Approved For Release 2005/07/13: CIA-RDP79-00957A000100030044-9 S 17973 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

October 1, 1974

and as amended be moved to third reading, passed, reconsidered and laid on the table?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which S. 3817 was passed and that it be returned to second

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the Senator would include all that in his request,

it would be done all at once.

Mr. TOWER. I have no objection to

doing that.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which S. 3817 was passed, that it be returned to second reading, that an amendment which I send to the desk be acted upon, that the motion to reconsider be made and a motion to table be made, the bill returned to third reading and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without

objection, it is so ordered.

The second assistant legislative clerk

read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following: received, or reserved, and any such provision is hereby preempted, and no civil or criminal penalty which would otherwise be applicable under such provision shall apply to such member or nonmember association, institution, bank, or affiliate or to any other person."

SEC. 204. The amendments made by this ster. 204. The amendments had by the stille shall apply to any deposit made or obligation issued in any State after the date of enactment of this title, but prior to the earlier of (1) July 1, 1977, or (2) the date (after such date of enactment) on which the State enacts a provision of law which limits the amount of interest which may be charged in connection with deposits or obligations referred to in the amendments made by this

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to, and without objection the bill as amended, is passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think that was a very simple solution to

a highly done plex problem.

FOR IGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1974

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3394) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

May I say, there are no additional roll-

call votes contemplated.

There are a couple of amendments which have been cleared. This is due to printing.

Mr. TOWER. Are you making a

speech? Mr. HUMPHREY. If I do, I know the Senator from Texas will want to re-

Mr. TOWER, I certainly would.

Mr. HUMPHREY (continuing). For the eloquence of my oration, but please be gone, dear friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY Jr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without

objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 14, line 25 immediately before the semicolon, insert a comma and the following: "except that for purposes of section 632(d), value shall be the gross cost incurred by the United states Government in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying the excess defense article.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, this is technical amendment to correct a drafting error in section 10 of the bill relative to the use of excess defense articles in the military aid program. As written, the provision in the bill would result in windfall reimbursements to the military services when their excess material or equipment is made available for use in the military aid program. Under existing law, the services are reimbursed with military aid funds only for the costs of "repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying" the excess material or equipment that is to be furnished to a foreign country under the military aid program. The effect of this amendment will be to leave the reimbursement requirement as it is in existing law, as the committee intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today I sent to the desk an amendment for which I now ask immediate consideration. It is but a brief policy statement on our aid program to Africa which I discussed with the acting minority leader, the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. — "Statement of Policy or. Assist-

ance to Africa."

The President is requested to review the regional allocation of conomic development assistance and to increase Africa's share of AID loans and grants. Per capita official development assistance to the developing countries of Africa, including both U.S. bilateral assistance and U.S. contributions to multilateral lending institutions, should be raised to a level at least qual to those for Asia and Latin America. A special effort must be made to provide more assistance to the six-teen of the world's twenty-five "least de-veloped" countries that are in Africa and to the fourteen African mations that are judged to be "most serious y affected" by rising costs of food and fuel. The President is requested to make a report to Congress on action taken to provide the developing countries of Africa with an equitable share of U.S. economic assistance at the time that AID's operational year budget for fiscal year 1975 is submitted to Congress and again with the submission to Congress of the proposed AID budget for fiscal year 1976.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What this really does is merely request of the President that he inform Congress at an appropriate time of the efforts being made to have Africa share equitably in the for-eign assistance program. There is no money involved, may I say.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I was

about to ask that question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia who is so correct in his sense of responsibility on matters, fiscal matters, no money was involved at all, merely to get the report from the President in reference to the assistance that goes to Africa and whether or not there is equitable showing.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank

my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President. Africa is not receiving an equitable share of U.S. foreign economic assistance: 16 percent of the people living in countries that receive some form of U.S. economic assistance live in Africa. But administration proposals for AID expenditures give Africa less than 6 percent of loans and grants. Original administration Public Law 480 requests also give Africa less than 6 percent.

Population-mid-1973 estimates-AID assistance requested: Africa, 298.7 million, \$168,992,000; Latin America, 295.2 million, \$267,461,000; Asia, 1,257.6

million, \$1,375,949,000.

