

land, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

370. Also, petition of Daniel Edlord Le Veque, Sheboygan, Wis., relative to proposed legislation concerning the practices of insurance companies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

371. Also, petition of Daniel Edlord Le

Veque, Sheboygan, Wis., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

372. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to opposing subsidies for falling newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

373. Also, petition of the president of the

New Jersey Jaycees, Jamesburg, N.J., relative to support of the bill, H.R. 10867, dealing with obscene and pornographic mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

374. Also petition of the Board of Supervisors, county of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to establishing uniform welfare provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE GREAT STONE FACES

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the January edition of the Elks magazine contains an article entitled "The Great Stone Faces" by Lucille J. Goodyear. This is an excellent history of Mount Rushmore and I recommend it to all my colleagues. At this point, I include the article, which is as follows:

THE GREAT STONE FACES

(By Lucille J. Goodyear)

With great dignity, the gigantic stone faces of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt lookout over the Black Hills of South Dakota. On the granite face of 6000-foot Mount Rushmore, carved in dimensions symbolic of greatness, four great Americans are memorialized who upheld the rights and dignities of the common man.

Portrayed through these likenesses are the beginnings and trials of our Nation during its first century and a quarter. Washington represents the fight for liberty and the birth of the Republic. Jefferson is the expression of this country's political philosophy. Lincoln embodies the preservation of the Union, and Theodore Roosevelt depicts the expansion and conservation of the Nation as it is today.

The idea for these awe-inspiring carvings came into being in 1923 when Doane Robinson, State historian for South Dakota, suggested a monument in the picturesque Black Hills. The monument he had in mind would honor notable heroes of the old West: Jim Bridger, John Colter, and Kit Carson.

Two years later he found a sculptor competent enough to carve a mountain. This was Gutzon Borglum, an artist then at work sculpturing a Confederate memorial on Stone Mountain in Georgia.

The idea of having Western heroes was quickly rejected by Borglum as being much too regional. He thought the project should have more national significance—suggesting Washington and Lincoln. A year passed before the final selection was made. Borglum won the first bout of the fight!

Whereas Robinson had suggested the unusual granite formations known as the Needles as the best place for the monument, Borglum continued to look for a more suitable setting. After much searching he selected the mountain named after Charles E. Rushmore, a New York lawyer. He selected this mountain because it was smooth-grained granite, it dominated the surrounding terrain, and it faced the sun most of the day.

According to Borglum's estimates, the total cost of the project would be about \$500,000, with a completion time of five years. Backers were not too interested in pledging the needed money as too many people thought the carving of a mountain was a

sacrilege—an out-and-out desecration of God-made beauty. Fund-raising efforts proved quite fruitless until May of 1927, when the White House announced that President Coolidge would vacation in the Black Hills.

It was arranged that the President would have the opportunity to hear first-hand discussions of the proposed carvings and make an appearance at Mount Rushmore. In his speech he showed his approval and interest by promising federal aid for the undertaking. Congress allocated \$250,000, which was matched in nickels and dimes of school children from all parts of America.

All phases of the job were under the watchful eye of the talented Borglum. He made a time-consuming study of presidential portraits and pictures, taking note of even the most minute details of the facial features. Models were made on the scale of an inch of model to a foot of mountain area.

The lighting studies he made gave him an idea of how the figures would look during every season of the year, every change of lighting and atmosphere. As the granite could not be "carved" in the true sense of the word, he had to plan meticulous drilling charts, which involved a great deal of study and thought.

Drilling for the first head, that of Washington, was begun on October 24, 1927. The blasting was done in such a way as to leave a great rough, egg-shaped mass. It was possible to dynamite within an inch or two of the intended surface, and occasionally this was done. But generally, blasting was not carried on closer than six inches to the surface. It was not practical to dynamite too near, because the charges had to be so small and the holes so close together that little, if any, labor was saved. Measuring, blasting, drilling, splitting, and smoothing was the ordinary work cycle. The term "carving" was only a figure of speech in this gigantic project. Borglum was said to use dynamite much like a surgeon would use precision instruments.

Despite financial difficulties during the depression, the Washington head was dedicated July 4, 1930. Two years later the work came to another halt because of dwindling funds. Senator Norbeck came to the rescue with a grant from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The \$50,000 grant was matched with funds from the Rushmore appropriation.

Again work was resumed. In spite of financial setbacks that time and time again threatened the work, Borglum continued with complete dedication, too involved in bringing his patriotic dream to a reality to give much thought to finance.

By 1939, all four heads were dedicated and only the finishing touches had to be added, but the great Borglum was not to see the actual completion. Death came to him early in 1941.

Having worked at his father's side for the final nine years, Lincoln Borglum was appointed superintendent to oversee the completion of his father's dream. The original plan had called for the statues to be "carved" down to the waist, but this idea had

to be abandoned because of diminishing funds.

Borglum's son spent the last of the funds on Roosevelt's face (which was never completed), finishing the lapels and collar of Washington's coat and putting some final touches on Lincoln's head. The vast enterprise came to an end in October of 1941, after 6½ years of actual work since the project's inception.

It should be noted that the fourteen years were not continuous work-days as work could not go on during the winter months, and there were times when men could not continue their work due to financial difficulties.

It might also be noted that Borglum's estimate was a very poor one—the project actually took fourteen years to complete, and cost \$989,992.32, including \$836,000 in Federal appropriations.

The carvings were an incredible task. And as studies have shown, the granite in this location erodes at the rate of less than one inch in 100 thousand years—thus assuring that if our civilization should perish, archaeologists of the future would be certain that these magnificent heads were representative of the "gods" of our time. Borglum purposely left a 3-inch layer of granite for weathering, enough so the faces will look their best in 300,000 years.

The stone faces are the largest ever carved, bigger than those of the Sphinx, the Statue of Liberty, or the Colossus of Rhodes. You could stand inside of Lincoln's eye, or take a stroll of 20 feet along Roosevelt's mustache. The figures have noses that are 20 feet long, mouths measuring 18 feet across, and eyes that measure 11 feet wide. The eyes have a penetrating quality due to the 22-inch projection for the pupil of each eye. This projection was just one of the many touches of Borglum's genius, for they truly give a life-like quality to the eyes.

Movement of the sun changes the shadows on the faces, giving them different expressions that make them look as if they have suddenly come alive.

Looking at the "giants of America," no one can deny that Mount Rushmore National Monument is truly one of the most inspiring feats of both sculpturing and engineering in history. It is also a "shrine for democracy"—dedicated to four of America's greatest leaders, and given to the world through the genius of a great and dedicated artist.

However, Gutzon Borglum felt differently about it. Although he carved the figures to the scale of men 465 feet tall, he did not intend that the memorial should be merely the expression of one man's talents or a monument known only for its gigantic proportions. To Borglum, and those who worked with him, "a monument's dimensions should be determined by the importance to civilization of the events commemorated."

Borglum was right. Looking at the near life-like features of these faces one feels a great surge of pride—pride in these great men and their deeds, and pride in a country that can boast of such fine leaders.

NIXON'S INFLATION FIGHT

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an excellent feature article entitled "Nixon's Inflation Fight" which appeared in today's issue of the New York Times. This article, written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., is a fair and detailed explanation of the alternatives available to a President who faces a severe test on his economic policies at a time when many are reacting politically to the need for fiscal heroism. Anyone can be in favor of fiscal restraint in the face of unpopular spending demands, but unfortunately everything which tends to pump up the economy, whether popular or unpopular, must be viewed in the light of its inflationary impact because the state of the economy must be one of the significant factors affecting the ultimate decision. Mr. Dale points out that the test of economic policy is a more demanding one for the President than the test of Vietnam. I would like to add that it is also a test for the Congress, and what Mr. Dale says about the dilemma facing the President must apply equally to us if we are not ultimately to pass the buck on all tough decisions to the White House.

The article follows:

NIXON'S INFLATION FIGHT; HE IS SEEN FACING A MORE SEVERE TEST ON ECONOMIC POLICIES THAN VIETNAM

(By Edwin L. Dale Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—For a long time now—12 months to be exact—there has been a lot of theoretical discussion about what President Nixon would do when his anti-inflation policy began to bite. There are still no sure answers, but the question is theoretical no longer.

NEWS ANALYSIS

The policy is biting, as economists were pretty sure it would eventually. This was shown in last week's statistics on everything from the gross national products to housing starts—statistics that were, so to speak, blissfully gloomy. The economy is undoubtedly slowing at last.

But the policy is biting in another way, much less statistical and certainly not blissful.

Boeing announced that 18,000 workers in the Seattle area would lose their jobs this year.

Dr. George Evans, vice president of the National School Boards Association, said that if the President vetoed the health and education appropriation bill, which would spend more money than the President believes right at a time of inflation, "some schools will have to close their doors early or drop programs—which could force dropout-prone, less motivated students on to the streets."

Chrysler's "indefinite" layoffs, as distinct from temporary ones, mounted toward the 7,000 mark, and there were indications that some of the dismissed men might have been among those hired under the ambitious program of American business to seek out the disadvantaged.

Dr. Campbell Moses, chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Nation's Health Crisis, said that the failure of the Administration to provide \$40 million for workers with heart

disease "means 50,000 people will die in the next 12 months who do not need to die."

A DEMANDING TEST

Presumably to make sure that the matter would not remain nonpartisan, Senator Fred R. Harris of Oklahoma, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said that the economy had enjoyed a record eight years of growth without recession under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations and was now heading down under the Republicans.

To many observers here, the test of economic policy—now that is arriving—is a more demanding one for the President than the test of Vietnam. For standing firm in the policy of economic restraint will not only cause what Mr. Nixon's chief economic adviser, Paul W. McCracken, calls "pinching and binding," but it will also probably be slow to show convincing results in checking the rise in prices that Americans have been facing.

To pick one of many similar forecasts out of a hat, a group of economists under Otto Eckstein, a member of the Johnson Administration's Council of Economic Advisers, has predicted that as the policy of restraint continues, unemployment this year will rise a full point—from about 3.5 to 4.5 per cent of the labor force—while the rise in prices will be only imperceptibly slower than the 5 per cent of 1969.

This would not be unusual in economic history. Prices always respond to a sluggish economy with a lag. But voters are not likely to be experts in economic history.

RESERVE BOARD'S ROLE

The test ahead for the Government is partly one for the Federal Reserve Board, soon to be headed by one of the handful of men Mr. Nixon trusts most, Arthur F. Burns, Federal Reserve monetary policy—which affects money, credit and interest rates—is at least as important as the President's budget, or fiscal, policy in slowing or expanding the economy.

From the available evidence, the President and Mr. Burns are determined to keep straight on the anti-inflation course. If he were afraid that the policy was being pushed too far, Mr. Nixon would not now be making his last-minute effort to shave the budget still further. He would be content to let the budget slip into deficit as a means of restimulating the economy.

It would be easy to fill the 50,000-seat D.C. Stadium here with middle-aged and older liberals who grew up in another time and think that the President's policy of stopping the economy dead in its tracks is all wrong.

They are not for inflation, but they believe there are better ways of dealing with it, mainly direct use of Presidential power and persuasion in individual price and wage situations. In the last analysis, they would accept some inflation rather than choke the budget and add to unemployment.

The new conservatives around the President think differently. They are skeptical of the efficacy of much Government spending. They also doubt that the increases in largely short-lived unemployment associated with a slowing economy will necessarily worsen the nation's social problem.

CRISIS OF THE CITIES

And perhaps above all they believe that in many subtle ways inflation is the enemy of a solution of social problems.

A good example is the financial crisis of the cities, which is caused in good part by the large wage increases for employees, from teachers to subway motormen—increases made unavoidable by an inflationary economy. The cities have to pay the wages, but their revenues, centered on the property tax, do not respond equally rapidly to inflation.

In any case, Mr. Nixon is heading toward his test. It appears that most money market and stock market men believe he will try to pump up the economy again—through spending more Government money on easing credit—as soon as the "pinching and binding" begin in earnest. This is perhaps a legacy of the view of Mr. Nixon as, above all, a politician.

But if he does pump up the economy again, the battle against inflation will be lost. Interest rates are where they are today in good part because men with money think that politicians will always make the inflationary decision.

What Presidents will do under strain is not predictable. But Mr. Nixon is aware that another man who had the reputation of being just a politician—Harold Wilson of Britain—stuck by "austerity" in economic policy for a full two years. The austerity included the most severe control of government expenditure in Britain's modern history.

Now all of a sudden Britain's economy is right again, and Mr. Wilson might even get reelected—something that would have seemed about as probable a year ago as the Mets winning the pennant.

MURRAY GETS ZENGER AWARD

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a distinguished journalist in my State, Mr. J. Edward Murray, has been named the recipient of the John Peter Zenger Award given annually by the University of Arizona's Department of Journalism.

In naming Ed Murray for this honor, the committee placed his name on the list which includes such notable names in the profession as Arthur Krock, Carl Mollenhoff, J. Russell Wiggins, John Knight, James Reston, and a beloved friend, Eugene Pulliam.

This award was conferred last Saturday in Phoenix and is given for service to freedom of the press and the people's right to know.

The awards committee has made another outstanding choice, and it is with great pleasure that I am able to concur in their choice of the managing editor of the Arizona Republic for this singular honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the former recipients of the Zenger award and an article descriptive of Mr. Murray and his work be printed in the Record.

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

MURRAY NAMED FOR ZENGER AWARD

J. Edward Murray, managing editor of the Arizona Republic, has been named the recipient of the 1969 John Peter Zenger Award of the University of Arizona's Department of Journalism.

Given annually for service to freedom of the press and the people's right to know, the award will be conferred at the annual convention of the Arizona Newspapers Association in Phoenix. The presentation will be made by Dr. Richard Harvill, president of the University, during the Zenger Award Luncheon, Saturday, Jan. 17.

Murray has been managing editor of The

Republic for nine years. Prior to that he was managing editor for 12 years for the Los Angeles Mirror.

Secretary of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Murray has been on the ASNE Board for several years. He is editor-chairman of its monthly magazine "The Bulletin." He also is a member of the Pulitzer Prize Jury.

In 1960-61 while national president of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, he appointed and then served on a study committee which produced "The Criteria of a Good Newspaper," a widely accepted set of professional standards for the judging of newspaper quality.

Chairman of the American Society of Newspaper Editors' freedom of information and press-bar committee in 1967, Murray opposed recommendations of the "Reardon Report," saying, "The classic function of the press is to find out everything about government. That's what the free flow of news means, what the reporter can find out, not what the public servant wants to give him."

