,808,000</b>	<b>-17,571,000</b>
<b>National Park Service</b>							
Operation of the national park system.....	295,173,000	323,147,000	324,515,000	321,130,000	+25,957,000	-2,017,000	-3,385,000
Construction.....	130,952,000	143,190,000	149,397,000	155,706,000	+24,754,000	+12,516,000	+6,309,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(21,800,000)	(30,198,271)	(30,198,271)	(30,198,271)	(+8,398,271)		
Rescission of contract authority (road construction).....	(-118,995,000)				(+118,995,000)		
Preservation of historic properties.....	23,133,000	6,589,000	5,667,000	5,667,000	-17,466,000	-922,000	
Historic preservation fund.....		35,000,000	40,000,000	80,000,000	+80,000,000	+45,000,000	+40,000,000
Planning, development and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000			
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	7,600,000	3,783,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	-3,850,000	-33,000	
<b>Total, National Park Service.....</b>	<b>470,858,000</b>	<b>525,709,000</b>	<b>537,329,000</b>	<b>580,253,000</b>	<b>+109,395,000</b>	<b>+54,544,000</b>	<b>+42,924,000</b>
<b>Total, Fish and Wildlife and Parks.....</b>	<b>1,202,351,000</b>	<b>1,354,036,000</b>	<b>1,394,897,000</b>	<b>1,421,030,000</b>	<b>+218,679,000</b>	<b>+66,994,000</b>	<b>+26,133,000</b>
<b>ENERGY AND MINERALS</b>							
<b>Geological Survey</b>							
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	320,193,000	353,622,000	367,524,000	355,247,000	+35,054,000	+1,625,000	-12,277,000
Exploration of national petroleum reserve in Alaska.....	100,492,000	209,541,000	209,541,000	209,541,000	+109,049,000		
<b>Total, Geological Survey.....</b>	<b>420,685,000</b>	<b>563,163,000</b>	<b>577,065,000</b>	<b>564,788,000</b>	<b>+144,103,000</b>	<b>+1,625,000</b>	<b>-12,277,000</b>
<b>Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	99,301,000	105,766,000	107,116,000	107,806,000	+8,505,000	+2,040,000	+690,000
<b>Bureau of Mines</b>							
Mines and minerals.....	177,297,000	160,529,000	203,300,000	188,409,000	+11,112,000	+27,880,000	-14,891,000
Construction of Metallurgy Research Center.....	9,259,000				-9,259,000		
Helium fund (permanent contract authority).....		(47,500,000)				(-47,500,000)	
<b>Total, Bureau of Mines.....</b>	<b>186,556,000</b>	<b>160,529,000</b>	<b>203,300,000</b>	<b>188,409,000</b>	<b>+1,853,000</b>	<b>+27,880,000</b>	<b>-14,891,000</b>
<b>Total, Energy and Minerals.....</b>	<b>706,542,000</b>	<b>829,458,000</b>	<b>887,481,000</b>	<b>861,003,000</b>	<b>+154,461,000</b>	<b>+31,545,000</b>	<b>-26,478,000</b>
<b>INDIAN AFFAIRS</b>							
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>							
Operation of Indian programs.....	626,183,000	655,656,000	672,096,000	675,175,000	+48,992,000	+19,519,000	+3,079,000
Construction.....	77,101,000	87,247,000	94,103,000	64,153,000	-12,948,000	-23,094,000	-29,950,000
Road construction.....	39,075,000	70,335,000	70,335,000	75,335,000	+36,260,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(36,795,000)	(22,912,000)	(22,912,000)	(22,912,000)	(-13,883,000)		
Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund.....	15,000,000				-15,000,000		
Alaska Native fund.....	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000			
Trust funds (definite).....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000			
Trust funds (indefinite).....	25,400,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	-2,400,000		
<b>Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....</b>	<b>815,759,000</b>	<b>869,238,000</b>	<b>892,534,000</b>	<b>870,663,000</b>	<b>+54,904,000</b>	<b>+1,425,000</b>	<b>-21,871,000</b>
<b>TERRITORIAL AFFAIRS</b>							
<b>Office of Territorial Affairs</b>							
Administration of territories.....	58,072,000	21,001,000	21,105,000	21,105,000	-36,967,000	+104,000	
Permanent appropriation (special fund).....	58,072,000	336,000	(336,000)	(336,000)	(+80,000)		
Transferred from other accounts (special fund).....	(620,000)	(940,000)	(938,000)	(938,000)	(+318,000)	(-2,000)	
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	101,717,000	96,083,000	109,544,000	98,852,000	-2,865,000	+2,769,000	-10,692,000
<b>Total, Office of Territorial Affairs.....</b>	<b>159,789,000</b>	<b>117,084,000</b>	<b>130,649,000</b>	<b>119,957,000</b>	<b>-39,832,000</b>	<b>+2,873,000</b>	<b>-10,692,000</b>



Item	1977 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommenda- tion	Increase (+) or decrease (-) compared with—		
					1977 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
<b>SECRETARIAL OFFICES</b>							
Office of the Solicitor							
Salaries and expenses.....	12,916,000	14,053,000	13,844,000	13,844,000	+928,000	-210,000	
Office of the Secretary							
Salaries and expenses.....	21,362,000	23,161,000	22,443,000	22,821,000	+1,459,000	-340,000	+378,000
Departmental operations.....	13,726,000	13,464,000	12,922,000	12,922,000	-804,000	-542,000	
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....	907,000	1,000,000	285,000	1,000,000	+93,000		+715,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	35,995,000	37,625,000	35,650,000	36,743,000	+748,000	-882,000	+1,093,000
Total, Secretarial Offices.....	48,911,000	51,679,000	49,494,000	50,587,000	+1,676,000	-1,092,000	+1,093,000
Total, title I, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior.....	3,252,138,000	3,666,031,000	3,815,980,000	3,779,582,000	+527,444,000	+113,551,000	-36,398,000
Consisting of:							
Appropriations.....	3,385,033,000	3,666,031,000	3,815,980,000	3,779,582,000	+394,549,000	+113,551,000	-36,398,000
Definite appropriations.....	2,758,914,000	2,963,631,000	3,113,580,000	3,077,182,000	+318,268,000	+113,551,000	-36,398,000
Indefinite appropriations.....	626,119,000	702,400,000	702,400,000	702,400,000	+76,281,000		
Rescission of contract authority.....	-132,895,000				+132,895,000		
Memoranda:							
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(63,595,000)	(55,034,271)	(55,034,271)	(55,034,271)	(-8,560,729)		
Permanent contract authority.....		(47,500,000)				(-47,500,000)	
Title I, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	3,315,733,000	3,721,065,271	3,871,014,271	3,834,616,271	+518,883,271	+113,551,000	-36,398,000
<b>TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES</b>							
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>							
Forest Service							
Forest protection and utilization:							
Forest land management.....	641,259,000	424,573,000	550,035,000	531,054,000	-110,205,000	+106,481,000	-18,981,000
Forest research.....	89,785,000	95,650,000	102,889,000	101,488,000	+11,703,000	+5,838,000	-1,411,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	33,480,000	24,743,000	55,559,000	44,551,000	+11,071,000	+19,808,000	-11,008,000
Total, forest protection and utilization.....	764,524,000	544,966,000	708,493,000	677,093,000	-87,431,000	+132,127,000	-31,400,000
Construction and land acquisition.....	40,159,000	22,564,000	45,141,000	34,630,000	-5,529,000	+12,066,000	-10,511,000
Youth conservation corps.....	60,000,000	30,375,000	60,000,000	60,000,000		+29,625,000	
Forest roads.....	206,800,000	212,115,000	212,115,000	212,115,000	+5,315,000		
Timber salvage sales.....	3,000,000				-3,000,000		
Forest roads and trails.....	12,952,000	126,241,000	175,833,000	165,833,000	+152,881,000	+39,592,000	-10,000,000
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authority).....	(208,104,000)	(78,781,000)	(78,781,000)	(78,781,000)	(-129,323,000)		
Rescission of contract authority (roads and trails).....	(-39,827,943)				(+39,827,943)		
Acquisition of lands for national forests:							
Special acts (special fund, indefinite).....	160,000	165,000	165,000	165,000	+5,000		
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges.....	54,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	-16,000		
Rangeland improvements (special fund, indefinite).....	700,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	+4,500,000		
Assistance to States for tree improvement.....	1,385,000	1,387,000	1,387,000	1,387,000	+2,000		
Construction and operation of recreation facilities (indefinite, special fund).....	2,552,000	4,084,000	4,084,000	4,084,000	+1,532,000		
Total, Forest Service.....	1,092,286,000	947,135,000	1,212,456,000	1,160,545,000	+68,259,000	+213,410,000	-51,911,000
<b>ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION</b>							
Operating expenses, fossil fuels.....	521,775,000	795,800,000	710,927,000	785,757,000	+263,982,000	-10,043,000	+74,830,000
Plant and capital equipment, fossil fuels.....	62,220,000	95,970,000	90,970,000	96,970,000	+34,750,000	+1,000,000	+6,000,000
Total, Energy Research and Development Administration.....	583,995,000	891,770,000	801,897,000	882,727,000	+298,732,000	-9,043,000	+80,830,000
<b>FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	212,712,000	344,310,000	290,326,000	291,623,000	+78,911,000	-52,687,000	+1,297,000
Strategic petroleum reserve.....	447,824,000	3,018,933,000	2,309,033,000	3,018,933,000	+2,571,109,000		+709,900,000
Total, Federal Energy Administration.....	660,536,000	3,363,243,000	2,599,359,000	3,310,556,000	+2,650,020,000	-52,687,000	+711,197,000
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</b>							
Naval petroleum reserves.....	305,624,000	205,995,000	155,739,000	155,739,000	-149,885,000	-50,256,000	
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE</b>							
Health Services Administration							
Indian health services.....	345,892,000	368,066,000	429,901,000	413,987,000	+68,095,000	+45,921,000	-15,914,000
Indian health facilities.....	163,163,000	74,425,000	79,057,000	72,107,000	-91,056,000	-2,318,000	-6,950,000
Total, Indian health.....	509,055,000	442,491,000	508,958,000	486,094,000	-22,961,000	+43,603,000	-22,864,000
Office of Education							
Indian education.....	57,212,000	45,087,000	59,660,000	59,660,000	+2,448,000	+14,573,000	
Office of Assistant Secretary for Education							
Institute of Museum Services.....	100,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	5,000,000	+4,900,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
<b>INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,560,000	1,545,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	-60,000	-45,000	
<b>NAVAJO AND HOPI RELOCATION COMMISSION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	400,000	25,200,000	1,950,000	2,050,000	+1,650,000	-23,150,000	+100,000

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1978—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1977 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommenda- tion	Increase (+) or decrease (-) compared with—		
					1977 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
<b>SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	85,236,000	89,033,000	88,243,000	88,108,000	+2,872,000	-925,000	-135,000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program).....	3,481,000	4,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+519,000	-500,000	-----
Science information exchange.....	1,972,000	1,977,000	1,977,000	1,777,000	-195,000	-200,000	-200,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	6,580,000	1,000,000	2,500,000	1,750,000	-4,830,000	+750,000	-750,000
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	2,950,000	9,700,000	2,210,000	2,425,000	-525,000	-7,275,000	+215,000
Construction.....	-----	325,000	325,000	325,000	+325,000	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	12,686,000	14,717,000	14,717,000	14,419,000	+1,733,000	-298,000	-298,000
Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	1,140,000	1,306,000	1,255,000	1,256,000	+116,000	-50,000	-----
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	114,045,000	122,558,000	115,228,000	114,060,000	+15,000	-8,498,000	-1,618,000
<b>NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES</b>							
<b>Salaries and Expenses</b>							
Endowment for the arts.....	77,500,000	89,000,000	89,100,000	89,100,000	+11,600,000	+100,000	-----
Endowment for the humanities.....	77,500,000	87,000,000	87,800,000	85,000,000	+7,500,000	-2,000,000	-2,800,000
Administrative expenses.....	11,743,000	18,000,000	17,100,000	17,100,000	+5,357,000	-900,000	-----
Total, salaries and expenses.....	166,743,000	194,000,000	194,000,000	191,200,000	+24,457,000	-2,800,000	-2,800,000
<b>Matching Grants</b>							
Endowment for the arts (indefinite).....	16,500,000	25,500,000	25,500,000	25,500,000	+9,000,000	-----	-----
Endowment for the humanities (indefinite).....	16,000,000	25,500,000	25,500,000	22,500,000	+6,500,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, matching grants.....	32,500,000	51,000,000	51,000,000	48,000,000	+15,500,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	199,243,000	245,000,000	245,000,000	239,200,000	+39,957,000	-5,800,000	-5,800,000
<b>COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	221,000	234,000	233,000	233,000	+12,000	-1,000	-----
<b>ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	227,000	1,230,000	1,100,000	1,080,000	+853,000	-150,000	-20,000
<b>NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,966,000	1,819,000	1,819,000	1,819,000	-147,000	-----	-----
<b>AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL ADMINISTRATION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	65,000	-----	-----	-----	-65,000	-----	-----
<b>FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	29,000	30,000	25,000	25,000	-4,000	-5,000	-----
<b>JOINT FEDERAL-STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	737,000	712,000	712,000	712,000	-25,000	-----	-----
<b>PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION</b>							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,032,000	1,336,000	1,271,000	1,317,000	+285,000	-19,000	+46,000
Land acquisition and development (borrowing authority).....	25,000,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	-17,500,000	-----	-----
Public development.....	4,081,000	12,354,000	12,354,000	12,354,000	+8,273,000	-----	-----
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.....	30,113,000	21,190,000	21,125,000	21,171,000	-8,942,000	-19,000	+46,000
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>							
Petroleum Reserves (indefinite, special fund) (by transfer).....	(400,340,000)	(561,200,000)	(561,200,000)	(561,200,000)	(+160,860,000)	-----	-----
Total, title II, new budget (obligational) authority, related agencies.....	3,517,586,057	6,318,239,000	5,729,761,000	6,442,171,000	+2,924,584,943	+123,932,000	+712,410,000
<b>Consisting of:</b>							
Appropriations.....	3,532,414,000	6,310,739,000	5,722,261,000	6,434,671,000	+2,902,257,000	+123,932,000	+712,410,000
Definite appropriations.....	3,496,502,000	6,250,290,000	5,661,812,000	6,377,222,000	+2,890,720,000	+128,532,000	+715,410,000
Indefinite appropriations.....	35,912,000	60,449,000	60,449,000	57,449,000	+21,537,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Borrowing authority.....	25,000,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	-17,500,000	-----	-----
Rescission of contract authority.....	-39,827,943	-----	-----	-----	+39,827,943	-----	-----
<b>Memoranda:</b>							
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(208,104,000)	(78,781,000)	(78,781,000)	(78,781,000)	(-129,323,000)	-----	-----
Total, title II, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	3,725,690,057	6,397,020,000	5,808,542,000	6,520,952,000	+2,795,261,943	+123,932,000	+712,410,000
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>							
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles.....	6,769,724,057	9,984,270,000	9,545,741,000	10,221,753,000	+3,452,028,943	+237,483,000	+676,012,000
<b>Consisting of:</b>							
Appropriations.....	6,917,447,000	9,976,770,000	9,538,241,000	10,214,253,000	+3,296,806,000	+237,483,000	+676,012,000
Definite appropriations.....	6,225,416,000	9,213,921,000	8,775,392,000	9,454,404,000	+3,198,988,000	+240,483,000	+679,012,000
Indefinite appropriations.....	662,031,000	762,849,000	762,849,000	759,849,000	+97,818,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Borrowing authority.....	25,000,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	-17,500,000	-----	-----
Rescission of contract authority.....	-172,722,943	-----	-----	-----	+172,722,943	-----	-----
<b>Memoranda:</b>							
Appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	(271,699,000)	(133,815,271)	(133,815,271)	(133,815,271)	(-137,815,271)	-----	-----
Permanent contract authority.....	-----	(47,500,000)	-----	-----	-----	(-47,500,000)	-----
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriations to liquidate contract authority.....	7,041,423,057	10,165,585,271	9,679,556,271	10,355,568,271	+3,314,145,214	+189,983,000	+676,012,000



## SPENDING CEILING

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. In closing, Mr. President, I want to underscore the fact that this bill is significantly above the budget and the House. This is because the committee made a conscious effort to respond to congressional priorities as well as the priorities established by the President.

Often the priorities of the President do not reach the other body in time for consideration by their committee, and have to be heard initially by this subcommittee and acted upon by the subcommittee and the full committee in this body and then taken to conference. This has pushed appropriations well above the subcommittee's target for the regular bill. While the total remains slightly below the subcommittee ceiling allocated by the full committee, we must recognize the inevitability of at least \$500 million in supplemental appropriation needs—many of them mandatory—that will be following along in fiscal 1978. I am deeply concerned that we are pressing so hard against the ceiling assigned under the first concurrent budget resolution. Therefore, I urge those who are interested in additional funding in one area or another to exercise restraint.

Now, Mr. President, that completes my initial remarks on the bill. I am sure that my esteemed colleague, Mr. STEVENS, the ranking minority Member, will have a statement of his own to make.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, again it is a privilege to present, with our distinguished majority leader and the chairman of our subcommittee, the Interior appropriations bill for consideration by the Senate. Senator BYRD has already provided an excellent overview of the major provisions which are contained in this fiscal 1978 appropriations bill, but let me take just a few moments to highlight other items.

During the hearings we held on this bill, the committee became aware of pressing management problems in several of the agencies under our jurisdiction—among them, the Park Service, the Forest Service, the Indian Health Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities.

Some of these problems we uncovered can be easily remedied; others are longstanding and may require complete revision of certain administrative procedures now being followed.

In each of these cases, our committee has included language in our report accompanying the bill, and in some cases we were compelled to add language to the bill itself, to make our concerns clear.

The Senate can be assured that our committee will follow up to see that the directives in this bill and report are carried out.

In the energy area, as the majority leader has indicated, we have provided approximately \$800 million more than the House of Representatives for the strategic petroleum reserves, the Energy Research and Development Administra-

tion, and the Federal Energy Administration.

This includes the main amendment which was added at the request of the Senator from West Virginia to restore the money to purchase oil for storage in these strategic reserves.

I happen to share some of the feelings expressed by the House of Representatives that it may not be possible to commit all of this money in the coming fiscal year. But in deference to the distinguished majority leader, as chairman of our subcommittee, we have unanimously included this money as a signal of our commitment to the strategic reserves program.

And I am hopeful that those administering this program will come forth before the markup of this bill in conference and demonstrate precisely how much money they will be able to utilize in fiscal year 1978.

Our committee has supported programs in this bill for the arts, humanities, museums, and historic preservation programs. These continue to increase in accordance with the ever-growing public interest in these areas.

For program services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, and Indian education, the committee has recommended a total of some \$59 million over the budget request. But we have managed to stay closer to the overall budget for these bureaus by making significant reductions in construction items which are related to the management problems I mentioned earlier.

Funding for the National Park Service, Forest Service, and Land and Water Conservation Fund represents a significant increase over prior year program levels and should enable those agencies to continue the aggressive program of preserving open areas which we began in the fiscal year 1977 supplemental approved by Congress and the President.

On the whole, I believe the committee recommendations establish a balanced program in the many divergent areas covered by this bill, and I urge the acceptance of the recommendations contained in the bill and its report by the Senate.

Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the majority leader, for his kind comments, and I wish to add my voice to what he has said with regard to our staff.

Mr. Dwight Dyer continues to be, I think, one of the most effective staff members of the Senate in the manner in which this bill, a very complicated bill, has been handled, and I have been pleased with the assistance that we have all received from Linda Richardson, who is on the committee staff assisting me in the minority.

We handled this bill without regard to partisanship and on the basis that this bill represents one of the most significant areas of our commitments to the parks and wildlife areas of the country as well as to the human resources programs of the Indian Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and to the cultural activities of the Federal Government, such as the Smithsonian

and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Coverage of this bill is becoming staggering, and I believe that the teamwork that we have been able to develop over the years between the chairman of our subcommittee and those of us who are privileged to serve with him on the Interior Subcommittee is demonstrated in the bill as presented.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I shall make a few brief comments concerning this bill.

First, however, let me say that this is the first of our 13 annual appropriations bills to be considered for fiscal year 1978. The Committee on Appropriations has reported out the Treasury-Post Office and Transportation bills earlier this week. By the end of next week, the committee hopes to report out the Labor-HEW, HUD-Independent Agencies, State-Justice-Commerce and Judiciary, Agriculture, and military construction bills. Let me point out that this is what the committee expects to do; however, there may be changes or additions to this schedule. This will mean that between now and the July 4 recess the Committee on Appropriations will have bills prepared for floor action, and I hope that we can pass most of these bills by that time.

Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, who is chairman of the Interior Subcommittee; and the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. STEVENS, will provide the details of this Interior bill that is now before the Senate. Briefly, this bill of \$10.3 billion is \$189.9 million over the budget estimate and \$676 million over the House. Much of this increase over both the budget estimate and the House bill is a result of the \$710 million that was put back into the bill for strategic petroleum reserve. The distinguished majority leader strongly recommended funding for the strategic reserves.

