

October 7, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 12143

the Columbia River Basin into the Colorado River Basin, but which is broad enough to preclude other water reconnaissance studies as well.

In introducing my amendment, I made the point that water importation from Canada is no longer merely the subject of academic discussion, but that many Canadian water experts and officials now recognize that Canadian water can be marketed to the United States on a sustained yield basis, and at a considerable profit to the Canadian provinces involved, and that these officials are indicating a growing readiness to talk about water importation.

This latter fact was brought out very clearly in an article and an editorial which appeared on September 18 in the *Deseret News*, a distinguished newspaper published in Salt Lake City. I ask unanimous consent that the article and the editorial be printed in the Record:

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CANADA WILLING TO DISCUSS WATER FOR UNITED STATES
(By Dexter C. Ellis)

Canadian officials have done an about-face and are now showing a "surprising willingness" to talk about diverting some of their surplus water to the arid Western United States, Gov. Calvin L. Rampton was told Tuesday afternoon.

The message came from Lewis G. Smith of Denver, a private water engineer, who has developed a plan to reverse the flow of the Mackenzie River in the Northwest Territory of Canada and make it run south down the Rocky Mountain Trench into the United States.

Mr. Smith visited the governor as part of his campaign to win support for his program from among the 17 western states which will urgently need great amounts of additional water in coming years.

AN EXPLOSION

When the grandiose North American Power and Water Alliance (NAPWA) plan to tap Canadian water sources was announced several years ago, it caused somewhat of an "explosion."

Top officials in Canada said "never." However, now they are realizing that unless they make arrangements to market their surplus water relatively soon, they may miss the boat, Mr. Smith said.

The thirsty states may turn to desalination or other sources, he explained.

EXPLAIN PROGRAM

Mr. Smith was in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, recently to explain his program to the Chamber of Commerce there which is vitally concerned with development of water for the vast wheat-growing prairies in that vicinity.

He said he has been invited back to explain his program to a broader array of Canadian officials.

Also, he and Jay R. Bingham, director of the Western States Water Council, will visit Friday with Canadian natural resource officials in Winnipeg.

ESTABLISH CONTACTS

Mr. Bingham said his visit is to establish contacts with his counterparts in Canada and does not constitute endorsement of Mr. Smith's plan by the Council.

Mr. Smith said Canada's interest in his plan stems from two factors. It would divert water southeastward to where it is needed in Canada, and would provide financing which the Canadians cannot generate on their own.

Gov. Rampton appeared greatly interested as Mr. Smith explained his proposal.

However, he questioned the idea that the U.S. government might become interested since a 10-year moratorium has been placed on any federal studies to augment water for the Central Arizona Project recently passed by Congress.

Mr. Smith said he hoped Canadian officials would support the plan to utilize U.S. funds for developing the Canadian prairies as well as helping the U.S. If they do, the American government might become interested.

The plan would not take any water from the Columbia River system, but might add to it, Mr. Smith said.

Gov. Rampton said that a lead time of 25 years is needed to obtain water for future needs. If the U.S. waits until the need becomes acute, the price of water from Canada would increase accordingly.

Mr. Smith said 180 million acre foot of water from the Mackenzie River now flows northward and is wasted into the Arctic Ocean.

His plan would divert an undetermined amount southward, with some being used by Canada and the rest flowing down the Rocky Mountain Trench into a natural reservoir on the southwest border of Montana.

From this 50 million-acre-foot impoundment, made by damming Centennial Valley, the water would fan out in natural and man-made channels to the arid southwest.

He said it is "surprising how simple" the water could be diverted and made to flow along natural channels.

Mr. Smith said that much of the Canadian opposition to NAWAPA was based on the fact that it would flood the Rocky Mountain Trench to great depth and destroy recreational values.

His plan, he explained, would raise the water level in the trench only a few feet and would not interfere with recreational uses.

Mr. Smith explained that some of the Canadian water would be diverted into the upper Green River and would be available for shale oil development in eastern Utah and Wyoming. Much of the revenue to pay off construction costs would be expected to come from this source, he added.

CANADA WATER IMPORTS COULD SOLVE SHORTAGES

Grandiose plans to import water from Canada and even Alaska for the thirsty Western States are not new.

Over the years, 13 inter-regional plans and eight international in scope have been proposed. Among the most ambitious was the North American Water and Power Alliance plan proposed to Congress in 1964 which envisioned diverting 110 million acre-feet of water from rivers in Alaska, the Yukon, and British Columbia at a cost of \$100 billion.

