

September 10, 1975

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

28363

a threat to world peace and to the security and economy of the United States; and Whereas an agreement signed on September 4, 1975 by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Government of Israel will, when it enters into force, constitute a significant step toward a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, thereby reducing the threat to the peace and to the security and economy of the United States; and

Whereas the President of the United States on September 1, 1975 transmitted to the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt and to the Government of Israel identical proposals for the United States participation in an early warning system, the text of which is incorporated herein, providing for the assignment of no more than 200 United States civilian personnel to carry out certain specified functions and setting forth the terms and conditions thereof; and

Whereas that proposal would permit the Government of the United States to withdraw such personnel if it concludes that their safety is jeopardized or that continuation of their role is no longer necessary; and

Whereas entry into force of the proposal is contingent upon its approval by the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of Congress that it supports and approves the identical proposals the text of which follows; and

That the President is accordingly encouraged to take such action as may be necessary to fulfill their purposes, including the use of any statutory authority of any agency of the Government of the United States:

In connection with the early warning system referred to in Article IV of the Agreement between Egypt and Israel concluded on this date and as an integral part of that Agreement (hereafter referred to as the Basic Agreement), the United States proposes the following:

1. The early warning system to be established in accordance with Article IV in the area shown on the map attached to the Basic Agreement will be entrusted to the United States. It shall have the following elements:

A. There shall be two surveillance stations to provide strategic early warning, one operated by Egyptian and one operated by Israeli personnel. (Their locations are shown on the map attached to the Basic Agreement.) Each station shall be manned by not more than 250 technical and administrative personnel. They shall perform the functions of visual and electronic surveillance only within their stations.

B. In support of these stations, to provide tactical early warning and to verify access to them, three watch stations shall be established by the United States in the Mitla and Giddi Passes as will be shown on the map attached to the agreement. These stations shall be operated by United States civilian personnel. In support of these stations, there shall be established three unmanned electronic sensor fields at both ends of each Pass and in the general vicinity of each station and the roads leading to and from those stations.

2. The United States civilian personnel shall perform the following duties in connection with the operation and maintenance of these stations.

A. At the two surveillance stations described in paragraph 1A, above, United States personnel will verify the nature of the operations of the stations and all movements into and out of each station and will immediately report any detected divergency from its authorized role of visual and electronic surveillance to the Parties to the Basic Agreement and to the United Nations emergency force.

B. At each watch station described in paragraph 1B, above, the United States personnel will immediately report to the Parties to the

Basic Agreement and to the United Nations emergency force and movement of armed forces, other than the United Nations emergency force, into either Pass and any observed preparations for such movement.

C. The total number of United States civilian personnel assigned to functions under this proposal shall not exceed 200. Only civilian personnel shall be assigned to functions under this proposal.

3. No arms shall be maintained at the stations and other facilities covered by this proposal, except for small arms required for their protection.

4. The United States personnel serving the early warning system shall be allowed to move freely within the area of the system.

5. The United States and its personnel shall be entitled to have such support facilities as are reasonably necessary to perform their functions.

6. The United States personnel shall be immune from local criminal, civil, tax and customs jurisdiction and may be accorded any other specific privileges and immunities provided for in the United Nations emergency force agreement of February 13, 1957.

7. The United States affirms that it will continue to perform the functions described above for the duration of the Basic Agreement.

8. Notwithstanding any other provision of this proposal, the United States may withdraw its personnel only if it concludes that their safety is jeopardized or that continuation of their role is no longer necessary. In the latter case the Parties to the Basic Agreement will be informed in advance in order to give them the opportunity to make alternative arrangements. If both Parties to the Basic Agreement request the United States to conclude its role under this proposal, the United States will consider such requests conclusive.

9. Technical problems including the location of the watch stations will be worked out through consultation with the United States.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATIONS, 1976—S. 1517

## AMENDMENT NO. 874

Mr. CULVER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 1517) to authorize appropriations for the administration of foreign affairs; international organizations, conferences, and commissions; information and cultural exchange; and for other purposes.

## DIEGO GARCIA INHABITANTS REPORT

Mr. CULVER. Mr. President, the Diego Garcia issue is still with us. Just this week, press reports brought to our attention previously secret information about people who used to live on that tiny island.