Mr. President, this bill does not exceed the budget target ceiling, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am hopeful that any Senator who has an amendment to this bill will notify us. So far as I know there is but one amendment on our side of the aisle. Is there another Member who wishes to speak on the bill?

At this time I ask the distinguished majority leader if he has any schedule that he wishes to follow. The Senator from Wyoming has an amendment and is prepared to offer it at this time.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alaska is very kind and generous to ask. I do not have any such schedule.

I believe the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. DURKIN) will be calling up an amendment, but the Senator from Wyoming also is going to call up one and has indicated his readiness. So if he will proceed now I think we can go with the

Senator from Wyoming and then with the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, if it should be the pleasure of the distinguished majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) might first be permitted to make some observations that seem appropriate before I proceed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes, indeed. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am happy to yield such time as the Senator from Oregon may need off the bill.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Alaska as well.

Mr. President, I merely take this opportunity to commend the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies of the Appropriations Committee, particularly the subcommittee's chairman, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, and the ranking minority member, Senator STEVENS, for their overall accomplishment in this very large and yet very complex budget.

I especially commend them on their recognition of the importance of providing sufficient funds for forestry management.

We have had difficulties over the years in many areas of forest management, and we have not solved all the problems even in this budget. But I do know that we would be far behind where we are today if it were not for the forward-looking, progressive spirit of the leadership of this committee along with its very able staff.

This year the Senate has added over \$213 million for forest management programs over and above the budget requests, but I remind the Senate that this is really a very small amount in comparison to the contribution made by our national forests monetarily where the national forests through timber sales and through permits and other programs provide over \$400 million to the general fund for the Treasury of the United States.

This committee has recognized the importance not only of adequate funds for forest management for the multiple uses of our national forests but especially in the area of timber sales. I mention timber sales not only because the State of Oregon is the largest timber producer in the Nation but more especially as it relates to the No. 1 social problem of our country today which is inadequate housing.

When we look at the building materials needed and required to meet our housing goals, it is very important to have available that part of the forest management program relating to timber sales.

I think it is also important to note that the Federal Government has been somewhat derelict in its responsibilities in the general field of forest management in permitting a large number of acres to accumulate which should have been reforested. It is an example of where the Federal Government has taken the money from timber sales into the General Treasury but has not provided suffi-

cient budget funds for reforestation. But 3 years ago this subcommittee committed itself to reforesting those 4 million-acre plus unreforested lands in a 10-year cycle or on a 10-year program.

I commend the subcommittee again this year for maintaining that commitment by providing \$8 million over the budget to sustain the 10-year objective of reforesting those lands.

We are also adding in this budget moneys for the recreation and park program and for especially the camps and recreational facilities that had at one point almost \$90 million backlog of operation and maintenance needs, and by adding money to this budget this subcommittee has reduced that amount of backlog, and we still have that to accomplish in the next few years.

I take this moment of the Senate's time to make these remarks not only because of the importance of our national forests to the Nation as a whole which, after all, the Nation as a whole does own and control, but also as it relates to meeting the needs of the people in the States where those forests lands exist by providing funds for balanced management.

I know that the Senator from Idaho, who will be on the floor shortly, will have some comments to make, and I would like to reserve a few moments of time until later to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Idaho relating to some of the problems that still exist, that cannot be totally answered by providing funding, but will have to involve some policy decisions as well.

I again commend the committee for its progressive, forward-looking action in providing this level of funding for our forestry programs, and I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me for this purpose.

#### UP AMENDMENT NO. 486

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I call up my unprinted amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FORD). The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 486:

On page 17, line 19, strike "\$188,409,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$190,559,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a limitation of 30 minutes on the amendment, to be equally divided. The Senator has 15 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, this amendment would add to the Interior appropriations bill (H.R. 7636) the amount of \$2,150,000 for the Bureau of Mines for the purposes of combating serious subsidence in the city of Rock Springs, Wyo.

Since 1969, the Bureau has been allotted funds to continue the backfilling of abandoned underground coal mine voids located throughout Rock Springs. While much work has been done, the Bureau has continued to identify new areas as critical and potentially subject to subsidence. In fact, new subsidence has just recently occurred in one area

forcing a number of citizens to abandon their homes.

As a result of the Bureau's suspicion that there are more areas of Rock Springs not yet identified through drilling that are likely to subside, the Bureau has recommended a halt in new construction in Rock Springs unless it is preceded by drilling to determine the thickness of the overburden. This situation presents a serious problem for the city as there is already a critical shortage of adequate housing brought about by an expanding population associated with energy development in that part of the State. It is thus vital that the backfilling program be continued.

I have with me at this time a map detailing the areas of the city of Rock Springs which have experienced subsidence in the past. It will illustrate for Senators how this problem exists throughout the city and the problems which the new critical areas recently identified by the Bureau of Mines pose for the city.

The Bureau has estimated that it will require the sum which I have included in my amendment to conduct the necessary exploratory drilling and to fill and seal the four most critical areas which have thus far been identified. I should point out that in one of these areas there exists an underground mine fire, while another area lies beneath a brand new elementary school. While the surface mining reclamation bill included language to permit backfilling in future years, it will be a year or more before the provision in that bill could benefit Rock Springs. As well, to delay reclamation for that period of time will only result in increased costs. For the sake of the people of Rock Springs, Wyo., I am hopeful that the Senate will accept this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I recently received from the Bureau of Mines be printed in the RECORD.

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF MINES,  
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1977.

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HANSEN: This responds to your letter dated March 30, 1977, to which we initially responded on April 11, 1977, regarding abandoned mine subsidence problems in Rock Springs, Wyoming, and requesting a report on work that should be done in that city to obtain surface stability in the Cedar-Alder Streets area. You also requested a description of other sites that the Bureau believes should be stabilized in the city.

You may recall that after the subsidence event in the Cedar-Alder Streets area during September 1976, that the Bureau drilled nine boreholes in the area to determine the cause of the damage to the surface. These test boreholes intercepted mine voids in the no. 1 bed within 50 feet of the surface which went well beyond the eastern limits of the workings shown on our mine map. Logs of the nine boreholes indicate that the overburden above the mine voids is mostly unconsolidated alluvium with a maximum of only 1½ feet of dense sandstone near the bed. A thin slab of this type of rock spanning voids between the coal pillars could not be ex-



pected to act as a permanent supporting beam. Adverse conditions discovered in the Cedar-Alder Streets area confirm earlier suspicions of our engineers that available mine maps for Rock Springs do not show the full extent of the abandoned underground workings.

With this in mind, our field engineers examined maps of all mine workings under the city, reviewed drilling data available from previous backfilling projects, and selected three of the most obvious sites in Rock Springs where underground conditions could be comparable to or even more critical than those found under the Cedar-Alder Streets site. All four sites are nearby indicated subsurface coal outcrops and it is our considered opinion that an extensive exploratory drilling program at these sites would be needed to accurately identify the extent of unmapped mine voids and the composition of the overburden material. This information would also give an indication of the amount of fill material that would be required and would assist engineering personnel in selecting the method to be used for injecting the material underground and determining the cost of the overall project work. Outlines of the following four critical sites are shown in red on the enclosed map:

Site 1—(The Cedar-Alder Streets area) is adjacent to the southwest portion of area 15 on the map that accompanied the Donner-Whalke report of 1969. A copy of the report is enclosed. Considerably more drilling will be required in this area to locate all of the unfilled mine voids.

Site 2—includes portions of area 3 (Donner-Whalke report) where mine workings are less than 150 feet below the surface and which have subsidence potential. There is some evidence of an underground mine fire in this area.

Site 3—includes an outcrop area immediately southeast of area 11 (Donner-Whalke report) and may contain some unfilled voids that are less than 60 feet beneath the surface.

Site 4—involves open mine workings that underlie the school structure immediately south of area 6 (Donner-Whalke report). These old workings are less than 200 feet beneath the new school and subsidence could eventually cause damage to the structure.

An exploratory drilling program for these four sites would involve a minimum of 150 boreholes with an estimated expenditure of \$150,000.00. Many of the boreholes intersecting voids could, of course, be used later to inject backfill material into the mine openings. After exploratory drilling is completed, a decision could be made about the system or methods that could be employed for injecting supporting material into the abandoned mine area.

Although hydraulic backfilling could be applicable to site 2, the Bureau would, because of the depth and the evidence of fire, recommend the pneumatic injection of dry ash at this and other sites where the mine voids are both close to the surface and above the existing mine water pool. This would avoid disturbing the overburden and would eliminate the need to place long slurry pipelines on and under city streets. This is so because trucks, equipped with air compressors, could transport fly ash to and inject it into each borehole site. We estimate that the cost of drilling additional injection holes and conducting a backfilling program at the four noted sites would approximate \$2.0 million.

Eventually, depending upon the results of an exploratory drilling program, it may be necessary to undertake a comprehensive exploratory program of all known or indicated outcrop areas throughout the city so as to identify the existing and unfilled shallow mine voids. Because of these possible critical areas, the Bureau would strongly recom-

mend that new housing or building developments not be undertaken without appropriate professional foundation engineering consultation to determine surface stability in the area.

Sincerely yours,

J. D. MORGAN,  
Acting Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader, as floor manager, has asked me to speak on behalf of the committee in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. We did have a request from the Senator before the committee for this money, and inquired from the Bureau of Mines as to its capability of using the money. I have been informed that if this proposed increase is made available, with an authorization of four new positions, then the Bureau would be able to expedite implementation of the work program suggested by the Senator from Wyoming in fiscal year 1978 in the following ways:

Carry out an exploratory drilling program in four areas of the city where Bureau engineers have noted a high subsidence potential and where the opportunity exists to advance subsidence control technology.

After completion of drilling, analyze exploratory data to determine system or methods that can be utilized for providing surface stability in the project area.

Develop technical contract specifications, advertise for bids and award a competitive contract to seal and fill abandoned voids—of which one, area 2, contains evidence of an underground mine fire—in the four critical subsidence-prone areas.

Estimates for the overall project work are \$150,000 for exploratory drilling and data analysis and \$2,000,000 for demonstration of subsidence control techniques in four designated critical areas of the city.

We believe that the Senator from Wyoming has made a case for this amendment, and, on behalf of the committee, I am authorized to state that the majority leader and I both are prepared to accept it.

I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. HANSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time, and move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANSEN. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to ask some questions.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we did give a commitment to the Senator from New Hampshire that we would follow the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I would prefer that, anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 487

Mr. DURKIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I now call up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. DURKIN) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 487: On page 36, line 24, strike the word "\$785,757,000" and insert in lieu thereof the word "\$797,757,000."

Mr. DURKIN. Mr. President, when the Senate voted this past Monday to authorize the fiscal 1974 Energy Research and Development—ERDA—programs, it approved a \$15 million increase in the cogeneration demonstration program. An identical boost has been approved by the House Science and Technology Committee and awaits full house action. Unfortunately, the House appropriations bill, H.R. 7636, would appropriate only \$3 million for this important program. I propose to increase this figure to provide the full \$15 million necessary for an adequate initiative in cogeneration. Cogeneration has application not only in New Hampshire and the energy-starved Northeast, but across the rest of the Nation as well.

Cogeneration is a method of using all of the heat created by industrial boilers, rather than wasting huge amounts. Although many industrial processes require relatively low temperature steam for manufacturing, they use fuels which are capable of achieving much higher temperatures. Other processes are suited only to very high temperature steam. Once the steam has cooled below a certain point, it is useless for manufacturing. Cogeneration techniques interpose an electric generator somewhere in the system to take advantage of the energy in these processes which otherwise is wasted. Thus, the efficiency of industrial consumption is increased to the maximum and additional energy is available without adverse environmental impact.

At this moment, industries across the country waste tremendous amounts of heat which could be used to spin turbines and generate electricity. For example, using this waste heat constructively, West Germany cogenerates 29 percent of its electricity using far less fuel than would be needed if this were done in the United States. In this country, we cogenerate only 4 percent of our power. If we are to save the quantity of imported oil and scarce natural gas which the President has asked and the country demands, cogeneration will have to account for much more of our electricity. The equivalent of more than 2 million barrels per day of oil could be saved this way by 1985.

To make our energy intensive industries energy conservers, we must adapt cogeneration to American fuels and American industrial processes. That is where ERDA comes in. ERDA's Industrial Conservation Division was directed by the Senate to demonstrate applica-

tions of new cogeneration technologies in some of our own industries. This program will test important new cogeneration techniques, as well as prove to our Nation's businesses that what is in the national energy interest can be in their economic interest as well.

Unfortunately, an appropriation of only \$3 million will cripple this effort. Rather than going forward with the initial steps necessary to a balanced effort, ERDA will be forced to move at a snail's pace. Instead of coordinating our research and development program to coincide with the energy cutbacks our Nation will have to make in the very near future, it would lag so far behind as to be useless.

ERDA's purpose is to facilitate energy research, development and demonstrations so that both businesses and consumers can benefit. It is essential that programs as promising as cogeneration get adequate funding. That is why I ask your support to increase the fiscal year 1978 ERDA appropriation to \$15 million for cogeneration.

The \$12 million figure that I am asking by way of increase is for the cogeneration of electrical energy. The authorization bill which came out of our committee last week provided \$15 million for cogeneration. The authorization in the House of Representatives provided \$15 million additional for cogeneration. Unfortunately, the House appropriation bill provided only \$3 million.

The \$3 million is not adequate to pursue adequately a very promising technology.

Perhaps to some, the word "cogeneration" may sound more formidable than it is. By cogeneration, in oversimplified layman's terms, is meant the utilization of heat to generate electricity, to take the heat from the stack, the heat that has already been used to run the plant, and use that heat to run an electrical generator.

The administration, when Dr. Schlesinger and the President announced their program, indicated that they felt we did not have anywhere near enough funds for providing electricity by utilizing cogeneration. The additional \$15 million in the authorization is to provide three demonstration projects in three industries which are very energy-intensive industries: the textile industry, the chemical industry, and the paper and pulp industry. With respect to the paper and pulp industry, I can briefly describe what the furnaces and the technology will do.

In essence, you ordinarily take the bark of the tree and chuck it out. Getting rid of the bark can be a fire problem; but, in this process, you preheat the bark at a low temperature. You cook the bark, turning the bark into charcoal. The gas that is generated by the low-temperature heating of the bark is used to generate steam, and the steam is used for purposes of steam in the paper industry, and it is also used to generate electricity, which can be used in the plant to reduce the need for electricity there, or can be exported to the power grid. The bark leaves a charcoal which can be activated and used to clean up the discharge, be-

fore the water from the plant goes back into the river.

The possibilities are substantial. West Germany now generates about 28 percent of its electricity by cogeneration. Unfortunately, the United States generates only about 4 percent of its electricity in that fashion. This technology, utilizing cogeneration, has a prospect of saving well over 2 million barrels of oil a day by 1985.

The \$3 million in the House bill, as I say, is not anywhere nearly enough to adequately insure that this program will be brought on the line in the near future. By appropriating only the \$3 million provided in the House language, the cogeneration program would be delayed for 2 years. For 2 years there would be no effective cogeneration program, and the country would be the loser.

Until now, ERDA's cogeneration program has not been sufficiently funded to allow it to demonstrate the most promising cogeneration technologies. It has limited its efforts to less efficient methods which will save less fuel. By fully funding this accelerated program, Congress can require ERDA to move faster in an area that will be critical to conserving energy in the near future.

If our industrial sector is to become as energy conscious as we are asking our consumers to be, Congress must provide ERDA with enough money to assist in the necessary demonstrations. Therefore, I urge that you support my amendment and increase the appropriation for ERDA's cogeneration program to \$15 million.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, was there a previous order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 30 minutes on each amendment, with 15 minutes to a side. The Senator has reserved the remainder of his time. The Senator from Alaska will determine who proceeds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the manager of the bill yield 2 minutes for general comments?

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator permit us to respond to the Senator from New Hampshire? I will later yield whatever time the Senator requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has discussed this amendment with both the distinguished majority leader, the chairman, and with me.

The situation is that we did agree to the House addition of \$3 million in this cogeneration area, but the Senate has, in fact, increased that authorization \$12 million more in its action this week.

As I understand the situation, if we were to adopt his amendment, it would put this item in conference, as is the authorization bill itself. Under those circumstances, I would be prepared, and have so notified the chairman of our subcommittee, to recommend the acceptance of the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire on the basis that it will

be an item in conference, not only our conference, but the authorization bill conference.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire wrote a letter to me with respect to his proposal. I did not receive the letter in time to take the matter before the subcommittee. I fully intended, as I told him, to take the matter up in the full committee. Having been deeply engaged on the floor yesterday in connection with certain amendments which I was supporting dealing with the Korean withdrawal policy of the President, and also dealing with negotiations to begin the normalization of relations with Cuba, I was unable to attend the full committee meeting.

I assured him, that being the case, that he could call up the amendment on the floor during the debate and it would be given consideration and certainly have my support.

The Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out the additional need to fund all the projects involved in the authorization. Along with my distinguished colleague and friend (Mr. STEVENS) who has already addressed this amendment, may I say to my very able, persistent, tenacious, and dedicated friend from New Hampshire that I am very happy to accept his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HART. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield 2 minutes?

Mr. DURKIN. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I want to congratulate and thank the Senator from New Hampshire for raising this issue. I want to thank the majority leader for his agreement to it.

I have introduced legislation to promote, on a wholesale basis around the country and as quickly as possible, the concept of energy cogeneration, an issue raised in the President's energy message. I believe it is beginning to receive a great deal of attention as a possible means of conserving, saving, and capitalizing on energy already being produced in the industrial sector which could amount to great savings once the technology is perfected and once we induce industrial energy users and producers to capitalize on that energy to the degree that many of our European neighbors are doing.

I want to comment on the diligence of the Senator from New Hampshire and thank him for bringing this matter up and keeping it alive in this year's appropriations. I hope the support of the majority will continue, when we take up the full bill, to try to bring into the national energy sector a thorough ongoing cogeneration as a means of helping to solve our energy needs.

I join with both the Senator from New Hampshire and the majority leader in urging the acceptance of this amendment. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Colorado. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.



Mr. DURKIN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DURKIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DURKIN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator has rendered a service. I thank him for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield from the bill such time to the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) as he may need.

#### INDIAN HEALTH NEEDS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska. I will be brief.

I just wanted the Senate to know what this Senator feels about the work of this committee with reference to this appropriation matter. I personally believe that the distinguished majority leader and our minority whip, as chairman and ranking member of this committee, have done a splendid job with a most difficult combination of problems.

In particular, I want to thank the committee for their understanding and consideration of the health needs of the Indian people as evidenced by some of the appropriation items included in this bill.

I want to thank them for considering three facilities in my State which they have heretofore authorized for construction. In this particular year, they agreed with us that once we had them built, we ought to certainly staff them with adequate professional people so that these buildings in remote parts of both the Navaho Nation and other Pueblos in my State would not just have a building called a hospital, but would have the kind of professional staff in the year of 1978 to begin to take care of some of the rather staggering Indian health needs.

In addition, I thank them again this year for understanding the significance of the Navaho irrigation project as the fulfillment of a national commitment of almost 100 years standing. In this bill they have once again allowed moneys to the Navaho Nation for the continuation of the Navaho irrigation project. They have put sufficient money in to keep that project, a huge irrigation program on the Navaho Nation lands, on schedule, getting another block of land ready for irrigation, and the delivery of water to that particular site.

I thank them for it. I commend them for their understanding of its national significance.

With reference to one other item in my State which has to do with the Navaho Nation and energy production, I

want to thank them for their understanding of the Four Corners roads needs which happens to be a combination of the Navaho irrigation project growth and eventual energy production in that area. They have permitted us to continue on this year by appropriating \$5 million. They have permitted us to continue on with a joint agreement between the State, the Navaho Nation, and the Hickory Apaches for the construction of some vitally needed roads. We will have to continue that in the future. They have recognized that they want to keep that on schedule to the extent they are appropriating authority, by appropriating the \$5 million needed to keep that rather major road project on schedule for the year 1978.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Alaska, with reference to that particular Four Corners road system, as it is included within the Indian roads and bridges program: Does he have any opinion with reference to the future of that program and project from and after this 1 year's appropriation?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, both Senators from New Mexico have requested the action we have taken in the subcommittee. We recognize that significant progress has been achieved through the combined efforts of his State and the Federal and Indian entities toward the improvement of certain highways providing access to and across Indian lands in the Four Corners area under the provisions of Public Law 93-643.

The subcommittee has expressed, I think, in this bill that the present program warrants action to fulfill the Federal commitment undertaken in Public Law 93-643. However, we have also felt that the annual appropriations must be limited to the amount that can actually be obligated during the particular fiscal year covered by the bill now on the floor. For fiscal year 1978, that amount, we were advised, is \$5 million. Therefore, that is the recommendation of the subcommittee with regard to this item in the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator from Alaska. I agree that that is the amount that can be used to keep this Four Corners road project on schedule. I thank the Senator and the full committee for including that in this particular appropriation bill.

