

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Conservation: Hearings, Reports,
Correspondence (1971-1973)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996)

July 2016

Conservation: Hearings, Reports, Correspondence (1971-1973): Correspondence 08

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_18

Recommended Citation

"Conservation: Hearings, Reports, Correspondence (1971-1973): Correspondence 08" (2016).

Conservation: Hearings, Reports, Correspondence (1971-1973). Paper 37.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_18/37https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_18/37

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Conservation: Hearings, Reports, Correspondence (1971-1973) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

creating improved conditions for the wildlife resource.

The actual needs of farm wildlife are minimal. Due to the biological characteristics of several major species, these animals will not tolerate crowded conditions. Many acres of space are required but only small amount of wildlife food and cover are necessary. The real need is for small amounts of habitat development on thousands of farms. This could easily be accomplished by emphasizing long-term retirement of partial farms and minimal habitat development projects.

I thank you for the opportunity to explain our views. We request that you allow us to assist you when programs effecting wildlife are being developed.

AMENDMENT NO. 166

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

Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. HUMPHREY) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1888, supra.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 155

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 155, intended to be proposed by Mr. WEICKER and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) to S. 1888, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.

AMENDMENT NO. 178 TO S. 1888

At the request of Mr. MONDALE, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. CLARK), were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 178, to S. 1888, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold hearings on foreign economic assistance legislation on June 26 and 27 at 10 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. each day in room 4221 of the Dirksen Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify on the above should contact the chief clerk of the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NATIONAL MUSEUMS ACT

Mr. PELL, Mr. President, on the 18th and 19th of July, in room 4232 of the New Senate Office Building, the Subcommittee on the Smithsonian of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will conduct hearings on various pieces of

legislation touching upon the National Museums Act and a proposed museum services bill, with particular emphasis being given to the conservation of art and artifacts. Those individuals or organizations who wish to file statements for the hearing record should contact Mr. Livingston Biddle at 225-4642.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON EXECUTIVES C, D, F, H, AND I

Mr. PELL, Mr. President, I wish to announce that on June 13, 1973, the Subcommittee on Oceans and International Environment will conduct public hearings on the following arrangements: The Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes (Executive C-93-1); the Amendments to the International Convention on Load Lines (Executive D-93-1); the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (Executive F-93-1); the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (Executive H-93-1); and Six Amendments to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea 1960 (Executive I-93-1).

The hearings will be held in room 4221 in the Dirksen Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. At that time, the subcommittee expects to hear executive branch witnesses and other interested individuals.

Persons wishing to testify should immediately notify the subcommittee.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RETIREMENT OF COLONEL DALFERES

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, in 1965, several Members of the Senate joined me in a study mission to Southeast Asia for President Johnson. Our military escort included Col. George L. J. Dalferes of the Air Force. During that mission, Colonel Dalferes served with dedication, deftness and diplomacy. His alertness to the needs of the situations which confronted us abroad was outstanding and his reactions were sharp and usually tinged with a gentle sense of humor. I came to know him and regard him very highly in consequence of that experience.

Over the years since 1965, my admiration for Colonel Dalferes' competence and character have increased. For much of that time, he has been a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. May I say that he knows the Defense Department and he knows the Hill. He has served both with honesty, integrity and with a devotion to duty which is in the best tradition of the military service of the United States.

I want to take the occasion of his retirement to wish the best to Col. George Dalferes. He has served with distinction and deserves the gratitude of his Government.

WATERGATE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. President, more and more in the discussion of the Watergate affair and related matters, we find disturbing references to the term "national security" and some suggestion that no such thing ever existed. The downgrading of the term as well as the concept of national security, seems to hinge almost entirely upon President Nixon's statement that many of the actions in the Watergate affair were dictated by a concern for national security.

My fear, Mr. President, is that in the haste which some segments of the media are exhibiting in their efforts to belittle the President much more than the prestige and credibility of the Chief Executive might be lost.

While this is in no way meant to be a defense or a justification for unlawful acts committed in the Watergate affair and the Ellsberg security trial, it is a very determined attempt to safeguard the idea and the concept of confidentiality in the operation of the Government.

