tion now to tell us that the United States, indeed, will continue to defend the Panama Canal, and its installations, after having insisted we must give them to Panama on the grounds that otherwise we could not defend them!

CONGRESS MUST ASSURE A STRONG CIA

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1977

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years a small number of former employees of the Central Intelligence Agency have capitalized on information which came to them in the course of their former employment by revealing names and identities of individuals with whom they had contact. Books, television shows, lectures and other means of communication have been employed for profit by these faithless individuals. In additon, many others including some in public life have drawn attention to themselves by utilizing this information.

It is, of course, improper for our Federal Government to conceal information from the people which they are entitled to have. On the other hand, the unauthorized disclosure of the names and identities of individuals engaged in intelligence activities in behalf of our Nation or any other friendly nation thereby jeopardizing their safety or diminishing their ability to perform their essential services should be treated for what it is—an offense against our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated Americans of our time who retired recently as Assistant Secretary of Defense and who previously served for 27 years with the Central Intelligence Agency, including 8 years as Chief of all of the Agency's Soviet Operations, is John M. Maury. Mr. Maury, now retired from public life, has written a number of useful articles regarding the CIA and its role in our Nation.

In a recent article entitled "Don't Cut Up the CIA Into Useless Pieces," Mr. Maury—without apologizing for some of the abuses and miscalculations of the CIA—comes down hard on the need for legislation against those who betray the CIA and our Nation. The concluding paragraphs of this article which appeared in the March 27 issue of the Washington Star follow:

[From the Washington Star, March 27, 1977]

DON'T CUT UP THE CIA INTO USELESS PIECES

(By John M. Maury)

Now is not the time for further investigations, recriminations and reorganizations. It is the time to look forward and see what can be done to ensure that past mistakes are not repeated and that the new administration has the best intelligence support that modern technology and human ingenuity can devise.

But it can hardly expect such intelligence so long as the most sensitive secrets of the intelligence community can be revealed with impunity by publicity-hungry politicians, disgruntled former employees or an irresponsible press. The irony is that we have federal criminal statutes protecting such secrets as corn crop statistics and internal revenue data, but detailed information on some of our most sensitive intelligence operations can be safely made public by disgruntled former employes of the intelligence community, openly violating with impunity their solemn oaths of secrecy which were a condition of their employment. Moreover, if information is leaked to the press, even the identity of the leaker is zealously protected under the prevailing interpretations of the First Amendment.

Therefore if the new administration wants to help itself by helping the intelligence services to do the kind of job which the national interest requires, it can do no better than give its support to the passage of legislation which will provide effective criminal penalties for the unauthorized disclosure by intelligence personnel of sensitive intelligence sources and methods.

This is not to suggest anything as drastic as the British Official Secrets Act, or the security laws of most of the European democracies, under which any disclosure of classified material could bring severe criminal penalties. But under our present laws only communications intelligence enjoys meaningful protection.

In cases involving the disclosure of any other intelligence sources or methods it is necessary to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant's intention to harm the United States or aid a foreign power—and as any trial lawyer knows, intentions are almost impossible to prove conclusively.

The intelligence officer who seeks to betray his organization—and his country—normally risks prosecution only if he is apprehended in the act of delivering classified material to a known agent of a foreign intelligence service. He can accomplish the same purpose with impunity by leaking his information to an overeager press, or peddling it to a publicity-hungry congressman.

Or better still, he can write books and articles, do TV talk shows and become a celebrity on college campuses throughout the country. He thus serves his foreign masters in two important capacities. He is a productive espionage agent whose personal security is assured by the protection of our First Amendment; and he is a valuable propagandist—an "agent of influence" disseminating through journalistic, political, TV and academic channels information designed to discredit and destroy our own intelligence agencies.

In passing the National Security Act of 1947 the Congress recognized the unique sensitivity of information on intelligence sources and methods by specifically charging the director of central intelligence with responsibility for protecting such information. However, the law did not provide him with the means to carry out this responsibility.

What is now proposed is a law similar to that applying to "Restricted Data" under the Atomic Energy Act. It would cover only information specifically designated by the director of central intelligence and the heads of the other intelligence agencies as relating to intelligence "sources and methods"—the identities of agents or the details of technical collection systems. It would have no application to other categories of classified material. And it would be binding only on those individuals who, by virtue of employment or a contractual relationship with an intelligence agency, voluntarily assumed, by sworn commitment, the obligation to protect source and method information.

In pressing for such legislation, it may be appropriate to recall the comment of Gen. Washington who, precisely 200 years ago, penned the following words in a letter to Col. Elias Dayton: "The necessity for procuring good intelligence is apparent and need not be further urged—all that remains for me to add is that you keep the whole matter as secret as possible. For upon secrecy, success depends in most enterprises of the kind and for want of it, they are generally defeated however well planned."