There are two items I want to mention briefly; then I shall conclude.

Along with Indian health, which, obviously, the committee has concerned itself with in ways far beyond those that I have explicitly discussed here, the question of Indian education is also considered. I commend them again for their concern. They have increased, in this particular bill, the appropriation for Indian education by about \$14.5 million. I think anyone that goes and visits our Indian reservations and pueblos and nations will understand that both health and education are paramount. I commend them for that.

In conclusion, we have a lingering problem of what hospitals to build next for our Indian people. In New Mexico, there is a facility known as Ship Rock Hospital, which serves Navajo people

from both New Mexico and Arizona. Again, I commend the committee for keeping that planning and design program on schedule. They have included \$800,000 to continue with the final plans and designs of that facility. I thank them for their understanding that it is a much-needed facility and that we have been working on it for a long time. This will keep it on schedule and, eventually, we shall have an appropriate facility in that part of New Mexico and Arizona.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) for his kind comments. The items he mentioned were included in the bill at the request of the two Senators from New Mexico. We are appreciative of their work with us.

It is my understanding that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. SCHMITT) wishes time. I yield him such time on the bill as he may require.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I associate myself completely with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New Mexico in expressing appreciation for the efforts of the committee in helping us on these extremely worthwhile projects in New Mexico, and particularly those for the Indian people.

#### COMMENTS ON H.R. 7636

I also hope that, as time goes by, one project which is deemphasized to a certain degree starts to receive more emphasis and inquiries, for New Mexico as well as for the entire Southwestern United States and potentially for the rest of the Nation. That is the project dealing with saline water and the refinement of saline water so it can be used for a variety of purposes in the arid zones of our country.

Mr. President, I also commend the committee on a number of items, very briefly, that have broad general application to New Mexico as well as to the rest of the country. In particular, I commend them for their efforts to maintain the funding for the strategic oil reserve and, with those efforts, the encouragement that goes to the administration to continue the development of an overall energy emergency preparedness plan that can give us a comprehensive and continually updated response to any potential economic attack on this country that would come as a consequence of future embargoes of the import of petroleum.

I also wish to mention to these gentlemen, and commend them for it, their emphasis on mine health and safety in the bill, not only on the increased research, but just the general emphasis of how important mine health and safety is going to be to the future solution of our energy problem.

The increases that are given the mine health and safety and other mining research are entirely justified. I hope that the close coordination that has existed within the Department of the Interior on research and inspection and enforcement of mine health safety matters can continue to be in that department. We shall be discussing this issue extensively next week in connection with the bill

that would transfer some of those jurisdictions to the Department of Labor, and much more will be said. At the present time, suffice it to say that the increased emphasis is very important.

I particularly wish to point out how important advanced research and technology will be to this area—not only to our ability to mine the large underground coal resources of this country, but also to providing the ultimate safety for the miner, that ultimate safety being the time when the miner is no longer in the mine and is able to operate his equipment from the surface—a time when equipment automatically supplies coal or coal-derived energy from the deep portions of the Earth.

Advanced research and technology have been proceeding far too slowly within the mining industry and within the Government. I hope that over the next year or two, we shall see increased emphasis in this area. There is a vast resource base, if you will, of technology which has yet to be tapped and which can be applied not only to the mining of coal, to the extraction of coal energy, but also to greatly enhancing the safety of miners, who must work in what otherwise is a very dangerous and dirty environment.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to bring up what normally is considered a small item but, in the long-term future of this country, may turn out to be critical. That is the question of helium. The committee has done exactly the right thing. Let me quote the report, which says that "the committee fully concurs in the House directive that the Bureau and the Energy Research and Development Administration jointly conduct a study aimed at developing a sound policy on helium conservation, storage, and future needs."

I believe it is well that this body and, finally, this country realize that, as we move into another century of much more sophisticated development techniques, helium will play an extremely important role. It is just one example. We are already experimenting in many parts of our technical communities with high temperature reactors of many kinds—gas reactors, both in the nuclear area and also high temperature use of coal and other fuels. In its closed cycle system, helium is one of the most important elements that we have for the transfer of energy. It is also a cryogenic material—that is, at very low temperature, it has interesting properties. It is particularly interesting as we examine the use of superconducting materials which will be important for the efficient transfer of power throughout this country. We must, as a country, realize that this extremely important natural resource is very limited. It comes largely as a by-product from the production of natural gas. We should not vent this element carelessly into the atmosphere from which it will eventually escape—it does not stay with the Earth. It eventually leaves our atmosphere for space. With that property, we must take every step we can to preserve it so it can, in fact, be used for future generations in the solutions of energy problems.

Mr. McCLURE. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a comment?

Mr. SCHMITT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. First, I compliment the Senator for having raised this issue in this context, because he brings to the debate an added dimension of credibility on a matter of this nature. It is a matter I have long been concerned with, because we are pursuing an unwise course, in my judgment, for allowing the helium to vent as we are locked in some kind of test of wills within the administration on this issue. They are pursuing a course that is full of folly, simply out of pride of past position and out of fear of confessing that they have been wrong.

It is a national disaster in very real terms, and we shall be paying, I am certain, hundreds of millions of dollars in settlement of contract liabilities without having anything to show for it. Future generations will pay a much higher price in the reduction of the opportunities in alternative energy sources and programs that will simply be foreclosed because the alternative of running helium at relatively low cost will be lost by actions being taken now.

I very much wish to stress the importance of helium in the future. All the scientists we have sought advice from agree, helium is an absolutely essential and critical resource and we are throwing it away.

I commend the Senator for having raised this issue this morning.

Mr. SCHMITT. I appreciate the confirming and supporting remarks of the distinguished Senator. I hope this Senate as a whole will now start to direct their attention to this program over the next year or two.

It can seriously restrict, as the Senator says, the options future generations have in how they solve their particular energy problems and, in fact, how we begin to find those solutions for them with a far-reaching and positive energy policy, which I hope Congress in its wisdom will provide for the rest of the Nation.

I thank the Chair. I yield back my time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his comments. I add my thanks to him and to the other Members of the Senate who graciously consented to the procedures we have followed on this bill in order that we might keep the schedule already set by the leadership, but at the same time consider the amendments that were adopted by the Senate in the ERDA bill when it was before this body on Tuesday that necessitated the change in procedure. Many people questioned it, but after examining it did give consent to the procedure we followed.

I am appreciative of their courtesy.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering H.R. 7636, the fiscal year 1978 Interior and Related Agencies appropriation bill. I would like to comment on the relationship between the bill and the First Budget Resolution.

H.R. 7636 as reported provides \$10.2

billion in budget authority, with estimated outlays of \$8.7 billion, including outlays of \$2.9 billion from prior year authority.

Under section 302(B) of the Budget Act, the Appropriations Committee divides among its subcommittees the total budget authority and outlays allocated to it under the budget resolution. The amount allocated to the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations by the full committee is \$10.6 billion in budget authority and \$9.5 billion in outlays. H.R. 7636 as reported would leave \$0.4 billion in budget authority and \$0.8 billion in outlays remaining within the subcommittee's allocation. It appears that possible later requirements totaling \$0.4 billion in budget authority and outlays for programs under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee may occur later in the year. If these occur, the Interior Subcommittee would have used up its budget authority allocation and have \$0.4 billion remaining in its outlay allocation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the relationship of the pending bill to the section 302 (B) allocation be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 7636: Fiscal year 1978 Interior and related agencies appropriation bill—Relationship to subcommittee allocation

	Budget authority	Outlays
[Dollars in billions]		
Subcommittee section 302(b) allocation	10.6	9.5
H.R. 7636	10.2	8.7
Remaining allocation	0.4	0.8
Possible later requirements:		
Forest Service firefighting	.1	.1
Miscellaneous natural resource programs	.1	.1
New or current energy programs	.2	.2
Total possible later requirements	.4	.4
Possible amount over (+) or under (-) subcommittee allocation		-.4

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I support H.R. 7636. The bill provides funds for many important programs. The distinguished majority leader deserves credit for bringing in a bill that fits within the subcommittee allocation. I am sure that the pressure for increases is great and I know that he exercised considerable restraint in reporting H.R. 7636 at these levels.

I would point out, however, that in the case of function 300, natural resources, environment, and energy, the amounts in this bill are likely to cause the first budget resolution budget authority target to be exceeded. Last month, in the first budget resolution, Congress adopted targets for function 300 of \$20.7 billion in budget authority and \$20 billion in outlays. Taking into account the programs within function



300 funded by this Interior appropriation, the demands on function 300 by other appropriation bills which also have an impact upon it, and possible later requirements in the form of supplemental bills, it appears that the enactment of this Interior appropriation will cause the functional targets to be exceeded by at least \$1 billion in budget authority. I would prefer to have the Congress maintain the targets as adopted for function 300. I would insist on it if the Senate and Congress did not have a reasonable expectation that the total of all appropriation bills will be within the congressional budget. It is certainly a prerogative of the Appropriations Committee to divide the funds allocated to it under the budget resolution among its subcommittees as it sees fit. This is true even if that division among subcommittees is at some variance with the targets in the budget resolution. This is an accommodation provided in the Budget Act very consciously to allow the Appropriations Committee the flexibility to live within the targets adopted in the resolution, provided that the total of these bills does not exceed the funds allocated to the Appropriations Committee itself under the budget resolution.

I have discussed these questions with the distinguished floor manager of this bill and have communicated directly with the chairman of the committee upon them. On the basis of these and other preliminary indications, I am assured that the sum of the appropriations bills will be within the budget resolution. Even though some functional targets in the first budget resolution may be somewhat exceeded in the enactment of these bills, other targets will be sufficiently under-subscribed in the same process so that the sum of all the bills does not exceed the budget.

So I will vote in favor of this bill. I will do so for the following reasons.

The bill funds important programs.

The bill as reported, plus possible later requirements, will not cause the subcommittee to exceed its section 302(b) allocation.

The bill should be consistent with the first budget resolution outlay target after the outlay estimates are reviewed in July.

The conference agreement should reduce the budget authority levels in function 300 below the levels in the Senate-reported bill.

The major increase in function 300 Budget authority is for acceleration of the strategic petroleum reserve which is an agreed-upon congressional priority, rather than for new programs.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee in a joint effort to maintain the policies established by the Congress in the first budget resolution.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader if he could, on behalf of the Appropriations Committee, inform the Senate as to whether it will be possible for the committee to remain within its first budget resolution allocation, taking account of likely action on the regular appropriation bills as well as supplemental requirements now anticipated?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. On behalf of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, let me say that the committee expects to be able to stay within the full allocation from the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1978.

If all of the possible later requirements materialize, it may be the case that an individual subcommittee would exceed its allocation. However, the supplemental requests we can anticipate at this time combined with the anticipated requirements of our regular appropriations bills will not place the committee over its full allocation.

The subcommittee ceilings are fixed by the full committee and can be adjusted by the full committee. We do not see an overall problem at this time, although we fully share the concern of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) as able chairman of the Budget Committee and assure him we are as committed as he is to assuring an appropriation level within the limits fixed by the Congress.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator MUSKIE, has already described the budget impact of this bill, and I do not intend to restate the same material. However, Mr. President, I do have some concerns and uneasiness regarding this bill and its relation to the budget which I believe are worth discussing.

It is true that this bill, by itself, is inside the allocation of funds provided to the Interior Subcommittee by the Appropriations Committee. It is also true that this bill is within the subcommittee allocation even after considering known possible later requirements, but there are two problems here. One is that this bill has more funds in the energy function of the budget—function 300—than was expected in the first concurrent budget resolution. If the Appropriations Committee intends to stay within its part of the budget, then the committee must have in mind a reduction somewhere else in the budget to compensate for this overage. I applaud Senator MUSKIE's efforts to seek assurance both from the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and from the floor leader of this bill, the distinguished majority leader, that the committee will in fact stay within its total allocation.

I should also say that even staying within its allocation could be a problem for the Senate if the priorities established by Congress in its budget resolution have been significantly modified by changes in the funding of appropriation bills. However, that does not appear to be a problem in this instance.

The second problem posed by this bill which ought to be recognized now is that we have used up virtually all of the flexibility intended for energy program funding in the budget resolution and we have not set aside funds for major new programs. We have instead set aside incremental amounts of funds for add-ons to existing programs. So I trust, Mr. President, that all my colleagues are satisfied with the funding for energy in this bill and that we are not going to be surprised later on by some new energy

expenditure idea which has not been taken into account either in this bill or in the category of "possible later requirements." Given the fact that we have used up much of our flexibility, any such later energy expenditure proposal will likely create severe budget pressures.

Finally, Mr. President, I hope that the conference with the House on this bill will result in a lowering of budget authority, thereby restoring some flexibility. It seems to me that a funding level for the strategic petroleum reserve which is lower than the Senate version would be appropriate. I have had some reservation that the speedup in this program envisioned in the Senate version is really necessary or useful, particularly if the extra funds cannot be spent effectively. Any such reduction in conference gives the budget some breathing room which may prove necessary later on.

I intend to vote for H.R. 7636, but I do so with uneasiness and with the strong hope that the conference result will solve the reservations which I have expressed here.

Mr. MUSKIE. On another subject in the bill, Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Interior has included in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies appropriation bill \$870,000 for Federal services for the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy Indian Tribes for fiscal year 1978. The funds were added to the bill in response to a recent supplemental budget request from the administration for \$916,000. I understand that the appropriation was reduced from \$916,000 to \$870,000 because of the subcommittee's concern that excessive funds had been requested for administering services to the Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Tribes. I am concerned that the level of funding was reduced even by this small amount but I share the concern of the subcommittee and of the tribes that the funds appropriated be used for services to the Passamaquoddy and Penobscot tribes and not for administering a new extension of the BIA bureaucracy in Maine. I would hope and I believe that subcommittee shares my view that all of these funds would be used for the direct benefit of the recipients in Maine.

This is the first time that the funds have been appropriated for the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy tribes. BIA and OMB were moved to request funding as a result of court rulings in Passamaquoddy against Morton but I want to make it clear and hope that the chairman will join with me in making clear that nothing in this bill should be taken to indicate a congressional determination or statement involving the rights of any parties in pending or future litigation regarding the aboriginal rights of Maine Indians.

I would note further that these funds for the Maine tribe are appropriated without particular direction to BIA as to how they should be used for the tribes in Maine. It is the tribe's desire and, I hope BIA will respect this desire, that the funds be used for self-determination act grants. Such a use would be consistent with the appropriation and I trust will be considered by BIA.

I want to thank the chairman and

the committee for their willingness to deal with this matter in response to a late request from the administration. I know that the unique situation of the Maine tribes makes the provision of Federal services a complex matter.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, let me respond to the concerns expressed by the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE).

The reduction in the budget request for the Passamaquoddy and Penobscot tribes was indeed directed at what the committee believes to be the excessive administrative costs involved in BIA budget proposals. It is not the committee's intent to reduce services to the tribes.

Further, I strongly endorse the Senator's view that, wherever possible, the BIA should contract with the tribes under the authority and intent of the Indian Self-Determination Act, to provide these services.

Finally, I can assure the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) that this appropriation and the services to the tribes that it will finance are in no way connected or related to any litigation involving the rights of any parties in connection with aboriginal rights of Maine Indians.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senators from Idaho and Oregon wish to engage in a colloquy.

How much time do the Senators desire?

Mr. McCLURE. Ten minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 10 minutes jointly to the Senators, for the colloquy.

#### MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding this time to the Senator from Oregon and myself because we have one area of particular concern—not concern with the figures or the directions of the budget, but with the understanding of a problem that confronts the management of the public lands as reflected in the budget and not necessarily shown on the surface of the report. That is the difficulty we are going to have as a nation in meeting the housing commitments we have already established as our goals.

Mr. President, an increase in funds for the planning of timber sales, as well as for current reforestation efforts and reducing the backlog of lands needing reforestation, is commendable. This will provide a volume of timber for sale offerings to meet the pressures for an increase in housing starts which are a welcome sign after a recent serious slump in our housing industry.

Of no less importance is a need for adequate funds for the planning process which was mandated by passage of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976. Congress stated its policy quite clearly in calling for the planning, funding, and execution of all responsibilities delegated to the Forest Service, including not only fiber production, but also the other goods and services that we need from our National Forest System.

It would be a tragedy for Congress to establish a policy which says, "We support a balanced program for our National Forests," and the next year turn around and say, "We are only going to fund part of the program." Partial funding was a legitimate public complaint during the debate on the Monongahela issue in the 94th Congress. The planning process is the key to resolving a bottleneck situation in our National Forests. That bottleneck is the situation created when 55 million acres of our national forests have been placed in a roadless area category, unavailable for development pending clearance by approved environmental impact statements. The Forest Service has attempted to move forward to clear these lands for future management, whether it be for wilderness designation, or for multiple use, or modified multiple use. To deny those planning moneys which set the stage for management would stifle opportunities for orderly planning and execution of a timber sales program, forest protection, and the other Forest Service activities. In

short, the studies must be completed as soon as possible. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Dr. M. Rupert Cutler has proposed a program designed to accelerate the resolution of the roadless area situation. His 15-month timetable, designed to resolve this bottleneck needs the funds to carry it out. This means that moneys for other programs must not be shifted around at the expense of those programs. Without the necessary funds for the planning process, we simply will not have the available acres cleared for management.

An increase in Forest Service personnel ceilings is helpful; however, our report must indicate that where personnel might still be a problem, it is the intent of Congress to support the agency use of contract services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a comparative table on forest management be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the comparative table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	FY 77	FY 78 request	House changes	Senate allowance
Forest management.....	\$641,259,000	\$424,573,000	+\$125,462,000	\$531,054,000
Budget request.....	424,573,000			
House allowance.....	125,462,000			
	550,035,000	House		531,054,000

House version is \$18,981,000 more than Senate version.

Mr. McCLURE. If, as a matter of fact, we do not have adequate management of the timber resources on the public lands of the Western United States, we have now seen a recovery of the housing industry to the point that we can expect confidently that we will have somewhat on the order of 2 million starts this year. But the statistic behind the fact is the matter of concern that not just those of us who came from the Western United States must confront. That is our identified housing needs established some years ago which were 26 million units.

We established a goal of 2.6 million housing starts for 10 years as the need for the housing industry, and we have not met that need, and the need is still as large as that targeted by the Congress of the United States some years ago.

We are now up to about 2 million starts a year, after a slump in the housing industry for a variety of reasons, but we do not have enough timber on the public lands or moving through the sawmills of this country to sustain a level of 2 million housing starts for as many as 3 years in a row.

So if we are successful in getting housing starts up and keeping them up for as much as 2 million units per year for the next 3 years, we will run into a shortage of available building materials, and that shortage will drive prices up, and it will inevitably pinch off the recovery in the housing industry at the very time when it is getting the momentum that we in Congress say we desire.

That is involved not only in the amount of timber that is put up for sale, it has to do with the amount of money that

is programed for the Forest Service and the BLM in bringing the timber to the point of offering it for sale, in doing the engineering that is necessary to lay out the road system that is necessary to move in and get the timber out.

It is also in the longer term absolutely essential to have enough money to do the reforestation and the intensive forest management that can enhance the yield of timber from our commercial forestlands so we can sustain a housing industry over a period of years.

But that masks one of the reasons we are having difficulty. One is personnel ceilings that are devoted to doing those jobs. As we have become more and more concerned about wilderness designation and special use classifications of various elements of our national resource lands, we have diverted more and more of our personnel into studying the allocations and studying the impacts, and reducing the numbers of personnel that were available to do the timber sales management, the programing, and putting the timber up for sale.

We have some problem in the submission by the committee or some latent problem if, as a matter of fact, those measures cause us to divert some of the amounts of money and personnel that have been programed in this bill.

When the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho was designated, I was a cosponsor of that bill. I supported it, and it was designated by the Congress of the United States, and immediately there was \$600,000 taken out of the Forest Service management funds that would have otherwise been spent on



other purposes, and programed into the management of that recreation area.

Some of the personnel moved over to doing the management of that recreation area.

When Hells Canyon National Recreation Area that involved the States of Oregon and Idaho was created, a similar thing happened. Some of the money and some of the personnel that had been programed for multiple use management were shifted over into the management of this special purpose unit.

In the Western United States, in particular, and in my own State of Idaho peculiarly, we have large areas of land that are now roadless and, therefore, within the classification of de facto wilderness areas and, therefore, subject to study for possible inclusion in future wilderness areas.

It requires a great deal of study; it requires a great deal of time to complete those studies and get them to the point of making a decision as to whether or not they shall be included in wilderness area or reduced to a special use area less than completely multiple use or classified for continuation in full multiple use.

This requires time, it requires money, and it requires personnel.

So a great deal of potential timber volume is tied up, at the same time a great deal of the budget and a great deal of the personnel are tied up in precisely that kind of an evaluation.