Bilateral assistance to Latin America and Asia is substantially supplemented by our contributions to the regional development banks. The United States has yet to contribute to the African Development Fund, and the proposed contribution for this year is minimal in comparison with our contributions to the Asian Development Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Inter-American Development Bank, fiscal year 1975: \$500 million "special

funds"-no-interest loan.

Asian Development Bank, fiscal year 1975: \$125 million ordinary capital, \$50 million "special fund"—no interest.

African Development Fund, fiscal year 1975: \$5 million—grant.

Per capita official development assistance-includes both bilateral assistance and contributions to multilateral lending institutions—is lower for Africa than for the other two regions. Per capita assistance to Africa has been decreasing where that to the other two regions has been increasing.

Region	Per capita commitments		
	1971	1972	1973
Asia Latin America Africa	\$1.75 1.71 1.38	\$1.79 2.13 1.21	\$1.93 3.01 1.18

It is to be noted that economic development assistance needs are greater for Africa than for the other two regions: 16 of the 25 "least developed countries" in the world are in Africa; 14 of the 25 countries judged to be "most severely affected" by the rising costs of food and fuel are in Africa.

October 1, 1974

If our foreign assistance is to be directed to solving the problems of the world's poorest people, the African states should be receiving more assistance per person than the other two regions. Yet they are receiving far less.

It is especially important that the African nations receive more assistance for

rural development.

Recent droughts in the Sahel and Ethiopia have revealed how vulnerable the people of Africa's poorest countries are to bad weather. They have not developed the most basic buffers against such occurrences: water conservation and irrigation; marketing systems to encourage maximum production in good years; improved agricultural technology; and drought-resistant seed varieties.

Three out of four Africans depend on agriculture for their livelihood. Yet percapita agricultural production has been declining since the mid-1960's. It dropped by 4 percent in 1973 alone.

With world food reserves diminishing, we must help develop the capacity of the African countries to produce their own food. Massive food relief may not be possible in the near future.

If the administration is serious in its commitment to increase food production in the developing world, more attention must be given to the rural development needs of Africa.

If the administration is serious in its commitment to increase food production in the developing world, more attention must be given to the rural development needs of Africa.

Surely it must be understood that Africa is an extremely important source of the raw materials the United States needs. For example, of the world's known reserves, Africa contains: 47 percent of the cobalt; 34 percent of the bauxite; 17 percent of the copper; and 23 percent of the uranium ore.

Major new reserves of important raw materials are continually being discovered in Africa. Much of Africa's wealth of mineral resources has not been developed. If we are to have access to these resources in the future, we must assist in African economic development now.

The nations of Africa are currently important producers and exporters of mineral resources and commodities. Of free world production in 1971, Africa accounted for: 97 percent of the diamonds; 81 percent of the cobalt; 78 percent of the palm kernels; 74 percent of the cocoa; 45 percent of the manganese; 30 percent of the phosphate rock; 28 percent of the coffee; 25 percent of the copper; and 13 percent of the crude petroleum.

The United States can and should expand its trade relations with the nations of Africa. We presently receive only 8 percent of Africa's exports, while the EEC receives 44 percent and the United Kingdom 15 percent. We account for 12 percent of Africa's imports, while the EEC accounts for 36 percent and the United Kingdom 16 percent. Both assistance for and trade with Africa should be expanded as part of a policy of strengthening our economic ties with the African countries.

Some indicators of the economic development assistance needs of the 16 African

countries that are classified among the 25 "least developed" in the world:

Their per capita GNP's range from \$60 to \$140. Most have per capita GNP's of \$100 or less.

For all but two of them, 80 percent or more of the labor force is in agriculture. Life expectancy ranges from 35 to 50. Persons per physician in these countries range from 17,000 to 92,000.

Most of them have a literacy rate of 5 to 10 percent.

Many have only 1 to 10 miles of improved roads for every 1,000 square miles of land area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.
AMENDMENT NO. 1924

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is at the desk an amendment that is a similar policy statement which, by the way, is a statement of policy by our Government. It is a statement of policy on the independence of certain African territories relating to Portugal and I ask, Mr. President, that this amendment by Senator McGez and myself be laid before the Senate and I shall explain it.