THE ENERGY CRISIS—FACT OR FANTASY?

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1977

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, in formulating its energy proposals, the Carter administration solicited the comments of 320,000 individual American citizens through the mass mailings early in March. With the same end in mind, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, a talk presented on January 13, 1977, to the Reading Rotary Club by Mr. James Stoudt, president of Gilbert Associates, Inc.

Mr. Stoudt and Gilbert Associates have been intimately involved in energy research and development for many years. He is highly respected both in Reading and in professional circles for his keen perception and unsurpassed public spirit. I have found Mr. Stoudt's Rotary presentation, a condensed version of which follows, to be an excellent statement of the difficult questions and potential answers which we must consider as we deliberate on energy policy in the months ahead:

THE ENERGY CRISIS—FACT OR FANTASY?

(By Mr. James Stoudt)

The Energy Crisis. Is it a fact or is it a fantasy conceived by those of us in the energy business to rip-off the public? It is my purpose today to convince you without a shadow of doubt it is real. I am convinced—my challenge at this luncheon is to convince you in the brief span of time of one-half hour without suffocating you with dry statistics or simply entertaining you with rhetoric.

Energy is a vitally important subject to us all. Our high standard of living today largely results from the tremendous increase in the use of hydrocarbon energy to replace the muscle power of man and animal . . .

For the first time in our history, we are faced with depletion of fuels. Also, for the first time, we do not have 50-60 years to make a leisurely shift to another energy resource.

Can the United States achieve "energy independence" in the reasonable near future from interruptible, high-cost foreign sources of energy?

In my opinion, the answer, based on present technology, environmental restrictions and demographic forecasts, is no—at least not in this century.

But there are some realistic ways this country can achieve "energy security" by the year 2000.

By 2000, U.S. population will be about 262 million, an increase of 23 percent from today's 214 million.

To support this growth, U.S. energy demand, without vigorous conservation, will increase from 71 quads in 1975 to about 174 quads in the year 2000. (QUAD—A Quadrillion BTU's. The energy equivalent of 180 million barrels of oil or 46 million tons of coal.) If we don't develop existing and new energy resources, the U.S. faces a potential "energy gap" of 148 quads as production

Mandela is the story. What the government of South Africa has done to her since her husband's conviction is beyond the bounds of all human decency.

For 19 months, while here husband languished in prison, Mrs. Mandela was held in jail on a charge of subversion. In 1970, she was tried on the charge and acquitted. In almost any other land—certainly in any country that has any respect whatever for the rights of the individual—that would have made her a free person, eligible to resume her rights as a citizen in good standing.

Not in South Africa. Even though she had been cleared by the court, Mrs. Mandela was, in effect, "found guilty" by the government. She was declared to be one of the estimated 150 "banned" persons in South Africa.

That meant she could not be quoted in the press, attend public gatherings, leave her home at night or on weekends, or have visitors other than relatives without official permission.

Until last month it was bad enough. Mrs. Mandela was permitted to live with her two daughters in the heart of Johannesburg's sprawling black township, Soweto. Her personal rights were restricted, but she had most of the conveniences of modern living. Her house had electricity, carpets, a bathroom, a kitchen filled with modern appliances and a telephone. She commuted daily to a $400-a-month job in the accounts section of a white-owned firm in Johannesburg.

But on May 16, security police removed Mrs. Mandela to the village of Brandfort, 160 miles from Johannesburg. She now lives in a house without electricity, bath or hot water. Her neighbors are 3,500 blacks whose language she does not speak, and 1,900 whites with whom she may not associate. She may not leave the town limits.

Why? There is only silence from the government except for a statement by security police that it was considered "better" that Mrs. Mandela leave Soweto, where considerable rioting erupted last year.

It is obvious, of course, that she is being punished for the sins, real or trumped up, of her husband.

How can anyone ignore such a "secondary conviction" of an innocent human being if he truly believes in a world where all people, if not totally free and equal, are at least entitled to the fundamental rights inherent with membership in the human race?

How can he feel anything but utter contempt for a government that would treat any human being the way South Africa is treating Winnie Mandela?

One must wonder if that kind of treatment is accorded to a person who was found innocent of a criminal charge, what kind of diabolical punishment she might have received had she been found guilty.

Winnie Mandela's case is only one, of course, among countless thousands of persecutions of blacks in South Africa.

But even by itself it should be enough to rally any who believe in the basic dignity of the human race to the side of President Carter in his crusade for the decent treatment of all peoples, no matter what their color or religion, no matter where they might live, and no matter what their economic status in life.

ALASKAN NATURAL GAS: PART I

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1977

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, over the next few weeks, I plan to insert a number of articles and background materials into the RECORD for my colleagues' information on the development of Alaskan natural gas reserves.