The result is that timber which will be available is not being moved to market, it is not being moved through the sales process, and not being offered for sale even in the instances where we know it will be commercial timberland, and the timber will be made available at some time in the future.

The result is we have an impingement upon the orderly processes of the market that will result in layoffs of men and women who are involved in this timber industry, the closing of sawmills needlessly, the disruption of community life and community values in areas of the West where we could avoid that if the Forest Service would take a critical and careful look at what is happening because of this kind of problem.

I know the Senator from Oregon shares with me that concern. I know the Senator from Alaska, with whom I have discussed this problem, shares that concern. I think it is necessary for us to focus our attention on that and to demand that the Forest Service focus their attention on that problem so that we do not run unwittingly into problems that can be avoided.

The Forest Service will go on forever whether a sawmill closes down this year and opens 3 years from now. That is of little moment to the Forest Service. Their retirement, livelihood and job security are not affected, but the communities in which they work, and the thousands of people dependent upon those communities are very vitally affected by that temporary interruption in the orderly management of the resources of this country.

I commend the Senators from Oregon and Alaska for having given attention

to that problem, both in the figures that are used in the appropriations and also in the report language. I would hope the Forest Service will pay some attention to what the committee has tried to do in this instance, and will help us alleviate that problem.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. McCLURE. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HATFIELD. I want to associate myself with the comments made by the Senator from Idaho. He has very poignantly set forth the problem that we face not only in the general forest management field in the West, but as it impacts upon the entire Nation relating to our national housing commitments.

I think very often we in the Congress will make some very specific goals in either the form of legislation or resolution, and we sometimes think that having made this kind of goal on paper that it is automatically implemented, when it really takes far more than rhetoric to implement anything.

I would use as an example just what happened in our area of housing. We made a commitment that we would have 26 million new units over a certain period of time, a decade, which would be about 2.6 million units a year. Yet, at the same time, we did not address ourselves to the policies of the Federal Government that would make material available to meet those housing needs or policies that, in effect, might inhibit the availability of such material.

Even last year, the Senator from Idaho knows, as we both sat on the same committee that worked out a so-called timber bill, a forestry bill, that was to solve the problems raised by the Monongahela court decision, he will recall we made a commitment in that particular piece of legislation to authorize the expenditure of \$200 million a year for reforestation purposes.

Even with the add-on that the subcommittee has made here in the Senate this year, we are at less than half of that level of funding, that very noble objective that we set forth in the authorization of \$200 million in that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if we could have 3 additional minutes for the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, further, I will say the Senator from Idaho was very correct in discussing the problems that are internal with the Forest Service that perhaps are even beyond the question or problem of funding.

I recall that when Chief McGuire was before our committee we were talking about some of the problems of programing in the Forest Service and how these problems could be resolved. He did indicate that money was one part of the problem. We asked him how much money it would take for certain programs, and he indicated that amount necessary. Then he indicated, further, that the cell-

ing that had been placed since 1966 on the Forest Service personnel level meant that, if they were to really meet today's requirements programwise, they would have to add 3,500 new personnel to the Forest Service.

Frankly, it seems to me that ceiling is not only an encumbrance, but perhaps it is an excuse as well. I think that some of these activities could be achieved through contract services far more broadly utilized than they are now through the Forest Service, and then also I think if one were to look at the internal problems, he would find that in the Forest Service a few years ago the forester was probably qualified to do about every facet of the job. Today, the Forest Service, like many other professions and industries, has tended to specialize and specialize so that a study now, rather than conducted by a generalist, is made up of a composite of specialists; the hydrologists, the soil expert, the wildlife expert, and all the others, so that each one has to sign off of a single study. To get all of that coordinated is becoming increasingly difficult and even once the study is completed we find now court actions, injunctions, administrative appeals, and what have you, have almost become a strategy rather than a seeking out of equity or seeking out of information.

Mr. President, I have been working on an omnibus wilderness bill for the State of Oregon, and I can certainly attest to the concern expressed by the Senator from Idaho about small villages and communities that are dependent upon the forest industry for their payrolls and for their livelihood and how the wilderness declarations would affect that community.

But more importantly, the fact that we have roadless areas and other areas which have been, in effect, frozen into a nonforest multiple use in an amount of 55 million acres, I believe, in the national forest—approximately at least—which is a figure that is now in effect put on the shelf as it relates to the possibility of multiple use and forest management practices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's additional 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Idaho for bringing this thought to the floor, and I appreciate the Senator from Alaska yielding this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we thank the two Senators for their contribution.

I call particular attention to the paragraph in our report which states that:

Concern has been expressed some 55 million acres of National Forests which have been designated as roadless areas, unavailable for development pending clearance by approved environmental impact statements. Funding provided by the Committee should enable the Forest Service to significantly reduce the backlog of required studies so that these areas can receive final designation as multiple-use, modified multiple-use or wilderness areas.

That was placed in the committee report at the specific request of the Senator

from Idaho. I think he has made a contribution to our efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, my namesake, HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished floor manager of the bill if he will refer to page 8 of the bill, the section dealing with the land and water conservation fund.

The House of Representatives took action which caused considerable concern to many Members of the House of Representatives, and I think it should be cause for concern to the Senate.

What the House of Representatives did was to take \$45 million which otherwise would have been available for State programs and made that sum available for Federal programs to Federal agencies instead.

I might say that during consideration of this measure in the House of Representatives, the able Congressman from the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, J. KENNETH ROBINSON, made an excellent statement in opposition to what the House of Representatives was doing, and I commend Congressman ROBINSON for his speech in this regard.

The present legislation, the legislation before the Senate—and I realize the situation the Senate committee found itself in as a result of the House action—appropriate \$306,700,000 for land and water conservation for State programs, but the legislation does take \$45 million away from the amount otherwise available for State programs and makes that \$45 million—to be exact, \$45,565,000—available to Federal agencies.

My purpose in rising is to express the hope that the Senator from West Virginia, as the floor manager of this bill, realizing the difficult position he found himself in as a result of the House action, in future legislation will carefully safeguard the funds for the State programs and not take those funds away from the State programs in order to make them available for Federal agencies.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the States can be expected to receive increased appropriations in future budget requests for the land and water conservation fund.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia for his expression of his interest and concern.

The allocation of these funds usually has been about 60 percent State and 40 percent Federal. The recommendations would change this to 51 percent and 49 percent.

However, the amount recommended in this bill for the States' share is an increase of \$130,767,000, up almost 75 percent over fiscal year 1977. Since funds earmarked for State use must be matched on the local level, there is a valid question as to whether all States will be able to raise the revenue required to meet the additional \$130 million figure that has been recommended.

If the State program is to be substantially increased, it would either be necessary to go over the budget requests by an even greater amount—and we are already over the 1977 level by \$2.5 billion—or the funds would have to be taken from approved Federal acquisitions. All of these federally authorized areas have significant backlogs in acquisition, and every year the committee receives numerous requests from Senators to provide additional funds for these activities.

So the distinguished ranking minority member and I, and the other members of the committee, feel that the recommendations under consideration provide the best balance for the program in view of the significantly increased funding.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for that detailed explanation.

In concluding, I emphasize that the Senator from Virginia was not advocating an increase in the funds but merely pointing out that what appears to be a reduction in funds from the land and water conservation fund insofar as the States are concerned. It was not actually a reduction because that amount of \$45 million plus was transferred to Federal agencies.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on passage of the Interior appropriation bill occur today not later than 1:30 p.m.

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

The bill is open to further amendment.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 488

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. SASSER). The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota (Mr. ANDERSON), for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY, offers an unprinted amendment numbered 488:

On page 31, line 15, strike out "\$44,551,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$47,551,000".

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment on behalf of my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. HUMPHREY, and myself to add \$3 million to the funds appropriated for the U.S. Forest Service for Dutch elm disease control programs. Dutch elm disease has been sweeping our country for a number of years. In Minnesota, it has had a disastrous effect. In the city of Minneapolis, for example, if no action is taken 95 percent of our elm trees may be lost to Dutch elm disease by 1985.

We feel that this modest increase in the appropriation would be extremely helpful, not only to my State but to some 41 other States who face a similar threat.

The U.S. Forest Service is presently spending \$553 million a year on forest protection and utilization programs. Of this amount, however, less than one-half of 1 percent will be spent on Dutch elm disease control.

The Dutch elm disease has caused a critical problem in Minnesota's metropolitan areas. The beautiful tree-shaded streets are being robbed by this deadly beetle. The people in my State are keenly aware of this critical situation and have already enacted disease control programs. The Minnesota Legislature has authorized \$28.5 million for this program to be spent over the next 2 years.

Only the States of Florida, Louisiana, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Hawaii, and Alaska have escaped infestation. According to the USDA study, the percent of trees killed is closely related to the length of time Dutch Elm disease has been present in a State. In States where the disease was first reported during the past 10 years, an average of 95 percent of elms still remain. In States where the disease was first reported from 21 to 30 years ago, an average of 32 percent of the trees are left.

The incidences of Dutch elm disease is highest in the Northeast, where 12 States have lost 75 percent of the elms within their municipalities. The impact of the disease is just now beginning to be felt in many Western and Midwestern States. Of the 16 affected States west of the Mississippi River, 12 have lost less than 25 percent of their elms and 9 have lost less than 5 percent.

Communities with large elm stands find that they must pay for the disease regardless of what course of action they follow. Either they can do nothing to impede the spread of the disease and face sizable tree removal costs after Dutch elm disease has taken its toll, or they can initiate a control program at a time when most of their elms are not yet infected. Studies show that control costs are from 37 to 76 percent less than the cost of removing dead trees where no control was attempted.

State and local governments recognize their responsibility in seeking to combat this destructive tree disease; \$30 to \$50 million is being spent by State and local governments on Dutch elm disease control programs. Last year in Minnesota alone, the State Legislature increased its funding for this program almost fivefold. These efforts are to be commended.

The \$3 million add-on authorized by my amendment is a first step in upgrading our Federal commitment to Dutch elm disease control. These moneys would be used for comparative field studies in an effort to determine the most cost-effective and environmentally sound sanitation program. Much work needs to be done on wood reutilization. Many communities see no alternative but to dispose of diseased elm wood through open burning or in land fills. Demonstration programs should be started to demonstrate the economic and environmental merits of converting elm tree residue into paper, charcoal, fuel, wood, and furniture.

These moneys could be used to provide scientific and technical expertise to State and local governments as well as provide a coordinated approach on a national level to the problem of Dutch elm disease control.

I am happy to respond to any questions Senators may have.



Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have discussed this amendment. I understand the nature of the problem. It is a \$3 million increase for an item we have already increased by \$1 million. I know it is a severe problem in many areas of the country, including Wisconsin and the Senator's State.

I am prepared to recommend that the majority leader accept the amendment on behalf of the committee and take it to conference.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, as the Senator from Minnesota knows, we have increased Dutch elm disease control funding by \$1 million. We had thought that would be sufficient. We were mindful of the need to control the problem, and we appreciate the urgency of the concern that has been ably expressed by the junior Senator from Minnesota in connection with the amendment that he is offering jointly on behalf of himself and his colleague (Mr. HUMPHREY).

I will join with the Senator from Alaska in urging the acceptance of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

#### INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I note from the committee report and from previous conversations with the distinguished Senator from Alaska that substantial reductions were made in funds for Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator such time as he may need to ask the question.

Mr. PEARSON. I would like to inquire from the managers of the bill, particularly the distinguished Senator from Alaska, as to the rationale, particularly in relation to the Haskell Junior College, an Indian institution of national reputation doing enormously good work for the Indians of this country, in my State of Kansas.

I know I have had a conversation about this with the Senator, but I think that this kind of cutting of construction funds, considering the institutional needs, which are well-known to both of us and to anyone who has studied the

problem, seems ill-advised. Perhaps the Senator might make a response.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have deleted certain new construction projects for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including one at Haskell Indian Junior College in Kansas. The Senator will note that we have also deleted projects at the Napa-kiak School in Alaska, and other schools in other States.

This action is taken without prejudice to any of the individual projects, but to express our concern over the Bureau's management of its building program, particularly school construction.

There is on hand an unobligated balance in the Bureau of Indian Affairs of \$62 million, and they have requested additional construction moneys this year.

In the bill, if the Senator will notice, on page 20, we have placed a proviso that States that within 90 days following the enactment of this bill—

the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress a plan for expenditure of planning and construction funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and shall advise during the year on achievement of plans and construction.

That is placed in the bill for the specific purpose of making it mandatory that we have this program explained, and particularly that we be provided with the details as to the commitment of the funds that have already been appropriated for school construction.

We know the Senator's longstanding interest in the Haskell Indian Junior College, and I am sure that he and other Senators will find some difficulty in understanding the way we have tried to bring this subject to a resolution.

Mr. PEARSON. What page are we on?

Mr. STEVENS. We are on page 28 of the report and page 21 of the bill. I assure the Senator, and I think the Senator from West Virginia would join me, that as we have stated in the report, there is no prejudice to any individual project. It just seems to me that since the Bureau of Indian Affairs has \$62 million available, some of it appropriated as long ago as 1969, that has not been committed, it is very difficult for us to approve additional funds, when those projects have not been completed as scheduled, and it appears that they are having difficulty in planning and executing their projects on a year-to-year basis. The House Appropriations Committee developed an excellent investigative report that sets out the BIA's management problems and recommends appropriate measures to correct them. To date, the Bureau has not properly responded to these recommendations.

Again I assure the Senator, knowing his concern for the Haskell Indian Institute, and I assume particularly in terms of the request for the new gymnasium, that we are cognizant of the support for these items. We, too, support them. We think there ought to be some detail supplied to us as by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as to what they are going to do with the money they already have before they ask us for more.

Mr. PEARSON. And that has not been the case with the money authorized and appropriated heretofore?

Mr. STEVENS. We have not been given accurate estimates of the use of the funds already supplied to the Bureau for use in construction of this item. If we get that detail before we go to conference, we would be more than willing to restore the money and to listen to what I am sure will be the pleas not only from the Senator from Kansas but other Senators and Congressmen involved in the States which are similarly affected by our action.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator very much. I understand his concern and his insistence upon an orderly procedure and procedures that will use these funds to their best advantage. I am just concerned because in the Haskell Indian Institute, in an authorization and appropriation of funds for dormitory buildings heretofore sought to be built there, the inflationary pressures ran over the amount involved and we had to cut back on some very much-needed construction for Indian children. Although I agree with the Senator and the rationale the subcommittee took, I hope this delay will not, in the end, cause a greater expenditure than it would otherwise.

Mr. STEVENS. We can assure the Senator that is our intent. If we can get some orderly progress in the planning and use of the funds in these school construction projects, we may not in the future be faced with so many reprogramming requests or such inordinate delay in the construction after it has been authorized and after the funds have been made available. I believe the Indian people are justified in their feeling that there has been too much delay in these projects once they have been authorized and the money has been made available. That was reflected to us in our hearings, and we really are trying to bring it to a head with the action we have taken.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I subscribe to the response which has been made by the Senator from Alaska, and I support his statement. I also appreciate the concern which has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be charged against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President,

I suggest the absence of a quorum under the same conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President I thank the majority leader and the Senator from Alaska for their consideration in giving me a little time just to review a matter or two in this bill.

I know that our colleagues from Oregon and Idaho, and from many of the Western States, have spoken today concerning the forestry provisions. I was the author of the 1974 Renewable Resource Planning Act program. I wanted to just make note of the fact that this bill provides the first real funding to implement that program. I am happy to note that the funds are at levels which will balance the multiple use of resources on a sustained yield basis.

The committee made selective reductions of \$51 million below the House recommendations, but I feel we should look at a few of these areas.

The soil and water and fish and wildlife programs on our national forests have long been left at too low a level.

These programs in the House are funded at about \$29,781,000, and they are funded in the Senate at \$26,781,000. On soil and water, the House again has its levels slightly higher than the Senate. The same is true in fire protection and the land management program as well.

I know that the Senators have made some reductions in other items that the House feels very strongly about. Particularly with regard to these four items, there really is not a large amount of money in the difference between the two Houses. I hope that, when the Senators go to conference on these items, they will be considerate of the need, particularly in fire protection and fish and wildlife, and will try to accommodate as best they can to some higher figure than is in the Senate bill.

If I may continue just a moment on it, the other thing I am concerned about is roads. There is a difference between the two bills of approximately \$10 million, the House being the higher figure of \$175,883,000. The Senate is about \$10 million less.

It is my judgment, frankly, that the road program is vital to the timber program. There is a desperate need for lumber. If we do not build these roads in advance, we are going to find ourselves with a tremendous shortage, which raises the cost of timber and lumber to the consumer. The House figures, gentlemen, I have to say, are much more toward what I think they ought to be. Frankly, it is my judgment that the money that we put into roads will yield a great dividend to our Federal Treasury as well as yielding a dividend to the consumer.

So, may I just say to the Senator from West Virginia that, when he goes to conference, I hope he will keep in mind those items.

I understand that on fire protection, with the youth conservation program we have, that can be bolstered. But on the road program, I think it is vital that we have a larger sum of money.

I would appreciate the Senator's comment.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator has indicated, the committee has approved a \$213 million increase for the Forest Service overall. That is substantial.

In addition, the Service will be benefiting, as the Senator has pointed out, not only from the recent Youth Conservation Corps increase but from the job stimulus program. But we are \$238 million over the budget and \$676 million over the House in the total bill. We could not agree with every House amendment and still accommodate Senate priorities.

As to the road construction, I can assure the Senator from Minnesota that we shall keep this vital interest in mind when we go to conference with the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Resources Planning Act that required a study of the road program recommended, actually, \$200 million for this. But, again, the House figure is about \$175 million or something like that. The closer we can come to that figure in the negotiations—and I know they will be tough negotiations with the House—the better off we shall be.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes. As the Senator has indicated, in the give and take of conference with the House, assuming the House conferees are agreeable with some of our priorities, we should certainly be giving sympathetic consideration to this particular area.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not come in as a critic. I came in to praise the work of the committee, primarily in this area of forest industry products.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, we understand that and we appreciate the Senator's making this statement for the RECORD, because it will guide us in conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator, very much.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I believe I had promised to yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. President, I wish to address my remarks first to the Senator from West Virginia.

On June 14, together with my colleague from Colorado, Senator HART, I wrote the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee concerning the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Roosevelt National Forest which were authorized in Public Law 95-42. These are in the State of Colorado. They are lands within the Big Thompson River Canyon that were subject to a severe, devastating flood on July 31, 1976, in which 139 people were killed.

It is my assumption, Mr. President—and I ask the distinguished Senator if it is also his assumption—that the ac-

quisition moneys for these lands would be contained in the additional \$22 million-plus increase in the budget request referred to on page 12 of the committee report.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The committee is aware of this new authorization to which the Senator has referred, but it was signed into law less than a week ago, and there was no time to conduct hearings or to inquire into it.

However, the committee has approved \$67 million for Forest Service land acquisition, a \$22 million increase. Within that general allowance, I know that the committee will clearly expect the Forest Service to allot sufficient funds to begin this acquisition program in the Big Thompson River canyon. We realize that this is a relief measure as well as a beneficial land acquisition, and we expect the Forest Service to give it high priority.

Mr. HASKELL. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I am delighted to see that the bill before us contains an appropriation of \$3,920,000 for acquisition of additional lands for the White Mountain National Forest. This represents considerable effort by interested nature societies, local town officials and citizens, as well as the entire New Hampshire congressional delegation.

We were all joined in this work by other interested Senators, particularly Senator LEAHY and Senator BROOKE. This is not surprising, since the White Mountain Forest is a recreational resource for the entire Northeast, being within a day's drive of more than 60 million people. As many as 5.4 million people have visited the area in a single year and this is expected to increase by as much as 10 percent each year.

In addition to their recreational potential, these parcels that could be purchased with this appropriation will provide increased protection for a number of significant animal and plant species. The consolidation that will result from such purchases would likewise protect the White Mountain National Forest from any adverse developments that might jeopardize the natural qualities of this region.

This action proposed today by the Appropriations Committee is fully in keeping with the intent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to use moneys for purchase of acreage east of the 100th meridian. Despite the fact that the land in question is within the borders of New Hampshire, I am sure that this legislation will provide the opportunity for millions of Americans to take advantage of the recreational benefits of the White Mountain National Forest. For this reason I applaud the action of the Appropriation Committee, and especially the assistance and understanding of the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement.



I also applaud him on his continuing interest in the projects and programs that affect the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.  
Mr. STEVENS. I yield back my time.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS SUBMITTED

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, today, the Senate is considering a \$10.3 billion appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1978. This bill provides the necessary funding for a number of important programs such as the National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and other activities in the Department of the Interior and for such independent agencies as the Energy Research and Development Administration's nonnuclear programs, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities.