So that the Congress can get the full story on this matter, without delay, and before we act on the Diego Garcia appropriation, I am today submitting an amendment which I intend to offer to the State Department authorization bill, S. 1517.

This amendment would require a report by the President not later than November 1 of this year, detailing the history of U.S. Government agreements, commitments, financial arrangements, understandings, and other relevant communications concerning the people who used to inhabit Diego Garcia. In addition, the amendment requests a judg-

ment on the current status of any U.S. Government obligations to these people, or proposed efforts to assist them.

Throughout the Diego Garcia debate, administration witnesses assured the Congress that this island was uninhabited and had no indigenous population. This was said to be part of its appeal as a base location since there would be no problems with the local population.

Now, it turns out, those statements were at best misleading, and were technically true only because of the prior eviction of the local inhabitants.

In fact, when the British Government agreed to let the United States lease Diego Garcia for military purposes, there were over 1,200 people living and working on this small island. Many families had been there for several generations, but they were forced to resettle in Mauritius, where they now live, apparently disgruntled and impoverished.

It is not clear that the U.S. Congress was ever told about these people, or about their eviction after the Navy acquired base rights.

The pleas of these people for assistance adds a new element, and a potential irritant, to our Indian Ocean policy. Before this becomes a contentious issue, we need to know the facts.

We need to know precisely how and why and to what extent the United States was involved in this resettlement effort.

Did we demand that these people be removed so that our base could be built?

Did we subsidize the relocation, either directly or indirectly?

Have we fulfilled all of our obligations to these people, or are they likely to seek further assistance from us?

Why was the Congress not fully informed of the plight facing these people?

My staff, and others, have made numerous attempts to get the answers to these questions from various officials. But the responses so far have been incomplete and at times contradictory.

In order that the Congress can learn the whole story about this matter, I believe that legislation mandating a report is necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment, as well as two newspaper articles on this matter, be printed in the Record.

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 874

On page 50, after line 26, add a new subsection (c) to section 455:

(c) Not later than November 1, 1975, the President shall transmit a detailed report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate with respect to—

(1) the history of all United States Government agreements, commitments, and financial arrangements regarding persons who inhabited, or were native to, the island of Diego Garcia prior to 1972;

(2) the history of any other United States requests, understandings, and relevant communications with the Governments of the United Kingdom, or Mauritius, or the inhabitants of Diego Garcia themselves concerning these persons; and

(3) the current status of any United States Government obligation to, proposed efforts to assist, or estimated cost of assistance for, these persons.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARY

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 9, 1975]  
ISLANDERS WERE EVICTED FOR U.S. BASE

(By David B. Ottaway)

PORT LOUIS, MAURITIUS, September 8.—More than a thousand inhabitants of the Indian Ocean island of Diego Garcia, which the Pentagon told Congress was virtually uninhabited, were forcibly removed before 1972 to make way for a controversial American naval base there.

The islanders are now living in abject poverty here in Mauritius, more than a thousand miles away, and have been petitioning the British and American embassies as well as the Mauritian government for help. But Washington has rejected all responsibility for their plight, and London has placed the onus on Mauritius, which already faces serious economic problems.

Diego Garcia and other islands in the Chagos group, 1,000 miles south of India's southern tip, were part of the British colony of Mauritius before Mauritius became independent.

Britain leased Diego Garcia to the United States in 1966, and the Defense Department now plans to expand its naval and air base facilities there. The proposal has aroused controversy in Congress and elsewhere because of its implications for an enlarged U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean.

Britain gave the Mauritian government about \$1.4 million in 1972 to provide housing, social services and other resettlement assistance for the displaced Diego Garcians, but they say little of this money ever reached them.

One American relief organization attempted in 1972 to raise the issue of United States "co-responsibility" for the fate of the Diego Garcians, but the State Department replied that their problems are strictly the concern of Britain and Mauritius, and not in any way those of the United States.

The organization has thus been obliged to try to help the Diego Garcians without assistance from the U.S. government.

Almost nothing has been written, outside Mauritius itself, about the fate of the island's hapless residents. The few Western press reports that have touched on the former inhabitants have generally described them as "transient laborers" from Mauritius numbering only a few hundred.