Now comes the Smith Plan proposed by Lewis G. Smith, a water resources engineer who resigned from the Bureau of Reclamation to pursue efforts to divert 185 million acre-feet from the Mackenzie and Liard rivers for distribution in the U.S. and southern Canada.

Smith's conceptual plan, however, has definite chances of succeeding where the NAWAPA plan failed. First, it would divert much of the water supply to southern Canadian farms, allowing population buildups in that area away from the crowded Eastern areas.

Second, it would help finance the Canadian projects by the sale of water to the U.S., some 38 million acre-feet annually. And third, it would raise the level of the Rocky Mountain Trench only a few feet. Canadians were especially incensed at the NAWAPA plan to make a vast reservoir out of this primitive Canadian waterway.

Smith's Western States Water Augmentation Concept—the full title for his plan—

would cost approximately \$50 billion to deliver 38 million acre-feet to Montana's Centennial Valley, envisioned as a 50 million acre-foot storage area, and another \$25 billion for the secondary distribution system.

To be sure, several other sources of water are available: Desalination, reclaimed Mississippi River water, and others. But, claims Smith, none offers the feasibility of Canadian imports.

However, they apply some leverage to the Canadians that their great water resources might be bypassed in favor of other water sources if they delay much longer.

Utah would benefit by water imports into the Green River, part of which could be used for statewide distribution.

The Smith plan has much to recommend it, although it is admittedly a long-range view in its early conceptual stages. Nevertheless, it plants the idea more firmly that the water-parched Western States may have to turn to Canada's vast resources to supply expanding populations during the next century.

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET MAYER, REPORTER OF THE DALLAS TIMES-HERALD

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], who is necessarily absent today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by him relative to Margaret Mayer, a reporter of the Dallas Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. TOWER

Mr. President, it has been my very great privilege both in Washington and in Texas to work with Margaret Mayer, now of the Dallas Times-Herald. I can testify from experience that she is one of the most astute and accomplished reporters covering this or any other town. She is fearless and she is fair. I wish we had more like her, and I think the Washington Press Corps feels the same way. Texans are particularly lucky to have her working for them here in the Nation's Capitol.

I am pleased that Editor and Publisher magazine has honored her in a recent article which sums up her distinguished career and continuing service. Under unanimous consent I include the article at this point in the Record for the information of Senators and, I hope, as an inspiration to young journalists throughout the nation:

ONE-WOMAN NEWS BUREAU: SHE KEEPS A BEAD ON TEXANS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
(By Luther A. Huston)

WASHINGTON.—The Sunday that Lyndon B. Johnson announced he would not be a candidate for reelection, Margaret Mayer was out in the wilds of Maryland. But she heard the news, dashed into Washington and wrote four stories, all of which made the first edition of the Dallas Times-Herald.

At the late lamented, or lamentable, Democratic Convention in Chicago she was in charge of a four-man staff, that included her managing editor, and, she says, "we did a damn good job." Her staff kept out of trouble, did not get beaten up by cops, gave the Times-Herald comprehensive coverage of the general news of the convention and the particular news of the Texas delegation. She wrote the leads.

Margaret Mayer is not the only woman who heads a major Washington news bureau but she probably is the only one-woman bureau in competition with a newspaper that main-

tains a four-man staff in Washington. She is the first correspondent the Dallas Times-Herald ever had outside of Dallas and the first to become the paper's top political correspondent.

In a way, Margaret Mayer had a hand in shaping the political career of Lyndon B. Johnson. She covered his final campaign for Congress in 1946 and his senatorial campaign in 1948, and in 1950 she left Austin and went to work for Senator LBJ in Washington.

"But I wasn't cut out for that sort of work," she said. "I was a newspaper woman and I wanted to get back to it. So, after three months, I quit and went back to Texas as state capitol correspondent for the Dallas Times-Herald." She stayed in Austin as the Times-Herald's correspondent for 15 years and came to Washington as that paper's correspondent in 1966.

Margaret Mayer is as Texan as a cowboy hat or a longhorn. She was born in that state, attended the University of Texas School of Journalism and went to work for the Austin American-Statesman after college.

"That was in war time," she says, "and a lot of the boys were going off to war. The girls were getting the jobs the boys were leaving."

