1978, the Commission will: Continue to provide congressional testimony on civil rights matters and analysis of proposed legislation; review and refer to civil rights enforcement agencies individual complaints of discrimination—approximately 2,000 complaints projected—publish the quarterly Civil Rights Digest, and disseminate the Digest and other Commission publications to Government agencies, private organizations, and individual citizens; conduct public hearings on major civil rights issues, and publish transcripts and reports of those hearings—four multiday hearings projected for fiscal year 1978; and support the work of its 51 State advisory committees—which are expected to hold approximately 340 public meetings and issues 25 published reports based on their independent investigations of local civil rights problems in fiscal year 1978.

The legislative life of the Commission has been extended five times, the latest action for 5 years until 1878. At that time, a limitation was placed on the agency's appropriation at $7,000,000. It has been necessary, therefore, for Congress to raise periodically the authorization ceiling for the Commission. The bill we propose would authorize funding for fiscal year 1978 of $10,540,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the fiscal year 1977 level. The fiscal year 1978 moneys have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget as consistent with the President's program.

I urge my colleagues to join with Representatives RODINO, BUTLER, BEILENSON, BURKE, CONYERS, DRINAN, FENWICK, MINETA, MITCHELL, SEIBERLING, and VOLKMER and support the Civil Rights Commission Authorization Act of 1977.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleague on the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), in introducing the Civil Rights Commission Reauthorization Act of 1977. During my tenure as the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the Civil Rights Commission has appeared and presented testimony on several issues which fall within the subcommittee's board jurisdiction. I certainly have not always agreed with the positions advocated or the conclusions reached by the Commission; however, I can attest to the generally thorough work and valuable contribution the Commission makes when it testifies on programs or reports on a particular issue.

I join with the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) in sponsoring the reauthorization because I believe that the Commission merits bipartisan support. However, I wish to announce that I am reserving judgment, and consequently my vote on this legislation, until the Commission has testified before our subcommittee on this bill. During the subcommittee's hearing, I plan to ask several questions concerning the Commission budget and their plans for studies and reports during fiscal year 1978.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights was created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957. Originally authorized as a temporary agency for a 2-year period, the Commission has been extended a total of six times. The most recent extension, which keeps the Commission operating through fiscal year 1978, was passed by the Congress in 1972 (Public Law 92-496). Last year, the Commission sought authorizations for both fiscal year 1977 and fiscal year 1978, but the Judiciary Committee wisely authorized appropriations for only 1 year. Thus, the Commission must come before Congress again this year seeking a 1-year authorization. They are requesting the sum of $10,540,000, which represents a $1 million increase over last year's authorized level.

Since its creation in 1957, no one could say that the Commission has not been active and outspoken on several important social issues which have arisen over the last 20 years. Specifically, the Commission was established to perform five primary functions: First, to investigate allegations that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote as a result of their race, religion, sex, or national origin; second, to collect and subsequently study information concerning legal developments which could constitute a denial of equal protection of laws under the Constitution; third, to appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to the equal protection under the Constitution; fourth, to serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to denials of equal protection of the laws; and fifth, to submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress. (See 42 U.S.C. 1975c.)

In order to carry out their statutory functions, the Commission conducts fact-finding hearings. Although the Commission has not been vested with enforcement authority, it does have subpena power. Using this power, the Commission elicits facts from a wide range of public officials, minority group representatives, and other citizens who represent diverse interests and points of view. Coupled with its hearing powers, the Commission sponsors conferences on regional and national levels in order to aid its fact gathering function. Finally, the staff researches and investigates issues which relate to its statutory functions. Using these tools, the Commission compiles and disseminates its product along with recommendations to the President and the Congress. These conclusions and recommendations are submitted for review and possible enactment by the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government.

As a result of the controversial nature surrounding many of the issues which arise within the Commission's far-reaching jurisdiction, some of the Commission's studies and reports have been criticized by Members of Congress and the public. In the past, I have taken issue with some of the conclusions reached and recommendations proposed in Commission reports. What we must all remember is that a report of the Commission is not the final authority on any given issue. These reports merely represent a factual, professional analysis, which we hope have been prepared as a result of diligent and nonpartisan research. This is certainly the approach I use as a member of the Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee which has jurisdiction over several of the issues on which the Commission reports.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to study the Commission's agenda for the upcoming year, and I look forward to the hearings on the legislation which will be conducted by the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, privacy is an essential element in the American ideal of liberty, a basic right recognized by the fourth amendment to the Constitution. As Justice Brandeis wrote, each individual's right to privacy is "the most comprehensive of rights, and the right most valued by civilized men."

