

tinually increased. He is smart, he is sensible. He possesses the uncommon ability to look at a problem, perceive the significant issues, and formulate an intelligent opinion. I particularly appreciate the fact that when asked a question, the majority leader would respond with a "yes," "no," or "maybe." He gives a definite, straightforward answer to a long, complicated question, and does not attempt to answer around the question.

When talking recently about Senator MANSFIELD, one of my constituents made the following remark, which I particularly enjoyed. "If you've got to have a liberal democrat, Senator MANSFIELD may be about the best kind there is," said my fellow Republican. It is an accurate assessment, and reflects my own feelings concerning the Senator's objectivity and integrity.

These brief comments can only portray in part the character of MIKE MANSFIELD. His loyalty and dedication to getting the job done right cannot be adequately expressed. One of my staff members was dumbfounded when she met Senator MANSFIELD coming to work at 6:15 a.m. as she was jogging around the Capitol grounds. But that is typical of the Senator—hardworking, and firmly dedicated to his responsibilities as the Senator from Montana, and as the majority leader.

I am glad to know the distinguished Senator, and to have worked with him. I think it now becomes our responsibility to see that we attempt to follow and pass on his exemplary leadership. We would do well to embrace his standards of fairness, his controlled discipline, and his sense of justice.

THE DUBUQUE-WISCONSIN REPLACEMENT BRIDGE

Mr. CULVER. Mr. President, Iowa's agricultural economy is highly dependent upon a safe and timely transportation system; the transportation of grain and other commodities from farms to markets is critical to Iowa and the Nation. One of the most important links in an effective road system is sound, well-constructed bridges. Though funds from the primary, secondary, and urban road systems of the Federal-aid highway program can be used for improving bridges located on these systems, these funds are usually committed by the States to the increasing costs of road construction and maintenance.

To help provide specific funding for the renovation of deteriorating bridges, the Congress established the special bridge repair and replacement program in 1970. Funds under this program are allocated to States according to a ratio of a State's deficient bridge replacement needs to national needs, and the Federal share of project costs can be as high as 75 percent. As costly as bridge replacement and repair projects are, it soon became apparent that the original level of funding was inadequate. For instance, Iowa received only \$2 million under this program in fiscal year 1976, which does not even come close to fulfilling our pressing needs. Consequently, the joint Senate-House conference committee on the 1976 Federal-Aid Highway Act. of which

I was a member, took an encouraging step forward by increasing the authorization of this program from \$125 to \$180 million annually.

The very unique problem facing the Dubuque, Iowa, metropolitan area demonstrates the immediate need for even greater Federal funding for replacing major bridges of substantial cost. The city of Dubuque is the industrial and commercial center for the seven-county, tri-State region with a population of 240,000 people. It is a growing area with a great future. Dubuque is also one of only a handful of cities of its size which are isolated from the benefits of the safe, modern, and congestion-free interstate highway system. The city's social and economic well-being is closely tied to both Illinois and Wisconsin, and fully 25 percent of the Dubuque work force commutes daily from those States.

Presently, transportation across the Mississippi River to Dubuque is provided only by two deteriorating bridges. First, there is the Julien Dubuque Bridge, which is a two-lane structure opened to traffic in 1943. The second bridge is the Eagle Point Bridge which was constructed in 1902. It is only 17 feet wide and has severe weight restrictions, limiting its capacity to passenger vehicles and small trucks. The 1990 transportation plan for the metropolitan area anticipates 39,000 river crossings daily, which greatly exceeds the present combined capacity of 23,000 vehicles per day. The need for constructing a new bridge to remove present hazards, recently became even more critical. The June inspection of the Julien Dubuque Bridge showed an increasingly rapid rate of deterioration, and repairs cannot be delayed much longer. Repairs, under existing conditions, would entail one-lane traffic, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for several months. This would be absolutely devastating to the city.

As a result of the outstanding efforts made by various city officials, the Dubuque Chamber of Commerce, representatives from the Dubuque area in the Iowa General Assembly, and other individuals to demonstrate the urgent need for a new bridge, progress is occurring at the State level. The States of Iowa and Wisconsin have included the proposed Dubuque-Wisconsin Replacement Bridge among their highest priorities for funding through the special bridge repair and replacement program. Iowa ranks it as the No. 1 bridge priority in the State, and Wisconsin ranks it as the No. 2 priority project. Unfortunately, this \$35 million project cannot be fully funded through the special bridge repair and replacement program, because of the program's limited national funding level. In addition, last spring the Iowa General Assembly appropriated \$4 million for work on interstate bridges, and this money will be spent according to the Iowa Department of Transportation's priorities. This appropriation provides initial funding for the proposed bridge, and the Iowa DOT is proceeding with design work. State officials have already entered into negotiations with Wisconsin regarding the construction of the bridge.