COVERED TEXAS POLITICS

At any rate, she started covering Texas politics in 1944 and has been at it ever since without any serious competition from the boys who came back from war or have entered the field since.

Twice she has left journalism. The first time was in 1949 when she took a leave of absence from the Austin papers and went to Vienna in the War Department's information service. That service was phased out after a year and taken over by the State Department, eventually becoming the U.S. Information Service, so she came back to Austin as a reporter for a few months until she joined Lyndon Johnson's staff in 1950.

For 15 years she was the Times-Herald's one-woman bureau in Austin and for almost three years she has been the paper's one-woman bureau in Washington.

"I'm used to being a one-woman bureau," she says, "and I like it. I love the freedom I have and the freedom I am given by my newspaper. It may be that our ideas do not always coincide but it is an enjoyable relationship."

A cardinal principle of Margaret Mayer's newspaper code is that a reporter stays on the job until it is done. She is scornful of time-clock reporters and the eight-hour day.

"The eight-hour day is something I have never known," she said. "The Sunday President Johnson announced his non-candidacy was a day off for me but I was on the job 15 minutes after I heard the announcement and stayed there until the first edition started to roll. In Chicago I worked around the clock. I work until the job is done and I could no more walk away from a story that is developing than I could walk away from a person bleeding in the street."

As a one-woman bureau, Miss Mayer has a lot of chores to do for her paper. Her first priority, of course is her fellow-Texan, Lyndon Baines Johnson. Second priority is the Texas delegation in Congress. These are general news assignments, producing stories to supplement wire service coverage on news of regional interest.

In addition to general news coverage, however, she writes a once-a-week editorial page column interpretive of events related to Texas politics and interests. For the Sunday paper she does a column made up of half a dozen items—something like Newsweek's Periscope column—but beamed on events related to Texas and Texans. Although she is not a "woman's page reporter" she also does a Sunday column covering the social activities of Texans in the Capital.

One of the "society" columns she wrote may have blighted the political career of a bright young man who had aspirations to be governor of Texas. Bill D. Moyers then Presidential Johnson's press secretary, had gubernatorial aspirations. He also was an expert in cooking Texas dishes and he was in charge of the food at a jet-set charity ball in Washington. Miss Mayer wrote about it in her column and the story got back to the rather stodgy, backwoods area of Texas from which came Moyers' major political support. "The story killed him in Texas politics," she said, so he turned to New York and a job as publisher of *Newsday* from which vantage point he still might launch a political career—but not in Texas.

Miss Mayer occupies the office from which Liz Carpenter worked when she was a very competent member of the Carpenter News Bureau before she became Lady Bird Johnson's press secretary. Liz and Margaret were in journalism school together. She does not expect Mrs. Carpenter to rejoin the Carpenter Bureau, headed by Les Carpenter, her husband, but thinks rather she may try the lecture circuit.

Miss Mayer, however, expects to continue writing national and Texas news—political and general—from her National Press Building office. "I like what I do," she declares.

THE CZECHOSLOVAK CRISIS

Mr. HART, Mr. President, it is often helpful to have an opportunity to view world events from the perspective of an informed citizen of another nation.

Such an opportunity was given to me recently. I read a speech by Asoka Mehta, one of India's outstanding political leaders and thinkers.

Since independence in 1947, as leader of the Socialist Party and now a member of the Congress Party, Asoka Mehta has been in the forefront of India's economic development.

During the vigorous debate over the Czechoslovak crisis in the Lok Sabha, the lower House of Parliament, Asoka Mehta broke rank with his party, voting to condemn the Warsaw Pact countries for their heinous action in Czechoslovakia. Asoka resigned from his Cabinet position as Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals.

This courageous speech permits us to see the Czech crisis through the eyes of an Asian. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA BY SHRI ASOKA MEHTA IN THE LOK SABHA ON AUGUST 30, 1968

I am very grateful to my friend Shri Surendranath Dwivedy for giving us this opportunity to express our concern for and solidarity with Czechoslovakia.

Why are we so concerned about Czechoslovakia? Because of its history, its long history of struggle for freedom, of a profoundly rich culture and traditions of which any country can be proud. We are concerned with Czechoslovakia because we have enjoyed the valued friendship of that country; it rushed to our help when we were in difficulties, to strengthen our defenses; it has helped us to build up our economy.