There are a number of items included in the bill which are of particular interest to me. The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore provides recreational opportunities for large numbers of people living in northern Indiana and metropolitan Chicago area and the fiscal year 1978 bill provides funding for the continuing development of this area. For land acquisition, the bill contains \$15.4 million and for operation of the park there is approximately \$1.5 million. Hopefully, this level of funding will allow the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore to offer continued services to the many visitors whom the park is attracting. One of my particular concerns is to insure that the Park Service has necessary funding to provide adequate supervision for the safety and security of the large number of people using the park as a result of the opening of the West Beach facility this summer. The Park Service, I believe, is sensitive to this problem, and has given assurances that they will have the necessary resources to handle the increase in visitors to the Indiana Dunes. However, if that should not prove to be the case, I expect the Park Service to notify the Appropriations Committee of any necessary increase in funding.

The bill also contains first-time funding for a program to develop recreational uses of railroad rights-of-way to be administered by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Although the Senate approved funding for this program in the fiscal year 1977 supplemental appropriations bill, it was dropped in conference. Therefore, I am particularly gratified that it is in both House and Senate versions of the fiscal year 1978 bill at a \$5 million level.

The types of projects eligible in this new program would include parks, bike-ways, conservation and wildlife preservation sites and they would be eligible for up to 90-percent Federal funding with the remaining 10 percent coming from State and local sources. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has identified \$30 million worth of possible projects for the utilization of abandoned railroad rights-of-way for recreational purposes. Approximately \$2 million worth of projects are in Indiana. Obviously, a \$5 million appropriation will not fund all projects but I am hopeful that a start can be made which will

demonstrate the excellent potential for this program.

The Senate has also agreed with the House's recommended increase of \$15 million in the Bureau of Mines program for advanced coal mining technology. The President's energy message specifically calls for a more than two-thirds increase in coal production for a total production level of over 1 billion tons per year. Our success in achieving this increase in coal production will depend in large measure upon the timely development of the advanced coal-mining technology. The total budget of \$70 million contained in the bill should help move us ahead in this area.

The Institute of Museum Services was established during the last Congress and the Senate bill provided \$5 million for the institute, an increase of \$2 million over the House figure. Grants made under this program will assist museums to expand and improve their services in such areas as the construction and installation of displays and exhibits, conservation of collections and staff training. Although \$5 million is a relatively small start for this program, it will give the program a chance to demonstrate its worth and provide some very necessary aid to museums throughout the country.

In the bill approved by the House, \$45 million was transferred from the States' share of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the Federal programs under the fund, and the Senate bill makes this same adjustment. This leaves the States with 51 percent of the \$600 million in the fund. In the past the authorizing legislation provided that the Federal Government receive no more than 40 percent of the fund. However, this has been recently changed to provide that the Federal Government receive no less than 40 percent of the money in the fund. This change in the legislation allowed for a 51 percent to 49 percent State/Federal split in this year's bill. While some of the \$45 million which was transferred went to a number of critical Federal programs, I would hope that no further reduction will occur in the States' share of the fund in future years. In fact, I believe that the States, and certainly Indiana, can effectively use more than a 51-percent share of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD and the ranking member, Senator TED STEVENS, deserve much credit for working out a bill that carefully considers and weighs our Nation's priorities for the Department of the Interior and the other agencies covered by this bill, and I want to thank them for their cooperation and assistance. Also, the staff of the subcommittee has worked long hours and been most helpful and cooperative.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I am very pleased to see the 1978 Interior and related agencies appropriations bill contains additional funding for the Sikes Act programs. These programs provide for participation by the Department of Interior through the Bureau of Land Management, and by the Department of

Agriculture through the Forest Service, in planning, developing, and maintaining fish and wildlife resources in cooperation with States on the vast acreages of land held by these Federal agencies. In the past, the Sikes Act programs have received inadequate attention and funding, and I feel that through a renewed effort to fund this program, we have a tremendous opportunity to develop and maintain wildlife and fisheries resources and the recreational opportunities which will flow from enhanced management. Many State game and fish officials testified in hearings on this subject earlier this year in favor of such increased funding, and I commend the committee for its actions in this regard. I am also pleased to see that the committee has directed the involved Federal agencies to plan for increased Sikes Act funding in fiscal year 1979. I ask unanimous consent that the attached letter from Mr. Earl Thomas, director of Wyoming's Game and Fish Department, be printed in the RECORD.

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

GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT,  
Cheyenne, April 6, 1977.

HON. MALCOLM WALLOP,  
U.S. Senator, Dirksen Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WALLOP: In your position as Senator from our State, we know you are interested in the implementation of the cooperative fisheries and wildlife management plans on lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management within Wyoming. Fish and Wildlife habitat management programs on these public lands have historically been either underfunded or not funded at all. The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, for example, recognizes the need for better programs on these resources. Other federal acts have addressed these needs such as the Endangered Species Act of 1973, Resources Planning Act of 1974, and more recently, the National Forest Management Act of 1976 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 often referred to as the Bureau of Land Management Organic Act.

In 1973, an amendment to the Sikes Act was passed and intended to stimulate cooperative planning between the several states and federal agencies having jurisdiction over the public lands. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department has worked long and hard formulating acceptable management plans for Wyoming and in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service and the B.L.M., these cooperative plans will hopefully justify appropriate federal funding and are essentially the basis of our request for your attention.

At its 66th Annual Convention in Dearborn, Michigan, Resolution No. 7 entitled "Sikes Act Implementation" was adopted by the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

"Now therefore, be it Resolved, That the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies urges Congress to extend authorization for Sikes Act funding and to appropriate funds so completed comprehensive plans for fish and wildlife habitat development may be implemented."

I bring this Resolution to your attention because it indicates a concern on the part of wildlife management agencies nationally over the need for a concerted effort to bring about sufficient funding for implementation of the Sikes Act. It is our understanding that there are 35 states, including our own, in

need for funding for cooperative fish and wildlife plans developed with the Forest Service which will require approximately \$26,000,000 to implement.

The B.L.M. has completed 52 habitat management plans in eleven states which will require \$8,284,000. A listing of these habitat management areas by state is attached.

It is our wish to have our interest in adequate financing for these fish and wildlife programs expressed for the record and we are actively seeking your consideration and support for appropriate funds sufficient to implement comprehensive plans for fish and wildlife habitat development under the Sikes Act.

We appreciate very much your interest in this and any other fish and wildlife management matters and thank you for your consideration in giving this matter your attention at the earliest appropriate time.

Sincerely yours,

EARL M. THOMAS,  
Director, Wyoming Game and Fish Department.

*Forest Service-State Comprehensive Fish and Wildlife Habitat Programs*

Region, State, completion date, and cost:  
1, Montana, December 1976, \$1,935,500.  
Idaho, December 1976, \$2,537,900.  
North Dakota (Grasslands), \$350,000.  
2, Wyoming, December 1976, \$753,000.  
South Dakota, December 1976, \$789,000.  
Nebraska, December 1976, \$323,000.  
Colorado, December 1976, \$365,565.  
Kansas, December 1976, \$145,000.  
3, New Mexico, December 1976, \$1,500,000.  
4, Nevada, December 1976, \$417,500.  
Utah, December 1976, \$450,000.  
5, California, completed, \$2,000,000.  
6, Oregon, completed, \$756,750.  
Washington, completed, \$186,200.  
8, Alabama, completed, \$252,430.  
Arkansas, completed, \$880,100.  
Florida, completed, \$334,069.  
Georgia, completed, \$227,100.  
Kentucky, completed, \$252,000.  
Louisiana, completed, \$373,812.  
Mississippi, completed, \$378,079.  
North Carolina, December 1976, \$350,000.  
8, 3, Oklahoma, completed, \$143,406.  
South Carolina, completed, \$149,380.  
Tennessee, completed, \$80,000.  
8, 3, Texas, completed, \$404,460.  
Virginia, completed, \$1,013,000.  
9, Indiana, December 1976, \$300,000.  
Michigan, completed, \$1,543,000.  
Mississippi, completed, \$378,079.  
Missouri, completed, \$375,000.<sup>1</sup>  
Ohio, December 1976, \$300,000.  
West Virginia, December 1976, \$800,000.  
Wisconsin, completed, \$413,000.  
10, Alaska, December 1976, \$3,356,000.  
Total, \$26,168,251.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Third year increment of five-year program for Missouri National Forests.

<sup>2</sup> Total costs for implementing the 35 programs. State plans yet to be completed include Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Arizona, and New York.

*Bureau of Land Management, Habitat Management Areas for 1978*

State, plans, funds, and major emphasis:  
Alaska, 4, \$877,000, big game and riparian habitat.  
Arizona, 4, \$921,000, big game and riparian habitat.  
California, 3, \$700,000, big game and T&E species.  
Colorado, 4, \$687,000, big game and T&E species and riparian habitat.  
Idaho, 6, \$627,000, upland game, aquatic habitat and big game.  
Montana, 2, \$829,000, big game and riparian.  
Nevada, 15, \$334,000, big game, riparian, T&E species.

New Mexico, 2, \$463,000, big game T&E species.

Oregon 1, \$206,000, big game, riparian, fisheries, T&E species.

Utah, 6, \$2,208,000, deer, riparian and aquatic habitat.

Wyoming 5, \$432,000, T&E species, riparian and aquatic habitat.

Total, 52, \$8,284,000.

*INDIAN PROGRAMS UNDER INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, again I want to commend the committee for its final expeditious work on Interior appropriations.

In particular, I want to thank the committee for recognizing the need for increasing our support for native American programs in housing and health. I note that the committee has recommended increases over the budget request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs housing program as well as for Indian health services and facilities.

I have long been concerned over the urgent need for adequate housing on Indian reservations. This increase will help to correct the critical need for housing.

Through the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, Congress paved the way for the upgrading of Indian health care programs throughout the nation, not only on the reservation but in our urban areas as well. In particular, I thank the chairman for including the funds for the second phase of construction of the Red Lake Hospital and extended care facility at the Red Lake Chippewa Reservation in Minnesota. The facility will be a major comprehensive curative and preventive health care program planned to meet the total health needs of the Red Lake population.

Indian health care and facilities are a continuing Federal responsibility. I thank the committee for its recognition of this commitment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The bill having been read a third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), and the Senator from New

Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), is absent because of illness in family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), would vote "yea."

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFFEE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Allen	Gravel	Moynihan
Anderson	Griffin	Muskie
Baker	Hansen	Nelson
Bayh	Hart	Nunn
Bellmon	Haskell	Pearson
Bumpers	Hatch	Percy
Burdick	Hatfield	Proxmire
Byrd	Hayakawa	Randolph
Byrd, Robert C.	Heinz	Ribicoff
Cannon	Hemas	Riegle
Case	Hollings	Sasser
Chiles	Huddleston	Schmitt
Clark	Humphrey	Schweiker
Cranston	Inouye	Scott
Culver	Jackson	Sparkman
Curtis	Javits	Stafford
Danforth	Kennedy	Stennis
DeConcini	Laxalt	Stevens
Dole	Leahy	Stevenson
Domenici	Lugar	Stone
Durkin	Matsunaga	Talmadge
Eagleton	McClure	Thurmond
Eastland	McGovern	Tower
Ford	McIntyre	Wallop
Garn	Metcalfe	Weicker
Glenn	Metzenbaum	Young
	Morgan	Zorinsky

NAYS—2

Bartlett

Roth

NOT VOTING—18

Abourezk	Goldwater	McClellan
Bentsen	Hathaway	Melcher
Biden	Johnston	Packwood
Brooke	Long	Pell
Chafee	Magnuson	Sarbanes
Church	Mathias	Williams

So the bill (H.R. 7636) was passed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make clerical and technical corrections in the engrossment of the Senate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HATFIELD, and



Mr. BELLMON conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

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

#### THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, Senators HUMPHREY, JACKSON, MUSKIE, and myself had breakfast with President Carter and Vice President MONDALE for an overall discussion of the situation in the Middle East.

The breakfast took 1½ hours during which we discussed the entire problems in the Middle Eastern area involving the State of Israel and its Arab neighbors.

You could not help but come away from that discussion with the clear feeling that the President of the United States is strongly committed to a real and true peace in the Middle East.

I have the utmost faith and confidence in President Carter and I support his objectives in the Middle East.

In the middle of July, the new Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Begin, will be coming to Washington to confer with President Carter. I am further convinced that these two leaders will have the same objectives, and those objectives are to secure, after 29 years, a real peace in the Middle East.

Today, at this very moment, the Vice President of the United States, WALTER F. MONDALE, is making a speech before the World Affairs Council of northern California in the city of San Francisco. I have before me a copy of that speech, and it is a most impressive document because it sets out the Carter administration's position on the Middle East, and I would like to read some excerpts from the Vice President's speech in San Francisco:

America has a special responsibility and a special opportunity to help bring about this kind of peace. This comes about first of all because of our unique and profound relationship with the state of Israel since its creation more than a generation ago. Our sense of shared values and purposes means that, for Americans, the question of Israel's survival is not a political question but rather stands as a moral imperative of our foreign policy.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, which is supported by all the parties, provides a basis for the negotiations which are required if there is to be a settlement.

To this end, the President has tried to describe our understanding of what the key elements of an overall framework for an agreement might be:

A commitment to a genuine and lasting peace demonstrated by concrete acts to normalize relations among the countries of the area.

The establishment of borders for Israel which are recognized by all and which can be kept secure.

A fair solution to the problem of the Palestinians.

President Carter has gone further than any of his predecessors to stress with

Arab leaders the essential point that peace must mean more than merely the end of hostilities.

The President's extemporaneous remarks in Clinton, Mass., last March, came from his heart and his mind, and they contain the President's basic thinking. I quote:

... the first prerequisite of a lasting peace is the recognition of Israel by her neighbors: Israel's right to exist; Israel's right to exist permanently; Israel's right to exist in peace. That means that over a period of months or years that the borders between Israel and Syria, Israel and Lebanon, Israel and Jordan, Israel and Egypt must be opened up to travel, to tourism, to cultural exchange, to trade, so that no matter who the leaders might be in those countries the people themselves will have formed a mutual understanding and comprehension and a sense of a common purpose to avoid the repetitious wars and deaths that have affected that region so long. That is the first prerequisite of peace.

I read further from the Vice President's speech:

We have made clear our view that Israel should not be asked to withdraw unless it can secure in return real peace from its neighbors.

The question of withdrawal is, in essence, the question of borders. For peace to be enduring, borders must be inviolable. Nations must feel secure behind their borders. Borders must be recognized by all.

Mr. President, during November, 12 U.S. Senators, Democrats and Republicans alike, traveled in the Middle East, and we talked with the leaders of Israel, Jordan, Egypt, and Iran. We came back from that trip and from our many in-depth conversations feeling that 1977 indeed was a year in which movement should take place to achieve peace in the Middle East.

Personally I, and I think all 12 of us, felt that there was deep sincerity by President Sadat, by King Hussein, by the then Prime Minister Rabin, and those in office with him, that they all had the same objective to finally end the state of hostilities that had taken place and was still in existence in the Middle East.

President Carter has made it a cornerstone of his foreign policy, and he has enlisted his time, his energies, to bring these peaceful negotiations to a successful conclusion. They are going to be difficult, they are going to be time-consuming. But the President of the United States deserves the support of all Americans and all peace-loving people all over the world in achieving these objectives.

I have the highest commendation for President Carter and Vice President MONDALE.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the Vice President be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT WALTER F. MONDALE

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 17.—Here is the text of Vice President Walter F. Mondale's speech to the World Affairs Council of Northern California:

In the last several months, I've undertaken two extended foreign trips on behalf of the President to Europe and Japan. The more I travel, and the more nations I visit, the more I come to believe that the peoples of the

world are not really so different . . . that all of us dream the same dreams for our children . . . and that the real key to peace and cooperation in the world lies in better understanding between people. Diplomats and heads of state and elected officials must play a role, but we should never underestimate the power of ideas and education and greater understanding to break down the barriers of suspicion and fear that too often separate the nations of the world.

Your programs in the school system, on television, the lectures and seminars you hold, your conference for model UN students are all an important part of that effort. And I'm particularly pleased to see that you're joining together with a number of groups involved in international relations in a new World Affairs Center here in San Francisco and I wish you every success in that venture. And so the contributions of an organization such as yours towards increased understanding in the world are really crucial, not only to the foreign policy efforts of this nation, but to the search for peace.

With the words of his Inaugural Address, President Carter identified at the very outset of his Administration the guiding spirit of this nation's foreign policy:

"Our nation can be strong abroad only if it is strong at home, and we know that the best way to enhance freedom in other lands is to demonstrate here that our democratic system is worthy of emulation. To be true to ourselves, we must be true to others."

And, he elaborated on the basic premises of our relations with other nations in his speech at Notre Dame this May:

Our policy must be rooted in our people's basic commitment to human rights.

Our policy must be based on close cooperation with the Western industrial democracies. With them we share basic values; with them also we share a recognition that global problems cannot be solved without close cooperation among us. This was the message the President had me take to Europe and Japan in the first week of the Administration, and this was the spirit which guided the President and his colleagues at the London summit last month.

Our policy must seek to improve relations with the Soviet Union and China. It must do so in a balanced and reciprocal way, while we maintain a strong defense.

Our policy must recognize that the cleavage between North and South is as important as between East and West. We must reach out to the world's developing nations, seeking to narrow the gap between rich and poor.

Finally, our policy must provide incentives for all nations to rise above ideology or narrow conceptions of self-interest and work together to resolve regional conflicts and to meet global problems that confront all people.

As an Administration, we are only five months old. However, these months have been a period of intense activity. We are committed to shaping effective policies that truly reflect America's values and objectives—and we are committed to implementing policies with other nations so as to shape a more peaceful and stable world.

One of our first tasks has been to ensure that our foreign policy reflects the commitment to basic human rights that we as Americans share. That commitment to the inherent dignity of the individual is at the heart of the American tradition. From it flows the democratic liberties that we cherish—such as the right to worship freely, freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and due process of law. Those are the basic strengths of our nation.

We have survived as a free nation because we have remained committed to the defense of fundamental moral values we cherish as a people. And unless our foreign policy reflects those values it will not earn the sup-

port of the American people. Without that support, no foreign policy, no matter how brilliantly conceived, can succeed.

I believe we have restored that commitment to human rights. I am proud that the United States today stands among those who uphold human rights and human dignity in the world. I am proud that no foreign leader today has any doubt that the United States condemns torture, political imprisonment and repression by any government, anywhere in the world. We believe that basic human rights transcend ideology. We believe all nations, regardless of political system, must respect those rights.

Just as respect for human rights is central to our foreign policy values, so progress toward a just and lasting Middle East settlement is essential to the prospect of a more peaceful world. The President has asked me to describe what we are trying to do to achieve peace in the Middle East. We want the American people to have the fullest possible understanding of our approach, for your support is crucial to its success.

President Carter has now met with the leaders of Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The President met with Prime Minister Rabin of Israel and we hope that we will soon meet with the new Prime Minister.

With the exception of the meeting with President Assad which was held in Geneva, I have participated in all of them and have sensed these leaders' great desire for peace, and their longing for the benefits that peace can bring to nations too long mobilized for war. Yet at the same time, we also found deep fears and suspicion which must be overcome if peace is to be achieved in that strategic and troubled region of the world.

A genuine and lasting peace in the Middle East is of essential interest to all Americans. Conflict there carries the threat of a global confrontation, and runs the risk of nuclear war. As we have seen, war in the Middle East has profound economic consequences. It can, and has, damaged the economies of the entire world. It has been a tragedy for the nations of the region. Even short of war, continued confrontation encourages radicalization and instability.

Genuine peace is needed by all parties to the conflict. The Arab nations need peace.

Israel, above all, has a profound interest in peace. There is no question about that. For almost three decades, Israel has borne the burden of constant war. More than half its entire budget is dedicated to defense. Its citizens bear the highest average tax burden in the world—more than 60% of their income goes for taxes.

And yet, at the same time, this valiant nation has managed to create a miracle in the desert. With ingenuity, hard work and skill, it has created a land that could be a model for economic development and for political liberty to be emulated throughout the Middle East. Democracy has thrived in Israel despite the kind of adversity that has crushed freedom in other lands.

And yet, what of the future? Is it a future in which Israel's three million people try by force of arms alone to hold out against the hostility and growing power of the Arab world? Or can a process of reconciliation be started—a process in which peace protects Israel's security, a peace in which the urge for revenge and recrimination is replaced by mutual recognition and respect?

America has a special responsibility and a special opportunity to help bring about this kind of peace. This comes about first of all because of our unique and profound relationship with the state of Israel since its creation more than a generation ago. Our sense of shared values and purposes means that, for Americans, the question of Israel's survival is not a political question but rather stands as a moral imperative of our foreign policy.

And yet, our special relationship with Israel has not been directed against any other country. We have been able to enjoy the friendship of much of the Arab world where we and our close allies have important interests.

It is precisely because of our close ties with both Israel and her Arab neighbors that we are uniquely placed to promote the search for peace, to work for an improved understanding of each side's legitimate concerns, and to help them work out what we hope will be a basis for negotiation leading to a final peace in the Middle East.

When this Administration entered office on January 20, we found that the situation in the Middle East called for a new approach. The step-by-step diplomacy of our predecessors had defused the immediate tensions produced by the war in 1973. But it was also evident that it would be increasingly difficult to achieve small diplomatic concessions when the ultimate shape of a peace agreement remained obscure. At the same time, it was unlikely that an agreement on a lasting peace could be achieved at one stroke.

