

between the United States and Panama, that the U.S. Congress undertake an investigation of alleged communist influence to force the United States to relinquish its sovereignty and control of the U.S. Canal Zone and Canal which are freely granted in the Treaty of 1903 and subsequently reaffirmed by the Treaties of 1936 and 1955.

#### THE FIGHT MUST CONTINUE AGAINST SOVIET HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is making a mockery of the Helsinki Accords to guarantee freedom of thought, religion and emigration among the citizens of most of the world's great nations.

I must take to the House floor today to raise my voice in strong protest against the continuing abuses of human rights by the U.S.S.R.

I urge all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to hold steadfast in their determination to speak out for the principles of religious freedom and free emigration whenever they are able.

I further urge them to cast a cold, skeptical eye toward any legislation seeking to favor any country which oppresses its own citizens and denies them the basic human liberties which we in this country take for granted and hold dear.

The Soviet Union is just such a country, Mr. Speaker—remarkable in its consistency to violate human rights, despite pious statements to the contrary issued by its ambassadors, government leaders and official press organizations.

Only just this week another violation of the Helsinki Accords took place in the U.S.S.R.—another addition to an unhappy list.

Jews in Kiev and surrounding communities were warned by Soviet authorities that they would face arrest and prosecution if they tried to take part in memorial services commemorating the 35th anniversary of the Nazi massacre of thousands of Jews and Russians at Babi Yar on September 29-30, 1941.

Mr. Speaker, this is nothing short of an outrage. As a member of the House Judiciary Immigration Subcommittee, I visited the site of that massacre during an official trip to the U.S.S.R. last year. The enormity of that crime in World War II is overwhelming.

People of all religions and of all nationalities should remember Babi Yar, so that it might never happen again. People of all faiths and citizenships should honor the dead who fell during that massacre, for they were the courageous people who bore the full brunt of Nazi brutality and yet still kept their faith in God.

For the Soviet Government to prevent Soviet Jews to memorialize their dead of Babi Yar is a disheartening commentary on the inhumanity continuing among us today.

The five Members of Congress who, last year, visited the U.S.S.R., and the site at Babi Yar all have signed a letter of protest to the Soviets for their intimidation of Jews seeking to mark this

mournful occasion. Our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ERLBERG) deserves great credit for drafting this letter.

We urge all our colleagues to send similar letters, for it is only through continuing public and official outcry such as ours, and that of peoples throughout the world, that the Soviets ever will change their antihuman rights policies.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite but a few more examples of abuses of freedom in the U.S.S.R., and all possible doubt will be removed as to whether the Soviet Union is "as good as its word" in abiding by the Helsinki Accords.

There is the case of Hillel Butman, a Jewish prisoner of conscience, who was unjustly accused of taking part in an air hijacking plot in 1971 to commandeer a plane to Israel. Since his "kangaroo" trial, Hillel has been in prison, where his health is failing and where he has been denied even the normal visiting rights given other Soviet prisoners.

Such a terrible situation violates the common principles of human decency agreed upon in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and reiterated in the Helsinki Accords.

Hillel Butman should be freed and allowed to rejoin his family and to emigrate to Israel. Many of our colleagues have sent letters to Soviet officials urging that this be granted. I and my colleague from Iowa (Mr. MEZVINSKY) dispatched another plea only Wednesday. The entire House must continue this fight.

There is the case of Pastor Georgi Vins, who has been imprisoned and persecuted by the Soviets simply because he desires to worship according to the dictates of his conscience and his Christian faith.

Pastor Vins has been twice arrested and imprisoned by the Soviets. His health is fragile and it is unlikely he will survive his present incarceration. His family has suffered greatly at the hands of authorities in the U.S.S.R.

This Congress already has declared its belief that Pastor Vins should be freed. Mr. Speaker, and I was proud to vote for the resolution we passed in his support.

This resolution states it to be the sense of Congress that Pastor Vins be released from imprisonment and that the Soviet Government should allow him and all other Christians and other religious believers to worship God freely according to their own consciences.

I take pride in noting that this resolution was passed overwhelmingly by the House, underscoring the commitment of this Congress to the cause of human rights.

There is the case of the Reverend Hugo Maksimilians Grivans, a Latvian and a Lutheran minister who has been denied permission to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. to join his family in Sweden. In failing health, Reverend Grivans has spent 16 years and 5 months of his life in Soviet prisons.

The Soviets apparently are persecuting him because he wrote an essay about the persecution of Christians by ancient Rome. He has committed no crime, and he should be allowed to leave the U.S.S.R.

to live out his few remaining years in a free country.

There is the case of Vladimir Bukovsky, a well-known Soviet dissenter now serving 12 years in prison for his persistent struggle for human rights in the U.S.S.R. It is believed he is in dangerous health and in urgent need of medical care.