I know something about it because for a period of time I was Co-chairman of the Economic Commission between India and Czechoslovakia. We are more concerned about Czechoslovakia because there a struggle of paramount importance is being waged and

people are struggling to make socialism—or, the proper word is communism—humane. It is the effort at giving humanity, imparting humanity, into communism that evokes our admiration.

It is not only a struggle for humane communism; it is also a struggle for humane international order. Between nations and between peoples, there has got to be a civilized code of behaviour, a code of behaviour which would evoke the allegiance of the 20th century man. Because it is that kind of struggle that is being waged there, that as socialists we are deeply and profoundly concerned.

Sometimes, it is said: why is it that some of us take such keen interest where the communist countries are involved? The reason is very simple. Those who claim to be the wave of the future have to maintain standards which have to be very different from those who are only the backwaters of the past.

The communists claim to be the wave of the future. We are entitled to judge them by the standards that history demands of us.

In this House there are many of us who are friends of the Soviet Union. I have myself had various opportunities of dealing with the leaders of the Soviet Union and but for the changed circumstances I had already planned a visit to the Soviet Union next month. Therefore, there is no question of our not being friendly with the Soviet Union. Because we are friendly to the Soviet Union, it becomes all the more necessary that when that country makes a grievous mistake, we do not hesitate to voice our protest and our deep regret.

Czechoslovakia has many lessons to teach us. When the people are endowed with a purpose and when the people are able to have a leadership that is committed to a cause, nobody is able to cow them down.

There are many colleagues of mine in this House who are constantly worried about arms. They do not know what will happen to India if we do not get all the arms that we need. I too am concerned about my country's defence. But it is not arms that will ultimately save a people; it is the mind and the heart of the people themselves.

If there is one country in the world that teaches this lesson that when the people are united, when they are filled with noble purposes, when their groupings are graced with a goal and when they have a leadership which is able to inspire them, even the mightiest army is not able to do anything, that is Czechoslovakia. Trying to shape our policies in the quest of arms may have validity up to a point. But when we are concerned with deep and profound issues, we must ultimately anchor our hopes in the unity and the faith of our people and not in borrowed arms.

Then again, Czechoslovakia: whatever has happened, it was said that 10 days shook the world in 1917, two days shook the world in 1968. In these two days, the people of Czechoslovakia have shown that given the unity they are able to assert their will to a great extent. If they have not succeeded fully, it is because we have failed them; it is the peoples of the world who have been somewhat mute in their support to the people of Czechoslovakia.

We salute them for their solidarity, strength, determination and the dedication that they have shown. It is our failure. Let us accept that at this critical hour, when people, not with arms but with their bare bodies, with their hearts and minds, were trying to oppose aggression and tyranny, we did not stand up for them.

This is our sovereign Parliament, and I would therefore like to invite your attention to what the National Assembly of Czechoslovakia had to say on the 28th of August. It adopted a resolution. I wish it were possible for me to read the entire text of it and

October 7, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

let it form part of the records of this House, but I will read only two paragraphs from it:

"The National Assembly considers forthwith the occupation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic by the armed forces of the five Warsaw Treaty countries as illegal and contrary to international treaties and in violation of the United Nations Charter as well as the Warsaw Treaty."

It goes on to say:

"The National Assembly insists on uncompromising pursuance of the principles and policies proclaimed and adopted in the Action Programme of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Programme of the Government. The Members of the National Assembly pledge that they will do their utmost to keep the process of democratisation continued without any disturbances."

It is the will of the National Assembly, the will of the Czechoslovakian people that was expressed by the National Assembly in the declaration made on the 28th August.

For me, it is a matter of deep sorrow and abiding regret that our Parliament is the only Parliament in the world that has gone on record saying that there has been no violation of the United Nations Charter.

Sir, may I next invite your attention to what the President of the National Assembly said. Like our Speaker, Sir, he is the tribune of the people of Czechoslovakia, and what has the tribune to say after his return from Moscow? He says: "It is a painful subject. We chose the path of compromise, but it was not easy. Please believe we put forward every argument we had. We were aware in Moscow that the agreement which was concluded could be considered as unacceptable and even be interpreted as treason." He added:

"But it is only thanks to the grand firmness of our people that we were not obliged to accept a long occupation and an imposed Government. It was this firmness which finally influenced the position taken by the opposite side. . . . Of course, there are moments when one must reject all compromises and risk the worst."

He went on:

"We made our decision as patriots and soldiers in the light of the number of cannons and planes on our territory."