But interviews here with several dozen Diego Garcians and others familiar with their plight revealed that there were once more than 300 families—between 1,200 and 1,400 people—living on Diego Garcia and two neighboring islets, many of them third- and even fourth-generation inhabitants.

Almost a decade ago, Britain began quietly evacuating the islanders to make way for future British and American naval, air and communications facilities, and the last Diego Garcians were ordered off the island by late 1971.

This allowed the Pentagon to tell Congress during the heated debate over the base that Diego Garcia was virtually uninhabited and that creation of the base would not cause any indigenous political problems.

But one old man, who said he was part of the final evacuation, recalled being told by an unidentified American official: "If you don't leave you won't be fed any longer."

And the plight of the Diego Garcians is a political issue in Mauritius, where opposition groups charge that the transplanted population has been neglected and uncompensated for its losses.

In the last year, the Diego Garcians have organized and have asked Britain and the United States to press the Mauritian government to provide them with housing, land, jobs and other facilities to start a new life.

About six months ago, they drew up a formal petition and presented it to the British embassy, with copies delivered to the American embassy, Mauritian Prime Minister Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, and several opposition leaders. They also discussed their

plight with U.S. embassy officials on several occasions.

[A spokesman for the State Department in Washington said that he was not aware of any petition and that the department is not considering any action "at this time." A British Embassy spokesman said the embassy here "has no knowledge" of the situation. He noted that if such an approach had been made in Mauritius, the matter would normally be taken up with the Commonwealth office in London.]

The petition is primarily a plea for help, but it also expresses the Diego Garcians' feelings about being summarily tossed off their island to make way for a military base.

"We the inhabitants of the Chagos Islands—Diego Garcia, Peros Banhos and Salomon—have been uprooted from those islands because the Mauritian government sold the islands to the British government to build a base," the petition begins.

"Our ancestors were slaves on those islands, but we know that we are the heirs of those islands. Although we were poor there, we were not dying of hunger. We were living free . . . Here in Mauritius when animals are debarked, an enclosure with water and grass is prepared for them. But we, being mini-slaves, we don't get anybody to help us. We are at a loss, not knowing what to do."

The document goes on to ask for a meeting with British embassy officials to explain their problems in detail.

"We (want to) let the British government know how many people have died through sorrow, poverty, and lack of food and care," it says. "We have at least 40 persons who have died."

It ends with an appeal to Britain to get the Mauritian government to provide them with plots of land, a house for each family and jobs, and says that if these facilities are not forthcoming, "It is preferable that we be sent back to our islands."

But the British reportedly told the islanders to address their petition to the Mauritian government, and the Diego Garcians are still waiting for assistance from some quarter while struggling to survive as best they can.

The conditions under which the islanders left Diego Garcia and their present difficulties were detailed by some of the former inhabitants in interviews at several of their homes in Roche Bois, suburb of Port Louis, where many of them now live.

One of the principal leaders is Christian Ramdas, 41, who was born on the island as were his parents, grandmother and most of his children. He said he went on vacation to Mauritius in 1965 shortly after Diego Garcia and the other islands in the Chagos group were formally split off from Mauritius to form part of the separate British Indian Ocean Territory, and was not allowed to return.

The three islands' former inhabitants, who are mostly Indo-Mauritian and speak a French dialect, originally went to the Chagos as workers on coconut plantations owned by Mauritians or by companies based on the British Seychelles Islands.

Working conditions on the Chagos Islands appear to have been close to those of slavery. The plantation workers were given food, housing and the equivalent of about \$4 a month to buy clothes, tea and coffee from the company store.

Yet there was apparently a certain security on Diego Garcia which they obviously miss here on Mauritius.

"The life was easy, very easy," according to Ramdas.

"We had animals and raised chickens," said a young woman who has found work here as a maid. "We could fish off the island and we didn't need a lot of clothes."

On Mauritius, the Diego Garcians seem lost souls, living for the first time in a

money economy where rent, food and clothing are priced far above their meager incomes and where they are either unsuited for the available jobs or discriminated against by employers who favor local Mauritians.

Although they apparently got along on about \$4 a month in the Chagos, they say a family can hardly make ends meet on Mauritius with \$65 a month.