This man is suffering greatly because he spoke out for the basic human liberties of freedom of thought and expression. Those of us in Congress should make it clear to the U.S.S.R. that we believe Bukovsky should be freed and provided medical care, and that we shall hold the Soviet Government accountable if anything more happens to him. Our State Department also should take an active interest in this case.

There are the cases of Dr. Alexander Lerner and Dr. Mikhail Shtern, both eminent scientists and Jews. Dr. Lerner has been refused permission to emigrate for more than 4½ years. Dr. Shtern languishes in a Soviet prison on false charges. Both deserve the support of Congress in their quests for freedom.

There is the case of Valentyn Moroz, a Ukrainian historian, Mr. Speaker. He is a brave man who has been imprisoned because he has fought for the cultural independence of the Ukraine. He is in a labor camp, having already served many years in a Soviet prison.

Valentyn Moroz recently renounced his Soviet citizenship for the injustices that government has perpetrated on his people. To show Congress support for him and his efforts for human liberties, I and my distinguished colleagues from New York (Mr. KOCH) and New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK) have introduced a resolution granting him honorary U.S. citizenship.

It is my fervent hope that the new Congress will make such a resolution among its first items of business in January. By extending this symbolic citizenship to Valentyn Moroz, the 95th Congress will show the Soviets that it intends to continue what the present Congress has done to foster human rights for all peoples.

Mr. Speaker, the record is clear, and the case is proved. The Soviet Union is guilty of gross abuses of human rights—of flagrant violations of the Helsinki Accords. The Congress of the United States must do all that it can to see that these abuses are ended, and that justice is done.

#### CONGRESSMAN AU COIN DISCUSSES INDIAN TREATY RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AuCOIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Washington Post carried an article by Mr. Neal R. Peirce dealing with a subject of great importance to those of us who represent Western States. The article dealt with Indian treaty rights and the tangent issues associated with those rights. In my State of Oregon, and in neighboring Washington State, this subject has become of increasing con-

cern as Indian hunting and fishing rights, as interpreted by Federal courts, come into conflict with the rights of non-Indians.

Congress must shoulder the responsibility for resolving these conflicts in a way which is fair to all our citizens. The congressionally established American Indian Policy Review Commission is due to report to Congress in 1977 and make recommendations on a whole range of issues involving the Federal/Indian relationship.

Few actions of the 95th Congress will be followed as closely by the people of Oregon, and I would hope that my colleagues who are not already familiar with the issues involved here would begin to study them so they will be prepared when the Commission reports to Congress next year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that Mr. Peirce's article appear in the RECORD:

**INDIAN-WHITE CONFLICT: CIVIL RIGHTS, TREATY RIGHTS, WATER RIGHTS**

(By Neal R. Peirce)

HELENA, MONT.—Across the "Indian country" of Western America, and in scattered Eastern states as well, an era of intense conflict is developing between Indians and their white neighbors.

The issues range from rights to water from the Mississippi, the Columbia and Colorado Rivers, to fishing for salmon in Washington State, from local property taxes on Indian lands in Montana to fire service for the Onondaga Nation in New York. Controversy centers around law enforcement jurisdiction on Indian reservations from Minnesota and Wisconsin to the Pacific coastal states.

The chief battlegrounds are the reservations, originally guaranteed to the Indians "forever" but later opened in part to white settlers. Today the ownership pattern of these areas resembles a checkerboard, a piece of Indian-owned land here, white-owned land there.

Since the rise of the "red power" movement in the 1960s, Indians have striven to reassert jurisdiction over their reservations' original boundaries. The federal government's policy switch from assimilation to "self-determination" has aided this effort, and Indians have prevailed in many court tests of treaty rights. Over \$3 billion a year flows from Washington into various Indian-related services and economic developments.

But whites living on or near reservations say the federal government has shown scant regard for local residents and local governments. The Indian "problem," they say, was created nationally, restitution programs were devised nationally, and all should be paid for nationally.

Threats to the whites' livelihood and lifestyle have led to the formation of predominantly white "civil rights" groups in 14 states and creation of a national protest group, the Interstate Congress for Equal Rights and Responsibilities. The Interstate Congress says whites are not being treated equally in Indian communities. "Will we have to yield to tribal law, yet pay taxes to state government, which won't serve us?" asks Jack Freeman, the South Dakota rancher who heads the Interstate Congress.

Lake County, Montana, a community of 15,000 (85 per cent white, mostly small farmers) provides a test tube case of the conflicts. There have been court battles over shoreline rights to Flathead Lake and disputes over tax-free sale of cigarettes on the reservation and the removal of Indian-owned land from the tax rolls.

Lake County's whites are particularly

irked by the shrinking number of taxable acres while inflation wreaks havoc with local government finances. Indian landowners can avoid property taxes by placing land under tribal trust status and giving up their right to sell it. Stories circulate about neighbors who are 1/16th and 1/32nd Indian avoiding taxes this way.

What's more, whites say, the Indians can vote in local elections and approve taxes they'll never have to pay themselves. They also are eligible for social services paid for in part through local property taxes.

