

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 25

SEPTEMBER 23, 1970, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1970

(PAGES 33259 TO 34492)

Dissent in an age of sophisticated technology clearly must be based on awareness of potential hazards and a degree of scientific and technical competence to evaluate these. This more or less burdens the scientist with a responsibility to speak out on issues which he feels may bring significant harm to society. I should narrow down the responsibility to independent scientists, thus eliminating those who are employed by industry and with few exceptions those who are dependent on federal funds. This pretty much localizes dissent to the campus.

The voice of the scientist is still strong and will be heard. I have in mind a number of recent instances in which a very few scientists provoked public discussion of a local issue and were productive in causing agencies like the Atomic Energy Commission to pay attention to them. For example, the Colorado Committee for Environmental Information was instrumental in opening up the plutonium contamination issue surrounding the Rocky Flats fire. Scientists were also effective in the case of the AEC's Project Rullison underground nuclear test last year.

Unfortunately the scientific and technical community has no collective conscience and it lacks organization for the easy expression of its dissent. Of course it has the discipline to correct error within itself when dealing with matters of science. Any researcher who publishes is quickly challenged if his results do not check out, but the area of science and public affairs the scientific community is not self-policing. The result is that when experts disagree in public confusion is propagated. The professional societies are most reluctant to engage in settlement of such disputes. The most august organization of science, the National Academy of Sciences, is most prestigious but operates on the slopes of Mt. Olympus. There is thus no High Court of Science to hand down decisions in matters of controversy involving the intersection of science and public affairs.

Environmental problems are particularly difficult to tackle because they involve so many disciplines and so many unknowns. A scientist who is an expert in a specialized field has to make an extraordinary effort to embrace many disciplines when he makes an ecological study. For example, the bomb-to-bone sequence of strontium-90 involves nuclear physics, particle chemistry, meteorology, classical physics, plant sciences, biochemistry, physiology, radiochemistry and other fields. Universities encompass many disciplines and have the potential for mounting the best attack on environmental problems. However, the various departments on campus are difficult to interlink in interdisciplinary activities. In general one requires some kind of institute to penetrate the ramparts of each department. It so happens that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration funded more than a score of Space Institutes on the major campuses. In view of the irrelevance of the U.S. space activity to the nation's pressing environmental problems, I would urge that half of these institutes be converted into Environmental Institutes.

As we attempt to insure the quality of our environment, we must recognize that extremism in cleaning up the atmosphere can produce an energy crisis. In the short term, if we impose restrictions on the sulfur content of fossil fuels on too stringent a basis, we can throttle the power output of many electric power plants, especially on the east coast. This summer the United States experienced power deficiencies which could be the forerunners of more widespread emergencies this winter. This could produce a pollution backlash, especially if the power outbacks keep plants idle and hard-hat workers are presented with value judgments in the form of paychecks vs possible air pollution.

In a sense, we should be thankful for the power emergencies of 1970 because they draw attention to the long term problem of providing the nation with abundant power. Against this backdrop, a favorable scenario has been set for the creation of a National Commission on Fuels and Energy. Senator Jennings Randolph introduced S. 4092 this summer to authorize such a commission to study overall problem of U.S. energy requirements for the next 20 to 30 years and to make recommendations for a national energy policy. Hearings on the measure were started this month and it appears very likely that the commission will be established. It will permit a thorough-going analysis of a multiplicity of problems which have heretofore never been attacked as a whole.

The nation needs to emulate the Dutch who take a half-century view of reclaiming land from the sea, except that our problem must be assuring an adequate supply of coal, oil, gas and electric power while also making sure that this is clean power. We can certainly find the fuel resources to drive the nation's economy in the year 2000 if we do not worry about pollution. But if so, we may end up coughing our way into the 21st century.

On the other hand, if we go overboard on pollution controls for fossil fuel burning, we may end up with a clean cold America.

I believe that we can protect the environment and provide the necessary power to run our factories, light our streets and warm our homes—if we plan for the year 2000 and examine all the alternatives and explore the research and development possibilities in tapping the vast reserves of energy which still rest untouched in U.S. soil.