Within the last several years many citizens have begun to fear that this basic right is being steadily eroded by the use of modern electronic technology to eavesdrop on conversations. Unfortunately, increasing numbers of Americans have begun to fear that Government is more interested in intruding into their private lives than in acting to protect their privacy.

Until passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the only Federal statute on wiretapping was section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which prohibited interception and divulgence of conversations transmitted by wire. The Department of Justice interpreted section 605 to mean that the law was violated only if an intercepted conversion was divulged to outsiders, and the question was never decided by the Supreme Court. It was not until the 1968 act that Congress enacted a comprehensive statute on wiretapping and electronic surveillance.

That statute, title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, actually extended official eavesdropping by authorizing frequent and prolonged electronic surveillance by Federal and State investigators in criminal cases. It also authorized, for the first time, the use of wiretap evidence in criminal trials. Most importantly, that 1968 act specifically disclaimed, in section 2511(3), any attempt to deal with one of the most senitive contemporary issues—the power of the Executive to engage in wiretapping and electronic surveillance solely for the purpose of gathering foreign intelligence.

Presidents since Franklin Roosevelt have asserted that their responsibilities as Commander in Chief under article II of the Constitution give them the power to conduct electronic eavesdropping without regard to the restraints of the fourth amendment.

On May 21, 1940, President Roosevelt issued a memorandum to the Attorney General asserting that electronic surveillance would be proper under the Constitution in cases of "grave matters involving the defense of the Nation." The exact nature of "grave matters" involving the defense of the Nation was never fully explained. However, it is now known that national security was used as a reason or a pretext to eavesdrop on the communications not only of foreign spies but also of law-abiding American citizens who had no connection with a foreign power but whose views were con-

State and Federal rape laws/model codes and secondary literature to provide substantive guidelines, recommendations, and criteria for drafting nonbiased rape law, and will provide a critical catalog of existing and proposed rape law revisions and model codes by jurisdiction, subject area, and utility.

FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT EFFORT FOLLOWUP REPORT

The Commission will complete and publish the final volume dealing with policymaking, of the "Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort" 1974 study. The study to date has documented the fact that Federal civil rights enforcement has not appreciably improved since the comprehensive study series originated in 1970. The Commission will therefore conduct reviews of all Federal agencies cited in the study to determine the extent to which they have adopted and implemented the recommendations contained therein. We will also review and evaluate any other remedial actions taken by these agencies.

STATE AND LOCAL CIVIL RIGHTS (HUMAN RIGHTS) AGENCIES STUDY

Over 90 percent of the States and more than 500 localities have civil rights or human rights commissions or departments. They vary enormously from State to State in terms of enabling legislation, types of discrimination covered, classes protected, extent of enforcement capability, constituencies, administrative structures, budgetary support, and quality of work product. This study will examine these agencies and their relationship with Federal civil rights agencies.

IMPACT OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENT POLICIES ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Actions by foreign governments may result in discrimination against U.S. citizens and residents because of their race, religion, sex, or national origin. This discrimination may occur either by the direct application of the policies of foreign governments to Americans, or through indirect methods, including the economic and/or diplomatic coercion of the U.S. and multinational private employers and U.S. Government agencies in regard to whom they hire, send overseas, or use as contractors, for example, the recent Arab economic boycott of American companies doing business with Israel or employing American Jews. The study will examine the adequacy of Federal agency policies to prevent such discrimination, and the extent to which those policies have in fact been enforced.

RACE AND GENDER ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR IN THE UNITED STATES

The focus of the project is on the individual and institutional determinants of race, ethnic, and gender attitudes and behavior. Employing several interlocking approaches, this project will examine the causes of occupational and job segregation and the development and consequences of ethnic and gender identity.

This study will provide an enhanced understanding of the basic dynamics of prejudice and discrimination, thereby contributing to the development of new approaches to the solution of civil rights issues.