Mr. President, the State of Iowa, with the support of the States of Illinois and Wisconsin, has submitted an application for additional funding under the priority primary program of the 1976 Federal-Aid Highway Act. The money authorized for fiscal years 1977 and 1978 under this program is allocated at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation for projects of unusually high cost on the priority primary system. The State has classified the replacement bridge as a priority primary project. I wrote Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman, Jr., supporting this application by Iowa, and it is hoped that this application will receive full consideration.

The people of Dubuque cannot stand to be isolated from safe, congestion-free, modern bridges any longer. Iowa has made an energetic and dedicated effort to develop sources of funding for this project, and I believe the compelling need for the Dubuque-Wisconsin Bridge clearly demonstrates the importance of Federal financial assistance in assuring adequate bridges on the Federal-aid highway system.

LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the fourth substantive session of the third United Nations Law of the Sea Conference ended in New York on September 17 amid gloomy press accounts that nothing was achieved and that the conference was foundering. In the wake of the New York session, there has also been renewed talk of the need for unilateral legislative action by the United States to authorize American companies to mine the mineral resources of the deep seabed without waiting for the Law of the Sea Conference to set internationally agreed procedures for such activity.

Before making hasty judgments concerning the results of the most recent session in New York and the desirability of going it alone on deep seabed mining, I believe that further reflection is in order about the complex nature of the Law of the Sea Conference and about how far the negotiators have come in the 3 years since the conference began.

In this connection, Elisabeth Mann Borgese, chairman of the planning council of the International Ocean-Institute in Malta, recently gave her evaluation of the conference in an article appearing in the October 1 edition of the New York Times. She points out, correctly in my view, that—

The treaty being negotiated is the most comprehensive and complex treaty ever negotiated in history.

To expect instant results or to cite one difficult session as grounds for throwing up one's hands in despair is, therefore, not realistic and does not do justice to the solid accomplishments achieved thus far. Not only has Dr. Borgese put developments at the Law of the Sea Conference in their proper perspective, but she has also made an excellent case, in my view, that since people everywhere will be affected by what happens to the oceans they have a right to know more about how decisions are made at the conference. I agree with her that, at the

least, representatives of accredited non-governmental organizations ought to be admitted to the working sessions of the four conference committees. Currently, all committee meetings, where most of the conference work is done, are closed to the press and the public.

It is my earnest hope that the next administration, as well as my congressional colleagues, will heed the advice and insight provided by Dr. Borgese. In particular, it is my view that as long as reasonable progress is being made at the conference, there should be no unilateral legislation enacted to license deep seabed mining by American companies. If unilateral action—whether legislation or an international agreement negotiated by a limited number of countries—eventually becomes necessary because of the intransigence of some delegations, I believe that such action should be carefully drafted so that the door is left open for an eventual broadly negotiated arrangement at the Law of the Sea Conference.

Mr. President, I submit Dr. Borgese's article of October 1 to be printed in full in the RECORD:

THE COMPLEXITIES OF A SEA CHANGE
(By Elisabeth Mann Borgese)

As the fifth session of the third Conference on the Law of the Sea ended, the news media reflected an atmosphere of gloom. They said that the proceedings were all but grounded. But there are a few aspects the public is not aware of, and the press has not stressed.

First, the treaty being negotiated is the most comprehensive and complex treaty ever negotiated in history. With the penetration of the Industrial Revolution into the oceans, the law of the sea is no longer what it used to be. Every issue facing the international community today reflects itself in the oceans: relations between industrialized and developing countries; the arms race; the impact of science and technology on institutions, on society, on the environment; relations between states, the international community, and the multinational corporations; food; energy; resource management; communications and international trade—to name only the most important ones.

To negotiate a treaty on the new law of the sea, therefore, is to negotiate a vital part of world order, including the new international economic order.

Second, and contrary to general opinion, the issues before the conference are not clearly circumscribed technical issues that can be solved in isolation. The general crisis in international relations reflects itself also in the crisis of the conference.

The breakdown of the international law of the sea is part and parcel of the breakdown of international law and order in general. It would not be fair to blame the delegates to the law of the Sea Conference for this breakdown. On the contrary, it is in the conference that the birth pangs of the new international order are more perceptible than anywhere else.

Third, and lest we forget among the daily frustrations: *Something* has been acquired in the nine years since the Maltese Ambassador, Arvid Pardo, drew the attention of the United Nations to the economic potential of, and the ecological perils to, the oceans and proposed that the oceans and their resources be declared to be the common heritage of mankind, that a Declaration of Principles be adopted, and that this conference be called to embody these principles in a treaty.

These principles are here to stay. Even should we fail this time around—which we shall not—they would crop up again, whether in the context of the oceans or with regard to

the environment, outer space and satellites, climate and weather modification, energy or food. We shall learn to do together what none of us can do alone.