UN Security Council Resolution 242, which is supported by all the parties, provides a basis for the negotiations which are required if there is to be a settlement. But Resolution 242 does not by itself provide all that is required. We, therefore, decided to work with the parties concerned to outline the overall framework for an enduring peace. Our concept was to use this framework as the basis for a phased negotiation and implementation of specific steps toward peace.

A major impediment to this approach lay in the fact that the positions of all sides were frozen. The words and phrases used by the parties had become encrusted with the fallout of countless diplomatic battles.

We have tried to regain momentum in this process. We have encouraged Arabs and Israelis to begin thinking again seriously about the elements of peace and not to remain committed to particular words and formulations.

To this end, the President has tried to describe our understanding of what the key elements of an overall framework for an agreement might be:

A commitment to a genuine and lasting peace demonstrated by concrete acts to normalized relations among the countries of the area.

The establishment of borders for Israel which are recognized by all and which can be kept secure.

A fair solution to the problem of the Palestinians.

The President has set forth, these elements not to dictate a peace or to impose our views but to stimulate fresh thought.

President Carter has gone further than any of his predecessors to stress with Arab leaders the essential point that peace must mean more than merely an end to hostilities, stating as he did in Clinton, Massachusetts last March.

"... the first prerequisite of a lasting peace is the recognition of Israel by her neighbors. Israel's right to exist. Israel's right to exist permanently; Israel's right to exist in peace. That means that over a period of months or years that the borders between Israel and Syria, Israel and Lebanon, Israel and Jordan, Israel and Egypt must be opened up to travel, to tourism, to cultural exchange, to trade, so that no matter who the leaders might be in those countries the people themselves will have formed a mutual understanding and comprehension and a sense of a common purpose to avoid the repetitious wars and deaths that have affected that region so long. That is the first prerequisite of peace."

We have found that the Arab leaders did not insist that this kind of peace is some-

thing that only future generations could consider. Some leaders, such as King Hussein, during his visit to Washington, have made clear their commitment to a "just and lasting peace—one which would enable all the people in the Middle East to divert their energies and resources to build and attain a better future."

So we believe that we have made some progress in getting Arab leaders to recognize Israel's right to exist and to recognize—however reluctantly—that this commitment is essential to a genuine peace. That peace must be structured in such a way that it can survive even if some leaders were to nurture aims to destroy Israel. Still, we have a long way to go, the Arabs have been insistent that Israel withdraw from the territories it occupied in the 1967 war. We have made clear our view that Israel should not be asked to withdraw unless it can secure in return real peace from its neighbors.

The question of withdrawal is, in essence, the question of borders. For peace to be enduring, borders must be inviolable. Nations must feel secure behind their borders. Borders must be recognized by all.

A crucial dilemma has been how to provide borders that are both secure and acceptable to all. It is understandable that Israel, having fought a war in every decade since its birth, wants borders that can be defended as easily as possible. But no borders will be secure if neighboring countries do not accept them.

The problem is that borders that might afford Israel the maximum security in military terms would not be accepted as legitimate by Israel's neighbors. Borders that Israel's neighbors would recognize, Israel has not been willing to accept as forming an adequate line of defense.

For this reason, the President has tried to separate the two issues. On the one hand, there must be recognized borders. But, in addition, there could be separate lines of defense or other measures that could enhance Israel's security. The arrangements in the Sinai and in the Golan Heights provide models of how Israel's security might be enhanced until confidence in a lasting peace can be fully developed.

We would urge all the parties to think realistically about security arrangements to reduce the fear of surprise attack, to make acts of aggression difficult if not impossible, and to limit the military forces that would confront one another in sensitive areas.

This approach recognizes the fact that there is a profound asymmetry in what the two sides in the Middle East are seeking. On the one hand, a principal Arab concern is to regain lost territory. On the other, Israel wishes peace and recognition. Territory is tangible, and once ceded difficult to regain short of war. Peace, on the other hand, can be ephemeral. Peaceful intentions can change overnight, unless a solid foundation of cooperation and a firm pattern of reinforcing relationships can be established to ensure that all have a stake in continuing tranquility.

We believe that separating the imperatives of security from the requirement of recognized borders is an important advance toward reconciling the differences between the two sides. It is in this way that Israel could return to approximately the borders that existed prior to the war of 1967, albeit with minor modifications as negotiated among the parties, and yet retain security lines or other arrangements that would ensure Israel's safety as full confidence developed in a comprehensive peace. Thus, with borders explicitly recognized and buttressed by security measures, and with the process of peace unfolding, Israel's security would be greater than it is today.

A further major issue is that of the future of the Palestinian people. It has been the source of continuing tragedy in the



Middle East. There are two prerequisites for a lasting peace in this regard. First, there must be a demonstrated willingness on the part of the Palestinians to live in peace alongside Israel. Second, the Palestinians must be given a stake in peace so that they will turn away from the violence of the past and toward a future in which they can express their legitimate political aspirations peacefully.

Thus, if the Palestinians are willing to exist in peace and are prepared to demonstrate that willingness, by recognizing Israel's right to exist in peace, the President has made clear that, in the context of a peace settlement we believe the Palestinians should be given a chance to shed their status as homeless refugees and to partake fully of the benefits of peace in the Middle East, including the possibility of some arrangement for a Palestinian homeland or entity—preferably in association with Jordan.

How this would be accomplished and the exact character of such an entity is, of course, something that would have to be decided by the parties themselves in the course of negotiation. However, the President has suggested that the viability of this concept and the security of the region might be enhanced if this involved an association with Jordan. But I emphasize that the specifics are for the parties themselves to decide.

This leads me to a further crucial aspect of our approach—the necessity of direct negotiations among the parties concerned. We cannot conceive of genuine peace existing between countries who will not talk to one another. If they are prepared for peace, the first proof is a willingness to negotiate their differences.

This is why we believe it is so important to proceed with the holding of a Geneva Conference this year. That conference provides the forum for these nations to begin the working out of these problems together directly face-to-face. We have a continuing objective to convene such a conference before the end of this year.

Underlying this entire effort to promote the process of negotiation is our determination to maintain the military security of Israel. There must be no question in anyone's mind that the United States will do what is necessary to ensure the adequacy of Israel's military posture and its capacity for self-defense.

We recognize that America has a special responsibility in this regard. In fact, in promulgating our overall policy to curb the international traffic in arms, the President specifically directed the government that we will honor our historic responsibilities to assure the security of the state of Israel. Let there be no doubt about this commitment by this Administration.

We do not intend to use our military aid as pressure on Israel. If we have differences over military aid—and we may have some—it will be on military grounds or economic grounds, but not political grounds. If we have differences over diplomatic strategy—and that could happen—we will work this out on a political level. We will not alter our commitment to Israel's military security.

Let me conclude by saying that we hope the concepts I have been discussing here today—concepts which the President has advanced at talks with Israeli and Arab leaders—will stimulate them to develop ideas of their own. We realize that peace cannot be imposed from the outside and we do not intend to present the parties with a plan or a timetable or a map. Peace can only come from a genuine recognition by all parties that their interests are served by reconciliation and not by war, by faith in the future rather than bitterness over the past.

America can try to help establish the basis of trust necessary for peace. We can try to improve the atmosphere for communication. We can offer ideas, but we cannot, in the

end, determine whether peace or war is the fate of the Middle East. That can only be decided by Israel and her Arab neighbors.

We believe that both sides want peace. As the President has said, "this may be the most propitious time for a genuine settlement since the beginning of the Arab-Israeli conflict almost 30 years ago. To let this opportunity pass could mean a disaster not only for the Middle East, but perhaps for the international political and economic order as well."

As we go forward in our mediating role, we will have to expect from time to time to have differences with both sides. But these will be differences as to tactics. Our overall objectives will be those that we believe are now shared by all sides: a permanent and enduring peace in the Middle East.

This is obviously a difficult task and there is always the possibility of failure. But it is an historic responsibility that requires the fullest possible support of the American people.

I believe we have this support. And as we go through the difficult days ahead, this support will sustain us. It will provide the strength we need to encourage all parties to put aside their fears and put trust in their hopes for a genuine and lasting Middle East peace.

John Kennedy once described the formula for peace not only in the Middle East but throughout the world, and I would like to close with his words.

"If we all can persevere, if we in every land and every office can look beyond our own shores and ambitions, then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

Mr. RIBICOFF. I will be pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I am very pleased to listen to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I approve entirely of everything he stated and I associate myself with those remarks.

I think it is particularly important and salutary that the Vice President of the United States is on the west coast or at some point in this country addressing himself to the question of the administration's position vis-a-vis a permanent peace in the Middle East. Too often in this day of fast electronic media there are misinterpretations of statements that are made, and there are segments of a speech that are given greater emphasis than other parts of a speech. It is fair to say there has been a considerable degree of apprehension as to the administration's posture vis-a-vis the Middle East.

The fact that the Vice President, speaking on behalf of the President, addresses himself to this question in such clear and unequivocal language as that which is contained in the speech that has just been placed in the Record is good.

I think it is particularly helpful. It will allay the concerns and the apprehensions that many have had. I know the President and the Vice President do have a sense of dedication and concern about the future of the State of Israel. I know that from personal conversations with them; I know that from their actions; and I am pleased that the Senator from Connecticut has seen fit to address himself to the subject today. His record of distinguished leadership in this area, and the record of the Vice President of the

United States, added to the public statements heretofore made by the President, will serve to calm the waters so that the Nation may be behind the President in his efforts to achieve a workable peace for all of the peoples of the Middle East.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, first of all, there is no question in my mind but that the President is thoroughly committed to the achievement of a peaceful and workable solution to the problems in the Middle East.

Moreover, the fact that Mr. MONDALE has today chosen to make a speech, which I consider to be a landmark speech, on this vital subject, indicates further the President's commitment in this regard.

Finally, may I say that the statement made by the very courageous and eminently able Senator from Connecticut is a fine contribution to the cause of peace in the Middle East.

I have always thought of Senator RIBICOFF as a man who is calm, sound in his judgment, careful, and thorough in his approach to issues, even-handed, fair and reasonable; and when he lends his voice, he lends support to the cause of peace that cannot be equalled in this Senate.

I am glad that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) has taken the floor today to call attention to the speech that is being made by the Vice President, and I congratulate him as he seeks to help to bring about a better understanding and to keep open the modes of communication in the hope that, in the final analysis, reasonable minds on all sides of the issue will prevail and that a workable and feasible agreement will eventually emerge which will have so great an impact upon the prospects for world peace and economic stability throughout the globe.

I also commend the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. METZENBAUM) on the remarks that he has made.

The Senate and the Nation are in the debt, in my judgment, to responsible men like these who see the need for leadership, who see the need for give and take and for reason to prevail.

These Senators are men who can provide that leadership, because the rest of us will follow their wisdom, their vision, their judgment and their leadership. I again commend them, and I commend the Vice-President and the President.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to thank the distinguished majority leader for his gracious remarks.

Unquestionably in the days, months, and years ahead, the Senate will be called upon to play a role in whatever decisions are made in the Middle Eastern area of the world. It is an important part of the globe. There are times when there will be strong emotions, there will be strong currents of opposition, and there will be need for calmness and understanding of the problems that have

separated the Arabs and the Israelis for these past 29 years.

But I am convinced that the Senate has a most important role to play, and the President cannot do this job by himself. No President can do this job by himself. Any President of any party will have to have the strong bipartisan support of the Members of the Senate.

It was my privilege to cochair this trip to the Middle East with the distinguished minority leader, Senator BAKER of Tennessee.

And the report that we have made, which will be released on Monday, underpins and underlies what has transpired during these past few months.

We saw the fantastic drain on the economies of Israel and Egypt because of a situation of no war—no peace. We saw the strivings and yearnings of President Sadat as well as King Hussein and the Israeli leaders to find a way out of this impasse. It became very important that all the leaders in this area looked to one country for leadership, and that country is the United States of America.

They recognized that if the leadership did not come from the United States it was not going to come at all.

And I think what is so important for the world to understand, important for Israel to understand, and important for the Arab Nations to understand is that Russian influence for all practical purposes has been ejected from the Middle East and the greatest impetus for peace and survival of all these countries to live in peace is that they look toward the United States for friendship and leadership.

I am confident that with strong United States leadership in this area we can finally bring peace to that most troubled part of the world.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I say in the beginning that I arrived in the Chamber after the colloquy had begun, but let me add one comment, if I may.

To begin with, I am pleased that our former colleague and present constitutional Presiding Officer of the Senate will be involved in formulation of policy in this administration in many parts of the world including the Middle East, and I pledge to him, as I do my colleagues, that those of us on this side of the aisle will try diligently to formulate an appropriate, hopeful, and optimistic foreign policy for this country.

I rise particularly, though, Mr. President, to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. He mentioned our trip together as cochairmen of the Senate mission to the Middle East. This was a mission that was sanctioned and indeed directed by the Senate by resolution. It was not a committee trip. It was a group of Senators who had a single purpose, and that was to examine the situation in the Middle East and the danger of nuclear proliferation in that area.

I say, Mr. President, that I have never in any circumstances had better official

relationship and more considerate working arrangement than I had on that occasion with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. It was truly extraordinary, one that I will remember all my life, and I think, Mr. President, that it did a great deal to help set the tone for those negotiations because it was clear, I believe, to our hosts in the countries that we visited that the delegation was united, that we came in the role of a factfinding mission and sought to elicit the points of view and attitudes of those countries for appropriate action on a bipartisan basis.

I think that the reports that have been formulated and published since and those that are soon to be published will be useful and helpful to the Senate and I believe to the administration as well.

But a huge measure of credit must go to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who has given so much of his life to public service to his State and to this Nation, a man for whom I have great respect.

I wished to pay that tribute while I had this opportunity.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader for those kind remarks.

That trip was a successful trip above all due to the intelligence, leadership, and cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

#### SENATOR RANDOLPH SAYS NEW CHALLENGES IN ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ESTABLISH RESPONSIBILITY FOR COAL UTILIZATION BY INDUSTRIAL USERS

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, the use and abuse of our natural energy resources for the past century or more has brought us to a point where some serious thinkers see our national economic system grinding to a halt.

But even the most pessimistic forecaster concedes that this need not happen. The real answer to our energy crisis is the will and sense of purpose to apply to this problem the ingenuity and expertise that has made the United States the leading industrial and technological nation on Earth.

My distinguished colleague from neighboring West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) has for almost three decades advocated establishing a national energy policy. Moreover, he joined with Senator Joseph O. Mahoney of Wyoming in 1944 to create the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act. He has long recognized the approaching crisis of dwindling supplies of oil and natural gas to meet the demands of an ever-expanding world economy. He has advocated that we turn our inventive and scientific skills to creating new oil and gas supplies from our most abundant fossil fuel—coal.

Earlier today, Senator RANDOLPH addressed an energy seminar sponsored by Johnson and Johnson, a leading manufacturer in the medical supply field. In his speech, Senator RANDOLPH delineated what he felt our national policy should be and what appropriate uses of coal industrial concerns should be planning for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by the West Virginia Senator be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Most people in the United States until a few years ago, largely because of advertising and marketing techniques, say energy in all forms as existing in inexhaustible quantities. Conservation of energy was unnecessary.

Yet today we recognize the need to change our definition of energy use from one of uncontrolled proliferation to one of efficiency and conservation. To run out of energy means the curtailment of the motion, vitality, and strength of the United States. Energy, as we have learned through vivid demonstration by the Arab oil cartel the last few years is tantamount to power.

"We must not, for the sake of our national security, come to depend on foreign countries. We must plan for the conservation of our national oil resources and the immediate development of practical methods for commercial production of synthetic fuels, so it cannot be said in the future—'too little and too late'."

Such a quotation is commonplace today, but I made the comment on January 15, 1944, in *Aero Digest*.

It is true that we live in an ocean of energy. Around us at all times nature is expending energy through the sun, wind, oceans, inland waters, earth heat, and lighting. We can tap only a fraction. The falling water of rivers could yield enough hydroelectric power to meet 80 percent of our total energy consumption, though we use it for 1 or 2 percent. If the winds were tethered, they could turn out twice as much electricity as water power now does. The tides' surge, if used, could provide substantial energy needs. The most colossal dynamo of all is the sun, an unimaginable vast powerhouse which directly or indirectly affects everything on earth. If all the world's fuels were gathered in one place and burned at a rate to match the sun's power, they could be consumed in four days.

Our use of energy has been moving constantly upward since the turn of the century. In addition our pattern of energy use has been to exploit one or two sources, which have been plentiful and easy to extract, while neglecting to develop other energy forms available to us. If we had fostered a more uniform energy development policy over the years, perhaps our oil and gas would not be in such a critically depleted state. The entire United States economy is at present three-fourths dependent on diminishing domestic supplies of petroleum and natural gas. The first congressional initiative to develop nonnuclear energy technologies was in the mid-1940's when Senator Joseph O'Mahoney of Wyoming and I introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives, the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, which was signed into law on April 5, 1944. That law authorized the first Federal programs for gasification of coal, liquefaction of coal and lignite, and production of synthetic crude oil from oil shale.

Under the Act of 1944 the Bureau of Mines continued preliminary investigations begun in 1916 on oil shale and begun in 1926 on synthetic oil from coal. Demonstration was undertaken of coal gasification and oil shale extraction.

In conjunction with the Department of Agriculture the Bureau of Mines' initiated new technologies to produce alcohol and other liquid fuels from agricultural residues.

Experience under this program led Secretary of the Interior Julius Krug to include in January, 1948 that—the establishment of a synthetic fuel industry is far too large an operation . . . to be undertaken under emer-



agency or war conditions . . . it should be undertaken now when the country is at peace and completed over a period of five to ten years.

In November 1943, I flew with Arthur Hyde, the first airplane flight in the United States, using gasoline produced from coal. It was from Morgantown, West Virginia to Washington, D.C. During the 11 years of the program under the Synthetic Fuels Act about \$82 million of Federal funds were expended out of appropriations totalling \$85.2 million.

The extensive knowledge and skill acquired in the conversion of coals and oil shale into liquid and gaseous fuels, for the most part have been lost in the intervening years.

These nonnuclear technologies did not become realities in the United States due to economic factors. But these same technologies were pursued to commercial realities in such oil deficient but coal abundant countries as South Africa. The American corporation, M. W. Kellogg Company, designed and supervised construction of the facilities in South Africa that are often cited as an example of the potential for coal liquefaction. But we did not proceed in the United States. We should have done so.

In addition, the amount of coal utilization has changed significantly since 1945; because of the comparative price of oil and gas and certain environmental considerations. At the end of World War II, the two biggest markets were railroads and manufacturing industries (primarily chemical), with home heating third and coking plants for the steel industry running fourth. Coking operations are still major coal consumers, but the railroads have disappeared as a coal market, the home heating market has almost disappeared, and the chemical industry has switched almost completely from acetylene (made from coal-derived calcium carbide) to ethylene (made from natural gas liquids and petroleum fractions).

The loss of these three markets has changed coal from a broad-spectrum basic raw material into almost a one-market product. That one major market is electric utilities.

The energy problems we face stem from a long history of neglect and the manner in which we have attempted to shape the components of the United States energy policy. No single villain has brought us to our present situation; just as no simple and single action will suffice. It was essential that the Johnson & Johnson Energy Steering Committee was formed to provide input into the developing national energy policy. I commend you on the importance you have attached during eight months to this Steering Committee, as evidenced by your assignment of the major corporate head of each affiliated company to its membership. We must now as a Nation move toward a consensus on exactly what is the energy problem. The problem has several parts each of which influences and is influenced by other national goals such as a clean environment, full employment and national security. I believe the diversity of our natural resources with coal as a base, with the capacity and desire we possess for using energy more efficiently, will give us room to maneuver and finally solve these problems.

Although America left the coal bucket behind in the middle forties, it now must be carried back. But while contents of the bucket will still contain the properties of coal, the form must be different. Homes, businesses, factories, and transport systems today require energy in three basic forms: electricity, gas and a variety of petroleum products. Thus, coal must be converted to these forms. Why? Because our coal reserves are sufficient to last for several hundred years and can supply power, gas and oil in large commercial volumes.

Coal is the one fossil fuel that is likely to remain in abundant supply at relatively low cost for the remainder of this century and into the next. It is the one major alternative replacement fuel that can bridge the gap from our current dependence on oil and gas to a future era of renewable energy resources.

In 1976, United States coal production reached 665 million tons, up 10 percent from the 1974 level but only 3 percent over 1975. Those most closely involved with energy problems in our country would want coal production increased to at least 1.2 billion tons per year.

Coal is an effective source of heat and can be converted into gaseous and liquid fuels and chemicals. The role for coal as a natural successor to oil and gas is established. Realizing coal's potential will however, depend on a recognition of the need to use coal, and the necessary policies to make such use possible.