Mr. President, I am justifiably concerned over the unlawful events which occurred in the Watergate bugging and in the Ellsberg case. But I am also deeply concerned over a growing tendency on the part of leftwing writers and Nixon critics to claim that there is absolutely no need for classifying any Government documents or activities. This, of course, is not a new theme. It is a theme raised repeatedly in the past by radicals and others whose activities have been the subject of security investigations. It should not be necessary to repeat here and now what we all know and what we have all known for many years—that it is a fine dream to hold that in a democracy all people should have a right to know all that goes on in their Government at all times. But it is a dream and that is all it is. Experience has taught us that giving lip service to this kind of an idea is both impractical and dangerous. As President Nixon has rightly stated, we must have secret communication in the conduct of the U.S. Government if those in charge of that Government are to meet their responsibilities and protect the national interest of the United States.

Mr. President, the whole idea that national security might have been compromised and endangered by the theft and publication of classified materials in the Ellsberg case was largely discounted by the individuals and publications who benefited from it in terms of increased circulation and the receipt of Pulitzer Prizes. And now we are told by the Washington Post that the Soviet Embassy in Washington obtained what Federal authorities believed to have been a complete set of the top secret Pentagon Papers during June of 1971. The newspaper did not seem much concerned about the fact that the secret papers were delivered to a foreign embassy by a man who used an alias and has been sought unsuccessfully for almost 2 years. Rather, the Post was most impressed with the fact that the Soviet Embassy was pre-

sented with the top secret papers at a time when the Justice Department was in court fighting to cut off newspaper publication of articles based on those documents.

I have no intention of defending the misconduct of Government officials in the burglarizing of the office of a doctor who had treated Daniel Ellsberg. I believe the action was stupid, ill-advised and thoroughly reprehensible. But that does not obscure or diminish my concern as an American citizen and a U.S. Senator that the classified information which Mr. Ellsberg was supplying to American newspapers happened to be delivered to the Embassy of a foreign government about the same time.

It would seem to me that the two activities—the distribution of classified information to American newspapers and the delivery of the same material to the Soviet Embassy—must have had some kind of a concerted motivation. In other words, I believe we need to know a lot more about the Pentagon Papers case than we do at present. And if Government officials broke the law and engaged in questionable conduct in the name of national security, I say it in no way diminishes the need for continued vigilance. In other words, we might consider the circumstances—such as those in the Ellsberg case—which so alarmed officials in the executive branch that some of them erroneously felt they were drastic enough to warrant breaking the law.

Mr. President, I repeat, it is impossible to conduct the affairs of government in the window of Macy's Department Store. And it is a frightening thing to attend, as I did on one occasion, a meeting of top officials in the White House and read all about it in the morning paper the next day. I am not talking about just any meeting. I am talking about a meeting which I felt was confidential enough that I did not even discuss it with members of my staff. Yet, the next day I found a completely accurate account of that meeting printed in the newspaper. It was so accurate that even the words I spoke were correctly attributed.

Mr. President, you almost have to have it happen to you to understand the feeling such an experience gives you. I was sufficiently alarmed that I called the President and suggested that something would have to be done to seal off the leaks of information from the executive branch.

In this connection, Mr. President, and in the atmosphere which existed about the time the Pentagon Papers were being supplied to the New York Times, the Washington Post and Columnist Jack Anderson, the President may have been entirely justified in establishing an intelligence unit in his own office which he felt he could trust absolutely. Where the trouble came in, as I see it, was in the zeal and the lack of judgment and lack of respect for the law which members of the unit brought to the tasks assigned to them. There is no excuse for such actions, nor do I cite any.

Now, Mr. President, so long as we are discussing the national security and the

President's contention that there is a need for secrecy at some times, it might be well to go back and examine the position taken by the major publications in the Pentagon Papers case in previous instances.

For example, I am reminded of a time when the New York Times and the Washington Post were suddenly scooped by the Saturday Evening Post in December of 1962 on a story related to the Russian missile crisis. To remind my colleagues, let me explain that the story in the Saturday Evening Post was written by Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett and it discussed what went on in a National Security Council meeting during the period of the crisis. Now even though the magazine article contained no work from any NSC report or any other secret document—unlike the Pentagon Papers published by the Times and the Post—the Times waxed indignant. It ran an editorial entitled "Breach of Security" and declared that the "secrecy of one of the highest organs of the U.S. Government has been seriously breached."