In fiscal year 1978, the Commission will also initiate over nine projects dealing with numerous issues of significant civil rights impact including enforcement of Federal nondiscrimination statutes, discrimination in the military services, the impact of foreign government policies on civil rights, and domestic violence.

Specifically, the Commission will begin work in the following areas:

COERCED STERILIZATION

Coerced sterilization includes both overt coercion and acceptance of uninformed consent. This study will ascertain the incidence of forced sterilization by race, sex, age, and economic status of those sterilized, and will investigate the impact of sterilization on the health and legal rights of the victims. The study will also determine the extent of Federal involvement in forced sterilizations, as well as investigate the implementation of State eugenics laws, including a focus on the differential impact of such implementation on low-income and/or minority women.

RACIAL/ETHNIC/SEXUAL HETEROGENEITY AND CONFLICT

This study will examine the cultural aspects of intergroup relations—the role played by power, identity, assimilation, and other such factors among all groups, including ethnics and whites. The study also will evaluate the extent to which the design and implementation of public and selected private programs and policies generate or exacerbate conflict, and will evaluate the manner in which the common and separate interests of groups can be met without encouraging increased group competition for resources.

EVALUATION OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF TITLE IX

This study will focus on both employment and programmatic provisions of title IX and will address Federal enforcement of the law as well as the nature and extent of voluntary compliance by school districts and institutions of higher education.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE MILITARY SERVICE

This study will probe the extent of racial, national origin, religious, and sex discrimination in the military service. We will examine representation of minority groups and women in each branch of the service, paying particular attention to rankings, promotion, recruitment, assignment, training opportunities, and the service academies. We will look at the degree to which the military effectively implements its equal opportunity enforcement responsibilities in housing, both in the U.S.A. and overseas, and the nature and adequacy of civil rights complaint and appeals procedures within the military.

TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

This study, a sequel to an earlier Commission report which documented the serious shortcomings of title VI enforcement, will review the current extent of discrimination in federally assisted programs and recommend a Government-wide strategy for combating this discrimination.

ABILITY OF SCHOOLS TO EDUCATE MINORITY STUDENTS

This study will examine the existing research evidence to ascertain what impact differences among schools have on minority students and to assess the potential of schools for providing effective education for all students. It will critically review the major research evidence which has been interpreted as showing that variations among schools do not have much differential impact on minority students, and recommend the types of research that will correct the past deficiencies in research strategies.

CONSULTATION ON ROLE OF THE CITIES

The Commission will plan, organize and manage a consultation bringing together a variety of urban specialists to discuss such problems as unemployment and underemployment, poor and inadequate housing, deficient schools, soaring crime rates, substandard social services, ineffectual public transportation, and lack of leadership.

CONSULTATION ON ALTERNATIVES TO TRADITIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAMS

During the past 20 years, civil rights efforts have been based on the assumption that equality of opportunity and, more recently, equality of results are best achieved by ever-greater governmental intervention in the social processes of the country. This approach has recently been attacked by some traditional supporters of civil rights and equal opportunity who now question the efficacy of massive and complex Government porgrams and their accompanying regulations and bureauracy. The purpose of this consultation will be to provide a forum for the exchange and exploration of rational and scholarly viewpoints of this increasingly critical issue.

CONSULTATION ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Although only limited data are available regarding the extent of violence within a family or quasi-family context, it is apparent that the victims of such violence are overwhelmingly female and the perpetrators are male. It has been alleged that police inaction and discriminatory treatment of female victims of such violence prevents most such cases from ever reaching the courtroom.

The Commission will hold a consultation to bring together people who are actively involved in combating domestic/marital violence on several fronts. This would include researchers, attorneys, and initiators of innovative programs to assist battered women. The participants will look at the effectiveness of already proposed and/or implemented remedies, including the specially trained police units established to deal with domestic violence calls, the halfway houses established by women's groups in several cities as shelters/refuges for abused women, and the attempts to provide legal assistance to battered women seeking divorce and support orders.

This list of Commission projects does not, by any means, reflect the full extent of agency activity projected for fiscal year 1978. In addition to these projects, the Commission will carry out its normal program of civil rights monitoring and information dissemination. In fiscal year

sidered subversive by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or by some other person high in Government.