A recent private survey of the Diego Garcians found that only 17 per cent of family heads had full-time jobs, 33 per cent were unemployed and 50 per cent worked part time.

Unskilled and uneducated, most "ilôts" (French for islanders), as the Diego Garcians are called here, seem doomed to find only menial jobs, unless the local government undertakes some kind of special retraining program for them.

A Mauritian government spokesman said that two plots of land had been bought for housing sites but that the Diego Garcians themselves had rejected the idea of living in separate cities and wanted individual homes in locations of their own choosing.

Some of the men, such as Ramdas, would like to return to Diego Garcia to work on the American base and look after the church and cemetery where their relatives are buried. "We asked the U.S. Embassy to allow some of us to go back there, but there has been no reply," Ramdas said.

In the first British-American agreement concerning Diego Garcia, signed in December 1966, some consideration was given to employing "workers from Mauritius and Seychelles to the maximum extent practicable consistent with United States policies, requirements and schedules." But no specific mention was made of taking on the former inhabitants as workers.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 10, 1975]

BRITAIN SAYS ISLANDERS WERE MOVED

(By Edward D. Nossiter)

LONDON.—The British government tonight acknowledged that it had emptied Diego Garcia of people in 1965 by closing down the island's chief source of employment, a copra processing plant.

A Foreign Office spokesman confirmed that about 1,000 islanders were induced to leave to convert Diego Garcia into a naval base, as reported to The Washington Post yesterday. The Indian Ocean island currently houses a British-American communications center, a move that caused heated debate and controversy before gaining congressional approval.

Officials here stressed that Britain gave Mauritius, where the Diego Garcians were forced to go, about \$1.4 million to resettle the refugees. There was no indication, however, that London made any attempt to learn how the money was spent or what had happened to the islanders.

The Diego Garcians on Mauritius are living in poverty and suffer a high rate of unemployment. Officials were unable to comment on the Post's report that islanders now in Mauritius had been forbidden to return to their former homes.

The British government is reluctant to describe its measures as "forced evacuation." That, a spokesman said, was a matter of interpretation. He preferred to say that the islanders felt they had no option because there was no work.

A private company, it was explained, had been running the copra plant until 1965. The British government then bought the plant to make way for the base. Officials observed that the factory needed extensive investment, but did not claim that the decision to shut down the plant was made on economic grounds primarily.

The spokesman observed that the Mauritius government had accepted the \$1.4 million as a full and final discharge of Britain's obligation to the displaced islanders. The Diego



Garcians say they have seen little of this money.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

I am deeply disturbed by reports that the United States, in cooperation with the British Government, evicted between 1,200 and 1,400 people from the island of Diego Garcia, to make way for the development of naval and other military facilities there. This is a serious charge, and if these reports are substantiated, it is clear that our Government has acted with a lack of human sensitivity. Furthermore, if it is also true that the administration has consistently refused any responsibility for the plight of these people, who are reportedly now living in poverty, the insult is compounded.

During the Senate debate this summer on whether to proceed with expansion of military and naval facilities on Diego Garcia, we were told that the island was uninhabited. For example, Gen. George S. Brown, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on June 10, 1975, that Diego Garcia was "an unpopulated speck of land." But if this claim was based on the actions reported in the Washington Post yesterday, then the administration was clearly misrepresenting the case.

Mr. President, I believe that the seriousness of the charges made in the press warrant a reopening of the entire issue of the American base at Diego Garcia. If these reports are true, serious issues of executive-legislative relations are involved—issues that can only be resolved by the Congress demanding the true facts in this case.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 875

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. (for himself and Mr. HELMS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 1517), the State Department authorization bill.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, this amendment would eliminate a section in S. 1517 which would establish a new program for the United Nations.

The section which I propose to eliminate carries a \$25 million contribution to the creation of a United Nations University.

I think this is something that the Senate would want to consider very carefully before helping to underwrite a new project for the United Nations.

The total cost to the American taxpayers for this past year, insofar as the United Nations activities are concerned, totaled more than \$400 million.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS: SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND VANDALISM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Committee on the Judiciary will resume hearings on the problems of school violence and vandalism. The subcommittee has been conducting an inquiry into these problems for the past 2 years. The preliminary

findings of our national survey indicate the incidence of violence and vandalism in our Nation's public school system has reached critical proportions. Earlier hearings include testimony from faculty, students, and administrative personnel on this growing problem. The purpose of this hearing is to address the issues of student rights and parental involvement in the school systems. This is the third day in the series of hearings by the subcommittee on this topic.