The Times editorial went on to ask the following questions:

How can advisors to the President expect to give advice freely and easily and at all times honestly and with complete integrity if they have to worry about what their arguments will look like in print a few weeks later?

What kind of advice can the President expect to get under such circumstances? How can there be any real freedom of discussion or dissent, how can anyone be expected to advance positions that may be politically unpopular or unprofitable?

Then, of course, the Washington Post had entirely different ideas about secrecy when it involved Otto Otepka, a State Department security officer who furnished a Senate subcommittee with classified documents during a capitol investigation. The Post, when it was freely publishing the classified material supplied by Ellsberg, apparently did not remember that they labeled what Otepka did as "unlawful" and "unconscionable." The Post at that time—the year was 1963—had this to say about Otepka's action:

He gave classified information to someone not authorized to receive it . . . he had no authority to give it . . . if any underling in the State Department were free at his own discretion to disclose confidential cables or if any agent of the FBI could leak the content of secret files whenever he felt like it, the Executive Branch of the government would have no security at all.

One wonders why Ellsberg, who was not an employee of the Government and was not assisting a duly authorized Senate subcommittee, was so blameless while Otepka was so lawless in the opinion of the Post.

There seems little doubt that as far as the New York Times and the Washington Post are concerned there are different kinds of security leaks. Some security leaks appear to be good while other security leaks appear to be bad. Where the Times and the Post are concerned, it is a question of who is leaking what to whom.

A DELIGHTFUL AND REFRESHING MOTION PICTURE—"TOM SAWYER." A FINE FILM FOR THE WHOLE FAMILY.

Mr. SYMMINGTON. Mr. President, moviegoers, particularly those parents who have been frustrated by the scarcity of quality films suitable for a family visit to the local theater, now have an excellent reason to rejoice.

Thanks to the collaboration of Reader's Digest, United Artists Corp. and producer Arthur P. Jacobs, a new motion picture is now available for audiences from 8 to 80. It is a musical adaptation of "Tom Sawyer" based on the beloved Mark Twain classic of American boyhood.

As Members of the U.S. Senate from Missouri, Senator EAGLETON and I were cohorts Sunday at a Missouri-style picnic at L'Enfant Plaza followed by a special showing of the movie at L'Enfant theater. We were particularly gratified by this film.

Samuel Clemens, known throughout the world as Mark Twain, is one of Missouri's most distinguished native sons. Born at Florida Mo., in Monroe County, his family lived at Hannibal on the Mississippi River during most of his boyhood.

Twain's "Adventures of Tom Sawyer" was written just about a century ago. It re-created the author's fondest childhood memories of life in Hannibal at a time when America was still thrilled by river boats and had not yet been changed by the industrial revolution, urbanization or the realization that our natural resources are not inexhaustible.

We were especially pleased that producer Jacobs filmed "Tom Sawyer" in Missouri in and near the equally historic Missouri River village of Arrow Rock, a village that he believes most closely resembles the Hannibal of Mark Twain's youth. In this way today's moviegoers are being given an opportunity to see what many river towns of the United States looked like 135 years ago. At least they can participate in America's heritage vicariously.

The cast gave superb performances. Johnny Whitaker is near perfect as Tom Sawyer; the incomparable Celeste Holm, one of our all time favorite actresses, delivers a memorable performance as Aunt Polly; and we of Missouri are especially proud of Jeff East, a lively teenager from Kansas City who makes his acting debut in the role of Huckleberry Finn, and Warren Oates, one of Hollywood's finest actors, is most entertaining as Muff Potter.

An important element in evoking the spirit of Tom Sawyer and his time is the delightful music and lyrics by Richard M. Sherman and Robert B. Sherman, who also wrote the screenplay. They are the same brother team who wrote the music for "Mary Poppins." In creating musical nostalgia, the Shermans not only establish contact with the older generation of moviegoers, but also with the youth of today who are showing an increasing interest in the country music so