18,000 tanks, 1,000 planes and 650,000 soldiers—that was the force of occupation that was imposed upon the little country of Czechoslovakia. He continued:

"We arrived at the conclusion that the ultimate moment had not yet come and that we could seek a compromise while bearing in mind the material and moral risks this would entail."

"The future will judge our decision. It will describe our choice either as wisdom or as treachery."

No one can charge, even history will not charge, the brave leaders of Czechoslovakia with treachery. But I do not know whether some of us will be condoned of that crime by history. They have been compelled to accept this compromise. What is the compromise? The President said:

"It will be necessary to grant the Government special powers concerning measures to be taken regarding the press and radio, the dissolution of clubs and bans on new political parties."

It is said:

"Czechoslovak party and Government leaders today worked against time to find a communist party leadership acceptable both to Czechoslovakia and Moscow and to restore order throughout the country."

They have to find a leadership acceptable to someone outside their country! That is what that country is being called upon to do. It is being called upon to give up a part of its liberalisation programme. What is the crime that Czechoslovakia has committed? It has given freedom of the press and freedom of expression. This the Soviet Union calls counter-revolutionary.

In this House, we are functioning in a multi-party Parliament. In this country, there is full freedom of speech and full freedom of the press. If this is counter-revolution, I have no doubt that every single democrat in this House would be proud to be called a counter-revolutionary. If revolution is to smother the free voice of Czechoslovakia, I say, lie upon that revolution. If counter-revolution is to let the people speak out and express their legitimate right, that counter-revolution is something which the Indian people have cherished.

Therefore, let no attempt be made to cow us down by using these words. This House stands fully, firmly and squarely behind the rights for which the Czechoslovak people are fighting. They have been told, they will not be permitted to fight for these rights. They are being compelled to compromise. Why are they compromising? It is because 14 million people can fight only up to a point.

What about the rest of humanity? What about 500 million people of India? To what extent are we giving them our hand of friendship and cooperation? To what extent is our shoulder being put by the side of their shoulder in their fight for these rights? This is the humane phase for which we have been working. This is what the Father of the Nation taught us. This is what we learnt from our leaders.

If they are fighting for that, surely we are with them. If we do not say that, if millions of people in other parts of the world do not say that firmly and unequivocally, if they are frightened and petrified, if their own small interests come in the way of assertion of their basic personality, are we entitled to blame the Czechoslovak people and leaders? Let him cast the first stone who has never sinned. I am a sinner and I will never cast the first stone at them.

God forbid, that our country should ever face this kind of situation. But if it ever does, I hope and trust that our people and Parliament would behave in the manner in which the Czechoslovak Parliament and people have done. This is the only tribute I can pay to Czechoslovakia. If ever, God forbid, such a situation comes, we shall emulate that illustrious example.

Why did the Russians do it? Mr. Ota Sik, one of the Deputy Prime Ministers of Czechoslovakia, was asked by the world famous Italian Novelist Alberto Moravia, what he thought was the motive of the invasion. This is what the Deputy Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia had to say:

"Certain groups in power felt threatened by the happenings in Czechoslovakia. If our attempt had succeeded, for them, it would have been the end. Hence the reaction. It was a reaction not against a definite change, but against any sign of life or movement. It was the pure and simple defence of the political status quo."

It is with this attempt at freezing the whole situation in the world and at controlling the movement of the spirit of man that this offensive was launched with 6.5 lakh soldiers, 18,000 tanks and 1,000 aeroplanes. It is against that, as the embodiment of the same human spirit, we are being compelled to raise our voice abiding protest.

There are many writers here. I also claim to be a humble writer. The occupation forces in Czechoslovakia have recently destroyed, razed to the ground, the Writers' Building because of their wrath against writers. As a humble writer, I would like to convey to the writers in Czechoslovakia that they can raze the structure, but they cannot destroy the spirit.

Sir, it is necessary for us to give our utmost support to Czechoslovakia. There is a very respected journal in our country. It had the most exalted association. I was distressed to find that from its mast-head it has removed the famous motto, "freedom is in peril, de-

fend it with all your might." Maybe the journal thinks it worthwhile to erase that motto, but the deathless message that our departed leader gave this country will never be forgotten. Freedom is in peril. Wherever it be, we shall defend it with all our might.