Federal agents continually wiretapped American citizens where domestic and foreign security concerns were involved until 1972 when the Supreme Court, in the famous Keith decision, declared that warrantless wiretaps were forbidden by the fourth amendment where there was no connection with the activities of a foreign power. The Court failed to consider, however, the question of whether such warrantless eavesdropping was permitted where the subject was directly involved with a foreign power, although several lower courts have so held.

Warrantless electronic surveillance conducted by agents of the Federal Government under the guise of national security is particularly insidious, even when involving contacts between an American and representatives of a foreign power, because it often is conducted with regard to the subject's political activities. This asserted exception to the protections of the Bill of Rights, with all the variations made possible through the use of modern electronic technology, could form the cornerstone of a future police state.

The dangers inherent in authorizing the President broad powers in the name of "national defense" or "national security" were clearly recognized by the late Chief Justice, Earl Warren, when he stated, in striking down a part of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, that:

> This concept of "national defense" cannot be deemed an end in itself, justifying an exercise of * * * power designed to promote such a goal. Implicit in the term "national defense" is the notion of defending those values and ideals which set this Nation apart * * *. It would indeed be ironic, if, in the name of national defense, we would sanction the subversion of one of those liberties * * * which make the defense of the Nation worthwhile.—So said the Chief Justice in *United States* v. *Robel*, 389 U.S. 258, 264 (1967).

The Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice, which I chair, began studying the issue of national security wiretapping 3 years ago, in April 1974, when we held hearings on several bills, including a proposal to require a court order prior to any interception of oral or wire communications in national security cases.

At that time Assistant Attorney General Henry Petersen, speaking for the administration, stated to the subcommittee, "let me be very brief. We oppose these bills. That is it." During the subsequent 2-year period, Mr. Petersen and his successors, as well as intervening Attorneys General, consistently opposed the concept of legislation imposing judicial restraints on national security wiretapping.

However, last year, President Ford announced a change in policy. He indicated a willingness to work with Congress to develop a system of court supervision of national security wiretapping. In response to his invitation for congressional input, Congressman RAILSBACK and myself wrote to the President offering our cooperation and included draft language we had developed as a substitute for H.R. 141, an earlier bill that I had sponsored on national security.

Although the President acknowledged our letter, neither he nor the Attorney General responded substantively to our draft language. Indeed, the Attorney General did not consult with us—although he surely did with the Senate—prior to preparation of a final draft bill which was introduced by Chairman RODINO as H.R. 12750, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1976.

An identical bill, S. 3197, was introduced in the Senate. While H.R. 12750 and S. 3197 represented a distinct departure from the former Administration's long held opposition to any statutory controls on foreign intelligence wiretapping, they were considerably more limited in scope than bills which earlier had been considered by our subcommittee. A broad coalition of civil liberties groups, in fact, argued that the bill simply constituted a disguised method of legitimizing the questionable practices which had in the past been represented by warrantless wiretapping. These groups, led by the American Civil Liberties Union, pointed out that the bill did not require a showing of criminal probable cause, did not permit judicial evaluation of the facts supporting a wiretap application, and failed to eliminate all exceptions to the warrant requirement.

Although I shared many of the reservations of the organized civil liberties community, I agreed to cosponsor H.R. 12750 after personal requests by the President and Attorney General to do so.

While our subcommittee held 3 days of hearings on H.R. 12750 in the 94th Congress, we failed to move to markup on the measure for the reason that the Senate, with which the Administration had collaborated originally in developing the legislation, failed to act.

With the convening of the 95th Congress, those of us who in the past have been involved with the issue, have had an opportunity to reexamine the whole question of national security wiretapping with a fresh perspective, unimpeded by the limitations imposed on the debate by the previous administration.

As a result of this reexamination I have developed a new bill, which I believe will meet the legitimate intelligence needs of the Nation and, at the same time, bring national security surveillance within the protective boundaries of the statutory law.

My bill, which I am introducing today, is entitled the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Amendments of 1977.

It repeals that provision of current law, tile 18, United States Code, section 2511(3), which disclaims legislative intent to limit the surveillance powers of the President in national security cases and permits electronic surveillance only when a Federal judge finds that there is probable cause to believe that the surveillance would produce evidence that one of a list of specific crimes has been or is about to be committed. This brings national security wiretapping and electronic surveillance, for the first time, within the procedures traditionally required for a search pursuant to the fourth amendment; procedures already required for wiretaps in criminal investigations.