Born on a homestead near Buffalo, S.D., Murray grew up on cattle and sheep ranches, working during school vacations for the Homestake Gold Mining Co., Lead, S.D. He was graduated as a Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Nebraska in 1938, majoring in philosophy and journalism.

Murray started as a reporter with United Press in 1938 in Chicago. In 1943 he went to Europe as a war correspondent, covering buzz bomb siege of London, Supreme Allied Headquarters as chief UP correspondent, and Mussolini's capture and death along with the war's end in Italy.

After the war he became UP manager for Italy, covered the Paris Peace conference, and toured Western European countries to report on post-war rehabilitation. In 1947 he toured the United States with then premier of Italy, Alcide de Gasperi.

Murray has toured Russia twice, in 1959 and again this year, along with four separate, news-gathering trips to European countries since 1962.

Murray and his wife Miriam live at 4501 E. Exeter Blvd., Phoenix. They have two grown children, Judith and James.

RECIPIENTS OF THE JOHN PETER ZENGER AWARD

Palmer Hoyt, 1954; Basil L. Walters, 1955; James S. Pope, 1956; J. Russell Wiggins, 1957; Rep. John E. Moss, 1958; Herbert Brucker, 1959; Virgil M. Newton, Jr., 1960; Clark R. Mollenhoff, 1961; John H. Colburn, 1962; James B. Reston, 1963; John N. Hieskell, 1964; Eugene C. Pulliam, 1965; Arthur Krock, 1966; John S. Knight, 1967; and Wes Gallagher, 1968.

A PRAYER FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, on December 28 the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., the distinguished dean of the Washington Cathedral, offered a prayer for the District of Columbia which, in my judgment, deserves wide attention. With his customary eloquence, Dean Sayre, in a very few words, invoked the traditions of the city of Washington and the fundamental principles which are the bedrock of our Republic.

His prayer should inspire and guide us as we enter a new legislative year. I ask

unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRAYER FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
(By the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr.)

Sanctify anew, Thou Ruler of Destiny, this bit of Federal soil which our forefathers set apart from any State to nourish the high mission of our common government. Bless, O Lord, the precious branches planted here: The deep-rooted responsibility of Law, the even measure of Justice, and leadership fitly chosen and held aloft before our people. Grant to all who serve in this District the same vision that drew Columbus to a new world, and a kindred steadiness of purpose to that of the first President whose name and flag we bear. So by Thy grace may we be worthy of that special place given to a capital city in Thy holy Name. Amen.

SPELLING OUT THE CASE FOR AMERICA

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, through various types of social disorders we are being violently informed on what is wrong with America.

This overdose of negativism can easily have the effect of clouding out any consideration of the positive. Some prominent and responsible public officials are endeavoring to correct this situation by calling attention to the fact that while we have some problems in America, everything is not all wrong—some things are right in America.

Just recently Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW wrote an article for the January 17, 1970, issue of Human Events. Because the article says some things that desperately need to be said, I am inserting it into the RECORD and recommending that my colleagues read this stimulating article:

SPELLING OUT THE CASE FOR AMERICA

(By Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW)

There are those within this country—a minority, but still too many—who would like to place the American system on trial.

They strive mightily each day to build their case—on campuses, in the streets, in the news media, or wherever a crowd of two or more may gather, especially if there is a television camera nearby to record their antics. They have a sure sense for theater but a poor sense for history.

But they have made a fatal mistake. They recount our sins without recalling our successes. They attempt to enumerate all that is wrong with America while avoiding any discussion of that which is right.

For that reason, I think their "politics of protest" has already failed. As a lawyer and a public official, I am grateful to Holmes Alexander for this opportunity to comment on the case. For I am confident that we, the people, stand in the docket; that history will be the judge, and that the verdict will be ours.

Should the charge be poverty amidst plenty, the fact is the percentage of poverty level incomes in America has been cut in half over the past two decades.

Should the charge be permitting inequities while professing equality, the fact is our courts have struck down discriminatory laws and our Congress legislated equal rights.

Should the charge be tolerating ignorance in an era of enlightenment, the fact is the percentage of high school enrollment has doubled and college enrollment tripled in 20 years.

Should the charge be imperialism and aggression, the fact is 400,000 American lives have been sacrificed in this century in response to pleas from nations who were resisting imperialist aggression.

The facts prove there is not a case against America but a strong case for America. But the fact we must defend our system at all is enough to cause deep reflection.

Our nation has always valued constructive criticism and loyal opposition as the spurs to progress. But in recent years we have been beset by a new type of critic with a new manner of criticism which is neither loyal nor constructive. We have protest without program, dissent without dialogue, radicals without reforms. Above all, we are hearing a spontaneous chorus of self-righteous outrage without the orchestration of reason.

It has been our nation's finest tradition to learn from error and so to erase social evils. Today, a social evil will be recorded as a sign of guilt—the stigma of a bad system, not the spur to a better one. This is masochism . . . a perverse and pointless pleasure in enjoying wrong without attempting correction.

Fortunately, the vast majority of this nation's citizens have no patience for idle introspection. We are a nation of movers. We believe that to stand still is to slip backward. Americans are a fair people, quick to respond when there is a reasoned appeal and social awareness. We have proved that through the civil rights acts.

But we are not prone to taking a bum rap, and that is what the masochist movement would have us do. In every unconscionable individual act, they would have the American people accept collective guilt. In every problem they would point to collective hypocrisy, collective intolerance, collective indifference.

Of course we have grave problems in this country. We have polluted waters and hungry people and slaughter on our highways. But even these problems are the adverse by-products of progress.

Our thriving industries caused pollution. Would we rather be without them?

Our tremendous prosperity illuminates in stark contrast the plight of the poor. Would we rather have the majority where it was four decades ago, on the marginal poverty level?

Our mass mobility creates our traffic turmoil. Would we rather keep everyone within the confines of his home, town or state?

Obviously, the answer is no—and just as obviously, we should approach these problems with the relative sophistication, reason and optimism which are rightfully ours. Our greatest danger lies in becoming so preoccupied with apologizing for our past that we end up apologizing for our present. The past is a lesson we have learned; the present is the lesson we shall teach.

The old story goes that if a glass holds water to its mid-point, a pessimist says it's half empty and an optimist describes it as half filled. Right now, we hear too many pessimistic voices not only telling us America's cup is half empty but calling it a leaking sieve.

This is not true. Nor will I say our cup runneth over . . . for there is much to do.

But our cup is sturdy, steady and pure, and it would be foolish if we poured the distillation of 200 years of American freedom down the drain.

ECONOMIC BLOCKADE OF
RHODESIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "A Dangerous Dependence," published in the Northern Virginia Daily, Strasburg, Va., of January 15, 1970. The editor of this newspaper is Mr. J. J. Crawford.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DANGEROUS DEPENDENCE

It was in November 1965 that Rhodesia, led by Prime Minister Ian Smith, declared its independence from Great Britain, thus severing the bonds between the white-ruled African nation and the Mother Country.

The British government quite naturally labeled the Rhodesian breakaway illegal, exerting every diplomatic and economic pressure at its command, including economic sanctions, in an effort to bring the Smith government to its senses.

It is not to the credit of this country that the United States joined with Britain in imposing sanctions and, in addition, strongly supported a later United Nations trade and travel blockade against Rhodesia. On balance, it appeared that the U.S. went out of its way to interfere with an internal matter which did not concern us, nor indeed the UN.

But, there is a further and still little known factor which casts even greater doubt on the wisdom of the U.S. stand. This factor has to do with the vital defense of our nation.

Before the boycott, the U.S. imported one-third of its chrome from Rhodesia, one-third from the Soviet Union, and the remainder was mined domestically. Today, our domestic chromite mining is inactive. Thus the U.S. is dependent on Soviet Russia for the major supply of this vital metal.

Chrome is essential in the manufacture of jet engines, gas turbines, guns and armor-piercing projectiles, aircraft, motor vehicles and many other types of defensive hardware.

In this connection, economist Anthony Sutton of Stanford University's Hoover Institution raises a significant question. Why, he wonders, does the Soviet Union—while supplying most of the arms and ammunition used against us in Vietnam—continue to furnish us with chrome?

The Stanford economist suggests that it may be a conscious exploitation of a "weak link" which makes us strategically dependent on the Soviets, while they have studiously avoided being put in the position of being dependent on us for strategic materials.

Whether, the gentleman is right or wrong as to the reason the Soviets continue to supply us, it seems to us our government is taking enormous risks in depending on the Soviets for material so vital to defense.

It makes little sense to defend ourselves at the costs of billions of dollars against Soviet missiles, without accompanying the program with an independent source of vital chrome that would not be closed to us immediately at the first sign of trouble.

Is it good judgment to carry on a point-less economic blockade against Rhodesia, whose independence is already well established, when an agreement with this friendly

African nation could supply the large part of U.S. requirements for chrome?

We have been opposed to U.S. sanctions against Rhodesia from the start, and revelations like the above simply substantiate the logic of our early position.

SOARING SIXTIES—THE KENNEDY
DECADE

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Ray McHugh, chief, Washington bureau, Copley News Service, recapped the last decade quite accurately in his article "Soaring Sixties—the Kennedy Decade" which appeared in the Elgin Daily Courier-News, Elgin, Ill., on December 29, 1969, just as the decade was drawing to a close. Probably his most factual statement, among many in the article, was his concluding paragraph, "If the sixties proved nothing else, they proved that nothing is certain in politics." I am sure that many besides the Kennedys would agree on this.

The article follows:

SOARING SIXTIES—THE KENNEDY DECADE

(By Ray McHugh)

WASHINGTON.—It is perhaps inevitable that the political historians will refer to the 1960s as the "Kennedy Decade."

If they do, it will be final thrust of fate that Lyndon B. Johnson must endure.

Seldom, if ever, has the United States seen such a time. A chart of the fortunes of both Republicans and Democrats would resemble a roller-coaster.

Curiously, the decade ends as it began with a moderate Republican president in the White House. But its history will be told largely in terms of Democrats John F. Kennedy and Johnson.

For Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower 1960 was a largely a year devoted to setting the nation's house in order for a new president.

President Richard Nixon has been in command during the final year of the decade, but he, too, has devoted most of his attention to tidying up. In his first year of office his task has been to bank the fires of inflation and unrest at home and the fires of war in Vietnam. In 11 months he has made promising beginnings, but it is the 1970s, not the sixties, that will tell Mr. Nixon's mark on history.

With an almost Shakespearean touch, the man who had great impact on the politics of the 1960s died on a cold rainy November Cape Cod day in 1969. Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy Sr. did not live to see the decade expire, but the high hopes and dreams he nourished 10 years earlier had already perished.

The elder Kennedy, son of an Irish immigrant, built a fortune estimated at \$400 million and perhaps because his wealth and ambition failed to bring him personal political glory, he dreamed an unprecedented dream of an American dynasty based on four sons—Joseph, John, Robert and Edward.

The tragedy that stalked that dream will always be told.

Joseph Jr., the son who was "supposed to be President" died in World War II.

The decade of the 60s opened with the stunning victory of the young, boyish Massachusetts Sen. John F. Kennedy over Vice President Richard Nixon in the 1960 election. It was an election in which Kennedy started as a rank underdog but finally triumphed in

a photo finish, thanks to his mastery of the television medium, particularly in debates with Mr. Nixon; his superior organization, that was forged by his father and his brother Robert, and to a charisma of youth.

After the relatively placid 1950s when the grandfatherly Gen. Eisenhower reflected a national mood the young Kennedy represented an exciting turn to what he called "The New Frontier."

Kennedy and his cinema-like wife Jacqueline brought an exhilarating atmosphere to the White House. Some writers spoke of a new "Camelot" populated by what Washington society columnist still like to call "The Beautiful People."

But if Kennedy brought youth to the executive mansion, he also brought inexperience. During his short, ill-starred presidency was sown the seeds of disintegration for a Democratic party machine that had dominated U.S. politics since 1932.

The Bay of Pigs fiasco in Cuba, the Vienna Conference with Nikita Khrushchev, the Berlin Wall, the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, the decision to enlarge the "advisory" force in Vietnam, the inability to get legislation from a congress dominated by his own party all pointed up serious weaknesses in the Kennedy administration. But all these were forgotten on Nov. 22, 1963, when a social misfit Lee Harvey Oswald fired three shots from a Dallas window that killed President Kennedy.

A stunned Lyndon Johnson took up the reins of power.

The Johnson years will always pose a political paradox. Here was a man recognized as the consummate politician. His rise to the Senate majority leadership had stamped him as one of the great congressional leaders of the century.

In the weeks following the assassination, Johnson showed his skills. A grieving congress swept aside the logjams that had blocked Kennedy programs and a torrent of civil rights and social welfare education poured forth. Johnson, a one-time Texas school teacher, added education programs that were unmatched in the nation's history.

"I want to be remembered as the man who did more than anyone else to further education in this country," he once confided to reporters.

In 1964 Mr. Johnson was unbeatable. The conservative wing of the Republican party which had gained a dominant position during Kennedy's troubles nominated its hero, Arizona Sen. Barry Goldwater. Against Kennedy he might have made an impressive showing. Against Johnson he was buried under an avalanche of votes and carried only six states.

In their hearts, as the GOP said, many Americans may have known that Sen. Goldwater's crusty conservative principles were right, but they voted for President Johnson, the memory of a slain John F. Kennedy, a promise that Vietnam would soon be ended, an assurance that despite a far-off war the nation could afford a "guns and butter" policy.

Election day 1964 was the Democrats' high-water mark of the sixties. Not only had they returned Johnson to the White House, they had achieved a 2 to 1 superiority in the Congress. Many Washington pundits were busy reciting the last rites over what they viewed as a Republican corpse.

But the seeds were beginning to take root. The "solid south" that had shown its disapproval of Johnson domestic policies as five states voted for Goldwater. The war in Vietnam increased in tempo. Slowly, President Johnson committed half a million troops to a conflict where he once promised no American boy would be involved. Inflation began to eat away at the monies a generous congress was pouring into domestic programs. Exorbitant promises followed too often by inept

administration spawned discontent, then open racial strife in cities across the country.

The liberal-labor-Negro-southern coalition that Franklin D. Roosevelt had knitted began to unravel.

Inside the White House, a beleaguered President Johnson found himself in a tug-of-war. A Kennedy faction, resentful of his presidency, plotted openly for Robert Kennedy who had stepped down as attorney general and won a New York senate seat. The Vietnam war and the violence in American cities became an albatross.