It is a statement of policy and not an amendment on funds.

There is a number on the amendment.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is as follows:

SEC. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON THE IN-DEPENDENCE OF ANGOLA. MOZAMBIQUE, AND GUINEA-BISSAU.--

Congress finds that the Government of Portugal's recognition of the right to independence of the African territories of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau marks a significant advance toward the goal of self-determination for all the peoples of Africa, without which peace on the continent is not secure.

Congress finds that negotiations between the Portuguese Government and African leaders on the timing and nature of progress toward independence are being conducted with the aim of bringing permanent peace and stability to these countries and of guaranteeing the human rights of all their citizens.

Congress finds that progress toward independence for the Portuguese African territories will have a significant impact on the international community and deserves the full support and assistance of appropriate international organizations and the community of nations.

Congress commends the Portuguese Government's initiatives on these fronts as evidence of a reaffirmation of that government's support for her obligations under both the United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Therefore, Congress calls upon the President and the Secretary of State to take the following actions designed to make clear United States support for a peaceful and orderly transition to independence in the Portuguese African territories.

(1) An official statement should be issued of United States support for the independence of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-

Bissau, and of our desire to have good relations with the future governments of these countries.

(2) It should be made clear to the Government of Portugal that we view its effects toward a peaceful and just settlement of the conflict in the African territories as a naistent with Portugal's obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty and therefore strengthening her as a North Atlantic Treaty Chganization partner.

(3) The United States should encourage United Nations support for a peaceful transition to independence, negotiated settlement of all differences, and protection of human rights of all citizens of the three

te Titories.

(4) The United States should open a dialog with potential leaders of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau and assure them of our commitment to their genuine political and economic independence.

(5) The economic development needs of the three territories will be immense once independence is achieved. Therefore, it is urged that the United States Agency for International Development devote immediate attention to assessing the economic situation in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bi sau and be ready to cooperate with their future governments in providing the kind of assistance that will help make their independence viable. In addition, the United States Government should take the initiative among other donors, both bilateral and multilateral, in seeking significant contributions of development assistance for the three territories.

(6) In light of the need of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau for skilled and educated manpower, a priority consideration should be given to expanding immediately current United States programs of educational assistance to the territories as a timely and substantive contribution to their independence.

(7) Reports should be submitted to the Congress on the implementation of these proposals and Congress should be kept fully informed on developments in United States policy toward the independence of the Portuguese African territories.

Since it is in the national interest of the United States to maintain and strengthen close relations with the independent nations of Africa, the Congress believes these positive initiatives should be undertaken without delay.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most significant changes taking place in the world today is the transition from colonial rule to independence in the Portuguese African territories of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau. The leaders of Portugal and of these territories deserve the full support and good will of the entire international community as they negotiate independence agreements and seek to build a foundation for peace, stability, justice and freedom for all their peoples.

I am submitting today an amendment to S. 3394 calling upon the President and Secretary of State to take actions that will make clear U.S. support for Portugal's policy of independence for her African territories and that will encourage other countries and international organizations to give their diplomatic and substantive support to this birth of three new nations.

The first portion of this amendment calls for an official statement of U.S. support for Portugal's policy of independence for her African territories. It also calls for an affirmation of our desire to have good relations with the future gov-

Approved For Release 2005/07/13: CIA-RDP79-00957A000100030044-9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD --- SENATE

enrments of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau. The United States in particular had an obligation to publicly support Portugal's recognition of these territories' right to independence when it was first annonuced, on July 27. We had joined the rest of the world in severely cricticizing Portugal's past policy of maintaing her African colonies by force. As one of her closest friends and allies, we should have been among the first to welcome the courageous decision to grant independence to these colonies. We should have made it clear from the beginning that Portugal was not alone in her effort to bring peace and freedom

Öctober 1, 1974

to the African territories.
Yet for several weeks there was no official statement that the United States welcomed Portugal's momentum decision. We were in a position of merely accepting the results of the independence policy instead of supporting and encouraging it.