The Flatheads reply that the number of conversions of Indian land to avoid taxes is exaggerated, and that their real reason is to consolidate tribal lands. Lost property taxes, they say, are more than compensated for by federal support of local schools and economic activity generated by the reservation.

There's been no violence between Lake County and their Flathead neighbors, but whites reportedly fear that the tribes will try to gain civil and criminal court authority over both Indians and non-Indians in all the territory that once belonged to the reservation. They foresee an unfair and inadequate judicial system run by a political system in which they have no voice.

Little of this conflict was apparent 20 or 30 years ago. Then, "assimilation" was official federal policy and the Bureau of Indian Affairs could note in 1957 that the Flatheads were "advanced in the stage of integration with the dominant culture." In those days, intermarriage between Flatheads and local whites was quite common.

But then came the 1960s, with a new federal policy of self-determination and the emergence of younger, more educated, aggressive tribal leaders. Today, on the Flathead reservations and others across the nation, young and professionally qualified Indian men and women—some with legal backgrounds—can return to their birthplaces and find employment in federally subsidized health, welfare resource programs.

The younger leaders are speaking out and challenging states and counties that try to assert jurisdiction over Indian country. Their role is more important than the highly publicized American Indian Movement (AIM)—although AIM has helped create a psychological climate for greater Indian independence, just as radical black power groups helped make the demands of moderate black civil rights organizations seem more credible in the 1960's.

All the wisdom of Solomon—and then some—would be required to determine the real "justice" in most conflicts between Indians and their white neighbors, between tribal "sovereign" rights and legitimate rights of local governments and their taxpayers. Strong national guilt concerning past injustices to Indians makes objective treatment difficult. Whites living on or near reservations say they have as much difficulty getting understanding from other residents of their states as from the power circles in the nation's capital.

Indians on the other hand complain that anti-Indian prejudice often appears in local communities, and the national reparations for past wrongdoings are still inadequate.

Local governments' loss of property taxes because of the special status of Indian tribal lands held in trust should be the easiest problem to resolve—possibly through direct federal subsidy to the localities involved. But sponsors of pending federal legislation to give localities annual payments in compensation for federally controlled lands within their borders have shown no interest in including Indian reservations.

No one doubts that imposition of local taxes on Indian reservations, even if such taxes didn't violate treaty rights, would be a crippling blow to local Indian economies. When Wisconsin's Menominee Indians were out of reservation status for a period of years,

they found themselves hit with a quarter million dollars in annual property taxes—enough to drive them from a position of self-sufficiency to poverty. The state of Wisconsin stepped in to pay them an identical amount for an annual scenic easement to the banks of the Wolf River and continued the arrangement until reservation status was restored.

Water rights and law enforcement problems are particularly difficult to resolve by legislation—partly because each situation is too unique for blanket laws to work. When whites affected by such issues have appealed to their state and federal officials for help, they have encountered some sympathy, some standoffishness—but rarely any help.

Gradually, court decisions in the Indians' favor are reducing the rights and impairing the income of reservation-area whites. Those whites, faced by vague and unresolved laws, indifferent state and federal government and fears for their own future, sadly end up bearing an inordinate burden for the cruelty and rapaciousness of the entire nation in its early dealings with its native peoples.

**PREVENTING A FEDERAL GIVEAWAY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Bingham amendment striking the Federal giveaway provisions in the Nuclear Fuel Assurance Act (H.R. 8401). The provisions would provide up to \$8 billion in subsidies to corporations for developing uranium enrichment facilities.

The Nuclear Fuel Assurance Act is an appalling piece of legislation. Uranium enrichment facilities are currently Government owned. This bill empowers the Energy Research and Development Administration to turn over Government-developed technologies to private industry, provide such companies with all sorts of additional technical assistance—then lease private companies with the profits and the Government with the risks. There are virtually no standards for ERDA to follow in negotiating such contracts and ERDA may obligate the Government for up to \$8 billion in financial guarantees.

Richard Nixon wanted to "sell" Government enrichment facilities to private industry. The Congress rejected that plan, but President Ford has resurrected it in a new form in the Nuclear Fuel Assurance Act. It appears that the Nuclear Fuel Assurance Act is essentially a private bill to benefit the Bechtel Corp., a huge multinational corporation, at the expense of the American people. In May 1975, Uranium Enrichment Associates—UEA—a consortium including Bechtel, submitted a proposal to ERDA for construction of an enrichment facility. This proposal included requests for extensive Government assurances and guarantees. On June 26, 1975, President Ford sent the Nuclear Fuel Assistance Act to Congress with provisions remarkably similar to the UEA proposal.

Bechtel has had a history of close association with the Federal Government. Former governmental officials who have been hired to represent Bechtel's interests include Caspar Weinberger, former Chairman of the FTC, and Secretary of HEW, George Shultz, former Secretary of the Treasury, and two top officials