The article that follows from Industry Week of May 23, 1977, outlines the present decisionmaking situation. I would add to the information that the Federal Power Commission staff report supported the Arctic gas pipeline route, but said the El Paso Alaska Co. route was a viable alternative.

CANADA MAY SWAY GAS LINE CHOICE

The U.S. government's multi-step procedure for choosing from among three competing pipeline projects for delivering Alaska natural gas to the Lower 48 states may, it turns out, be a moot exercise. Ultimately, the decision may be dictated by Canada.

Even as the U.S. heads toward its choice, parallel decision-making machinery is grinding in Canada on how—and how fast—that country should develop its gas reserves in the Mackenzie River delta in the Northwest Territories. What Canada decides could determine, or at least limit the options for, the Alaska natural gas delivery system finally approved by the White House and Congress. That possibility looms larger as the result of developments this month in the double-track decision process.

SPLIT VOTE

In the U.S., the Federal Power Commission (FPC) made its long-awaited recommendation to President Carter: a divided, 2 to 2 decision in favor of each of two pipeline routes through Canada.

One route proposed by Arctic Gas Pipeline Co. and backed by FPC Administrative Law Judge Nahum Litt (IW, Feb. 14, Page 23), calls for a line from Alaska's North Slope to the Mackenzie delta. There it would pick up Canadian gas and follow the Mackenzie River south.

The other proposal by Alcan Pipeline Co., a subsidiary of Northwest Pipeline Co. and several Canadian firms, contemplates a route through Canada along the Alcan highway to the U.S.

The commission rejected a third proposal: El Paso Alaska Co.'s plan to build an "all-American" line through Alaska to the port of Valdez on the state's southern coast. There the gas would be liquefied and hauled by tanker to California.

NOT SO FAST

Meanwhile, a special Canadian commission, headed by British Columbia Judge Thomas Berger, has weighed in with a recommendation that would appear to harm chances for adoption of Arctic Gas's proposal. The panel urged a ten-year delay in construction of a pipeline in the Mackenzie delta to allow time for settlement of native land claims. Even after ten years, said the commission, no pipeline should be built linking the delta with Alaska; the environmental damage would be too severe.

If the Canadian government adopts the Berger recommendation, the Arctic Gas route would be out of the running. Conceivably, however, Canada could veto a pipeline through the country altogether; the Alcan project, too, crosses areas which are the subject of native claims.

In that event, the only alternative left for the U.S. would be to adopt El Paso's proposal—the one rejected by the FPC.

The next move will be made by Canada. In early July its National Energy Board is expected to come out with its recommendation on Mackenzie delta gas development plans and pipeline routes. Armed with that report, as well as the Berger commission's input, the Canadian cabinet will make a final decision. It will come by September, Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau has promised President Carter.

Mr. Carter is required by law to act on FPC's proposal and make a recommendation to Congress by Sept. 1, although he is permitted to request an extension to Dec. 1. Congress then has 60 days to act.

TO BE (DEFENDED) OR NOT TO BE (DEFENDED)? THAT IS THE (PANAMA CANAL) QUESTION!

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1977

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, have we in the Congress been had?

For several years, the American people have been bombarded with State Department propaganda that the Panama Canal could not be defended.

And—the only way to keep it "open, secure, efficient and neutral," was to give it to Panama, together with the Canal Zone.

Stories from Panama City, June 2, reported U.S. negotiators have drafted an agreement with Panama's negotiators that would surrender the zone and waterway as of December 31, 1999.

However, the reports said a second agreement had been reached providing for the "neutrality" of the canal.

For months the news media has reported the chief stumbling block in treaty negotiations has been the matter of "guaranteeing the neutrality" of the canal—in other words, its defense—after we turned it over to Panama. Official leaks to the press revealed the United States wanted the right to come in and defend it, if necessary, while Panama said it wanted the OAS or UN to do that.

As a matter of fact, Panama's dictator, Omar Torrijos, reportedly fired his last Foreign Minister, Aquilino Boyd, because of differences over this matter of defense of the canal.

So it is evident that some agreement must have been reached on defense of the canal if a second pact has been drafted.

Mr. Speaker, President Carter as a candidate often stated he would not soon give up "practical control" of the Panama Canal. Unless Mr. Carter has completely reversed himself, I conclude that Torrijos has agreed to let the United States defend the canal after Panama takes it over.

This brings me to the point.

Mr. Speaker, if under a new treaty Uncle Sam is going to defend the Panama Canal, then I ask, why the official baloney for the past few years that it was no longer possible for us to defend it?

Which is it to be?

What are we to believe?

Can we defend the Panama Canal, or can't we?

Were we told repeatedly the United States could not defend the canal only to brainwash us into accepting surrender of the vital waterway to a weak country that commonsense tells us cannot defend it?

Mr. Speaker, have we been had?

It certainly will be a ludicrous official policy contradiction for the administra-