The hearing is scheduled to be held on Wednesday, September 17, 1975 at 10 a.m. in room 2228, Dirksen Office Building. Witnesses invited to testify include representatives of groups familiar with educational problems—the Children's Defense Fund, Cambridge, Mass.; the National Committee for Citizens in Education, Columbia, Md.; the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Chicago, Ill.; and the American Civil Liberties Union, New York, N.Y.

Anyone interested in the subcommittee investigation or desiring to submit a statement for the record should contact John M. Rector, staff director and chief counsel of the subcommittee, U.S. Senate, A504, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202-224-2951).

#### NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, will hold a 3-day hearing—September 22, 23, and 25, 1975, on mortgage credit.

The purpose of the 3-day hearing is to receive testimony on residential mortgage credit needs of the Nation for the period 1975 to 1980; whether our existing financial system is adequate to meet these needs, and what changes need to be made in Federal laws or regulations to insure adequate mortgage credit flows for the future.

The hearing will be held in room 5302, Dirksen Senate Office Building, and will begin at 10 a.m. each morning.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION REGARDING THE GAO

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on Thursday, October 2, the Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting, and Management will conduct hearings on legislation regarding the General Accounting Office.

One of the bills which we shall consider is S. 2268, the General Accounting Office Act of 1975. Title 1 of S. 2268 would amend the Budget and Accounting Act to provide the Comptroller General procedural remedies through court action to prevent the obligation or expenditure of funds in what he has reasonable cause to believe would be an illegal manner. Title 2 and title 3 deal with enforcement of access to records of non-Federal persons and organizations and Federal departments and establishments, including authority to issue subpoenas. Title 4 authorizes the Comptroller General to study profits of Government contractors and subcontractors whose Government business exceeds \$1 million.

S. 2268 was drafted and proposed by

the General Accounting Office. Chairman RUBINOFF and Senator PERCY cosponsored the bill with me. Similar legislation, S. 3014, was before the 93d Congress, along with S. 3013, the General Accounting Office Act of 1974, which is now Public Law 93-604, and S. 2049, an omnibus bill, which was subsequently separated into S. 3013 and S. 3014.

The subcommittee will also receive testimony on S. 2206. It is my bill which provides for the appointment of the Comptroller General and Deputy Comptroller General by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, after considering recommendations from the Senate and House Committees on Government Operations. Each would serve a 7-year term. No person would be eligible for reappointment to either office if he has served in either capacity for more than 9 years. Either could be removed from office by the Senate or the House, by resolution.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29 includes, beginning on 25608, my introductory statement regarding S. 2206 and S. 2205, which provides for congressional selection of the Architect of the Capitol, the Librarian of Congress and the Public Printer. S. 2205 is before the Senate Rules Committee.

The hearings on S. 2268 and S. 2206 will begin at 10 a.m., on October 2, in 3302 Dirksen Senate Office Building. Interested Members of Congress and Comptroller General Staats will testify. A hearing will be scheduled at a later date for other persons who wish to testify on either or both of these bills.

Prospective witnesses, or those interested in submitting statements for the record, should communicate with the subcommittee staff, 161 Russell Senate Office Building, 224-1474—majority—or room A-602 Immigration Building, 224-1480—minority.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, beginning September 17, 1975, at 2 p.m., and continuing on September 24 and 29, open hearings will be held jointly by the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and the Priorities and Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on the subject of independent research and development.

The purpose of these hearings is to examine the results of a 2-year study by the General Accounting Office, of parallel studies by DOD, other Government agencies and industry, which will provide the basis for any appropriate legislative action deemed necessary, including possible changes to the existing provisions of section 203, Public Law 91-441.

These hearings will involve appearances by the Comptroller General, the Cost Accounting Standards Board, the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Energy Research and Development Administration, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, several industry associations, and other expert witnesses. These hearings will be held in room 1114, Dirksen Senate Office Building.

U.S. SENATE LIBRARY