In his speech to the United Nations, President Ford made the first statement on behalf of our Government in support of the transition from colonial rule to independence that was taking place in Africa:

We rededicate ourselves to the search for justice, equality and freedom. Recent developments in Africa signal the welcome end of colonialism. Behavior appropriate to an era of dependence must give way to the new responsibilities of interdependence.

This is the kind of response the United States should give—without hesitation—when a people's right to self-determination is realized. I hope this statement will be officially elaborated in the near future to make it clear to the leaders of Portugal and of the African territories that our country will not merely accept the final products of their negotiations and struggles, but will support their commendable goals and will encourage the deliberate and responsible manner in which the independence settlements are being reached. We must also assert without reservation that we will welcome these new governments as members of the community of nations and will do everything we can to build good relations between their countries and ours.

The second provision of this amendment calls for U.S. recognition that Portugal's attempts to reach a peaceful and just settlement of a conflict that has lasted more than a decade are in keeping with her obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty. Article I of the treaty states:

The parties undertake . . . to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means and in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice are not endangered . . .

The United States has been criticized in the past for continuing to give Portugal economic and military support as a NATO ally during the conflict in Africa. We insisted that our aid was not be used to perpetuate Portuguese colonialism. But many understandably felt that the economic, military, and moral support that membership in the NATO alliance provided for Portugal helped enable her to continue fighting for her colonies. Some even believed that the United States preferred for strategic reasons

that Angola, Mozambique, and Ciuinea-Bissau remain in the hands of our ally.

Now is the time to reaffirm the first and most fundamental principle of the NATO alliance: that disputes should be settled peacefully and that the only solid foundation for a lasting peace is justice for all concerned. The Government of Portugal made the first big step in the direction of peace and justice by ceasing the fight to maintain her colonies and recognizing their right to self-determination. In the negotiations that have followed, Portugal and the African leaders have demonstrated a commitment to an orderly transition to independence and to observing the human rights of all the citizens of the three territories. The inevitable outbreaks of violence have been responded to with moderation on both sides; and Portugal and the liberation movements have worked together to maintain order, calm fears, and build a solid foundation for independence. Indeed, an example is being set for the rest of the world of what can be achieved when negotiations are carried out in a spirit of tolerance, cooperation, and sincere commitment to a fair settlement and a lasting peace

We must now reassert our full support of our ally, Portugal, as she makes this significant contribution to world peace and justice, the highest goals to the NATO alliance

When President Spinola first announced Portugal's "immediate recognition of the right to independence" of the African territories, he stated:

We have reentered the world after more than a decade of ostracism. We have . . . rejoined the community of nations.

The third provision of this amendment states that we should encourage United Nations support for Portugal's efforts to bring about an orderly transition to independence in her African territories.

Portugal obviously felt the community of nations would welcome the policy of independence and would give its support to her fulfillment of her obligations under the United Nations Charter, article I, section 2—

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination for all peoples.

Having been criticized by the U.N. in the past for her colonial policies. Portugal is convinced that the transition to independence in the African territories is a matter of international concern and that the United Nations can play a positive role in this process.

U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldhelm's participation in Portugal's negotiations with Guinea-Bissau was welcomed. Portugal asked members of the Security Council to vote in favor of Guinea-Bissau's admission to the U.N. even before a final independence settlement was reached. The Portuguese Government announced that it would welcome U.N. observers to assure that any votes prior to independence in the territories were fair and honest.

The United Nations has a responsibility to give its support to efforts to assure that the transition to independence will be peaceful, that human rights will

be observed and that the independence of the new nations will be sound and viable. Now is not the time to criticize decisions reached in negotiations or to question the motives of Portuguese or African leaders. Now is not the time to take sides in the General Assembly or the Security Council over the timing and nature of the transition to independence. Now is certainly not the time for U.N. Member States to encourage one side or the other to take an uncompromising position. The United Nations can best fulfill the purposes for which it was established by mediating where necessary, by carefully observing developments to make certain that human rights are not being violated, and by supporting every effort to assure a peaceful transition to genuine independence for Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau.

The fourth provision deals with our relations with the African territories themselves.