Coal gasification involves a program designed to provide technology which will supply gas from coal to electric utilities and industrial users and as a chemical feedstock. Synthetic natural gas from coal provides a product essentially free of sulfur but with combustion characteristics similar to natural gas.

As natural gas production declines, substitute energy supplies must be found. The United States presently has over \$100 billion invested in its gas transmission, distribution and end-user equipment system. On an economic basis, keeping these gas pipelines full, even with higher priced synthetics may be cheaper than creating new systems. The production, transportation and distribution of natural gas also is more efficient—67 percent for synthetic natural gas compared to 37 percent for electricity.

The capital required to produce and deliver a unit of energy in the form of synthetic natural gas from coal also is less than that required to produce electricity from coal. The use of utility-financing mechanisms could reduce synthetic fuels prices by one-third, compared to 100 percent equity financing.

For residential customers, synthetic natural gas is more efficient and less costly than electricity. To deny American consumers such synthetic substitutes would be to commit them to higher cost alternatives.

Liquefaction is the production of a clean-burning oil from coal to release petroleum and natural gas now being fired in power boilers. The synthetic crude oil produced from these processes could also be upgraded to gasoline, fuel oil and other needed fuels.

In the longer term, coal liquefaction also will be important in the production of chemicals and similar specialty products and in the production of liquid fuels for transportation. However, timely commercial development of coal liquefaction by the private sector, without Federal assistance, would appear unlikely. Direct funding by the Federal government, with some industry participation, would seem necessary for the development of this technology before the 1990's.

In June 1975 the Federal Energy Research and Development Administration projected that coal liquefaction would contribute 2.5 million barrels of oil per day by 1985 from first generation processes. However, the General Accounting Office recently found that, "it (is) highly unlikely that any commercial-size coal liquefaction plant will be operating in the United States in 1985."

The United States must now stockpile high cost oil in an attempt to neutralize oil against the possibility of another embargo. Oil, I emphasize, is too important to our economy and the economy of the world to be used as the political weapon of some producers.

By the end of 1978 approximately 150 million barrels of crude oil will be stored at Federal expense. The fuel reserve system will

entail one billion barrels; enough to supply three million barrels per day for one year. Such a strategic reserve capability should protect our nations economy against a recurrence of the massive unemployment that confronted the nation during the 1973 embargo.

But let us consider the costs and what could be achieved for the same investment. These emergency stockpiles will cost about \$12.5 billion. An identical Federal investment could construct coal gasification facilities capable of supplying the equivalent of 1 million barrels of oil per day for at least 20 years.

The Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974 has required the Federal Energy Administration, under certain circumstances, to issue orders to power plants and some major industrial installations to convert or start using coal, rather than oil or gas boilers. On May 11, 1977, the Federal Energy Administration announced the first round of orders to major industrial plants under the provisions of the 1974 Act.

The "notices of intent" will require industries to convert to coal utilization in plant activities. A total of 56 "notices of intent" were issued in 25 states. Of these, 24 were to plants currently burning oil and gas as fuel. The other 32 are construction orders to plants in the planning stage which will from "day one" burn coal.

The first round of "notices" to utilities were announced in June of 1975. A second round was issued in April of this year. If all 102 boiler operations at the 50 sites told to convert to coal by the Federal Energy Administration comply, the yearly energy savings would be 84 million barrels of oil and 50 billion cubic feet of natural gas. To encourage greater coal utilization, I introduced S. 273, the Natural Gas and Petroleum Conservation and Coal Utilization Act of 1977 on January 14. This bill would prohibit construction of new electric power plants and major fuel-burning installations not using energy sources other than gas or oil. In addition, it would extend the Federal Energy Administration's authority to issue construction and prohibition orders until September 30, 1980. Installations constructed to use alternative energy sources, of course, must be consistent with environmental policies. This measure would provide a stability to future energy supplies not presently afforded by oil imports.

The week of May 16 the Senate passed S. 1468, a measure that would extend the Federal coal conversion program for six months under Section 2 of the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974. This would allow for the Federal Energy Administration to consider a second round of construction and prohibition orders until January, 1978. It also gives the Energy and Natural Resources Committee extra time for full consideration of proposals for broader coal conversion authorities. Evaluation of these proposals can now proceed without disruption of the present coal conversion program.

Participants in this important conference know that a major proposal before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee is the Coal Utilization Act of 1977 which incorporates provisions from my bill, S. 273, and reflects the findings of the Senate's National Fuel and Energy Policy Study started six years ago. The Committee will hold its final day of hearings on June 24th and mark up will begin in early July.

Realizing coal's potential also will require satisfactory solutions to the environmental problems associated with its mining and burning.

Coal is not a uniform substance, but a mixture of fossilized materials from plants that vary in both physical and chemical composition. Impurities found in coal can be classi-

fed into those that form ash and those that contribute sulfur. The sulfur contents of coals vary anywhere from 0.3 percent to 5.6 percent.

Almost one-half of the electric energy in America is generated today by coal-fired plants. But one of the biggest problems the coal industry faces is that the bulk of recoverable reserves, as well as much of present capacity, does not meet today's sulfur standards. Forty-one percent or 176 million tons of the coal burned by electric utilities in 1975 did not meet sulfur standards. In the East, 48 percent of the coal burned could not comply. So the question is: "How can we best clean coal to make electricity?" Congress has determined that where the physical and economic capabilities to burn coal exist, coal should be burned but only to the extent that environmental constraints permits. As Chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, I am concerned that we maintain the momentum of recent years in achieving a cleaner and healthier environment. Energy production and environmental improvement need not be conflicting goals.

On June 10, the Senate passed the Clean Air Amendments of 1977. The amendments contain modifications that will facilitate our national conversion effort to coal. Some states in reacting to the Clean Air Act of 1970, originally established more stringent emission standards than necessary to meet national ambient air quality standards. The measure passed last Friday allows states to revise their standards to assure they are reasonable and equitable. This will enable some industries to burn a lower grade of coal and allow increased sulfate emissions in some areas. When national ambient air quality standards for protection of public health are being achieved and maintained; and when Federal new source performance standards will be met; then the States, in my judgement should have sufficient flexibility to determine what are the appropriate environmental requirements to achieve economic growth with environmental quality.

Another provision of the 1977 amendments, which I introduced during Committee consideration, recommends that one state may no longer allow emission of pollutants which adversely affect a neighboring state. A facility located in one state must notify the adjoining state of the potential impact of its emission prior to the commencement of construction of a new facility or modification of an existing stationary source. The amendment also provides that a state or local subdivision may petition the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for relief if a facility would be in violation of the adjoining state's air pollution standards.

An amendment passed in the Senate by Senator Metzbaum and myself, which authorizes the President to require major industrial firms burning coal but not meeting proper air standards, to burn coal supplies that are locally and regionally available. Many industries currently transport Western coal long distances to achieve air quality standards without installing sulfur removing devices. Moving Western low-sulfur coal to the East, to avoid sulfur removal requires the same 5-8 percent energy loss for transportation as does the scrubbing process itself. The cross-country transportation of Western coal to avoid scrubbers, therefore, is not economical.

Development of coal-related environmental technologies will be accelerated. I believe that scrubbing devices, also known as flue gas desulfurization systems, will be used and improved. This equipment removes sulfur pollutants from gas emissions and adds about 20% to new plant investment.

When a final consensus is reached on coal

conversion, I believe the policy on which it is based should set forth that:

High sulfur coals must be used in producing a large part of our power.

Scrubbers constitute the best immediate answer to pollution control until technologies such as fluidized bed are commercially developed.

Where air quality standards are not impaired, coal washing and regional coal blending can meet the requirements of sound public policy, and scrubbing devices can be delayed or further improved.

An indication of the growing consensus and recognition in the Senate that we must increase coal utilization to assure our energy independence was evidenced by the passage of the Energy Research and Development Administration Authorization Act for fiscal year 1978, on Monday, June 13, by a vote of 79-1.

The bill authorizes approximately \$965 million for the Energy Research and Development Administration's fossil energy program for fiscal year 1978. This represents an increase of about \$481 million for total fossil energy development, and an approximately \$140 million jump in budget authority for increased coal technology compared with fiscal year 1977. This increase in funding is on line with the Carter Administration's policy for increased coal utilization. The figure the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources recommends for the coal program is \$45 million more than requested originally by ERDA for fiscal year 1978. This increase was made to assure the objectives outlined in ERDA's request which calls for the construction of a synthetic fuels-from-coal industry, responsible for developing low and high BTU gas and coal derived liquids as well as improved methods of direct coal utilization are achieved.

If we are to develop a definite National Coal Policy from the mine face to the ultimate energy user, it must be bulwarked with strong research and development programs. Only through an adequate assessment of new technologies for coal can we assure that our Nation's finite fossil fuel resources are extracted, utilized, or otherwise converted to useful forms of energy in a manner suitable to both our environment and economy.

Many private companies who wish to build the first plants utilizing new technologies are frustrated in their attempts. For example, interstate gas pipeline companies have said that they are now in the marketplace actively seeking financing for coal gasification plants. When these companies approach traditional financing institutions, the companies discover these institutions are reluctant to commit the billion dollars needed for the first of these plants, because the financiers have no history on which to base an educated decision. Financiers are willing to consider the subsequent plants, but not the first ones. Because of this and the need for assessment of new technologies, I introduced an amendment attached to the authorization bill, which was passed, providing the Administrator of ERDA the authority to make Federal loan guarantees of up to 75%.

This amendment does not provide loan guarantee or socioeconomic aid without further action by the Congress. The Congress based on ERDA's request would specifically have to appropriate the amount and kind of financial assistance to be provided. Where the cost of a demonstration facility exceeds \$50 million, the amount of loan guarantees, extent of socioeconomic aid, and the amount of borrowing authority granted to the Administrator must be approved by both Houses of Congress. No specific sum of loan guarantee authority was authorized by the Committee, however. Requests would be revived on a project by project basis. I initially introduced this provision in 1974 and twice

since then. The Senate approved the provision three times. This amendment is identical to the loan guarantee provision contained in the House version of the ERDA authorization bill recently reported by the Science and Technology Committee. The amendment adopted on Monday has the full support of John O'Leary, Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration.

Coal technologies for the most part will involve long leadtimes. Decisions must be made now if the Nation is to rely on increased coal use in the future. In determining the price we are willing to pay the issue is one of the extent and the strength of the national commitment to increased coal use. The interest shown in coal by Johnson and Johnson is most encouraging. I hope in the near future you can make the corporate decisions necessary to provide greater utilization of this fossil resource. Decisions made in the 95th Congress, together with the Carter Administration and private industry, to issues on coal-related programs will do much to strengthen the use of the coal substitution option in the next decade.

#### THE SENATE PROMOTES PRINCIPLES OF FREEDOM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I want to take just a moment to comment on a very historic week here in the U.S. Senate, when the Members of this body went firmly on record in support of human rights and the cause of freedom throughout the world. Despite a variety of proposals and counterproposals that sometimes obscured the central issues, a prevailing consensus of the Senate becomes obvious in retrospect: This Nation is not about to buckle under to intimidations by the Communist regimes in Asia, Europe, or even in our own hemisphere. The American people are not ready to concede defeat to Communist aggression, or to agree to finance it with their tax dollars. With few exceptions, the Members of the Senate have, I believe, accurately gaged the attitude of the American public on this vital issue, and reflected it on the Senate floor.

Major victories for freedom were scored early in the week, when the Senate concurred with a resolution condemning harassment of an American journalist in Moscow, and a resolution endorsing a firm U.S. stand on human rights at the Helsinki conference, which opened in Belgrade on Wednesday. I offered these resolutions so that we might coalesce our variable perspectives around one policy position, and so that Soviet officials would make no mistake about our resolve on the human rights issue.

#### NO AID TO VIETNAM

Even more significant were clear expressions of congressional intent on the questions of aid to Vietnam, recognition of Cuba, and withdrawal of U.S. troops from Korea. On Tuesday, the Senate—by a vote of 55 to 38—approved my amendment directing U.S. representatives to the World Bank and Asian Development Bank to vote against any loans to Communist Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. That amendment also provided for a reduction in U.S. contributions to those international monetary organizations if they proceed with approval of aid to any of these Communist Governments.



On Thursday, the Senate roundly denounced language in the State Department authorization bill which had been earlier reported from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That language would have endorsed the administration's proposed withdrawal of 40,000 American troops from South Korea within 5 years, and would have permitted the partial lifting of the U.S. trade embargo against Communist Cuba. Parliamentary maneuverings and substitute language may have fuzzed up the central message for some members of the press and the public, but the basic thrust of the majority was this: The President must formulate his future Korean policies in close consultation with Congress, and the President must give due consideration to Cuban transgressions before agreeing to "normalize" relations.

#### A SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CUBA

The Senator from Kansas proposed a sense of the Congress amendment which would have specified four preconditions for normalizing relations with Cuba, including the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Africa and compensation for confiscated American property in Cuba. An effort to table my amendment—in effect, to kill it—was soundly defeated by a vote of 53 to 39. Thus, the concept of demanding certain concessions from Cuba prior to resuming diplomatic relations was generally endorsed, and I hope that message reaches the White House.

It is easier, however, to fight Castro than it is to contravene the Senate majority leader on the Senate floor. The distinguished majority leader offered substitute language which would not so offend the sensitivities of the administration or the Cuban regime. It is always disappointing to see the will of Congress thwarted by parliamentary maneuverings which confuse more than they clarify. When the Senate finally approved my amendment on Cuba with the majority leader's substitute language, it was so modified as to be hardly recognizable. But the essence of the day's deliberations was clear: the Senate rejected outright resumption of trade and relations with Cuba without preconditions. The committee voluntarily withdrew language it had earlier approved allowing partial lifting of the 1962 U.S. trade embargo, and the sense of the Senate, as a whole, on this issue became clear.

#### VICTORY FOR FREEDOM

In this Senator's opinion, these were victories for the cause of freedom, and not for any political party or platform. We saw an encouraging display of bipartisan agreement on central issues concerning the future of U.S. relations with Vietnam, Cuba, and Korea. The Senator from Kansas was pleased to have participated in clarifying these points for the executive branch and for the rest of the world, and he is proud of the sentiment which the Senate expressed. It can be hoped that more specific policy guidelines will yet be laid down regarding future relations with adversary nations, so that we can proceed with bold and deliberate efforts to advance the cause of liberty throughout the world.

#### APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE). The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94-280, appoints the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, to the National Transportation Policy Study Commission, in lieu of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), resigned.

#### TIME-LIMITATION AGREEMENT— H.R. 7557

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at such time as the transportation appropriation bill, H.R. 7557, is called up and made the pending business before the Senate, there be a time limitation thereon of 1 hour, to be equally divided between Mr. CASE and Mr. BAYH; that there be a time limitation on any amendment of 30 minutes; a time limitation on any debatable motion or appeal or point of order, if such is submitted to the Senate, of 20 minutes, and that the agreement with respect to the division and control of time be in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the agreement is as follows:

Ordered, That when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of H.R. 7557 (Order No. 250), An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of such and the manager of the bill, and that debate on any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order which is submitted or on which the Chair entertains debate shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of such and the manager of the bill: Provided, That in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto, shall be controlled by the Minority Leader or his designee.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Case): Provided, That the said Senators, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, debatable motion, or appeal.

#### TIME-LIMITATION AGREEMENT— H.R. 7552

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the Treasury Department appropriations bill, H.R. 7552, there be a time limitation of 1 hour, to be equally divided between Mr. WEICKER and Mr. CHILES; that there be a time limitation on any amendment of 30 minutes; a time limitation on any debatable motion or appeal or point of order, if such is submitted to the Senate for discussion, of 20 minutes, and that

the agreement be in the usual form as to the division and control of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the agreement is as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, June 20, 1977, at the hour of 1:00 p.m., the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of H.R. 7552 (Order No. 249), An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and for other purposes, and that debate on any amendment shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of such and the manager of the bill, and that debate on any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order which is submitted or on which the Chair entertains debate shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of such and the manager of the bill: Provided, That in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Minority Leader or his designee.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Florida (Mr. Chiles) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Weicker): Provided, That the said Senators, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, debatable motion, or appeal.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 12:30 P.M., MONDAY, JUNE 20, 1977

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 12:30 p.m. on Monday.

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

#### ORDER THAT NO ROLLCALL VOTES OCCUR PRIOR TO 3 P.M. MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no rollcall votes occur on Monday prior to the hour of 3 p.m.

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

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7552 AND S. 717 ON MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 1 p.m. on Monday the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Treasury Department appropriation bill, H.R. 7552, and that upon the disposition of that bill the Senate then proceed to the consideration of the mine safety bill, S. 717.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER INDEFINITELY POSTPONING SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar

Order No. 255, Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, be indefinitely postponed. The House concurrent resolution on the same subject passed the Senate earlier this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MOYNIHAN AND SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD ON TUESDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Mr. MOYNIHAN be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that he be followed by the junior Senator from West Virginia for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

#### NATIONAL SEA GRANT PROGRAM ACT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 4301.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives.

*Resolved*, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4301) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for the National Sea Grant Program Act during fiscal year 1978, and for other purposes."

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ORDER FOR FINAL VOTE ON MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY MEASURE TO OCCUR NO LATER THAN 8 P.M. ON TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1977

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the final vote occur on the mine health and safety bill on Tuesday of next week not later than 8 p.m.

Mr. STEVENS. That is agreeable.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I waive paragraph 3 of rule XII.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Birdie Kyle be given the privilege of the floor during the consideration of Calendar 245.

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

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

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

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN ACTION TO BE TAKEN DURING THE RECESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate over until 12:30 p.m. Monday, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives and from the President of the United States and that they may be appropriately referred, and that the Vice President, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Acting President pro tempore, and the Deputy President pro tempore, be authorized to sign all duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions during that recess.

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

#### NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PEACE AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION COMMISSION ACT OF 1977

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 245.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 469) to establish a commission to study proposals for establishing the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Resources without amendment, and from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on this matter.

This bill was reported first by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported by Senator RANDOLPH, a member of that committee, and then it came to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Foreign Relations Committee reported it on June 10, with amendments.

If Senators have a copy of the amended bill, it will be noted that those amendments are small, but we think it puts the matter in better condition. It proposes the following, which I shall read from the first part:

The Commission shall undertake a study to consider whether to establish a National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution. . . .

This is not a new thing to be called up in the Senate. I believe the testimony has been that they have been working on a matter of this type since 1935, in one way or another. The matter has been before the Senate at various times.

The State Department does not favor this legislation, but our committee reported it, anyway.

This measure does not do what some of the bills in the past ought to do—that is, to establish the Academy. This would establish a commission to study the feasibility of the Academy and the various things it should do. I believe that, in its amended form, the Senate should pass the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the chairman and the leadership of Sen- Foreign Relations yield to me at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the changes made by the Foreign Relations Committee, with the understanding of the chairman and the leadership of Senator JAVITS, who is in the Chamber, are agreeable to those of us who are the authors of the bill as it came from the Human Resources Committee.

I am very happy that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUMAGA) is in the Chamber. He is one of the sponsors of the original bill that was reported by the Human Resources Committee as of May 12. It then was properly reported to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That committee, as the Senator from Alabama has indicated, favorably reported S. 469 on June 10. We also have the sponsorship of the able Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD).

So, as the Senator has indicated, there has been a proposal of this type since 1935, when a former Member of the Senate, Matthew Neely—with whom the Senator is well acquainted and with whom he served—offered the program for the creation of a Secretary of Peace. That was an early day. He believed in a Federal department.

In 1945, as a Member of the House, I offered such legislation; and, indeed, the Senator from Alabama has been vitally interested in this general area over several Congresses. I remember the famous Arden House Conference on Disarmament sponsored by the Senator from Alabama and Senator HUMPHREY—a source of creative and constructive ideas on disarmament.

The idea of the study and the very constructive changes that Senator JAVITS proposed in the committee have helped us to bring to the Senate now something that might not have had the approval of certain departments—the State Department or other departments.

Now, as we call for a study, I hope that the Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance—it is not wrong to speak provincially for the moment and say that he is a West Virginian—and his associates in the State Department will not feel that there is an intrusion in any sense upon the State Department. Its task of safeguarding our national interests would be complemented by an academy of peace.

I have never thought of the State Department—and I say this in good faith—as being particularly a peace department. I have felt that it was a department for coping with problems of the interdependence of nations and peoples, and that is as it should be.

But here we give the thrust to the development of a program that, hopefully, will bring the nations of the world together, the peoples of the Earth together.



I have long felt that we must somehow or other learn to live together as neighbors in a world of peace. First, however, we must learn more about "causing" peace.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to say the Senator from West Virginia presented this matter to the Committee on Foreign Relations. He made a most persuasive presentation. It was following that, with the new amendments that Senate JAVITS proposed and that the committee accepted, that it reported the bill to the floor of the Senate.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia I wish, if he could do so, that he would come here and take the leadership in presenting the bill. I have an appointment to which I must go, and if he will do that I will appreciate it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would be delighted. If I may, I will stand at this point in the Chamber.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator feels more at home there.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, I thank the Senator very much.