In order that electronic surveillance may continue when required for foreign intelligence purposes, the bill writes into the law four provisions not currently available in normal criminal cases.

First, it expands the list of crimes the investigation of which may serve as a basis for an electronic surveillance. The new crimes are, violations of the Export Administration Act and the Foreign Agents Registration Act, crimes likely to involve foreign intelligence situations. Of course, wiretaps already may be sought in cases of violations of espionage, sabotage and treason statutes.

Second, the bill permits the permanent waiver of notice of the surveillance to a subject who is overheard as long as the evidence obtained is used only for intelligence purposes and not for criminal prosecutive purposes.

Third, it permits the Court to authorize a surveillance for up to 90 days where the subject of the investigation is an agent of a foreign power. In purely criminal investigations under current law, authorization of an electronic surveillance may not exceed 30 days.

Fourth, the bill permits the government to maintain strict security by confining wiretap applications to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit when foreign intelligence information is sought.

I believe that my bill will permit wiretapping and other electronic surveillance where necessary for obtaining foreign intelligence information, but, at the same time, respond to the objections raised by the civil liberties community to the administration's 1976 bill. That bill permitted electronic eavesdropping simply upon the finding by the Attorney General that the subject of the surveillance was an agent of a foreign power. It did not require the traditional fourth amendment showing of probable cause to believe that evidence of criminal activity would be found. In addition, the 1976 bill did not permit the judge, to whom the application for a warrant is made, to demand evidence supporting the facts certified in the application. My bill would permit the judge full power to test the assertions supporting the application.

Finally, my bill clearly avoids any congressional recognition of an inherent Presidential power to conduct surveillances outside the procedures established by law.

I believe that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Amendments of 1977 offer an excellent opportunity to bring the decades, long debate over national security wiretapping to a close with a responsible measure which will meet the intelligence needs of the Executive within the limitations imposed by the fourth amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the support of the President, the Attorney General, and my colleagues for this measure.

For the RECORD, I would like to submit an explanation and analysis of the bill and the actual text:

THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1977

EXPLANATION AND ANALYSIS

Explanation

The bill is styled as the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Amendments of 1977 rather than as the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, as was the 1976 Administration bill.

The language difference illustrates a fundamental policy difference between the two proposals. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1976 would have created a special national security electronic surveillance statute for which the threshold of implementation would be probable cause that the subject of the surveillance is a "foreign agent." In addition, the factual assertions supporting the application would not be subject to examination by the judge. The proposed Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Amendments of 1977 do not create a new statute. They merely amend the existing electronic surveillance statute, Chapter 119 of Title 18, United States Code, to permit surveillance for intelligence purposes where the traditional criminal probable cause showing has been made. Specifically, the Amendments would: (1) remove the existing Congressional disclaimer with respect to national security surveillance contained in 18, United States Code, Section 2511(3); (2) permit surveillances for a period of 90 rather than 30 days; (3) permit waiver of notice to the subject of the surveillance, and (4) permit the government to present applications for national security electronic surveillance to a small group of judges so that security easily could be maintained and specialized judicial knowledge of national security matters could be developed.

Section-by-section analysis

Section 1.—Title.

Section 2.—This section amends the definition provisions of Chapter 119, United States Code, to provide a definition of "foreign intelligence information." It is almost identical to the definitions proposed for the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1976 as reported by the Senate Judiciary and Intelligence committees.

Section 3.—This section deletes the disclaimer in 18, United States Code, Section 2511(3), in which Congress recognizes a Presidential surveillance power beyond that authorized in the statutory law.

Section 4. This section amends 18 United States Code, Section 2516 to permit applications for electronic surveillance orders involving foreign intelligence information to be made to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Its purpose is to permit such applications to be made to a small number of judges so that security can be maintained and so that the judges to whom such applications will be made may develop sufficient experitise in national security matters.

Section 5. This section amends Title 18 United States Code, Section 2516(1)(a) to add to the list of offenses for which electronic surveillance may be used, two additional misdemeanor offenses which are particularly important in foreign intelligence situations. These are violations of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and the Export Administration Act.