The 1966 elections saw a major Republican comeback in the House and Senate and as important, in governors' mansions and state legislatures across the country. (In 1969 a Republican claimed the governorship of Virginia. In 1966 it won Florida and lost Georgia's state house by a whisker.)

More and more, the President who was elected by a landslide, became a prisoner of his own politics, particularly the Vietnam war. He took over almost direct personal control of military and diplomatic operations. Peace, some associates said, became not a goal, but an obsession.

Johnson also found himself the target of an almost hysterical attack by some elements on his own party allied with certain commentators. David Broder of the Washington Post has labeled the strategy "The breaking of a president."

The more President Johnson talked in 1967, the less his party and the nation listened. On March 31, 1968, the tall Texan recognized the inevitable. He announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

That decision broke the last threads that were holding Democrats together. Alabama's segregationist George Wallace was already charting a nation-wide bid for the ultra-conservative vote and the traditional southern Democrat. Minnesota's liberal Sen. Eugene McCarthy had humbled the President in the New Hampshire primary. Sen. Robert Kennedy was out to reclaim his brother's place in the White House and even the little-known Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota was challenging Johnson's choice—vice president Hubert Humphrey.

A new Kennedy bid was again cut short by an assassin's bullets. This time the killer was a fanatic Jordanian immigrant named Sirhan Sirhan who objected to Sen. Kennedy's support of Israel—a support that was no stronger than that of any other candidate. Sirhan shot the senator on the night he won the California primary and appeared destined to overtake Humphrey in the race for the nomination.

At Miami Beach in August of 1968, Republicans sensed that the country was spent after eight years of passionate, bullet-punctuated politics. They rejected the liberal-leaning Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York and the conservative hero Gov. Ronald Reagan of California in favor of a comfortable, seasoned, moderate Richard M. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon who was John F. Kennedy's victim in 1960 seemed to have met his political Waterloo in 1962 when he failed in a bid for the governorship of California, but throughout the sixties he kept his GOP credentials in order. From his New York law office he added to his stature as a world affairs analyst and in tireless campaigning on behalf of 1964 and 1966 candidates, he gathered a broad cross-section of support and kept contact with the people.

For the Democrats, the 1968 convention in Chicago was a scene to be forgotten as soon as possible. Humphrey won the nomination, but the divisions in the party were overshadowed only by the violence in the streets triggered by radicals, anarchists, and anti-war demonstrators.

The convention atmosphere was so hostile that President Johnson did not make an appearance.

In view of the divisions, Humphrey made a remarkable race. The candidacy of Wallace denied Nixon a sizeable bloc of southern electoral votes and conservative ballots across the country. By concentrating on metropolitan areas and by utilizing organized labor's biggest effort, Humphrey came within half a million votes of victory. He wasn't beaten until California and Illinois fell into the Nixon column more than 12 hours after the polls closed.

The decade, however, carried still more upheavals.

Sen. Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, the youngest of Joe's sons, resisted the pleas of many Democrats to seek the 1968 presidential nomination after Robert was killed. Many of the party's top pros believed "Teddy" could have won at Chicago; even the senator has said he thought he could win the nomination but that he would have lost to Mr. Nixon because of his inexperience.

It was a foregone conclusion that Sen. Kennedy would be the nominee in 1972. The Nixon camp began to build its defense almost immediately. Then on a warm July evening this year fate intervened again.

A car Sen. Kennedy was driving plunged off a bridge into a Cape Code tidal pool. A young Washington secretary who was riding with the senator drowned. The senator did not report the accident for more than nine hours—until after the girl's body was found.

The senator escaped from the accident without serious injury, but its still unexplained circumstances have ruled him out of the 1972 presidential picture.

Perspective is still missing, but as the 1960s end it appears in Washington that the Republican party is emerging from its 40-year minority position to bid once again for the broad mainstream of American voters while Democrats struggle among themselves to find an identity that has slipped away.

To project these trends through the seventies, however, would be a risky undertaking.

If the sixties proved nothing else, they proved that nothing is certain in politics.

GRAZING FEES—PART VI

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on December 23, 27 days after I wrote to Secretary Hickel asking for the facts he had before him when he concluded that he should propose not to raise grazing fees, I received a curious bundle from Assistant Secretary of the Interior Harrison Loesch. He sent me a pile of documents 7 inches high, which could be related to the grazing fee issue, but it came with a letter full of disclaimers that the material had any bearing on the Secretary's decision.

In fact, he stated categorically that the Secretary did not have before him the one document developed in response to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Resolution of August 7, 1969—the Bureau of Land Management analysis on grazing fees.

I find it difficult to understand why Secretary Hickel, wanting to make a decision, and Assistant Secretary Loesch, aware that a decision was imminent, did

not ask the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and his staff to bring their report up to the Secretary's office so he could read it and perhaps ask a few questions about it. After all, the Secretary was proposing to issue a regulation not to raise grazing fees—a proposal which would invite the public to direct their views to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

Let me quote two very clear paragraphs from Assistant Secretary Loesch's letter to me of December 23:

In response to your specific inquiry, the Secretary did not have before him the Bureau of Land Management analysis which we forwarded to Chairman Jackson on December 19, because by November 25, BLM had not delivered it either to my office or to the Secretary. However, I had been briefed on its proposed contents and conclusions by that date.

No formal report approved by the Department was developed on this subject after January 14, 1969.

In contrast, the next two paragraphs are classic examples of words selected from the dictionary at random. They read:

As to the particular data upon which the conclusion was reached that the proposed rulemaking is appropriate, I respectfully suggest that one cannot invariably pinpoint that specific evidentiary showing which led one to a particular finding. As our earlier correspondence has stated, we have had numerous expressions of views from many and diverse groups.

I am certain that you understand that the Secretary received advice on this issue. It is also obvious that recommendations are largely based upon data that staff members have received, and that it is not feasible to list all documents, conferences, and correspondence which may have caused staff reactions.

I see no reason to clutter up the RECORD with such gems among the 23 enclosures as the "Taylor Grazing Act," hearings held by committees of Congress, comments from last year's grazing fee analysis, court cases which I have earlier inserted in the RECORD when they were timely, and so forth.

However, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of December 22 and Secretary Loesch's letter of December 23 be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with enclosure No. 14—BLM report to the Secretary dated November 10, 1969.

There being no objection, the above letters and enclosure were printed in the RECORD as follows:

DECEMBER 22, 1969.

HON. HARRISON LOESCH,
Assistant Secretary, Public Land Management,
Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY LOESCH: Chairman Jackson of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has shared with me your 19 December letter and a Bureau of Land Management review on grazing fees. You say it does not have the Department's brand on it but that this "review was only one of many factors considered in our overall evaluation."

On 26 November—27 days ago—I asked for each report and analysis the Secretary had before him when he decided to publish his proposal on grazing fees on 25 November. Was this one of the items he had studied?

In addition, and in particular I wanted, and I still want, each such report developed

since 14 January 1969 which has the Department's brand of approval. In addition will you signify which of these reports, if any, was developed subsequent to 7 August 1969 and which reports, if any, were the principal ones on which it was concluded the proposal not to raise fees might be justified.

In my considered opinion your Department has been less than responsive. Will you therefore arrange to have your response in my hands by 5:00 p.m. tomorrow, 23 December 1969.

Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1969.

HON. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Reference is made to your letter of December 22 concerning ours of December 19 to Chairman Jackson. Here is a list of material which was considered at staff levels on the issue of the grazing fee structure, and copies of each (except No. 18 which you already have) are herewith delivered:

1. Taylor Grazing Act.
2. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, on grazing fees on public lands, February 27 and 28, 1969.
3. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, March 4 and 5, 1969.
4. Bureau of Land Management review of the Public Land Law Review Commission's Study, the Forage Resource, July 15, 1969. Also, a copy of the Solicitor's July 16, 1969, letter transmitting this review to the Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall.
5. An analysis of comments protesting and supporting proposed grazing fees, January 8, 1969.
6. The final judgment issued in the United States District Court for the District of Utah in the case of J. R. Broadbent, et al., v. Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, March 15, 1969.
7. The final judgment issued in the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico in the case of Pankey Land and Cattle Company v. Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, May 9, 1969.
8. Consolidated brief for appellees, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in Pankey Land and Cattle Company v. Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior and Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture, October 1969.
9. Plaintiff's reply brief in Pankey Land and Cattle Company v. Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, and Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture.
10. Letter of December 26, 1968 to Director, Bureau of Land Management, from Harry F. Lee, President, Public Lands Council.
11. Resolution of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, signed by Honorable Henry M. Jackson, Chairman, on August 7, 1969. Also, Honorable Henry M. Jackson's letter of August 7, 1969, transmitting this resolution.
12. Congressional Record of September 17, 1969, containing your comments.
13. Public Land Study, the Forage Resource for the Public Land Law Review Commission, by the University of Idaho with Pacific Consultants, Inc., vols. 1-4 inc.
14. BLM report to the Secretary, dated November 10, 1969.
15. Review of Federal Land Administration for Livestock Grazing, of the Interdepartmental Grazing Fee Committee, January 1967.

16. Statistical Reporting Service, U.S.D.A.; Special Report on the Grazing Fee Survey, dated November 29, 1968.

17. Western Livestock Grazing Survey—1966 by the Statistical Reporting Service, U.S.D.A.

18. A review of the BLM Grazing Fee System, dated November 1969.

19. A review of the Forest Service Grazing Fee System, dated November 1969.

20. Letter of October 20, 1969 from Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall to the Secretary of the Interior.

21. Consolidated brief of Pankey Land and Cattle Company before the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals.

22. American National Cattlemen's Association objections to proposed increase in grazing fees.

23. ANCA's position on livestock grazing fees.

In response to your specific inquiry, the Secretary did not have before him the Bureau of Land Management, analysis which we forwarded to Chairman Jackson on December 19, because by November 25, BLM had not delivered it either to my office or to the Secretary. However, I had been briefed on its proposed contents and conclusions by that date.

No formal report approved by the Department was developed on this subject after January 14, 1969.

As to the particular data upon which the conclusions were reached that the proposed rulemaking is appropriate, I respectfully suggest that one cannot invariably pinpoint that specific evidentiary showing which led one to a particular finding. As our earlier correspondence has stated, we have had numerous expressions of views from many and diverse groups.

I am certain that you understand that the Secretary received advice on this issue. It is also obvious that recommendations are largely based upon data that staff members have received, and that it is not feasible to list all documents, conferences, and correspondence which may have caused staff reactions.

I regret that you feel that the Department has been less than responsive. The delay in answering your letter of November 26 is indefensible, and for this dereliction I apologize with all my heart.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON LOESCH,
Assistant Secretary.

MEMORANDUM

To: Secretary of the Interior; through: Assistant Secretary, Public Land Management.

From: Director, Bureau of Land Management.

Subject: Senate Committee Resolution on Grazing Fees.

In our October 20 memorandum to Assistant Secretary, Public Land Management, reference was made to a staff meeting scheduled with the Forest Service on this subject.

The meeting was held on October 23 and we were successful in accomplishing the coordination of the two agencies' respective evaluation studies. It was suggested that Interior and Agriculture prepare a joint report, concurred in by BOB. This approach is considered desirable since the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee resolution was addressed to the Executive Branch and the fee schedules have been a joint effort by the three Departments.

It is difficult to draw a long-term conclusion from our reviews. We have evaluated data resulting from only the first increment of the 10-year schedule. Definite trends have not been established and are not expected until perhaps 1973. In summary, the results

to date of our review of the grazing fee increase indicates there has been no noticeable impact upon the livestock industry stability, loaning arrangements, or collateral values.

For example, the Economic Research Service data relating to farm title transfers shows that forced sales as a percentage of all classes of title transfers did not change for 1969 in the Mountain and Pacific regions, as compared to previous years.

We have surveyed our field offices and find that there have been 762 grazing permits transferred so far in the first eight months of 1969, indicating that ranches with public land grazing privileges are continuing to be bought and sold in the market place. The 10-year tract record establishes 1969 as a typical year.

The 1966 Western Livestock Survey indicated that an average permit sales price of \$14.41 was being paid between ranchers for public land grazing privileges. A sample of the 762 permit transfers in 1969 suggests that the average sale price has not decreased since the new fee schedule was announced in January 1969. Our data indicates that this value may have increased responding to supply and demand and other market factors.

The changes in the private forage market, i.e., the index used to keep the 1966 base fee of \$1.23 current with market conditions, has increased at a rate consistent with the trend in these values for the past 10 years. Also, an examination of the current lease rates for comparable forage set by State and private land owners continues to substantially exceed public land fee rates. In addition, the livestock industry's net income picture has been good in 1969 with the market prices received by ranchers for their products well above 1968 prices.

The FHA of the U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that the number of requests for farm purchase loans continues to exceed the funds available for these loans. The amount loaned to date in 1969 in the 11 Western States exceeds the amount loaned in 1968, indicating the demand for loans continues to increase.

The Grazing Regulations, 43 CFR 41152-1 (k) (1) state, "Fees will be established by the Secretary in 10 equal annual increments to attain the fair market value of range forage at the 1978 fee year. Fair market value is that value established by the Western Livestock Grazing Survey of 1966. . . ." 43 CFR 41152-1 (1) (1) further states, "Fees for any fee year, will be published as a notice in the *Federal Register*. The regulations further provide that: "In addition, annual adjustments may be made for any of the 1969-78 fee years, and thereafter, to reflect current market values." This in essence is an adjustment of the base fee (\$1.23) using an index of range forage values to insure continued fair market value. This factor resulted in a \$0.02 addition to the 1968 base fee (\$0.33 plus \$0.09 annual increment, plus \$0.02 comparability). We presently have all the data required to establish the fee for the 1970 grazing year. The 1970 fees would be the existing \$0.44, plus \$0.09 annual increment, plus \$0.04 to maintain comparability or a total fee of \$0.57. As the regulations now stand, to implement the 1970 fee, a fee schedule outlining the second incremental step must be published by the Secretary prior to the 1970 grazing year.

We will meet again on November 13 with the Forest Service to compare individual drafts of the report requested by the Senate Committee. We anticipate that the final draft of this joint report will be available for your review by November 24.

We are prepared to brief you on this material at your convenience.

JOHN O. CROW,
Acting Director.

TAFT TO MAIL NEWSLETTER TO
FIRST DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS;
CHALLENGE OF THE SEVENTIES
MAJOR THEME

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days, I hope to begin mailing my latest newsletter to my constituents in Ohio's First Congressional District.