I yield to the Senator from Hawaii. Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the measure I am deeply gratified that the Committee on Foreign Relations has reported the measure, amended as it is, and I commend and congratulate the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) for the great leadership he has demonstrated in bringing this measure to the floor.

While I was hopeful that the original bill would be reported, considering the opposition of the Department of State, I suppose as a cosponsor of the measure, I should be happy that the measure is on the floor at all.

Peace is something man has sought throughout his history but something which has eluded him throughout the years.

We have academies for the training of military officers, academies which train our young people, the brightest of our young people, in the art of war.

Here is a measure, as introduced originally by the Senator from West Virginia and myself, which would have set up an Academy of Peace, to take the brightest of our young people in America and send them to this academy, as we do to the military academies, but instead of training them for warfare, to train them in the part of peace.

This is a dream which mankind has had for centuries, has had from the very beginning of recorded history, and I am hoping that this will be the beginning of an accelerated process whereby we will eventually establish an Academy of Peace which in turn will eventually come under a Department of Peace.

As the Senator from West Virginia has cosponsored with me a measure to create a Department of Peace, he well knows what I am talking about; but I do harbor a dream, deeply ingrained with my heart and conscience that the United States will be the first nation on the face of this Earth to establish a Department of Peace dedicated solely to bringing about peace

and brotherhood in this world much too strewn with strife.

I thank the Senator for yielding, and I happily join him in support of the pending measure.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the comment, the cogent comment, of my colleague from Hawaii.

There are many people, as he has indicated, who have dreamed of just an Academy of Peace or a study for 1 year to see whether a Peace Academy could be properly brought into being, with the report of the commission to study it, but hoping that we could have a Secretary of Peace, a Department of Peace. In fact, I have naturally dreamed that for 32 years, and have introduced legislation constantly to bring it about.

The Senator's concern, the thrust of his statement here, which is very eloquent, is that we have now not only the opportunity but we have the challenge to do something, and this, although merely the opening of the door, may be the instrumentality legislative-wise by which we can move forward toward that time when not just emotion but the realism of the Earth on which we live and the peoples who populate it cause us to think in terms of working for programs of peace, and that we, this Nation and our peoples, composed of the peoples of many nations who come here and become citizens of the Republic of the United States work toward that coveted goal.

Certainly the Senator's comments are appreciated. I wish Senator HATFIELD could be here because I know he has stated so very often in language such as that of the Senator's the hope that the Senator has expressed. Senator HATFIELD has said that—

It is long past time for us to begin using some of our resources to explore alternate methods to our traditional ways of defending our country.

And I sincerely agree that, indeed, the time has come.

Another who has dreamed of peace, Howard Fliieger, editor of U.S. News & World Report, has said:

The objectives of a Peace Academy are ennobling. A Nation schooled in the ways of peace is an ideal that, once attained, could be civilization's greatest achievement.

I feel now, as I did in 1945, that if America does not take the leadership in keeping people's of the Earth together in peace, then utter chaos is certain to result.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will be noted that the Committee on Foreign Relations amended this resolution very materially, and then reported it without dissent, and I know of no objection to the resolution, and when, as, and if the amendments are adopted, I shall have no objection to the adoption of the bill.

I have been advised that Senator CASE, the ranking minority member, has been consulted and that he sees no objection on the part of the minority.

Now, Mr. President, that said, and speaking now as a Senator deeply concerned with the foreign relations of our country, with which I have been intimately and directly concerned for 30

years, having served on what was then the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House before I came here, let me say that this is a matter of very longstanding consideration, and those who have fought for it, like Senator RANDOLPH, and now Senator MATSUNAGA, have waged a long and profound struggle even to get to that point.

I think it would be essential to understand the situation to include as part of my remarks what is contained in the committee report under the title "Background" from page 2 to page 3, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done, Mr. President.

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

#### BACKGROUND

As noted in the report of the Committee on Human Resources (S. Rept. 95-140, May 12), more than 140 bills have been introduced since 1935 relating to the establishment of a department of peace or an academy of peace. In addition there have been numerous similar proposals to sponsor postgraduate training by the Federal Government, either through scholarship programs or the establishment of Federal academies in the international relations area.

In lengthy hearings in 1963, the Committee on Foreign Relations examined a number of these proposals establishing variously a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, a U.S. Foreign Service Academy, and a Freedom Academy. In view of the diversity of opinion on the subject of establishing a Government academy—even the one proposed by the Kennedy administration—no action was taken by the Foreign Relations Committee. Moreover, the succeeding Johnson administration did not resubmit the academy proposal, nor has any administration since that time.

No action also was taken in succeeding Congresses on similar bills until 1971, when S. 390, a bill to provide for a U.S. Foreign Service scholarship program, sponsored by Senator Dominick, was favorably reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee, after hearings, reported the bill adversely to the State.

No further action was taken on S. 390 but in 1972 the text of the bill was reported by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee as part of an Omnibus Education Act. Senator Fulbright, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, offered an amendment to strike the provisions of S. 390 from the Omnibus Education Act which was agreed to by a vote of 48-42.

In 1973, Senator Hartke's bill, S. 1024, to establish a Department of Peace, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. No action was taken on it by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The next similar proposal (S. 1976) was introduced in 1975 also by Senator Hartke and would have established a George Washington Peace Academy. Hearings were held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on May 13, 1976.

No further action was taken on S. 1976, as such, and therefore the Foreign Relations Committee's request for sequential referral was moot. However, the substance of the bill was recast as a proposal to establish a study commission instead and offered as an amendment to the Education Act Amendments of 1976, and agreed to by the Senate. It was deleted in conference and the conference report stated:

The managers wish to urge the appropriate committees of the Senate to give further study to this proposal to create a National Peace Academy and to encourage the ap-

propriate committee on the House to conduct hearings on such proposal.

No such hearings were held by either the Senate Committee on Human Resources or the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CULVER). The Senator from New York. Mr. JAVITS. That demonstrates this matter has been here since 1935 and that more than 140 bills have been introduced since that time relating both to the establishment of a Department of Peace or an Academy of Peace.

Now, Mr. President, for a time during the worst part of the cold war, this whole thing got mixed up with something called the Freedom Academy which was conceived of as a school to train anti-Communist operatives.

It complicated the thing greatly because those who were in a search for peace, not war, saw in the Freedom Academy only another exacerbation for war.

In addition, as has been said, the State Department has been opposed—it still is, as far as I know. But the reason for their opposition is by no means arbitrary. They have a very strong case because they conceive of the department as a department of peace itself, that is what its business is all about.

Naturally, they do not look with favor upon some other department to do their job. If they are going to be eliminated, OK. But no one proposes that in his right mind at this time.

Therefore, I do not wish that the proponents of this resolution to have any illusions about the attitude of the Foreign Relations Committee as I know it on the issue of a Department of Peace.

Whether or not we should have some kind of an academy to deal, as this resolution says, when amended, to question the study of whether existing institutions which assist in resolving conflict in the areas of international relations are enough or not, whether we should have another one is the reason for the amendment. It will be noted that section 3(a) (1) now reads:

Whether to establish a National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution.

And it has now been confined to international relations rather than all relations, management, different races, communities, families, et cetera, according to the original authorship of the bill.

So bearing in mind, first, that the State Department is by no means unreasonable about this matter since they have a very strong case and will undoubtedly be heard by this Commission; second, that we are authorizing a limited study not for a department of peace but for an academy, a scholarly institution, if one is required, and I emphasize the word "if," considering the long struggle of those who want this and our realization in the Committee on Foreign Relations that they should have their day, they should have their chance, and this is a fair chance.

I might say that other important national developments have passed through this kind of an operation of study by Commission. Many have resulted in legislation; many have not. I think and I

feel the committee felt that those who feel so strongly about this should have the deliberative opportunity which this will present to the Commission to give them, as I say, their full day in court and full consideration for their ideas.

But I wish to emphasize for the guidance of the Commission, as managing the bill I am a part of the minority but I believe this is also the view of the whole committee that when we amended the resolution as it came from the Human Resources Committee, where I am also the ranking minority member, and I joined in referring it without amendment because I felt strongly that this was really a foreign policy question and the Foreign Relations Committee should settle it, we emphasized the fact that we look to the Commission to advise us on whether or not a national academy of the kind contemplated should be established at all.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered en bloc.

There being no objection, the committee amendments were considered en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as far as we are concerned we are prepared to vote.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I make this further comment, either asking the able Senator to yield, or on my own time.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think that sometimes it is best, I say to my colleagues, to note create in the first instance but to study the reasons to create or to hear the reasons not to create.

As Senator JAVITS knows, when we were attempting to bring the purest of water to the American people from our Committee on Environment and Public Works, we not only brought forth legislation, but we also established a Commission on Water Quality, and the former Governor and Vice President, Mr. Rockefeller, shared that Commission of public members appointed by the President, Members from the Senate, and Members from the House of Representatives. That study went on for a period of 3 years. We were able to make a contribution by the very fact that we were in the process of studying all the problems that are associated with development of a clean water supply.

We have thought that it might be best to even have a Commission on Air Quality. So from time to time, I know that the Senator is interested in a White House conference of one type or another, as I have been. We have had the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals. There is the White House conference which we expect to have on balanced growth in this country to study the problems of the Nation from the standpoint of concentration of population and opportunity for more rural sections for certain facilities to be established.

So I agree thoroughly with what the Senator has said. This is the process of study. This is the determination which will be made. It will be made, of course, with witnesses appearing at hearings to be held throughout the country. All sorts

of procedures will be followed so that we will see if it is right and necessary to have a peace academy. I think it is, of course.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. RANDOLPH. But I would have said it was necessary to have an Air Force Academy. I think it is necessary to have a West Point, a military academy, and wish to make it known that Gen. Andrew Goodpaster, superintendent of West Point Military Academy, feels the study commission to be a vital first step toward peace. I think it is necessary to have an Annapolis, the Naval Academy.

But I think this is not another layer of academies as such, but it is an academy dedicated to the purposes of the studies of peace. Whether the commission will lead to even the establishment of the academy is one thing that we do not know, as the Senator has indicated. Yet I must relate what Milton said to Cromwell in 1652:

Peace hath her victories/No less renowned than war.

I have long believed—and my 32 years of effort, of course, have not brought it into being, and others have joined—that we should have a department of peace or a secretary of peace.

I acknowledge that the concept of teaching peace and conflict resolution, and mutual respect, and even universal understanding, is one which eludes many practical minds. But I believe peace can be taught. The study commission authorized in S. 469 will provide an apparatus for teaching these concepts.

But the matters are in transition always in the troubled world in which we live. The need for providing an institutional basis for the peaceful resolution of conflict might be challenged by the observation that we are now in a state of peace. And I would respond that we are in a state of relative peace.

And I join the Senator from New York again, the Senator who chairs the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), and others, who have a common purpose here of trying to work together hopefully in this elusive but necessary search for peace among the peoples of the world. I hope, with the poet, Alfred Houseman, for that millenium. He said:

Peace is come and wars are over, welcome you and welcome all.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield in 1 minute.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his very considered reply to my remarks, and may I say, of course, I join him in understanding that man's dearest hope is peace, and I join him in the dedication to bringing it about insofar as our powers and authority may open any basis for us to act in respect of it at all, and I join him in the prayer that is what we may long after I am gone and any of us are gone.

I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, I



thank the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) for yielding.

I wish to thank him also for having contributed toward the advancement of the bill by offering amendments to the bill so that the bill itself, as amended, could be brought to the Senate floor.

While I was hopeful that the bill would be reported in its original form, considering the opposition of the State Department to the bill in its original form, what the Senator from New York has done was to expedite the consideration of the bill by the Senate.

The great Chinese scholar and philosopher Confucius, once said that there can be no peace until every individual citizen has a desire for it.

The Academy of Peace, which was proposed in the original bill, and which I do hope will come about as a result of the study by the commission, will train the best of our young people in the art of peace. Part of that art will be to convince the people of America as well as the people of other nations to learn to desire peace, to want peace. We will have taken a giant step forward in this direction when we have graduates from the Academy of Peace going throughout this country, as well as throughout the world, to sell peace and even to train others in the art of peace.

And I wish to congratulate the Senator from New York and to thank him for the contribution which he has made toward the advancement of this bill in the Senate.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, have the committee amendments been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet, Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 469) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: A bill to establish a commission to study proposals for establishing a National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution.

S. 469

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution Commission Act of 1977".

#### ESTABLISHMENT

Sec. 2. There is established a commission to be known as the Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution.

#### DUTIES OF COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission shall undertake a study to consider—

(1) whether to establish a National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution;

(2) the size, cost, and location of an Academy;

(3) the effects which the establishment of an Academy would have on existing institutions of higher education;

(4) the relationship which would exist between an Academy and the Federal Government;

(5) the feasibility of making grants and providing other forms of assistance to existing institutions of higher education in lieu of, or in addition to, establishing an Academy; and

(6) alternative proposals, which may or may not include the establishment of an Academy, which would assist the Federal Government in accomplishing the goal of promoting peace.

(b) In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) review the theory and techniques of peaceful resolution of conflict between nations; and

(2) study existing institutions which assist in resolving conflict in the areas of international relations.

#### MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission shall be composed of nine members as follows—

(1) three appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate;

(2) three appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(3) three appointed by the President.

(b) Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission each shall be entitled to receive the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332) for each day during which they are engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(2) Members of the Commission who are full-time officers or employees of the United States or Members of the Congress shall receive no additional pay on account of their service on the Commission.

(3) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including a per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(f) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(g) The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members.

#### DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

Sec. 5. (a) Subject to such rules as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classifications and General Schedule pay rates, shall have the power to—

(1) appoint a Director who shall be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay in effect for level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316);

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he considers necessary; and

(3) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this Act.

#### POWERS OF COMMISSION

Sec. 6. (a) The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable. The Commission may administer oaths and affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission.

(b) When so authorized by the Commission, any member or agent of the Commission may take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(c) The Commission may secure directly from any Federal agency information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman, the head of any such Federal agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

#### REPORTS

Sec. 7. The Commission shall transmit to the President and to each House of the Congress such interim reports as it considers appropriate and shall transmit a final report to the President and to each House of the Congress not later than one year after the date on which appropriations first become available to carry out this Act. The final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it considers appropriate.

#### TERMINATION

Sec. 8. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after transmitting its final report under section 7.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out this Act.

#### DEFINITIONS

Sec. 10. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Academy" means the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution;

(2) the term "Chairman" means the Chairman of the Commission elected under section 4(e);

(3) the term "Commission" means the Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution; and

(4) the term "Federal agency" means any agency, department, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, including any Government corporation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### AUTHORITY TO CALL UP DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATION BILL AT ANY TIME AFTER MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the leadership be authorized to call up, at any time after Monday, the Department of Transportation appropriation bill.

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

#### THE DEATH OF WERNHER VON BRAUN—A SALUTE TO THE PASSING OF A TRUE 20TH CENTURY PIONEER

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, yesterday, Dr. Wernher von Braun died from the progressive effects of a long fight against the onslaught of cancer. His passing marks the end of the career of one of the scientific pioneers of the 20th century. In future generations, when men have become more than novel strangers and random explorers of outer space, the name of Wernher von Braun will be acclaimed as one of those men of lonely brilliance who helped to open the universe for the benefit of mankind.

Dr. von Braun's life was, in many ways, typical of that experienced by millions in this age of turmoil and change. As mighty empires and apparently unshakable philosophies have fallen into ruins around them, these men and women have sought to find the pathway into a new era. Von Braun was born into the orderly pre-World War I Prussian society of imperial Germany. His nearly lifelong quest for the perfection of rocketry and space technology was carried on against the background of raging ideological conflicts, first in Nazi Germany and later in the West's competition with Soviet communism. Like so many geniuses, he was a man who was able to endure the frustrations and obstacles thrown in his path by others, because he believed so utterly in his own dreams.

Von Braun once remarked that rockets and space were so all-pervading in his life that, even in his youth, rather than receiving a watch and a new suit at the time of his confirmation in the Lutheran Church, he was given a telescope. Paradoxically, though his own vision reached far into space, he himself never left the confines of Earth's own gravity. Yet, he predicted and hoped for the day when space travel would render war and violent conflicts between men obsolete. He hoped that man, when he saw the Earth and the human saga in a universal perspective, would realize that the heritage and kinship that he shared with others of his own species transformed the sometimes pathological divisions between men into costly and barbaric trivialities.

Fortunately, at the end of World War II, Dr. von Braun and many of his colleagues from the German rocket research center at Peenemunde chose to surrender to the American forces rather than to the Soviets. His expertise provided the United States with a priceless resource in the scientific and technical race between the West and the Soviet

bloc. With his Teutonic discipline, genius, and singleness of purpose, Wernher von Braun probably contributed more to the American effort to conquer space, place a man on the Moon, and reach Mars with a rocket than any other person in our space program.

Dr. von Braun has passed from us, but he has left us with an unforgettable legacy. Like Moses, he was only allowed to view the future from the heights, but he pointed the way for those who are to follow. He will remain, however, one of that infinitesimal company of the geniuses of all ages who have touched the stars while still standing on the Earth. All Americans and people of every nation owe Wernher von Braun a genuine debt of appreciation and respect for the destiny that he has helped to shape for our posterity.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate has just completed a week of remarkable achievements. A total of 45 measures have been passed this week, including such major pieces of legislation as the ERDA authorization, the international financial institutions bill, the bills on international security assistance, international development assistance, the State Department authorization, the arms control and disarmament bill, and the Interior appropriations bill.

Senators have every reason to be congratulated on their dedication and application of talents, and I personally thank my colleagues for their willingness to come in early and stay late in order to transact the business of the people in an expeditious but orderly fashion.

Only 2 weeks remain now until we reach the Independence Day nonlegislative day period. During these 2 weeks, much work has to be done.

Next week, the Senate will come in on Monday, and at 1 o'clock will take up the Treasury appropriation bill, which will be followed by the mine safety bill. No rollcall votes will occur prior to 3 p.m. on Monday.

The Senate will continue work on the mine safety bill on Tuesday and will complete action thereon no later than 8 p.m., with rollcall votes throughout the day.

Other measures which the leadership expects to take up next week are as follows. They will be taken up not necessarily in the order stated, nor are they considered to be the exclusive listing.

I have reference to the Transportation appropriation bill, the HUD appropriation bill, the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill, the Public Works appropriation bill, the HEW appropriation bill, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, the Intelligence Committee authorization bill, the mass transit bill, and various other measures that may be cleared for action. Conference reports also may be called up.

I think it is obvious that the Senate will hold lengthy sessions daily, and a Saturday session appears at this time to be unavoidable.

Again, my compliments to my colleagues. I hope they and the staffs and officers and pages will have a pleasant

and restful weekend, as we look forward to another heavy week of work ahead. Especially do I wish a pleasant Father's Day weekend for all who have reason to celebrate it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the measures that have been passed this week.

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

June 13—(Total=7):  
S. 1340—ERDA Authorization.  
H.R. 3416—Flue-Cured Tobacco Quotas.  
S. 1061—D.C. Borrowing Authority.  
S. Res. 188—Senate Rules Amendment.  
H.R. 5645—Civil Rights Commission.  
S.J. Res. 62—Volunteers in Schools.  
S. Res. 178—Budget Waiver.  
June 14—(Total=22):  
H.R. 5262—International Financial Institutions.  
Eighteen Committee Funding Resolutions (S. Res. 97, 140-142, 144, 146-149, 151, 156-159, 161, 164, 170, 189).  
S. 760—Private bill.  
S. 422—Private bill.  
H.R. 3314—Private bill.  
June 15—(Total=5):  
H.R. 6884—International Security Assistance.  
H.R. 6714—International Development Assistance.  
S. Res. 194—Soviet Detention of Robert Toth.  
H. Con. Res. 249—Belgrade Conference.  
S.J. Res. 63—Federal Home Loan Bank Board.  
June 16—(Total=9):  
S. Res. 195—Rosalynn Carter.  
H.R. 7606—Bull Run Reserve.  
S. Res. 196—Nez Perce Commemoration.  
H.R. 6689—State Department Authorization.  
H.R. 6179—Arms Control and Disarmament.  
H.R. 6893—Members' Residence for State Income Tax.  
S. 455—Private bill.  
S. 1142—Private bill.  
H.R. 1440—Private bill.  
June 17—(Total=2):  
H.R. 7636—Interior Appropriations, 1977.  
S. 469—Peace and Conflict Academy.  
Forty-five measures passed this week.

#### RECESS UNTIL 12:30 P.M. ON MONDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, and as a mark of respect to the passing of a great man, Wernher von Braun, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 12:30 p.m. on Monday.

The motion was agreed to (Mr. MATSUNAGA in the chair, presiding); and at 3:25 p.m. the Senate recessed until Monday, June 20, 1977, at 12:30 p.m.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17, 1977:

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

James W. Garvin, Jr., of Delaware, to be U.S. Attorney for the District of Delaware for the term of 4 years.

The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.