We must begin now to build good relations with the future leaders of these emerging African States on the basis of respect for their right to determine their own political and economic policies. We must establish open and frank communications with political leaders, labor leaders, and representatives of various groups within each society to find out their concerns and goals.

Our ties with those who will lead these states after independence are not as close as those of many other nations. The African States, the Scandinavian countries, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China all assisted in the movement toward independence and developed close working relationships with the political leadership of these territories. While we were not prepared to give our support to a military solution to the problem of colonialism in Portuguese Africa, we made a mistake in not communicating frequently at high levels with these leaders. We should have made every effort to find out how they sought to shape the future of their countries and to communicate to them the reasons for our policy position. We have a lot of catching up to do.

There is no reason to assume that these countries will seek good relations only with those nations that assisted in their struggle for independence. The current cooperation between liberation movement soldiers and the Portuguese army in Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau is evidence that even former adversaries will be welcomed if they wish to cooperate in the effort to build a sound basis for independence. These leaders realize, as do the leaders of the African nations that have been independent for some time, that it is essential to have constructive economic and political relations with all other nations in order to assure genuine independence.

Our diplomatic support for the independence of the Portuguese African territories must be combined with substantive support. One of the best ways for the United States to show its genuine commitment to independence for these territories is to be prepared to provide assistance to their future governments in their economic development programs. The fifth point of this amendment asks

Approved For Release 2005/07/13: CIA-RDP79-00957A000100030044-9

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

October 1, 1974

enac we begin preparations now to offer such assistance. This will be a valuable supplement to our policy of supporting Portugal, for Portugal has made clear her intention to cooperate in the economic development of these countries once they are independent. This is quite a burden for Portugal to assume, given her current economic problems and her own great development needs. I am sure she will welcome the participation of other donor nations.

We must consult with the future governments of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau as to their economic development goals and offer the kind of assistance that is consistent with these goals. Such an economic assistance program would provide tangible evidence of our recognition of these countries' right to self-determination and of our desire to build good, cooperative relations with them.

It is recommended that this preparation for a bilateral assistance program be combined with an effort to encourage other bilateral and multilateral donors to offer economic assistance. Just as the transition to political independence in Portuguese Africa is a matter of international concern, so is the transition from economic dependence to economic independence.

This amendment last calls for an immediate increase in our current programs of educational assistance to the Portuguese African territories. While economic development assistance will have to begin after the independence governments have determined how foreign assistance can best be used, these educational assistance programs were intended from the beginning to help prepare for independence. The needs of all three territories for skilled and educated manpower are said to be tremendous. Without African doctors, engineers, agricultural specialists, nomic planners, teachers, and mechanics. these cannot be truly independent African States. The most significant and immediate contribution our country could make to a viable independence for these territories is to expand our programs of educational assistance.

Mr. President, the significance of the

transition to independence in Portuguese Africa, and of our policy at this time, must not be underestimated. Our actions now will have a profound impact on our relations with Portugal, with the new nations, and with the independent African States for years to come. We must be clearly on the side of independence, economic and political self-determination, justice, and lasting peace for the people of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau. I believe that the policies outlined in this amendment will help provide a solid foundation for mutually beneficial relations between the United States and these emerging African States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the votes by which the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, that is on both amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to lay on the table includes both amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask, is there any further business?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to express my thanks to the acting minority leader, and for the cooperation of my colleagues.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HELMS, SENATOR MCCLURE, SENATOR EASTLAND, ASENATOR MANSFELD ROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the orders for the recognition of Senators tomorrow be modified as follows: that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Helms) be recognized first for not to exceed 15 minutes; that he be followed by Mr. Mc-Clure for not to exceed 15 minutes; that he be followed by Mr. Eastland for not to exceed 15 minutes; and that he be followed by Mr. Mansfield for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without of jection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized each for not to exceed 15 munutes and in the order stated: Mr. Hilliams, Mr. McClure, Mr. Eastland, and Mr. Mansfield. There will then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

At the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, S. 3394, the Foreign Assistance Act. Rollcall votes are expected to occur on amendments thereto and, hopefully, on final passage tomorrow.