Fourth, during this process, and little as we may be aware of it, issues and obstacles are changing. What seem to be unsurmountable problems today may offer easy and unsuspected solutions tomorrow.

To give just one example: The alternatives before us in the committee charged with the responsibility of creating the international seabed authority quite likely are not either a system managed and controlled by the international community, or free access for states and companies. Quite likely, there is a third possibility in a comprehensive and flexible system of joint ventures, acceptable to states and companies, under the financial and administrative control of the authority and for the benefit of all countries, especially the poorer ones.

Dilemmas may turn out to be optical illusions, and if an apparently insoluble problem is approached from a slightly different angle new solutions may * * * and-dried articles were agreed upon during this session, each new perspective have been opened for the next session, at the United Nations in May.

The effort to build a new international order in the oceans may turn out to be the most important international development of this century. People everywhere are affected directly by what happens to our oceans. They have a right to know more about how decisions are made.

It would not detract from the efficiency of the decision-making processes or of the debates of this great conference if the press and at least the representatives of accredited non-governmental organizations were admitted to the working sessions of the committees. Public support is essential if the treaty that will result from this conference is to be ratified and observed. This support must be built now, through the wide sharing of this knowledge. There would be, I believe, less gloom if there were more participation.

SENATOR JOHN C. CULVER AND
THE GREAT RIVER ROAD

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, every American, whether or not he has had the personal opportunity to enjoy its unique beauty, recognizes that the Mississippi River is one of our Nation's greatest natural resources. It is the most scenic North-South waterway in the Nation, and it has played a major role in the development of America. The history and culture of the Midwest, going all the way back 300 years ago to the first French settlers and fur traders, has been dependent upon the "Father of the Waters."

Almost 40 years ago, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickles initiated the concept of the Great River Road, a midcontinent parkway from Minnesota to the Gulf of Mexico. The purpose of the road is to enhance environmental and historic values along the river by assuring that remaining undeveloped areas are preserved, and to provide access to the most scenic, historic, and cultural sites in the Mississippi River Valley. Though much planning and thought have gone into this vital project since the late 1930's, construction funds were not authorized until \$90 million was included in the 1973 Federal-Aid Highway Act. It has only been recently that these funds were finally allocated to the States.

Senator JOHN C. CULVER was one of the original coauthors of legislation author-

izing construction funds for this project when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, and he has continued his deep interest in the development of this program ever since. In fact, as a member of the Senate Transportation Subcommittee last year, he helped to include an additional authorization of \$78.75 million for the road in the 1976 Highway Act. Recently, Senator CULVER delivered the keynote address at the annual convention of the Mississippi River Parkway Commission in St. Louis, Mo. In this speech, Senator CULVER examined the history of this program and the problems it has faced over the years. His remarks clearly demonstrated how the Great River Road will preserve for all Americans the priceless heritage and tradition which lie along the banks of the Mississippi River.

As a Senator from one of the States bordering the Mississippi River, I know firsthand the importance of the Great River Road and commend Senator CULVER's address to the attention of my colleagues. I submit a copy of his speech to be printed in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN CULVER

In my major committee assignments in the United States Senate, I believe I am fortunate to be a member of two committees—armed services and public works—that deal with some of our most important national priorities, as viewed by most Americans.

There are differences on details, but the vast majority of Americans are agreed on the need for a strong national defense.

And, while we sometimes lose our perspective on longer range objectives, we do share a basic sense of what we are defending with our armed forces—our values, our freedoms, our cultural and economic heritage, our god-given natural resources.

Along with the construction of public buildings and highways, part of the responsibilities of the public works committee relate to the preservation of our natural resources and beauties.

Certainly, one of the most precious of those natural resources is the legendary great river and the magnificent valley through which it flows.

I have a home at McGregor from which we look down a thousand feet at one of the most picturesque bends of the Mississippi, across to Prairie du Chien. I feel close to that river.

"It is," as Mark Twain wrote, "The longest river in the world—four thousand three hundred miles. It is also the crookedest river in the world, since in one part of its journey it uses up thirteen hundred miles to cover the same ground that the crow would fly over in six hundred seventy five."

The magic world of Huck Finn was dominated by this "monstrous big river," and the impact of the Mississippi on our history, our culture, and our economy is remarkable.

What, then, could make more sense than to design a protected corridor to provide access to the Mississippi for living Americans and generations to come. This is, of course, what the Great River Road Project is all about—not just to provide another road to compete with other ribbons of concrete, but to preserve the special quality of the river valley with a park-like corridor to insulate the road from unsightly defacement and over-development and to enable millions of Americans to enjoy the scenic beauties and recreational opportunities the Mississippi provides.

Obviously, a project of this magnitude and long-range significance cannot be ac-

* become plainly visible, even if no cut-