The newsletter touches on a number of subjects, but for the most part considers many of the challenges that this country and the world face as we push on into the decade of the seventies. I believe my colleagues in the Congress and our citizens across the country will face up to the many problems we face. I am hopeful that this second session of the 91st Congress will take the kind of positive action we need on areas such as anticrime legislation, air and water pollution control, transportation, and health, education, and welfare.

For the information of my colleagues, following is a copy of my February 1, 1970, report to the first district:

THE SEVENTIES

The sixties are history, and, as we look ahead into the decade of the seventies, we can give thought to some of the challenges that will face us at home and abroad.

No single problem calls out for more immediate attention than continuing the progress towards peace in Vietnam.

At home, we have finally begun to devote the kind of time and energy that will be needed to reverse the tragic pollution of our environment.

With a concerted effort by federal, state, and local governments we can attack the problems of air and water pollution, transportation, housing, employment, education, recreation, and a number of other environmental problems which call for early attention.

I believe America must have the will to face up to the challenges of the seventies with effective solutions, not mere restatements of the problems.

VIETNAM, RESPONSIBLE POLICY

The course of action and decisions that led us into the present predicament in Vietnam have brought about a broad examination and new challenging thinking on America's proper role in international affairs.

Our leaders, backed by our citizens, must chart a course of responsibility and participation in the quest for world peace, security of nations, self-determination for all peoples, and the world-wide improvement in meeting the aspirations for a better quality of life.

This quest must be carried out with proper recognition of domestic priorities, needs, and aspirations.

It demands an accurate assessment of national potential and a realization of the effective limits of national power.

Our policy in Vietnam today is, I believe, finally oriented to satisfy these principles.

The sacrifices made and the burden we have borne and still bear as individuals, as families, and as a nation, demand a responsible policy.

I believe President Nixon and his Administration are leading us on such a course through the graduated and certain elimina-

tion of our combat role at as an early a time as is possible under the circumstances.

This is being achieved through deeds, not promises, by effective Vietnamization of the military effort, by encouraging political and economic development, and by taking steps to reestablish U.S. credibility in world opinion.

The results of this policy are already evident.

American troop presence has been reduced by almost 70,000 men. The level will be lowered 50,000 more in the next three months.

At the same time, the continuation of the weapon and equipment improvement and modernization plans for South Vietnam forces continues to bring the most effective type of pressure on the North for an early, negotiated settlement.

This seems to me to be a careful and a workable plan.

I oppose the suggestions that we should rigidify the plan with specific schedules or time commitments. This could only hurt the chances for success.

We should preserve flexibility of response within the framework of the principles I have mentioned.

For instance, if the Vietnamese are unwilling or unable to carry out Vietnamization, we may have to consider new policies, such as helping South Vietnam to preserve secure and defensible areas with our continuing material support, but without reversing the policy of the withdrawal of U.S. combat forces.

Such a policy would avoid a return to the discarded and discredited earlier concept of prime U.S. responsibility to provide military defense forces for others, while supporting a developing people who seek life, freedom, and self-determination.

Meanwhile, as citizens, we can support this plan by exercising responsibility and restraint in our statements, while not shying from unbiased examination of facts and full discussion of America's responsibilities and alternatives.

AMERICA'S NEW DIRECTIONS

President Nixon, in October, pledged "to begin a decade of government reform such as this nation has not witnessed in half a century."

He has completed sweeping reforms in a number of areas in domestic and foreign policy that give promise for the seventies.

There is new hope in the world today, due, in large measure to—

The signing of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty;

The opening of the Strategic Arms Limitations Talk (SALT);

A new policy on the use and control of chemical and biological weapons, and

The search for a dramatic new partnership of nations, emphasizing cooperation and self-help.

As we move into the decade of the seventies, the Administration has adopted major new proposals for government organization. Included in these reforms are—

The establishment of four new Cabinet level domestic Councils;

A program for consolidation of federal grant programs;

Proposals for the most thorough reform in history of the nation's postal system;

A new Office of Child Development aimed at implementing the President's commitment to improve the first five years of life, and

A complete reorganization in such areas as the Manpower Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I am excited about many of these reforms and take pride in the fact that as an elected member of the Republican Leadership in the House, I have been a part of the formulation of some of the new policies.

CONGRESS, MUCH TO BE DONE

The record of the first session of the 91st Congress left as much undone as was completed, despite the fact that it was the sixth longest session in history.

While Washington was filled with charges and countercharges of Congressional "foot-dragging" and not unusual "playing of politics", Congress did pass some major bills.

Most recent on the list is the Tax Reform Bill which passed the Congress on December 22, and was signed by the President on December 30.

Many of us were disappointed that some reforms failed and that other provisions are counter-productive but the anti-inflationary aspects appeared to require its support.

By the time the bill becomes fully effective, it will provide—

Repeal of the investment credit;
Extension of the surtax at 5% through June, 1970;

A low income allowance of \$1,000;
Greatly reduced tax rates for single persons, and

A 15% boost in Social Security Benefits.

On November 19, Congress passed and sent to the President a draft reform bill which restored a draft lottery as in World War II.

The new system reduces the principal exposure of our young men to the draft of from seven years to one year. Under the plan, which went into effect on January 1, young men will now know at age nineteen the degree of likelihood that they will or will not be drafted.

For the first time in many years, more of our young men can plan ahead for future careers without the weight of possible induction hanging over their heads.

While I continue to support an eventual shift to an all volunteer army, the new system is much more equitable than what we have known these past several years.

As Vietnamization of the war continues, I am hopeful that draft calls can continue to be reduced, as was done in November and December of last year.

In other action, Congress approved a simple two year extension of the Antipoverty Program.

This in no way represents across-the-board approval of many past antipoverty programs, but it expressed confidence in Director Don Rumsfeld's abilities to rework many agency efforts.

Man landed on the moon in 1969, but even as Apollo 11 settled down onto the rocky surface, many at home wondered whether or not we were committing too much of our resources to the space program, while our cities and domestic programs suffered.

Congress, perhaps in response to the need for a massive rebuilding of America's cities, sliced appropriations for the National Aeronautic and Space Administration.

I have been as proud of our Apollo program as have all Americans.

At the same time, however, we must allocate our resources to devote our energies to many of the problems at home.

The Administration will continue to support an energetic although not overly ambitious space program. We will continue the exploration of space, but we will keep our eyes on our earth as well.

Congress, on December 12, approved the \$4.8 billion Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969.

Included in the bill is a provision to prevent interference in the use of technological innovations in experimental HUD programs, such as "Operational Breakthrough" which is geared to produce 26 million new housing units in the next eight years.

In environmental areas, Congress approved the National Environmental Policy Act which authorizes massive research programs into

the problems of air and water pollution, and preservation of our natural resources.

The House and Senate both passed the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, but minor differences in the two bills remain to be ironed out in Conference.

I joined with several colleagues in the House in an effort to boost the measure to \$1 billion. We were unsuccessful, and had to settle for a \$600 million clean water bill.

On September 18, the House passed a proposed constitutional amendment which would abolish the electoral college and provide for direct popular election of the President and Vice President.

The measure must receive a two-thirds majority in the Senate and then be passed by three-fourths of the states before taking effect. It will be some time before we can expect final action on the measure.

The second session of the 91st Congress should take action on needed crime control legislation to combat the terrors of organized crime, narcotics, and obscenity.

A great deal of long overdue consumer oriented legislation awaits action, including the Administration's plan for a high ranking Office of Consumer Affairs.

THE RISING COST OF LIVING

The next most serious challenge we face is that of inflation and fiscal irresponsibility.

There have been some forward steps and some setbacks on this front during the first session of the 91st Congress.

Some \$7.5 billion were cut from the budget after January, 1969, and a \$192.9 billion ceiling was put on Federal spending.

Increasing uncontrollable costs and other boosts over budget, however, added back about \$5 billion of the expenditures cut.

We must continue a policy of strict economy and sound assignment of priorities, if we are to check the continuing inflationary pressures.

OUR CROWDED AIRWAYS

For some time, I have been critical of the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Transportation Safety Board, and the Airlines for failing to meet head-on the problems of air safety.

I am happy to see the FAA held hearings on the subject in Cincinnati, this January.

Cincinnati can take pride in the fact that a new, national Citizens for Air Safety has been formed in our community. I share their concern for the need for immediate, coordinated action on the nation's air safety system.

We must rethink our entire approach to our air system and come up with new techniques and equipment with which to handle an ever increasing number of airplanes and passengers.

The House has passed a bill, recommended by the President, which would earmark \$10 billion for airport and airways development programs.

I was pleased to support the proposal and am hopeful that the Senate will take early, positive action and send the measure to the President for his approval.

The bill would provide for new user charges to be paid into a special trust fund, to support part of the cost of beefing up the nation's air system.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORTS

One year ago this January, I was elected by my Republican colleagues to serve as Chairman of the House Republican Conference Committee on Research, and that position was made one in leadership.

Since that time, the Research Committee has studied a number of interested areas, including the problems of—population; environmental quality; revenue sharing; federal grants, housing; organized

crime; draft reform; narcotics and drug abuse; and education.

It has been an interesting year of research.

Many of our recommendations have been embraced by the Republican members of the House and others. We look forward to continuing our study into problems and needs of the seventies.

WASHINGTON SIGHTS, SERVICE FOR ALL

Although I can't guarantee the same personal sightseeing service afforded my wife, Kay, recently, I can guarantee that my Cincinnati and Washington offices are ready to do all that we can to make your visit to Washington a most pleasant one.

Feel free to check with my District Office, 754 U.S. Post Office and Court House Building, Cincinnati, (684-3284) for any pamphlets or other information you might require.

Washington winters are generally quite pleasant, and, if you've got some vacation time coming, February and March are probably the least congested times to visit the Capital.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS

The series of Neighborhood Meetings, which we originated in 1967, were continued this Fall, with most gratifying results.

An average of about 300 area residents turned out for the Deer Park, Montgomery, Mt. Washington, and Glendale meetings.

As in the past, the sessions gave me a chance to meet first hand with First District constituents to discuss some of the problems and issues facing the Congress and to get their thinking on many of those subjects.

A number of my Congressional colleagues are now holding similar sessions in their Districts. All report a very favorable response by their constituents.

I believe it is essential to maintain close communications with a Congressional District. These neighborhood meetings have opened new channels of communication.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND CIRCULATION CELEBRATION

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, an interesting and enjoyable celebration occurred this month, signifying something of the growth we are continuing to experience in the Southwest. The Phoenix Gazette, the afternoon newspaper published in our State capital, has completed 12 months with a daily circulation of more than 100,000 readers.

Mr. President this indicates more than a progressive newspaper that is well merchandised and promoted; it indicates a quality of news product recognized by an increasing number of readers who want to be well informed.

I congratulate all who had a part in this accomplishment: Harry Montgomery, associate publisher; Mason Walsh, general manager; Don Martz, circulation director; and Lowell Parker, managing editor. These people, along with a hardworking and dedicated staff and ownership up and down the line, have helped to signal the arrival of another major paper in the Southwest. I extend to them my congratulations.

BUSING OF SCHOOLCHILDREN

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Ban Busing-for-Balance," published in the Memphis Press-Scimitar, be printed in the RECORD.

I wish to quote from one paragraph of the editorial:

The custom of young children attending schools in their own neighborhoods is based on the soundest kind of logic.

I may add that this custom is based, too, upon convenience, safety, time, and economy. It facilitates the involvement of parents and the community leaders in the neighborhood or community school. The parent-teacher associations, for instance, are important adjuncts to the public schools. The editorial adds:

Busing is a costly, arbitrary and artificial device. Instead of relieving social injustice, it creates more. It violates fundamental civil rights in the name of civil rights.

Mr. President, I have tried hard to promote equality and justice in our society.

This program of "costly, arbitrary, and artificial device," as it is described by the editorial, is a degree of intrusion into and control of the lives of the people, and is something that I have not supported and do not support.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAN BUSING-FOR-BALANCE

In its landmark decision of May 27, 1968, the Supreme Court said there should no longer be schools for whites and schools for Negroes—but "just schools," as one justice put it.

If that didn't mean all schools were simply to cease regarding the race of pupils, then there's no such thing as plain English.

But since then, those in charge of putting the Supreme Court ruling into action have been busy ordering "racial balance" in Southern schools, even if it takes busing of white pupils to formerly Negro schools, and Negro pupils to formerly white schools.

In short, what they are doing is actually the opposite of what the Supreme Court called for. They are "regarding" race more than ever—requiring the counting of Negro and white students in each school where "instant integration" has been ordered, and assigning percentages which can only be met in many cases by busing.

This ironic situation is pointed up in Mississippi where 30 school districts are in the throes of the process ordered by the Health, Education and Welfare Department.

The effect in some Mississippi towns has been to make objection to integration itself secondary, while parents bitterly resist the busing orders.

The Supreme Court has never ordered busing of students. That's a bureaucratic device. The Court last Oct. 29 said: "The obligation of every school district is to terminate dual school systems at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools."

Common sense would say that simply meant race would be no barrier to any child at any school.

Common sense is on the side of the Petal,

Miss., parents who voiced their objections last week to the busing of 250 white children to a previously all-Negro school.

One said: "I want my children to keep going to the school close to us. Let the black and white children go to the same school—that doesn't matter—but I don't want my children bused to a school 15 miles away."

HEW's racial numbers game, with the busing provision, will destroy the neighborhood school, where the vast majority of American children, not just those in the South, get their basic education.

The custom of young children attending schools in their own neighborhoods is based on the soundest kind of logic. Busing is a costly, arbitrary and artificial device. Instead of relieving social injustice, it creates more. It violates fundamental civil rights in the name of civil rights.

Authority above the bureaucratic level should step in and stop this racial numbers game.

Equal opportunity in education—the principle stressed by the Supreme Court in its original desegregation ruling of 1954—will be most surely guaranteed by the natural course of events as housing prejudices and restrictions are broken down and the improving economic status of Negroes changes neighborhood residential patterns.

Meanwhile, HEW and the Justice Department should discontinue enforcement of these far-out, artificial, bumbling guidelines which in their over-emphasis on color are a travesty on true civil rights.

NCAA PULLED POWER PLAY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I brought to the attention of the Members of this House the resurfacing of the longstanding feud between the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Amateur Athletic Union.