Section 6. This section amends 18 United States Code, Section 2517(3) to make it inoperative in cases where foreign intelligence surveillance information is sought. Section 2517(3) provides that evidence received from an electronic surveillance under Chapter 119 may be disclosed in judicial proceedings.

Section 7. This section amends Title 18 United States Code, Section 2518(5) to permit electronic surveillance for a period exceeding 30 days where foreign intelligence information is sought.

Section 8. This Section amends Title 18 United States Code, Section 2518(8) to provide for waiver of notice to the subject of an electronic surveillance in cases involving foreign intelligence information.

Section 9. This section creates a new Section 2521 in Chapter 119, United States Code, which permits application to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for and approval of waivers of the notice and time provisions of Chapter 119 in cases involving foreign intelligence information.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

PROTECTNG REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Government Operations Committee released its first report of the 95th Congress, entitled "Protecting Redwood National Park." Almost since the establishment of Redwood National Park in 1968, it has been a known fact that logging upslope and upstream from the park and the famous "worm"—which is where the tallest known trees in the world are located—is damaging park resources. A series of Interior Department studies and independent reviews document the fact that clearcutting and associated logging operations have caused extensive damage to the timber, water, and soil resources in the park.

The report, which was approved by voice vote by the full committee and by a bipartisan 6 to 1 vote of the Environment, Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee, recommends a comprehensive program for protecting the park and its magnificent virgin redwoods. Perhaps the most important recommendation is that the park be enlarged by a minimum of 21,500 acres up to the 74,000 acres proposed in legislation (H.R. 3813) introduced by Representative PHIL BURTON, chairman of the House Interior Subcommittee on Parks and Territories. I want to commend and add my support to Representative PHILLIP BURTON for his efforts over the last several years to protect and enlarge Redwood National Park; I note that his subcommittee began hearings on H.R. 3813 last week.

The report recommends that the Interior Department and the National Park Service should be given the authority to enforce restrictions on timber cutting in the Redwood Creek basin which are considered necessary to protect park resources. The committee also finds that the Interior Department and the Justice Department should require the three timber companies to carry out proper land rehabilitation and reforestation in order to minimize future erosion damage to the park.

In addition, the report recommends—and I want to stress this point—that the Congress and the administration should work closely with the State of California in order to offset the expected initial and interim loss of jobs and revenue to Humboldt County resulting from increasing the size of the park. I also want to emphasize that it is my belief the expansion of Redwood National Park and the resulting increase in tourism will in the long run prove to be an asset to the local economy.

Full-scale logging in the Redwood Creek basin for this season is slated to begin in April. This Friday the Arcata Redwood Co.'s voluntary deferral of cutting expires on two tracts of land they own near the Tall Trees Grove. In light of this fact—and I cannot overemphasize the urgency of the present situation—the report recommends that Congress and the administration seek a moratorium on logging in the Redwood Creek basin for a period of time sufficient for Congress to act on legislation designed to protect the park. Congressmen UDALL and PHILIP BURTON of the House Interior Committee and Senators JACKSON and ABOUREZK of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee have recently requested the timber companies to impose such a moratorium.

Last month I wrote President Carter asking his assistance in seeking a moratorium on logging by the timber companies for a reasonable period of time in order to give Congress an opportunity to act. The President is supposed to have an announcement on this subject at the end of this week. If the Congress and the administration are not successful in stopping timber cutting in the Redwood Creek basin in the next several weeks on a voluntary basis, I believe we should be prepared to take whatever steps are necessary to enforce such a logging moratorium. Those trees and this park are too valuable for us to do otherwise.

One final point: For those concerned with the expense of acquiring additional land for Redwood National Park—and I admit it will be expensive—let me point out that money spent for that purpose would come from funds appropriated under the Land and Water Conservation Act. Congress has authorized and both Presidents Ford and Carter have requested significant increases in appropriations for the land and water conservation fund. These increases are expected to continue at least until the end of this decade. Any money spent for land acquisition for Redwood National Park will come from this account, and will be budgeted for over a several-year period.

The giant coastal redwoods are a national treasure created by nature over thousands of years. Unlike other outstanding examples of America's natural heritage, such as the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, and Mt. Rushmore, the great virgin coastal redwood forests are an endangered resource rapidly on their way to becoming extinct. Action is