#### MONDALE DEPLORES VIOLENCE AND COLLUSION SURROUNDING FARMWORKERS' ORGANIZATION EFFORTS

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, I must express my deep concern over the reports of violence and collusion against striking farmworkers in the Salinas Valley in California. The organizing effort of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee is one of the few hopeful movements which promises to end the exploitation of our most powerless citizens—the migrant and seasonal farmworker.

Powerful forces seem determined to perpetuate that powerlessness and to deny these workers the right to select the union of their own choice. I am disturbed by the following reports of violence, intimidation, and harassment from Salinas:

That the general counsel of UFWOC, Jerry Cohen, was beaten unconscious and sustained a concussion and other serious injuries when he was trying to protect the lives and safety of striking farmworkers;

That several striking workers have been shot at and some wounded by gun-wielding vigilantes;

That roving caravans of trucks and cars filled with persons acting without apparent legal authority, have threatened the life of some picketers, and beaten others, smashed windows of cars with baseball bats, and intentionally provoked violence;

That the UFWOC headquarters in Salinas has had to be evacuated because of bomb threats;

That local law enforcement officials have made mass arrests of picketers

under a legally questionable temporary restraining order against picketing, but did not arrest a self-proclaiming citizens justice committee which through mass picketing, in violation of a court order, closed down for a week the trucking plant of Interharvest, a grower that signed with UFWOC;

That many instances of violence reported to the police, including the beating, threatening, and shooting of union workers and organizers, have resulted in few arrests by local law enforcement officials.

Acts of violence, harassment, and intimidation have pervaded the otherwise peaceful and prosperous Salinas Valley in the past month. They are related to the July 27 announcement by UFWOC and the California table grape growers that the 5-year farmworker organization effort had culminated in collective bargaining agreements, and that the international boycott of table grapes was over. Following close on the heels of that settlement, the same vegetable growers in the Salinas Valley who for years had vigorously resisted farmworker organizing efforts, voluntarily approached another union, not UFWOC, and willingly signed contracts covering their farmworkers. Growers apparently feared a UFWOC organization drive in Salinas, and they signed contracts without consulting their workers.

A committee of Catholic bishops, together with both unions involved, was aware of the potential violence of a full-blown jurisdictional dispute and negotiated a settlement agreement.

Pursuant to that agreement, some new contracts were negotiated by UFWOC with amenable growers, but other growers have not yet recognized the expressed interest of their workers in UFWOC representation. In addition to the implication that present contracts may not be with unions that represent their employees, the growers' bitter resistance to signing contracts with UFWOC, while willingly signing with other unions, perpetuates agribusiness' ability to more easily obstruct legitimate farm union organizing. The result of the breakdown of the jurisdictional pact is violence, intimidation, and harassment.

I condemn this resort to violence. It would be unconscionable if farmworkers are denied their right to choose a union of their own because of resort to physical brutality, and varied forms of threats and reprisals. The intimidation, harassment, and interference with legitimate organizing efforts in the Salinas Valley cannot be justified nor tolerated, and is a total anathema to the heretofore expressed, and observed, commitment to the principles of nonviolence to which Cesar Chavez and UFWOC are dedicated. In fact, consistent with those principles, and because of the heightening violence together with legally questionable injunctions against legitimate union organizing activity, UFWOC has called off their strike in the Salinas Valley, and instead, called for a boycott of all non-UFWOC lettuce grown in California and Texas.

I understand that after many requests by union officials and others, an investigation into this violence and intimidation has been initiated by the State attorney general of California. I am hopeful that this investigation will result in the restoration of law and order in the valley and the recognition that agricultural workers have the right to organize and choose their own union without intimidation.

Additionally, as chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, I intend to watch the situation in Salinas closely, and I have directed the staff of the subcommittee to investigate the recurring charges and allegations of violence and intimidation.

I hope other Senators will also look into this matter.

I think we all have an obligation to assure, in every way possible, a peaceful and nonviolent resolution of the farmworkers' struggle for justice and dignity.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLEN, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN, Mr. President, I am delighted to have the opportunity of speaking in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1.

First, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Indiana for his hard work, and for his dedication to the cause of the resolution which he is espousing. I am glad, though, that he is willing at this time to allow some other Senators to be heard on this question. This matter has been under debate in the Senate for more than a week, and it has been the practice, up until the last legislative day, that the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would be the order of business. The distinguished Senator from Indiana would come in, deliver a speech of from 1 hour to an hour and a half, to 2 hours, and then the matter would be laid aside and the second shift of the Senate would start work. Very little opportunity was given to

those in opposition to this measure to speak. The junior Senator from Alabama on one occasion, did have the opportunity of speaking for an hour or so.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just briefly?