Mr. William Gildea has a very fine account of the episode in his column appearing on Sunday, January 18, in the Washington Post and I ask an inserting of his article "NCAA Pulled Power Play" in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1970]

NCAA PULLED POWER PLAY

(By William Gildea)

The grief that the National Collegiate Athletic Association caused seven college basketball players by denying them the right to play in last summer's Maccabiah Games for its own selfish reasons is best illustrated by the case of Jack Ajzner.

Ajzner, a University of Cincinnati student, was one of seven players from six schools originally named to represent the U.S. in basketball in the Maccabiah Games. He had a special reason for wanting to compete.

Ajzner came to the U.S. eight years previously from Israel and had looked forward to returning to his homeland to play before his parents and friends as a competitor in the Games.

"From the time I started high school," he said, "I told myself, 'If I ever make it in basketball, I want to represent the United States in the Maccabiah Games.' I thought about it a lot."

He never got the chance. When the time came, and he was named to the team, he was threatened with loss of his athletic scholarship if he made the trip.

"Without it," he said, "I would have no place to go. Nowhere to turn. I could end up without anything . . . I could ruin my life losing my scholarship."

Ajzner kept hoping. He joined what was left of the U.S. team for training in the Catskills. "I was with them until the end," he said. "The last day. The last minute. Up to the time they left for the airport I thought somebody would come up with a letter or something saying it was all right to go."

Ajzner lost. So did the other six. So did the U.S., in more ways than on the scoreboard, where it came up short in the championship game and lost the Maccabiah basketball title for the first time.

The others who didn't make the trip and their schools, which chose not to take on the powerful NCAA, were: Eric Minkin of Davidson, Ed Fogler of North Carolina, Steve Bilsky and Al Cotler of Penn., Steve Kaplan of Rutgers, and Andy Bill of UCLA.

In a letter to the NCAA's executive director, Walter Byers, Gaylord P. Harnwell, Penn president, cited the inconsistency in NCAA policy of sanctioning all sports in the Maccabiah Games except basketball, and urged that the appointed players be allowed to compete. "Not to do so would penalize them unjustly," he wrote.

The contents of Byers' reply to Harnwell were made known during the NCAA convention here last week. In the letter, Byers wrote that the NCAA "hoped to persuade" the Amateur Athletic Union to give up some of its control over U.S. teams in international competition.

The seven athletes were losers because of this long-standing feud between the NCAA and AAU. But another defied the ruling and his school backed him.

Enter Yale and its now famous substitute player, Jack Langer. After the seven players were named to the Games and the NCAA said they couldn't go, Yale's athletic director, DeLaney Kiphuth, went on record as saying the seven should be permitted to go and that if he had a player named he would encourage the player to go.

It hadn't dawned on Kiphuth then that he actually had a Jewish basketball player at Yale, the obscure sophomore Langer. In searching for replacements, the Maccabiah basketball committee came up with Langer's name.

Kiphuth never faltered when he heard the news that Langer had been named to the Maccabiah team. He stuck to his beliefs and encouraged Langer to go. And Yale continued to play Langer in its games this season.

Thus the NCAA was faced with the first known case of a school violating a rule and admitting it. Most violations deal with recruiting and few are discovered.

A statement, delivered by Kiphuth last week, gave Yale's position. "The right of Mr. Jack Langer to participate . . . in the games an event of special significance to a member of the Jewish faith and an event previously sanctioned . . . by the NCAA has become a matter of principle for Yale University."

It cited the "arbitrary exclusion" of the basketball players and concluded, "Yale has no intention of letting Mr. Langer be used as a pawn between two conflicting groups which are both seeking control over U.S. participation in international basketball competition."

The NCAA put all Yale teams on probation Thursday for two years, the severest punishment ever given an Ivy school by the NCAA.

Kiphuth called the NCAA's move "extreme." He described the members of the other Yale teams, which are now ineligible for all postseason tournaments and championships as "damned disappointed."

"I talked it over with various squad mem-

bers before and, of course, they said, 'I hope it doesn't come down to this.' But there is agreement that we will stand by Langer.

"All week (at the NCAA convention) there has been all this talk about how awful this is and how the rule has to be upheld. And the image of the NCAA. And what the public will think. Well, if they change the rule I think it might look good in the public eye.

"Nobody has talked at all about whether it was good for the boy to go to Israel."

This attitude of the NCAA toward the athlete is reminiscent of its power play in track and field in 1965. At that time, it ordered the National AAU championships off limits for college athletes, although this would also keep them out of a subsequent U.S.-Russia dual meet.

Gerry Lindgren and Tommy Farrell were the only well known athletes to defy the NCAA that time. A Senate hearing followed, during which Col. Earl (Red) Blaik declared:

"The NCAA is more interested in power over athletes than it is in education . . . It has able, energetic leaders who understand the power of television money and have become Napoleonic, unreasonable and uncompromising."

Rep. Robert Michel (R.-Ill.) said last week he would seek an investigation of the Yale case by the House Judiciary Committee. Michel has an interest. His son, Scott, is a sophomore on the Yale basketball team.

Perhaps there are others who are interested.

IN SUPPORT OF INGALLS FIELD

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to quote for the RECORD the full text of an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Covington Virginian which attests in eloquent detail to the importance of scheduled airline service at Ingalls Field:

IN SUPPORT OF INGALLS FIELD

The charges of inadequacy of our regional airport at Ingalls Field made by some Greenbrier County witnesses as reported in our columns yesterday, can be better understood when some of the facts are known.

We have an airport at Ingalls Field serving the Counties of Alleghany and Bath and the cities of Covington and Clifton Forge and adjacent territory. These communities own the airport. It has scheduled service by Piedmont Airlines.

Greenbrier County has an airport in the Greenbrier Valley near Lewisburg. It has no scheduled commercial airline service. They want one desperately, but so far have been unable to get one.

One of the issues at the hearing held by the Civil Aeronautics Board at The Greenbrier Tuesday was to determine whether or not Piedmont Airlines, now serving Ingalls Field, should be taken away from us and given to Greenbrier Valley Airport. The Greenbrier people were for this. Naturally our people were strongly opposed to it.

Most of the Greenbrier witnesses confined their testimony to the need of scheduled airline service to their area.

However, some testimony was offered charging that Ingalls Field was inadequate and unreliable. It is expected that this testimony will be refuted from official records

when the case for Ingalls Field will be presented at the continuation of the hearing in Washington on Monday.

Ingalls Field has been a successful operation. It has met every requirement of the Federal Aviation Authority and the Civil Aeronautics Board as to safety and service.

Few airports are perfect. The high ones—Ingalls Field—at times have high winds which make landing difficult. The low ones—Greenbrier County Airport—at times have morning fogs and planes cannot land until the sun has burned away the fog.

The truth is that The Greenbrier and Greenbrier County do need scheduled airline service. The truth is that both of these fields are valuable and usable fields.

Airline service has become an absolute necessity to the tourist and resort business which is the lifeblood of Bath County. The purchasing power of the people of Bath County in the four years of Piedmont service, has increased by nearly two million dollars a year to a little more than \$10,000,000. (It is estimated that more than \$4,000,000 of this is spent in Covington.)

Scheduled airline service would do the same thing for Greenbrier County and The Greenbrier. We want them to have it—only we don't want them to have ours.

CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Sniping at Burger," published in the Farmville, Va., Herald of January 14, 1970. The editor of this newspaper is Mr. J. B. Wall.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNIPING AT BURGER

The Associated Press transmitted a story from Washington recently which quoted two law professors in an analysis of Chief Justice Warren Burger's role on the Supreme Court since he succeeded Earl Warren.

The gist of the story was that Burger had turned out to be a conservative, the inference was that this is bad. The two professors—one at Yale and one in Chicago—had scarce praise for Burger's votes. One termed his record so far "unspectacular and mediocre." The A.P. story also reported that one professor found Burger's vote in a certain case very deplorable.

The effect of the news story, which apparently originated primarily in the minds of the reporter, and two college professors who are obviously most liberal in their views, was to smear the reputation of the Chief Justice as less liberal than he should be (liberalism and morality being equated as the same in the popular misconception).

It should be kept in mind that President Richard Nixon appointed Burger because he was a law and order Justice of long experience. Mr. Nixon was the choice of the people. Chief Justice Burger was the moderate or conservative the President felt the court needed to restore the proper balance to that body. The vast majority of the American people, according to the polls, are behind both Burger and Nixon. But it is certain that because he is not a flaming crusader, Burger will constantly be under attack from those on the left.

NORTHWEST/NORTHEAST MERGER
APPLAUDED BY MONTANA

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, Montanans have become increasingly concerned of late with their State's transportation network. Railroads have cut back on trains and eliminated services. Local service airlines, whose very purpose is to serve the smaller communities, no longer find it attractive to do so, and desire to become trunk carriers, thus leaving serious voids in Montana's intrastate air service. Amid this chaos, air transportation in Montana got a major boost in November when Northwest Orient's president, Donald W. Nyrop, announced the proposed merger of Northwest Orient and Northeast Airlines. Northwest has been the star performer in Montana as far as air service is concerned. Northwest has always provided an excellent service. As soon as each Montana airport has become equipped to handle modern jet transports, Northwest has placed into service at these airports the most modern and luxurious of jets providing both first-class and economy service. Where we have airports still incapable of handling jets, Northwest has continued to provide excellent service with its Electra fleet. It has delayed the Electra retirement date until the Federal Aviation Administration, the State and city governments can galvanize together an airport modernization program to bring the airports into the jet age. At the same time, Northwest has reached into its own pocket and advanced its own money on a loan basis to help with Montana airport modernization projects.

We in Montana salute Northwest. We see in the recently announced merger with Northeast many benefits to our State, and to the country as a whole. As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and chairman of the Postal Rates and Parcel Post Subcommittee, I am deeply conscious of the postal advantages of combining the two airlines route systems, as well as the obvious advantages to the traveling and shipping public.

Northwest Orient's route system includes service to 47 cities in the United States and the Orient including six in Montana. These cities are, going from east to west, Billings, Bozeman, Butte, Helena, Great Falls, and Missoula. Northwest Orient, as well, operates coast to coast in Florida, Alaska, and Hawaii. Northeast Airlines' route system serves more than 30 cities in the United States, Canada, Bermuda, and the Bahamas. Its prime strength is on routes from Boston, New York, and New England to Florida and the Bahamas. Northeast was recently granted a major nonstop route award from Miami to Los Angeles.

Northwest Orient's president, Nyrop, listed some specific benefits as a result of the merger:

1. An integration of the two route systems which would effect economics in operation that can eliminate the financial losses being incurred by Northeast Airlines.

Common stations for the carriers include: New York's Kennedy and LaGuardia Airports; Newark; Washington's National and Dulles Airports; Tampa; Miami; Fort Lauderdale; Philadelphia; Cleveland; Detroit; Chicago, and Los Angeles.

2. The ability of each carrier to feed important traffic to the other by combination of existing routes.

Major markets that can now be linked include: Boston and New England to Chicago, Milwaukee, Twin Cities, Montana, The Pacific Northwest, and the Orient; Midwest cities to Bermuda via Boston and the entire Northern tier of states to the Bahamas via New York; and through on connecting service between Florida-California and the Orient.

3. The ability to switch aircraft to meet seasonal traffic flows will result from the merger of the two airlines' jet fleets.

Northwest Orient today operates an all Boeing fleet of 106 fan jet aircraft while Northeast Airlines' fleet consists of 35 jets—eight Boeing 727-100's, thirteen Boeing 727-200's, and fourteen McDonnell-Douglas DC-9's.

Northeast Airlines heavy Florida and Bahama schedules in fall-winter will be a natural complement to Northwest Orient's operations which peak in the spring-summer months.

4. The ability to consolidate sales and advertising efforts with each carrier benefitting from the other's market identification.

My congratulations to Northwest Orient and its dynamic and able president, Donald W. Nyrop, on this merger move. I heartily endorse this planned merger of Northwest and Northeast. It is in the maximum public interest, and I hope the merger can be accomplished swiftly.

THE REVEREND MAURICE D.
ASHBURY

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the rector of All Saints Parish in Frederick, Md., must not only fill the difficult roles of pastor and priest; he must also discharge the responsibility of public service and community leadership which has been a part of the job since Maryland was a colony.

Over the last two centuries many distinguished and famous men have served as rector in Frederick. They have included the Reverend Thomas Bacon, who was appointed by Lord Baltimore and who undertook the first compilation of the laws of Maryland; the Reverend William N. Pendleton, who became a general of artillery in the Confederate Army; the Reverend Osborne Ingle, who earned the love of the entire community; and even the infamous Rev. Bennett Allen, whose dueling, gambling, wenching, and drinking helped to bring about the disestablishment of the Anglican Church and the American Revolution. From the best to the worst, they have all been uncommon men.

For the last 20 years, this historic parish has been fortunate in the leadership exerted by the Reverend Maurice D. Ashbury. Mr. Ashbury has now retired, and the best wishes not only of his own parish but of the entire community have gone with him. I wish to join his many friends in wishing him a happy and constructive period of retirement, and in extending congratulations and best wishes to his successor, the Reverend A. Dickerson Salmon.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published recently in the Frederick, Md., News which details some of the Reverend Mr. Ashbury's accomplishments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVEREND ASHBURY PREDICTS INDIVIDUAL SALVATION

(By Ann Kessinger)

The Reverend Maurice D. Ashbury, rector of All Saints Episcopal Church, stepped down from the pulpit and into retirement a few Sundays ago, marking the end of a career which has spanned four decades, two of which were spent in Frederick.

During his years as rector of the All Saints Church, one of the oldest churches in the city, Rev. Ashbury has seen it almost double its membership and greatly expand its facilities.

In addition, he has felt "an increased spiritual strength in his parishioners, so his successor, the Reverend A. Dickerson Salmon, formerly of Grace Episcopal Church in Brunswick, has inherited a solid religious body capable of making a great contribution to the Frederick community.

Rev. Ashbury predicts for the coming decade in Frederick a return to the gospel of individual salvation, which he said has been largely ignored in favor of social activism through the left wing of the church.

In Frederick this new concern will be seen in the increased evangelism in the churches, he said, adding that the degree of social concern in the local church will not diminish but will be tempered by a renewal of religious faith.

Rev. Ashbury has led an active life in Frederick, contributing his time and experience as minister and counselor to many local organizations.

In 1960 he helped found Counseling Services, Inc., and as president of this organization he offered professional guidance to Frederick County residents who could not otherwise obtain such help.

As president of the Frederick County Tuberculosis and Public Health Association, and later as president of the Maryland Tuberculosis Organization, Rev. Ashbury illustrated his active concern with the health problems of this community.