May I, therefore, through you, Sir, appeal to the House, to both sides of the House, that the Government, the Parliament and the people must, in unequivocal terms, continue to support the people of Czechoslovakia because it is only then that they can be free. They are on razor's edge if we do not stand by them.

We read this morning in the National Herald that Czechoslovakia had been threatened that Slovakia would be made a part of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia would probably be made something else. Anything can happen there.

Therefore, let us discard, let us throw aside, limited ideas and think in terms of the greatness of the issues involved and extend to Czechoslovakia the fullest of support and our solidarity as the Resolution moved by my hon. friend Shri Dwivedy seeks to do. To those who seek to traduce and trample upon the protagonists of humane socialism all that I can say in the immortal words of the Spanish Republicans during the Civil War is "no pasarán."

NEW THREAT TO THE OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, earlier this month I wrote to the Secretary of the Interior to express my concern over the proposed foreign trade zone and refinery complex to be established at Machias Bay, Maine. In the past the Department of the Interior has firmly refused to permit foreign trade zones to be used as a means of bypassing the oil import program. I rise to inform my colleagues of a proposal which calls for a reversal of that policy and which could lead to the complete dismantling of the mandatory oil import control program.

The proposal presently under consideration is establishment of a foreign trade zone at Machias Bay, Maine, and construction of a refinery complex by Occidental Petroleum Corp. after it has received permission to import 300,000 barrels per day of crude oil into the zone and has received a license to import 100,000 barrels per day of refined products manufactured in the zone into the New England area. The finished product quota for which Occidental Petroleum Corp. has applied consists of 90,000 barrels per day of No. 2 fuel oil—which is a substantial portion of the daily home heating oil requirements in all New England—and 10,000 barrels per day of gasoline. Most of the remaining production of the refinery would find, by one means or another, its way into the U.S. market.

This proposal can only be described as a blatant attempt to obtain a competitive advantage in the marketplace by circumventing the oil import program. The wisdom of the oil import program was graphically illustrated a year ago during the crisis in the Middle East. Without the program, the closing of the Suez Canal and the boycott of the Western nations by the oil producing Arab States could have had a disastrous effect on our efforts to supply our forces in Vietnam and to provide adequate energy needs at home. Yet, within 1 short year, actions are being taken to under-

mine the very program which made the United States self-sufficient during that hour of crisis.

The privileges which Occidental Petroleum seeks for itself are great indeed. The Occidental refinery would be the fourth largest in the United States and would equal almost 25 percent of the total existing capacity of all east coast refineries. The proposal asks that Occidental be granted the right to import into the United States 100,000 barrels per day of finished products. This amount is more than that authorized for importation by all of the segments of the industry and would be assigned to only one company. Granting a license to import 100,000 barrels per day of finished products would give Occidental an opportunity to realize domestic prices on products generated at offshore costs. It is estimated that this privilege would represent a competitive advantage of at least \$40 million per year to the company.

Since the refinery output would be designed exclusively for importation into the United States or for sale to the United States for use abroad, the Occidental refinery is equivalent to a domestic refinery in spite of its location within a foreign trade zone. The proposal contemplates exclusive utilization of foreign source crude oil—300,000 barrels per day. A comparable domestic refinery of this size would only be entitled to an import allocation of 13,920 barrels per day of crude oil or 4.6 percent of its input. This is a far cry from the 100 percent input of foreign crude oil which Occidental seeks for itself, and which would be equal to 50 percent of the total amount now imported to the east coast.

The granting of the proposed licenses to Occidental Petroleum Corp. is not simply a redistribution of the oil import quotas now available. The refinery at Machias Bay would receive 100 percent of its input from foreign sources and would sell most of its output in the U.S. market. At the same time, all other refineries in districts I to IV, also selling their output in the U.S. market, would be allowed to receive an average of approximately 7 percent of their qualified input from foreign sources, while larger companies average around 5 percent. A suspension of the rules in favor of Occidental would give it a windfall of 284,080 barrels per day of foreign crude oil produced at low cost due to favorable geographic conditions and low wages paid to foreign laborers.

If Occidental wishes to operate a refinery complex at Machias Bay and play by the same rules as everyone else, fine; but every indication is that the company will not proceed with its plans for the refinery complex unless the rule book is rewritten for its benefit. Apparently the company plans cannot be economically justified under the standards which we require of the rest of the petroleum industry. If Occidental is allowed to proceed, other American oil companies will be in a position to request similar treatment. Will we grant these concessions to other companies and destroy the American domestic oil industry? Or will Occidental Petroleum Corp. be the only company singled out for special treatment?