Mr. ALLEN, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I prefer to finish my remarks, because the distinguished Senator from Indiana has, from time to time, asked that those who oppose this resolution take the floor and speak out against it, and then when some of the Senators have done that, the distinguished Senator from Indiana would interrupt to ask questions or carry on colloquy.

So I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that the junior Senator from Alabama will be delighted to yield to him on the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. BAYH. I appreciate that. I am sure the Senator from Alabama does not want to leave the impression that the Senator from Indiana has done something contrary to normal Senate procedure in seeking the opportunity to develop colloquy with his colleagues.

Mr. ALLEN, No. The Senator is within his rights under the rules. If the Senator from Indiana had been here when I started my remarks, he would have heard me commend him for his hard work and for his dedication in this matter.

He has engaged in colloquies with the opponents of the measure, and has consumed considerable time that the opponents of the measure could have been using.

The Senator from Alabama, however, regrets that the distinguished Senator from Indiana has threatened to grind the Senate proceedings to a halt; and in furtherance of that plan, to object to the customary meeting of the Senate committees during sessions of the Senate, and that, now that the period set aside for the transaction of morning business has been closed, the committees, because of the objection of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, are unable to meet.

These committees have many important bills before them, on which they will not be able to hold their sessions, as is the custom in the Senate, the Senator from Alabama understands, because of the objection of the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

He threatens, too, in a letter which all of the Senators received, to do away with the two-shift system under which the Senate has been operating for the last 10 or 12 days, which has resulted, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina remarked just the other day, in passage of a greater number of important bills by the Senate than in any comparable period of which he had personal knowledge.

So the discussion that has been taking place with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 1 has not stopped consideration of important measures coming before the Senate. It has not prevented, up until today, the meeting of Senate committees. But now all of that is to be a thing of the past, because the proceedings in the Senate are to be ground to a halt by the

distinguished Senator from Indiana, exercising the power that he has under the Senate rules.

The Senator from Alabama certainly does not say that the distinguished Senator from Indiana is acting contrary to the rules, because he is not. I suggest, however, that the Senator, under the state of affairs existing in the Senate at this time, is the filibusterer, rather than those who are opposing the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Why do I say that? Mr. President, what is a filibusterer? A filibusterer is a person in a parliamentary body, in this case the Senate of the United States, who stops, impedes, or obstructs the flow of legislation and of legislative action through parliamentary devices, artifices, and use of the rules of that body.

So, whereas the limited discussion of those of us who want to be heard with respect to this amendment to the Constitution has, up to now, prevented a vote on the amendment—on one amendment—the action of the distinguished Senator from Indiana is preventing and will prevent action on dozens of important measures pending before the Senate.

So who is the filibusterer in this case? Not, I submit, those who oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1, because they have not been heard on the floor of this body since this bill was laid down as the pending business, I daresay, for as many as 20 hours.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) several days ago pointed out that during this Congress, the 91st Congress, the Senate on one occasion considered an amendment to a bill pending before the Senate for 49 days; and during that entire time no cloture motion was filed, no effort was made to choke off that debate, committees were not prevented from meeting, and this Senate debated that measure for 49 days. I believe this is the 12th or 13th day that this matter has been debated. And again I say that the debate that has taken place has been of such short duration that it has permitted the Senate to act on more than a dozen important bills in that time.

Mr. President, we have pending in the Senate some six or seven appropriation bills for the operation of various departments and agencies of this Government, which cover the period from July 1, 1970, to July 1, 1971. We are already into that period. We have been in that period since the first of July. Yet, these bills have not been passed. The distinguished Senator from Indiana says, "You're not going to get an opportunity to pass those bills. You have to act on Senate Joint Resolution 1, or I am not going to let you pass those bills."

So who is the filibusterer? Is it the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1, who are speaking against a measure that cannot even be put into effect until 1976? What is so important about it? Yet, weigh that against bills that would carry on the operation of this Government.

So what is the hurry about passing Senate Joint Resolution 1? Between now and 1976, even the distinguished Senator from Indiana might change his mind. The Members of the Senate and the