As a reward for his work in the field of health, Rev. Ashbury was named in 1968 a member of the Royal Society of Health of London, with 5,000 members in the United States.

Rev. Ashbury was president of the City Ministerium before it became a county-wide organization, and he helped coordinate the activities of the city ministers in their efforts to solve the spiritual needs of Frederick.

In addition to his involvement in this community, Ashbury has been an author and teacher. He has written two books, "A History of the Episcopal Church for Laymen" and "Church Teaching in the Book of Common Prayer," and for three years he was a professor at the Bishop Payne Divinity School in Petersburg, Va., which is now part of the Virginia Theological Seminary.

Rev. Ashbury graduated from high school in 1919 at Portsmouth, Va., and earned his B.A. at the University of Virginia in 1927. He later attended the Theological Seminary in Alexandria, Va., where he received his B.D. Cum Laude at graduation.

Since his first ministry in 1929 in Petersburg, Va., where he was deacon of the Good Shepherd Church, Rev. Ashbury has served in five parishes in Maryland and Virginia: From 1930-34 he was rector of the Emmanuel Church at Cape Charles, Va.; 1934-42, rector of Bath Parish in Dinwiddie County and St. John Church in Petersburg, Va.; 1942-45, rector of Emmanuel Church in Bristol, Va., and St. Thomas's Church in Abington, Va.; 1945-52 rector of St. Mary's Church in Baltimore; 1952 until the present, rector of All Saint's Parish in Frederick.

Although Rev. Ashbury has given up active service, he will still assist in other parishes as a substitute and assistant pastor when he is needed.

Rev. Ashbury will continue to live in Frederick, at 1604 North Market Street where he has lived since he moved from the parsonage a year ago while the building was being renovated.

He is married to the former Frances Walker and has four children, Maurice D. Ashbury, ACPA and sometime lecturer at Mt. St. Mary's College in Emmitsburg, John W. Ashbury, a former editor of the News-Post, Mrs. Francis G. Leberz of RFD 5, Frederick and Mrs. Robert E. Trout of Frederick.

THE FEDERAL ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, on January 5, 1920, to be exact, an organization was founded that has had a good and a profound influence on the Government of the United States. That organization is the Federal Bar Association.

The Federal Bar Association is a group of lawyers who are, or at sometime in their careers have been, employed in the service of the United States, in the legislative, executive, or judicial branch. A number of Members of each House of the Congress, along with many legislative staff employees, belong to the Federal Bar Association, and indeed I have the honor to be among them.

Currently the association has more than 14,000 members and has chapters in every State of the Union, in the District of Columbia, the Territories, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as well as in a number of foreign countries where our Government has a sizable staff of employees.

The purpose of this excellent organization is stated in its constitution and by-laws:

The objects of the Federal Bar Association shall be to advance the science of jurisprudence; to promote the administration of justice; to uphold a high standard for the Federal judiciary, attorneys representing the Government of the United States, and attorneys appearing before courts, departments, and agencies of the United States; to encourage cordial and friendly relations among the members of the legal profession; and to promote the welfare of attorneys employed by the Government of the United States.

It would be difficult to overestimate the good which the Federal Bar Association has done, for as the activities of the Federal Government have broadened over the last half century, the association has offered through its ideals and its objectives a beacon to guide the Government lawyer, who plays such an important part in these activities under our system of law.

Had it been otherwise, had such an organization grown up having something quite different from the advancement of the science of jurisprudence and the promotion of the administration of justice as its aims, who can doubt that the history of this country in our time would have been strikingly different?

Thus it seems most appropriate that we congratulate the Federal Bar Association, its officers, and members on this occasion, and wish that association continued success in the years to come.

GIVE ISRAEL AN EVEN BREAK

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, last evening I had the honor of going to Pittsburgh to address the 27th annual dinner of the Jewish National Fund Council of Pittsburgh and the Tri-State Area.

This dinner was attended by several hundred persons from Pittsburgh and its surrounding communities who work throughout the year so that the Jewish National Fund can perform its vital work in Israel of land reclamation and reforestation.

During the evening, many of the guests at the dinner expressed their strong approval of Eric Hoffer's column published yesterday morning in the Pittsburgh Press. In his column, Mr. Hoffer, the San Francisco social philosopher, made an eloquent case for continued U.S. support for Israel's diplomatic position in the Middle East, a position with which I strongly concur.

Mr. Hoffer stated:

It is not in our interest to weaken Israel, our only trusted and battle-tested friend in the Mediterranean, or for that matter anywhere else.

I agree with my friends in Pittsburgh that this is sound thinking.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE ISRAEL EVEN BREAK, UNITED STATES TOLD

(By Eric Hoffer)

There is no reason to assume that the people who shape America's foreign policy are naive enough to assume that by helping Nasser and other Arab loudmouths to get what they want most, namely the defeat of Israel, we would win over the "Arab world" to our side.

One need not be a prophet to predict that, no matter how pro-Arab our policy might be, an Arab victory would be accompanied by a hysterical defiance of America and the West.

A triumphant Nasser would grab every oil field in the Middle East and would have the oil companies lick his boots.

The simple truth is that it is in America's interest to keep things as they are.

SHORT ROUTE TO HANOI

It is not in our interest to open the Suez Canal to Russian ships hauling cargo to North Vietnam. It is not in our interest to weaken Israel, our only trusted and battle-tested friend in the Mediterranean, or for that matter anywhere else.

A strong Israel will never involve us in a war. Israel does not ask for an American commitment, for the simple reason that such a commitment would not be worth the paper it is written on.

No country on this planet is going to fight for Israel. The Jews have been, are, and will remain alone in the world.

No country lifted a finger to save six million Jewish men, women and children from Hitler's gas chambers.

TOO, ALONE IN '67

No country showed the least inclination to come to Israel's aid in the spring of 1967 when Nasser blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba, mobilized umpteen divisions and hundreds of tanks in the north of the Sinai Peninsula, and Jordanian and Syrian divisions in the east of Israel, and openly proclaimed his aim to wipe Israel off the map.

Nor is there any reason to believe that the Sixth Fleet would lift a finger should Russian ships start to lob bombs into Israel.

America is not in the mood to get involved in a new war.

Israel does not decide itself. It knows that it must fight alone. It will not stake its existence on the words of well-meaning American windbags and the words of the other two "great powers," Britain and France.

All Israel expects is that America and the West should not be "neutral against" it.

To the Israelis the status quo is an acceptable solution to their problem. It keeps the borders distant from the centers of population and it gives Israel elbow room.

WON'T QUIT NOW

Decades of skirmishing with Arab saboteurs do not seem unendurable to a people that had to live for centuries surrounded by hate-crazed Poles, Ukrainians, Russians, and Romanians, and had to endure murderous programs without the ability to fight back.

The "Arab world" is a myth.

The Arabs cannot strive and build, cannot fight, and cannot bide their time. All they can do is threaten, brag, lie, and cry. A battalion of Israelis could capture and hold the Arabian oil fields.

Let us hope that the present pro-Arab noises in Washington are only moves in a diplomatic game. It fares ill with a country when its government is unable to recognize its enemies, or even prefers them to friends.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION III OR LEGAL HURDLES FOR PRETRIAL ADVOCATES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues three items on the subject of preventive detention. This is a matter with which we all will have to deal seriously in coming months, and I would hope that the

following insertions would contribute to a high level of debate on bail reform legislation.

A recent Newsweek article cites a landmark case involving a defendant who was released after being arrested for allegedly committing a second felony within 4 months. The article goes on to indicate the opposition to administration pretrial detention proposals which arose at a University of Chicago meeting of 50 legal experts. The article further suggests alternatives to "preventive" detention such as speedy trials and "probationlike surveillance," while also pointing out the need to protect society.

I also commend a November 10, 1969, Washington Post editorial which advocates court authority in fixing terms of release for an accused. While urging that society be protected—even by using limited forms of pretrial custody—the editorial also recalls the constitutional right to bail in noncapital cases. Though I do not fully agree with this editorial, it merits attention as a fair treatment of the issue.

Finally, I call attention to a November 30, 1969, Washington Post article which presents a useful summary of the implications that 1951 Supreme Court decisions in *Stack* against Boyle and Carlson against Landon may have for the controversy over pretrial detention. The article outlines the position of the Justice Department that Carlson against Landon provides a precedent for pretrial detention, arguing that the decision makes void objections to preventive detention on the grounds of the eighth amendment. Also illustrated is the stand of opponents of pretrial detention, who cite *Stack* against Boyle as proof that bail is a constitutional right in all noncapital cases. In this same vein, the article explains the potential problems of double trials and probable guilt that pretrial detention might raise.

The texts of the three respective items follow:

A PRESUMPTION OF GUILT?

In June of 1967, a young black dropout named Tyrone Parker made his first contribution to what one judicial expert calls "the most towering legal issue of the coming decade." Parker accomplished this unspectacularly enough; he was arrested and charged with assault with a deadly weapon in Washington, D.C. In years past, the Federal judge who heard the charge would almost surely have noted that this was Parker's second felony arrest in four months, and set a bail sum far too high for him to put up, thus safely separating him from society until his trial. But in 1966 a controversial measure called the Bail Reform Act decreed that Federal judges must let suspects accused of noncapital crimes go free without bail or post a reasonable bail bond if there is no evidence that they might flee. No longer could a man be denied pretrial liberty because of poverty—or because of a judicial suspicion that he might go out and repeat his offense.

The Bail Reform Act seemed like a welcome reaffirmation of the presumption-of-innocence principle, and most civil libertarians still see it that way. Unfortunately, Tyrone Parker also saw it as a good thing. Within the next two years, he was arrested no fewer than eight more times on charges ranging from bank robbery to assault. He was released after each arrest—and not convicted on any of the charges until this summer.

DILEMMA

While extreme, Parker's case represents a common pattern in urban crime. One Washington police study found that 35 percent of all robbery suspects released under the new bail law were accused of committing at least one felony while awaiting trial. The scenario is repeated with depressing regularity in all the large cities, where the delay between arrest and trial is growing along with the crime rate (in Brooklyn Federal court, for example, the average trial delay now stands at two years). Not surprisingly, the dilemma has stirred feelings of impotence and rage among judges and policemen. "Under this act," fumes one Federal judge, "I'd have to turn a raving maniac loose on the streets."

President Nixon has felt sufficiently disturbed by the issue to put forth one of the most potentially explosive suggestions of his Administration—the preventive, pretrial detention of such chronic repeaters as Tyrone Parker. Under Mr. Nixon's proposal, certain criminal suspects could be jailed without bail for up to 60 days if a judge decided they posed a probably threat to society. While the option would apply only in Federal courts and only to some offenders (e.g., those accused of "dangerous crimes" like assault and rape, or those charged with crimes of violence while free on bail), Attorney General John Mitchell has implied that preventive detention should be copied on the State and local levels.

The proposal has already triggered a volley of protest. One lawyer calls the Administration's proposal "the first step toward a police state." One prominent liberal crusader says he would give up his opposition to the Vietnam war, the space program, the oil-depletion allowance and the farm subsidies rather than accept preventive detention.

"HOSTILE"

It was against this backdrop that some 50 legal experts gathered at the University of Chicago last week to conduct the first full airing of the issue—and the tone of the meeting was heavily against preventive detention. Donald Santarelli, a youthful firebrand of the Attorney General's office, delivered an impassioned defense of the Nixon proposal, but a Strom Thurmond rally at Harvard would have gotten a warmer reception. "It was a hostile, liberal-oriented audience," Santarelli later snapped to a reporter. "No one is willing to deal with the hard issues of how to deal with crime." What are the hard issues? "Convict the guilty and protect society," he shot back.

The opposition to preventive detention went well beyond ideological polarization or anti-Nixon bias. Even tough law-and-order men admitted doubts about the proposal's constitutionality. Mrs. Patricia Wald, director of a Washington legal service, worried about setting a dangerous precedent. "We're going down a new road," she said, "and I'm not sure where it's leading. There is nothing to stop the 60-day detention from becoming a year. Who knows?"

ELUSIVE

Although Santarelli argued that the plan contained adequate safeguards, the problem of how to judge which suspects are dangerous posed a major issue for the conference. How broadly, for instance, could a "dangerous crime" be defined? Once that description applied only to crimes involving bodily injury; today it usually includes all felonies except forgery, counterfeiting and the like. Moreover, wouldn't pretrial jailing be likely to cost a man his job? And wouldn't the fact that a judge had detained a "dangerous" suspect prejudice the jury at his trial?

The anti-detention position was most dramatically summed up by Sen. Sam Ervin Jr., the crusty North Carolina Democrat

who sponsored the 1966 Bail Reform Act. After a speech sprinkled with down-home homiletics, Ervin concluded: "One of the prices we pay for a free society is the taking of calculated risks. One of these risks is admitting a man to bail."

On the other side, a few speakers pointed out that the U.S. judicial system already employs a not-so-subtle form of preventive detention. Since the Bail Reform Act applies only to Federal courts, state and municipal judges can and do preclude the pretrial release of hard-core offenders by setting prohibitively high bail. "Let's bring it out in the open," said one detention advocate. "Let's not use the subterfuge of dollars to determine danger."

DELAY

If any consensus emerged, it was that a social evil is not cured by legalizing it—and that before preventive detention is resorted to, other reforms should be explored. These include such techniques as probation-like surveillance of persons out on bail and, most urgently, less delay in bringing accused criminals to trial.

The Administration, for its part, wants many of the same objectives; preventive detention is just one of twelve points in the anti-crime package that the President sent to Congress. But Mr. Nixon is sticking to his guns on the issue, and the Congressional debate should produce some agonizing soul-searching. In a city that has the highest robbery rate of any in the country, and where the number of serious crimes jumped 25 per cent last year, the nation's lawmakers will be asked to strike a balance between two of the most basic tenets of American jurisprudence—the presumption of innocence and the protection of society. "We can only hope," says one lawyer, "that the cure they produce won't be worse than the malady."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1969]

A MODERATE COURSE OF BAIL REFORM

As the Senate District Committee settles down to hearing evidence on the pretrial detention bills, it is more than ever before apparent that existing practices of releasing accused persons will have to be tightened. At the same time, however, there is widespread concern about the proposed encroachments on personal rights. The committee has a great responsibility to write and approve a bill that will stand up in the courts.