Where will the U.S. Government draw the line?

If for any reason the executive arm of the Federal Government should grant the necessary foreign trade zone authorizations and oil import quotas necessary to the establishment of the Machias Bay project, then we can look forward to several of the following results: impairment of the national security of the United States through the failure to provide an atmosphere in which a domestic oil industry can exist and provide a supply of oil which would be adequate, dependable and certain at all times; flooding of the U.S. market by cheap foreign produced crude oil at a time when the domestic oil industry is suffering a recession across the Nation, and the Department of the Interior has expressed its concern over the status of the Nation's crude oil reserves; a subsidy to consumers of one region paid for by the increased prices charged consumers of other regions of the Nation; an increase in the unemployment rate among American workers; an overall reduction in the use of American-flag vessels by the petroleum industry; a competitive advantage being granted by officials of the U.S. Government to a company that is singled out for special treatment; establishment of many foreign trade zones which would be used to circumvent U.S. trades tariff, and quota barriers; and ultimately, the dismantling of the mandatory oil import control program.

The Foreign-Trade Zones Board has scheduled a hearing on the application for the establishment of a foreign trade zone at Machias Bay, Maine. The hearing is to be held in Portland, Maine, on Thursday, October 10, 1968. Although it apparently took the examiner nearly 3 months to determine the application and accompanying exhibits complied with the regulations. Much of the vital data relating to economic feasibility will not be available for inspection until 9 days before the hearing and 6 days before the deadline for submitting written summaries of testimony. Because of the serious issues involved, it is anticipated that numerous public officials and interested parties will request permission to appear and that several days will be required to hear the testimony. Therefore, I ask the Foreign-Trade Zones Board to reschedule the hearings at a later date which would permit thorough investigation and preparation of testimony and to schedule additional days on hearings, part of which would be held in Washington, a more convenient location with more adequate facilities. In view of the fundamental policy questions involved, I would also urge the Foreign-Trade Zones Board to conduct the hearing rather than the technical Examiner's Committee as now proposed.

THE 90TH CONGRESS—RECORD ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the 90th Congress is rapidly drawing to a close. It is expected that within a week or so we will adjourn sine die. With adjournment will come an appraisal of the record of this Congress on human rights.

The Senate—the Committee on Foreign Relations in particular—has not done the job we should do in the field of human rights.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, through a special subcommittee, of which the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is the chairman, held hearings in early 1967 on the Three Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery. All three conventions were reported favorably by the subcommittee. However, only the Supplemental Convention on Slavery was reported favorably to the Senate by the full committee. The Senate then ratified this convention on November 2, 1967.

In October 1967, the President declared that 1968 would be observed in the United States as International Human Rights Year. In January 1968, the President announced the creation of a special Presidential Commission for Observance of Human Rights Year. The President also called for ratification of nine specific human rights conventions. They are the Conventions on Genocide, Freedom of Association, Slavery Supplement—ratified—Political Rights of Women, Forced Labor, Employment Discrimination, Equal Remuneration, Discrimination in Education, and Racial Discrimination.

On September 20, 1968, the Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on the Protocol to the Convention on the Status of Refugees. This convention was reported favorably to the Senate and the resolution of ratification was agreed to on October 4, 1968. Thus, this convention became the second to be ratified during the 90th Congress and the only one to be ratified during International Human Rights Year.

Mr. President, we have made some progress but too little.

However, as I stated in my remarks immediately after ratification, this belated ratification of the Protocol on the Status of Refugees is welcome, since this vote demonstrates clearly that these various international conventions, designed to internationalize human rights, can be ratified without prejudice to national or State law. Extending appeal before the International Court to the field of human rights is a milestone which should ease the path of other human rights conventions still awaiting Senate ratification.

Mr. President, I hope fervently that this action by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate itself indicates a move towards reasserting the Senate's constitutional and traditional role in foreign policy matters and, specifically reasserting its leadership role in internationalization of universal human rights.

THE ACLU IS RAPIDLY EXPANDING ITS SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the third and final article on the American Civil Liberties Union, written by Mrs. Shirley Scheibla has been published in *Baron's Weekly*. In her first article, Mrs. Scheibla describes the objectives and early activities of the ACLU; the second article discusses its current activities; this final article discusses the ACLU's