Happy result. I have received several letters from residents of Wallowa County, expressing dismay that despite their attempts to meet with the Secretary of Interior, they were turned away. I insert excerpts from these letters in the Record.

I greatly appreciate Secretary Hickel's interest in the future of Hells Canyon. I hope, however, that he will not consider that his trip was completely successful. Looking at the area of controversy is only one aspect of the investigation; listening to those most familiar with the country is certainly also a necessary part of the job.

Yours very truly,

UNION, ORE., June 1, 1970.

Congressman J. H. UFanman.
House of Representatives.
Washington, D.C.

Dear. Mr. Hickel:

As you continue your tour of the country, I hope you will take time to stop in Washington, D.C. and meet with the Secretary of the Interior, as I have done. I think you will find it worth your while. I am convinced that the future of Hells Canyon will depend upon your visit. If you accept our invitation to meet with us, I will make arrangements for you to meet with the residents of this same county, who will be completely denying your visit.

The letter from the residents of Hells Canyon, which was previously sent to the administration, was received several weeks ago. Since then, the administration has been doing nothing to help the residents of Hells Canyon.

The letter from the residents of Hells Canyon is signed by several members of the local population. These members are concerned about the future of Hells Canyon and have been trying to get the attention of the administration.
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text, the British Government have taken the view that the use of other gases, including tear gas, was prohibited.

The French stand, made known on the same day, was even more categorical. In a speech to the Delegation consisted of: "All the texts that are written in force are identical. The mission of the French mission is to prohibit the use of tear gas in the category of chemical weapons. The United States mission, which went beyond the category of tear gas, was not mentioned."

The French, according to the delegation's opinion, apply to all gases employed with a view to toxic action on the human organism, whether the effects of such action are a more or less temporary irritation or whether they are permanent. It was, however, a more temporary irritation that the French mission wanted to cover. The French mission wanted to cover the very possession of weapons containing lachrymatory substances in small doses.

Further debate concerned neither with the interpretation of the Protocol, which was carried out by the French, nor with the adoption of a protocol to be added in a discussion on this point, but rather with the strengthening of its provisions by extending the ban to cover the very possession of chemical weapons.

The French delegate said that he was prepared to answer the question whether the use of tear gas was prohibited, or at least restricted within the framework of the then contemplated prohibition of preparations for chemical warfare. No one denied the right to use tear gas in time of peace for police operations.

The Special Committee of the Disarmament Conference in its Report of May 31, 1932, included in the definition of chemical weapons a category of "lachrymatory gases," which included tear gas. The United States mission did not object to the inclusion of tear gas in a list of "incendiary weapons." The United States mission accepted the U.S. viewpoint that the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons included tear gas. The United States mission accepted the U.S. viewpoint that the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons included tear gas. The United States mission accepted the U.S. viewpoint that the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons included tear gas.

The Special Committee of the Disarmament Conference in its Report of May 31, 1932, included in the definition of chemical weapons a category of "lachrymatory gases," which included tear gas. The United States mission did not object to the inclusion of tear gas in a list of "incendiary weapons." The United States mission accepted the U.S. viewpoint that the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons included tear gas.

The French delegate then drew attention to the difficulty of regulating the use of lachrymatory substances. Thus, for instance, a lachrymatory substance used even before World War I by the French army to arrest dangerous criminals, was used for chargingtargeting purposes. It was clear that there were difficulties in defining the use of lachrymatory substances.

The U.S. delegation did not object to the above suggestion. At the January 1933 meeting of the Special Committee, it questioned the requirement of submitting a list of lachrymatory substances and appliances, as it would be an extremely arduous task, but it was not opposed to the principle of restrictions.

C. K. CONVENTION

The United Kingdom Draft Convention, submitted to the Geneva Conference in the Disarmament Conference on March 10, 1933, contained the following provision: "The prohibition of the use of chemical weapons shall not apply to lachrymatory gases which shall be used in self-defense by law enforcement officials for police operations as well as in the use of the various appliances by which the said lachrymatory substances are utilized.

The proposal change again confirmed the readiness of the U.S. government to accept the use of tear gas even for internal police operations.

Plants and Animals

The above may apply to the use of chemicals hazardous to public health. In its Report of May 31, 1932, the Special Committee of the Disarmament Conference stated that the prohibition should extend not merely to substances harmful to human beings, but also to plants and animals. The Committee explained that the prohibition should extend to substances intended to be used by their authorities for police operations as well as in the use of the various appliances by which the said lachrymatory substances are utilized.
regard to bacteriological weapons. The Com­
mittee declared:—
That all methods for the projection, dis­
charge or secretion in any manner, in places inhabited or not, of pathogenic mi­
crobes in whatever phase they may be (viru­
ulent or capable of becoming so), or of fitter­
arresting viruses, or of other substances for the purpose of bringing them into contact with human beings, animals or plants, shall be prohibited. This applies to all methods of application, and in any indirect manner—for example, by polluting the atmosphere, water, foodstuffs or the soil. Protection should be induced in the later stages of the disease.

The resolution was adopted unanimously; the United States was a member. It would follow logically that bacteriological and poison gases would be included in future disarmament conferences.

Mr. Browne is a distinguished editor and writer of the Buffalo Evening News, has just returned from a tour of the Far East, in which he visited several key countries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Browne is a distinguished editor and writer of the Buffalo Evening News, has just returned from a tour of the Far East, in which he visited several key countries.

His trip to the Far East has given him an insight into the difficult problems of that area with which our country has become so intimately concerned.

No matter how many books you read, no matter how many periodicals you study, no matter how many television reports you watch, it is only on-the-spot study and reporting that you can obtain the full feel of the conditions and understand the complexities of the geography, the economies, the politics, and of the national spirit of a community, a state, or county.

VALUE OF PERSONAL VISIT

Mr. Browne has set a fine example for his profession by taking the time to make this presentation. In doing so he has demonstrated that the term "growth-regulating" can be applied only to plants.

The preceding analysis seems to provide sufficient evidence that the ban on the use of irritants such as tear gas and chemicals affecting the respiratory passages, as well as the application of irritants, paralyzing, tear-gas gas, and other harmful agents, which now exist or may be developed in the future.

NO BETTER WAY TO GET FACTS THAN BY PERSONAL VISIT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is no better way to have an understanding of political and economic conditions in a field than to go to the scene and see for yourself, talk with the people, talk with local experts, and obtain a true feeling of the atmosphere.

Millard C. Browne, editor of the editorial page of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, has just returned from the Far East, in which he visited several key countries.
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