There seems to be wide agreement that the courts should be given authority, in fixing the terms of release for an accused, to consider protection of the community as well as means of assuring the appearance of the defendant for trial. In fact, the courts have always acted to shield the public from alleged criminals when the risks have been deemed to be high. Monetary bail has customarily been fixed at points that would insure incarceration pending trial. This is certainly not a desirable practice, but in moving away from it, society cannot afford to go to the other extreme of ordering release without bond for every alleged criminal who can be expected to show up for trial.

The chief question raised by the present bills is what can be put in the place of high bail bonds for the unreliable defendants accused of grave crimes. The answer of the Department of Justice and of Senator Tydings is "preventive detention," but we think both proposals paint with too broad a brush. The administration bill would prescribe preventive detention for a large category of crimes if the judge should find a "substantial probability" that the defendant committed the offense and that no conditions of release would assure the public safety. This smacks too much of condemning and punishing a person who, under the Constitution, must be presumed innocent until he has been found guilty by a due-process trial. The Tydings

bill would similarly authorize preventive detention in a large category of cases, although it would limit the holding period without trial to 30 days in contrast to 60 days provided in the administration bill.

In our view this drastic remedy ought to be reserved for those defendants who have previous records involving serious crimes and those who have records of bail jumping, intimidation of witnesses, violation of their conditions of release and so forth. We are well aware of the fact that such a provision would not cover all the cases in which the public might be exposed to high risks from persons accused of crimes of violence. Perhaps monetary bail or some other device short of incarceration will have to be kept in the picture for use in some cases of this kind, while relying upon conditional release without monetary bail in the great majority of cases. This would not be an ideal solution, but it would be much better than instituting a broad system of preventive detention that would likely be found unconstitutional.

It is well to remember that the constitutions of several states grant an absolute right to bail. Article 8 of the Federal Bill of Rights provides that "excessive bail shall not be required," thus carrying at least a strong implication that the door to release must not be closed entirely in regard to the broad category of serious but non-capital crimes.

Whatever Congress may do to the Bail Reform Act, it will have to revise also the Bail Agency Act if the reform is to be meaningful. The administration bill for this purpose would greatly broaden the powers of the Bail Agency and authorize increased funds so sorely needed for supervising the activities of released persons and aiding the courts in making their decisions about conditional releases. The revitalized agency would not only report violations of the conditions of release but would also help released persons to find jobs and medical and social services if needed.

With this better screening of arrested persons and supervision of those conditionally released, along with speedier trials under the proposed new court system and pretrial detention in the more flagrant cases in which known criminals and bail jumpers have forfeited their rights to be trusted, enormous improvement in the administration of justice could be expected. The District Committee can make much greater progress by taking this cautious approach than by fostering a drastic measure that would invite extinction by the courts.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 30, 1969]

THE 1951 DECISIONS ON JAILING OF REDS EYED (By David R. Boldt)

The fate of U.S. Communists rounded up 18 years ago may have a decisive effect on the current controversy over "preventive detention."

That's because the principal Supreme Court precedents dealing with the right of defendants to be released prior to trial involve those Communists.

No red-blooded American rapist, robber, or other violent criminal—the kind who would be kept in jail as a danger to the community under proposals now before Congress—has fought a bail case to the Supreme Court.

As a result, packs of lawyers, both Justice Department legalists seeking to bolster the preventive detention concept and others seeking to discredit it, are busily studying two 1951 decisions relating to the Communists.

As often happens in legal disputes, each side figures the Court saw things its way.

The constitutional issues concern the right to bail and "due process" requirements. The differences between proponents and opponents are so profound that they differ even over the basic purpose of bail.

The Justice Department insists that bail

has been used openly and surreptitiously to detain persons who might constitute a danger to the community. Opponents of the preventive detention concept hold that bail's only sanctioned purpose has been to insure that a defendant will appear for trial.

The constitutional issues have not received the same attention as, for instance, the problem of allowing potentially dangerous criminals back on the street to intimidate witnesses and commit further crime.

Nor have they been as clearly delineated as the practical issue of whether preventive detention would further slow the process of justice by adding additional hearings to existing monumental court backlogs.

One reason the constitutional issues have been in the background is that they are complicated and difficult to present. Witnesses before congressional committees often omit constitutionality from their oral testimony and cover it in complicated legal briefs, salted with Latinisms and case citations, that are submitted later.

But Congress' assessment of the constitutional factor may have decisive weight, since the congressmen would be reluctant to waste their time and energy enacting legislation likely to be voided by the courts.

Somewhat simplified, here is the way the Justice Department sees things in its constitutional brief, starting from a bit before the Communists get into the act.

First, the department says there is no "constitutional right to bail." The Eighth Amendment states only that "excessive bail shall not be required."

As every school child who got through civics should know, they say, that wording was lifted directly from the English Bill of Rights; and in England the wording has never been taken to prohibit pretrial detention.

Moreover, in the United States, persons charged with crimes punishable by death could always be denied bail even in law passed by the same Congress that passed the Eighth Amendment. Surely this shows that jailing dangerous persons before trial is constitutional.

Finally, the Supreme Court settled the question pretty clearly in "Carlson vs. Landon," the department says.

In that case, Frank Carlson, a resident alien and chairman of the Communist Party's defense committee in Los Angeles and other party officials who were not U.S. citizens, had been arrested in the fall of 1951.

Deportation proceedings, under the then recently passed McCarran Internal Security Act, were begun and Carlson and his colleagues were kept in jail. They said they had a right to bail. The Supreme Court said they did not.

Justice Stanley F. Reed, writing the majority opinion, said: "The contention is . . . advanced that the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution compels the allowance of bail in a reasonable amount . . . (The) cases cited by the applicants . . . fall flatly to support this argument. We have found none that do . . . Indeed, the very language of the Amendment falls to say that all arrests must be bailable. We think, clearly, here that the Eighth Amendment doesn't require that bail be allowed."

Thus, the Justice Department attorneys conclude, their preventive detention proposal will pass the Eighth Amendment hurdle.

Not so fast, say the opponents. They give short shrift to the part about the English Bill of Rights as the origin of the Eighth Amendment.

The opponents like to read from Justice Hugo Black's dissent to the Carlson decision: ". . . It is well known that our Bill of Rights was written and adopted to guarantee Americans greater freedom than had been enjoyed by their ancestors who had been driven from Europe by persecution."

Next, they argue that bail is not denied to persons charged with a capital offense because they are dangerous to the community. Instead, bail is denied because the stakes are so high that even an innocent person might reasonably decide to flee, if released.

A capital offender, such as a jealous husband who murders his wife is probably, for instance, the least likely of any criminal to repeat his crime on release.

Then the opponents of preventive detention pull out their own Communist case, "Stack vs. Boyle," which was decided by the same Court as Carlson earlier in 1951.

Loretta Stack, and 11 other second-string Communist Party functionaries were rounded up and charged under the Smith Act with advocating the violent overthrow of the government. They were held under high bail (\$100,000 in one case).

In the Stack case, the Court ruled that these Communists were entitled to bail they could meet—then it went a little further.

Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, writing the majority opinion, said, "... federal law has unequivocally provided that a person arrested for a noncapital offense shall be admitted to bail.

"The traditional right to freedom before conviction permits the unhampered preparation of a defense and serves to prevent the infliction of punishment prior to conviction. . . . Unless this right to bail before trial is preserved, the presumption of innocence, secured only after centuries of struggle, would lose its meaning."

So there you have it, quoth the preventive detention opponents.

When not actually confronting one another, both sides will admit that there is not yet any clear definition as to what the Constitution requires in regard to bail.

But the opposition forces note that in the administration's Carlson case, Justice Reed makes a careful distinction between the rights of aliens here "at the nation's invitation" and those of U.S. citizens. Reed says, the allowance of bail for persons "charged in fact, that the granting of bail to alien Communists isn't necessarily the same as with bailable criminal offenses."

Also, since Carlson involves a civil, not a criminal case, its relevance to preventive detention may be more limited than that of Stack, a criminal case, in regard to preventive detention of criminal.

In addition to the Eighth Amendment interpretations, the lawyers differ over whether preventive detention would violate the Fifth Amendment guarantee that "no person shall be deprived of . . . liberty . . . without due process of law."

Due process, freely translated, means here that a person should get a fair chance to defend himself in proceedings specified by law.

The administration thinks it meets this requirement by providing that preventive detention be imposed only after a hearing at which the accused person is represented by counsel, and given the opportunity to cross-examine and call witnesses, as well as to present evidence. The judge can impose preventive detention only if he is reasonably sure that the suspect committed the offense with which he is charged.

This procedure leads to another kind of trouble, according to Daniel J. Freed, professor at Yale Law School and former head of the Justice Department's criminal division.

Freed asks, "How can any defendant get a fair trial if he has been declared 'probably guilty' by a judge after an elaborate hearing?" The "presumption of innocence" simply disappears, Freed says.

The Justice Department's answer is that the finding at a preventive detention hearing isn't significantly more prejudicial than a grand jury indictment—but they concede that the point is a sticky one.

CONGRESS INADEQUATE FOR THE SEVENTIES

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, Eric Allen, publisher of my hometown newspaper, the Medford, Oreg., Mail Tribune, recently wrote a stinging commentary on the record of the first session of the 91st Congress and the urgent need for reorganization to enable Congress to deal with the challenges of the seventies. I think Mr. Allen does an excellent job of explaining what is wrong with Congress and why the American people are questioning its ability to solve the Nation's problems.

I fully agree with his thoughtful conclusion:

Perhaps asking Congress to reform itself and its procedures is a little like asking a dinosaur to redesign itself into a mammal. But unless it does—and a growing number of Members are aware of the need and are pressing for the changes—the Congress will continue to fall behind in its routine work, and fall utterly to meet the needs of a fast-changing nation that is creating new problems faster than the old ones are being solved.

I commend the text of the editorial, "Congress Inadequate for the Seventies," to all of my colleagues who share my interest in making Congress a more responsive and more effective branch of Government.

The editorial follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, Jan. 1, 1970]

CONGRESS INADEQUATE FOR THE SEVENTIES

If the challenges of the 70s are to be faced and conquered, we will need the tools to do it.

Man's greatest tool for the solution of mutual problems is the institution of government. When it works, it can work magnificently. When it fails—as it does far too often—it leaves behind a sour residue of cynicism.

Making government work is a never-ending task, and it should engage the attention of men of good will, from the doings of the City Council and Planning Commission, to the operation of the State Legislature, to the Congress itself, with a passing hopeful nod at the United Nations, which isn't a government, not yet, anyway, but could someday become enough of one to afford us the mechanism for keeping the peace.

During the past year the Congress has shown itself to be inadequate for the tasks it must do. The first session of the 91st Congress is over, yet due to inertia, shilly-shallying, buck-passing and (sometimes) deliberate delays, it is further behind in its work than at any time in living memory.

We think it is high time the Congress began earning the rather handsome salaries of \$42,500 it voted itself, and reorganize itself to meet the nation's needs. They are many, and not easily solved.

There is no reason whatsoever that it should take almost a full year to pass most of the bread-and-butter appropriation bills, and more than a year to pass others. And the list of national problems that it has yet to come to grips with is longer than the list of those it has faced, or pretended to face.

The seniority system, and the deadening effect it has had on the committees of Con-

gress, is one of the worst offenders. Another is the fact that the Congress, despite its adequate salaries and big personal staffs, has yet to create mechanisms to research and provide the answers it needs to arrive at intelligent legislation on a variety of complex issues.

Perhaps asking Congress to reform itself and its procedures is a little like asking a dinosaur to redesign itself into a mammal. But unless it does—and a growing number of members are aware of the need and are pressing for the changes—the Congress will continue to fall behind in its routine work, and fall utterly to meet the needs of a fast-changing nation that is creating new problems faster than the old ones are being solved.

PRAISE FOR HUGHES

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, this is the last day in New Jersey under the leadership of Gov. Richard J. Hughes, who has served our State in that capacity for the past 8 years.

As the Governor of New Jersey, Richard Hughes has brought the State into the forefront of progress. He has been an admirable leader.

I believe his success is very capably illustrated by an editorial which appeared in the Red Bank Daily Register, of last Friday, January 16, 1970.

The editorial follows:

[From the Daily Register, Jan. 16, 1970]

PRAISE FOR HUGHES

In assessing the eight-year tenure of Gov. Richard J. Hughes, who relinquishes the reins Tuesday to Gov.-elect William T. Cahill, it would be short-changing the man to list only the manifest accomplishments of his incumbency. To those concrete gains must be added the things he sought and was frustrated on, and probably most important, the lesson he brought home to the people.

That lesson was that our state had been for too long shirking too many of its responsibilities. The time of reckoning is upon us, and now it's going to hurt more than it would have had we listened earlier.

Gov. Hughes inherited a legacy of neglect. We had gotten only a little behind the times then, but the Soaring Sixties already were off the ground and rocketing into the space age. We were ill prepared for the tremendous change under way. Our population and industry were burgeoning, and with them a whole new concept of public needs.

The governor saw them, named a blue ribbon panel to assess them. In seeking to meet them, he sometimes came to grips with a legislature that was not always as foresighted, or was lacking in the courage needed to face up to the political challenge of telling a constituency that it had run up a bill that had to be paid. He brought New Jersey into a period of fiscal maturity.

There were real achievements, too. Three new cabinet departments were created—community affairs, transportation and higher education. The strongest air and water pollution laws in the nation were enacted. The crime fight was stepped up with laws authorizing a statewide grand jury, witness immunity and a state Commission of Investigation. Proposed "give-away" of 400,000 acres of state-held tidelands was blocked. Voters gave approval to bond issues totaling

\$1.4 billion for institutions, highways, colleges, pollution control and water supply, and commuter rail facilities.

A state public defender system was instituted. A plan for the Hackensack meadows development, snarled for centuries, was put into motion. There was a five-fold increase in expenditure for higher education.

The leadership on those gains came from Gov. Hughes. He served his state courageously and well and will be commended by history. We hope his successor will inherit his courage as well as his problems and be able to build on the Hughes record.

SALUTE TO INDONESIA

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a generation of Americans who dreamed with the song that "Bali Hai will call you" should be happy to know that the real island of Bali does call. Not only is it possible to visit the lush island of Bali, but the nation of Indonesia, of which Bali is a part, is actively encouraging tourists to visit the luxurious new government hotel on magical Bali as well as enjoying the exotic sights of Java, Sumatra, and the other islands. A number of American banks have opened in Jakarta, and a dozen international airlines maintain offices there. New hotels are opening to cater to those businessmen who have recognized the economic promise of this rich nation and to those tourists who are there simply to admire its exotic beauty.