Conference reports may also be called up, as well as other measures that have been cleared.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come be tre the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate and in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. amorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:30 p.m. the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, October 2, 1974, at 10:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 1, 1974:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Richard L. Roudebush, of Indiana, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duy constituted committee of the Senate.)

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100030044-9

SECRET

JOURNAL

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Called Tom McGurn, Office of Technology Assessment, to advise him that we are sending him a letter addressed to Mr. Emilio Daddario, Director, OTA, from CIA Records Management Officer, enclosing a declassified document which had been requested by Norman D. Sandler, a summer intern with OTA. There had been a delay in obtaining a copy of the document and because Sandler had not given CIA a forwarding address, we requested that OTA send the material to him. 2. Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
Assessment, to advise him that we are sending him a letter addressed to Mr. Emilio Daddario, Director, OTA, from CIA Records Management Officer, enclosing a declassified document which had been requested by Norman D. Sandler, a summer intern with OTA. There had been a delay in obtaining a copy of the document and because Sandler had not given CIA a forwarding address, we requested that OTA send the material to him. 2. Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	Tuesday - 1 October 1974
Assessment, to advise him that we are sending him a letter addressed to Mr. Emilio Daddario, Director, OTA, from CIA Records Management Officer, enclosing a declassified document which had been requested by Norman D. Sandler, a summer intern with OTA. There had been a delay in obtaining a copy of the document and because Sandler had not given CIA a forwarding address, we requested that OTA send the material to him. 2. Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
Mr. Emilio Daddario, Director, OTA, from Management Officer, enclosing a declassified document which had been requested by Norman D. Sandler, a summer intern with OTA. There had been a delay in obtaining a copy of the document and because Sandler had not given CIA a forwarding address, we requested that OTA send the material to him. 2. Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	Called Tom McGurn, Office of Technology
Mr. Emilio Daddario, Director, OTA, from Management Officer, enclosing a declassified document which had been requested by Norman D. Sandler, a summer intern with OTA. There had been a delay in obtaining a copy of the document and because Sandler had not given CIA a forwarding address, we requested that OTA send the material to him. 2. Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	Assessment, to advise him that we are sending him a letter addressed to
by Norman D. Sandler, a summer intern with OTA. There had been a delay in obtaining a copy of the document and because Sandler had not given CIA a forwarding address, we requested that OTA send the material to him. 2. Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
obtaining a copy of the document and because Sandler had not given CIA a forwarding address, we requested that OTA send the material to him. 2. Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	Management Officer, enclosing a declassified document which had been requested
Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	by Norman D. Sandler, a summer intern with OTA. There had been a delay in
Called Jim Davidson, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	obtaining a copy of the document and because Sandler had not given CIA a for-
Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	warding address, we requested that OTA send the material to him.
Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Government Operations Committee, to inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
inquire as to the status of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission. Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
Davidson said he was very interested in working with us to resolve our problems even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
even though the bill may go to the floor this Friday or the following Monday. Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
Davidson showed a real appreciation of the conflict between the National Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Security Act of 1947 and some of the provisions of S. 3418. Davidson suggested that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
that we might attempt to move an amendment on the floor but if that failed, all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
all was not lost because the bill, if passed, does not go into effect for one year. Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
Davidson said the one year period was expressly for the purpose of focusing the Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
Executive Branch's attention on the provisions, which to this point he said they had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
had been relatively unsuccessful in doing. I told Davidson that we had detailed comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
comments prepared which were held up in OMB but that I would attempt to shake them loose and get back to him this week. 3. Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
Called Bill Skidmore, OMB, to remind him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	them loose and get back to him this week.
him of our letter on S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Commission, which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	Colled Bill Chilmans OMB to maniful
which was with them for approval. Skidmore was vaguely familiar with S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
S. 3418, but not on top of it and said he would find out who was handling the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
the matter and be back in touch with us. He seemed to appreciate the necessity to move on the bill this week.	
to move on the bill this week.	
The state of the s	
	CECRET CL BY COLOR

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100030044-9

	SECRET	
6.	Received a call fro	m George Gilbert, OMB,
	cy's legislation program for the s nat we would have any items for ir	
message but that th	e Director did feel very strongly	about the Intelligence
	ls legislation and he might recom	
a message. I told	Gilbert we would get a paper over	to him on our legislation