Such interest by tourists and foreign businessmen is an indication of the remarkable recovery that Indonesia has made since its bloody experience of coup and counter-coup in 1965. Not only the tourists, but also the citizens of Indonesia are enjoying a better life under the leadership of President Suharto. Municipal lawns are trimmed and streets have been repaired; a fleet of rehabilitated buses has come close to solving the transportation problem which the citizens of the city faced a few years ago. Inflation, which was growing at a rate of 600 percent a few years ago, will be held this year to a growth of 10 percent. The price of rice is stable. From a bankrupt country on the brink of chaos, President Suharto and his government have reestablished Indonesia's international credit and restored her internal stability. And what is more important, they have reestablished Indonesia's sense of self-respect and pride. Observers in the capital have sensed a mood of optimism and cordiality among the citizens, and with just cause.

On December 28, Indonesia's 20th anniversary of independence, this nation will have witnessed the peaceful passage of the territory of West Irian from a dependency to a full-fledged part of the nation by the "act of free choice" of the citizens to remain a part of Indonesia. Indonesia in return has promised to develop West Irian and to grant it a substantial amount of autonomy. Indonesia,

as a whole, is preparing to hold the first elections in the country since 1955—truly a fitting way to enter the third decade of independence. The Indonesian Parliament has passed a long-debated elections law in accordance with the law that elections must be held before July 1971.

Within the last year, Indonesia has attempted to reevaluate its national goals and the aspirations of its people through the national general program and the 5-year development plan. While inviting foreign capital to its islands in exploitation of oil and other natural resources, it has not forgotten the human needs of its people and has kept before it the five principles of Pantja Sila, which have guided the nation since its founding. In planning for the future, the government has attempted to maintain the balance of life between man and nature, the balance of individual efforts and the needs of the nation and community and the balance between equality and justice. These stated goals are perhaps worthy of reconsideration by more developed nations, such as our own.

On the day of its independence, as Indonesia looks forward to the new order of the future, we wish the people success. Their national problems will not be easy to solve and they have left many scars. But with the feeling of good will toward their countrymen and neighbors in the Pacific, Indonesians must surely be successful.

A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, today I join with many of my colleagues in introducing a bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

I congratulate the President for asking Congress to double the amount of funds presently available for the arts and humanities. And, I wholeheartedly agree with him that this is a vital part of our commitment to enhancing the quality of life for all Americans. For too long our cultural progress has been frustrated by lack of sufficient funds.

Expression through art and music are intrinsic to the human environment. Even the most primitive societies have developed often complex cultures. Our Nation, though the most technologically advanced, has been negligent in expressing appreciation and support for our rich cultural resources.

The importance of the arts in society is evidenced throughout history. And, today, lack of support for the arts is taking its toll, especially in the case of our disappearing symphony orchestras. We must reassert its importance if we are to have a balanced society with opportunities for cultural growth available to all Americans.

As Artemus Ward once advised Abraham Lincoln's Secretary of the Navy in a mythical interview:

Let me write the songs of a nashun . . . and I don't care a cuss who goes to the legislater! . . .

LETTER FROM A MARINE IN VIETNAM

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, I share with my House colleagues the activities of an outstanding and dedicated young lady in my district, Miss Denise Evers. Denise, the chairman of the Heartland Youth for Decency, in La Mesa, Calif., received a letter from Bill Desmanico, a 19-year-old marine serving in Vietnam. This letter exemplifies the caliber of our young fighting men in Vietnam and Bill's sincerity and candor speak for themselves. His letter was reprinted on November 27, 1969, in the La Mesa Scout, La Mesa, Calif., and I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LETTER

DEAR DENISE: My name is Bill Desmanico, and I'm a Marine stationed here in South Viet Nam. I hope you can find the time in your busy schedule to read this letter.

I first heard about your organization about three days ago from Chaplain Donoher of my Division. And before I go any further, I want to thank you. You, and all the other people of your organization. You are like a dream come true to a lot of guys over here, believe me. You've certainly restored my faith in some of the younger generation of America. I was beginning to think it was a lost cause. But now, I know that so long as there are some people like you, it could never be a lost cause.

You can't imagine how it is for some of us guys over here. A lot of us are all 18 and 19. We really feel rotten and helpless sometimes when we read about the anti-this and anti-that establishments. What really gets us mad, is to read or hear about some young radical telling the world how he had been wronged. Or how America's leaders are barbarians because they send us here to Viet Nam to kill. They think they know everything, and they don't. But a lot of people seem to think they do. I wish I could drag one of them over here. Then maybe after he's seen the things I've seen and lived with this past year, he won't be so quick to open his mouth.

I guess I'm getting carried away. But, that's how we all feel over here. I don't think anyone has really asked us what we thought of being over here. They'd be surprised at some of our answers.

Well, like I said, my buddies and I want to thank you for doing something we are not able to do at the moment, and that every young American should do. I myself want to volunteer my services in any way I can. I mean it! If I can be of any help to you at all, let me know. I'm due to come back to America around the 20th of December. And if I can be of any help when I get home, just say the word. Money, I haven't got, but words, believe me, I've got a lot of.

I'm 19 years old, and I'm from Massachusetts. Like I said, I've been here in Viet Nam

for almost a year now. If I can be of any help on my way home, I'll stop in California and do so. Right now, I can't do that much, except let people over here know you exist. I do have one of your stickers on my seabag, and I've got one of your small flags on my helmet. I get a lot of questions about that flag. And when people ask that question, I just sound off like a tape recorder and let them know all I know about you and your organization.

But, I still feel I don't know enough. I'd appreciate any information you can give me. And remember, my offer is always open.

I still can't believe that there are still some decent guys and girls back in the "world." To us, America is the world.

Hey! Take care, and keep it up, for us, please? Thanks a lot.

Respectfully yours,

BILL.

THE GREAT NATIONAL FOREST RAID

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the commercial timber operators, always mindful of the growing lumber markets, keep seeking ways to gain access to the forest stands in our public lands. The latest efforts in this endeavor, the misnamed "National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act," popularly known as the National Timber Supply Act, will compel the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to increase the allowable limits on cutting logs in our national forests, as well as allocating all timberland that is capable of commercial production to serve that purpose, with the exception of those lands which already have been reserved for other purposes.

This National Timber Supply Act will negate the multiple-use principle which governs the management of our national forests by assigning top priority to logging, thus ignoring the fact that these forests are important not only as a source of lumber but also, that these lands have other uses, such as watershed protection, flood prevention, soil and wildlife conservation, recreational purposes, and esthetic refuges. All these interests are adversely affected when lumbering operations begin, and this legislation will let the lumber companies loot our national forests.

Mr. Speaker, a number of conservation organizations have labeled the National Timber Supply Act as potentially the most dangerous anticonservation bill to come before Congress in many years. Mr. John L. Franson, Central Midwest representative for the National Audubon Society, recently wrote an article in the December 1969 *Badger Sportsman*, published in Chilton, Wis., exposing the true meaning of the National Timber Supply Act, and it merits the consideration of my colleagues.

The article follows:

ACT MAY START VICIOUS EXPLOIT OF PUBLIC LANDS

(By John Franson)

Almost a quarter of a century ago, fervent conservationists like Gifford Pinchot fought

to protect our national forest system from being raided by private interests. Pinchot and a small band of other men finally managed to designate vast portions of lands as "forest reservations".

These eventually became our national forests. Pinchot was a bitter enemy of wholesale clear cutting and an advocate of what he called "ecological forestry" or possibly what is termed now as selective cutting.

As long ago as this seems, the private lumbering interests looked upon the public lands as a windfall for timber supply. As the years passed, large tracts of private land owned by lumber and paper companies were cut and recut. Privately owned timber supplies were wantonly harvested and exhausted. This is most evident on small woodlots of farms which are now nothing but scrub timber and brush.

Industry has done as it pleased. Northern Wisconsin can testify to this. Once the entire state was slashed and cut. Then, as Aldo Leopold said, "It burned for 30 years".

Due to the foresight of Pinchot and others, the public forest lands have been modestly cut for the most part. Some areas have even been declared off-limits to timbering. The selective cutting of timber on these public lands promised a sustained yield if these practices were continued—and if we did not get greedy.

Some 20 years ago the lumbering interests proposed that the federal government turn the national forests over to the states for cutting. The states promised to return the forests to the federal government for reforestation, after they had had their way with them. Conservationists defeated this effort, but it looks as though they have run the complete circle.

The public is easily confused by the tricky labels placed on certain pieces of obnoxious legislation. One pending in Congress now is called the "National Timber Supply Act". On the surface the act and its proponents seem very reasonable.

They say that a building supply shortage and a drop in lumber prices will require a greater annual harvest of timber. With most of the private holdings stripped, the lumbering interests naturally turn to the national forests.

The timber act would require that the timber harvest in the national forests be increased. Part of the profits from this increased harvest will go to a fund used "only for increasing timber yield". Thus a vicious circle of lumbering on public lands begins.

The additional money from this fund would not necessarily be used for replanting. It could be used for building logging roads through scenic sections of national forests, which may now be roadless. Possible it could even be used for inroads into previously untouched areas. Certainly it would be used for personnel increases to facilitate logging.

Not only does the proposed National Timber Supply Act threaten the public domain, but apparently it is needless legislation. The so-called "short supply" of timber is not necessarily due to a housing emergency or the demand for more lumber. This move could be a confession of poor management by the private land owners, but it is questionable whether or not an increased yield really is necessary.

In this age of technology, there are many materials which already replace lumber if we were running short. On the other hand, indications are that we are not short at all. The private lumber industry is now exporting 4 billion board feet of logs and lumber a year. More than enough to meet domestic needs. Even the domestic shortage of which the lumber lobby speaks was only temporary last spring.

The lumber interests also say they need more lumber to make up for a price decrease.

Lumber prices have increased by almost one-half of what they were six months ago.

The sharp drop in lumber prices last spring might even suggest that a look should be taken at the lumber inventories of large corporations. These rises and declines in lumber prices hint of a privately administered price and supply situation.

But the Department of Agriculture played right into the hands of the lumber industry—they announced sharp cuts in the price of national forest timber.

Today, the uses of our national forests vary far beyond timber supply alone. Fortunately in most cases, their management allows for intense recreational use by the American public. This, in the long run, may be their best and most cherished purpose—not timber supply.

Gifford Pinchot's idea of ecological forestry was a forest that would not only provide wood products, but hold soil as watersheds, support wildlife and provide the necessary uses to man such as scenery, wilderness and the host of recreational activities that are presently enjoyed in the national forests.

Some of the Forest Service's most recent activities are disturbing enough without the National Timber Supply Act. Lately the Forest Service seems to have acquiesced to the school of clear cutting—except they don't call it that. There is a new word in the Forest Service for clear cutting. It is called "even aged management"—a very positive sounding phrase for questionable management.

The American public is faced with reversing a trend toward "clear cutting" back to "selective cutting." The clear cutting trend has prospered in the new forestry schools many of which are influenced, promoted and underwritten by the lumbering interests.

The lumber lobby has been working hard in Washington. The House Agriculture and Forestry Committee has already favorably reported on their version of the National Timber Supply Act. The Senate seems inclined to schedule hearings. Some of Wisconsin's biggest paper industries have endorsed it. The public remains unaware of what is taking place.

Between this innocent-sounding act and the lumbering trends—the cries of "Timber!" will soon be echoing in our national forests as they never have since we fought to save them a quarter of a century ago.

POST OFFICE REFORM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we reconvene I suggest that one of the major legislative assignments that should be concluded in this session is reform of the Post Office Department as recommended by the administration and Postmaster General Winton M. Blount.

Therefore, I direct the attention of the Members to a brief but effective editorial commentary in *Chicago Today*, Saturday, January 10, on the recent announced plans of the Post Office to train young men for postal jobs and to help them complete the high school material that may be missed:

POST OFFICE "JOB ACADEMIES"

The Post Office department rates high marks for its plan to establish "postal academies" for school dropouts in Chicago and five other cities. The idea is not only to prepare these people for postal jobs but to give them what they missed by quitting school.

The target is 2,100 pupils or graduates by July 1, 1971. That's not a great number, but

it's a start toward reclaiming the lives of youngsters who have risked wasting them by leaving school too early. Besides Chicago, the areas involved are Washington, Newark, Atlanta, San Francisco, and Detroit. An initial bill of \$1,161,746 for the program will be paid by the office of economic opportunity and the labor department.

The employment itself is ideal for the trainees. As Postmaster General Winton M. Blount observed, postal workers "walk every street, knocking on every door; many employees are known, trusted and respected by most individuals in or out of the ghetto; and employees walk daily in every business establishment where employment opportunities exist."

This is one field in which the postoffice is really carrying the mail.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that a reformed Post Office Corporation will be in good hands with a talented administrator such as Postmaster General Blount whose imaginative leadership is demonstrated in the establishment of Post Office academies to train high school drop-outs.

NEW YEAR FORECASTS

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, by all the New Year forecasts, 1970 will not be a happy year for the U.S. economy. Leading economists give us a grim choice—more of the same kind of inflation we experienced last year, or a collapse of the economy into recession with serious unemployment and a decline in the Nation's business activity. Or worst of all, both at the same time.

Reporters for the Washington Post recently summarized the views of leading economists and economic observers for 1970 in an excellent series of articles that I submit here for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

One writer, Hobart Rowen, quotes an economist who sums up the outlook most succinctly:

Any way you look at it, it will be a rough year.

Rowen adds:

There is not going to be much relief in the areas that most closely affect the average consumer and businessman—high interest rates and high prices—because inflation has become so deeply rooted.

Behind this pessimistic conclusion is a growing recognition that the economic policies of the administration are not effective, and that they must be changed now if we are to avoid pushing the economy permanently out of kilter.

As the Post articles indicate, the administration's continued reliance on tight monetary policy as virtually its only anti-inflationary weapon is unwise. Many liberal and conservative economists, some enlightened administration officials such as Secretary of Labor George Schultz, and at least the minority of Federal Reserve Board members now agree we should carefully but noticeably relax

the stranglehold on money supply and allow interest rates to return to reasonable levels.

Monetary policy is only one of many tools available for successful management of the economy, and it needs to be placed back in proper perspective. It is not a cure-all. Indeed, it contributes to inflation if improperly used. As Mr. Rowen observes:

It is now generally agreed that the wide swings in the application of monetary policy in the past few years—from great ease to very tight—have themselves contributed to both inflation and recession in this country.

If 1970 is to offer any hope for a return to a stable economy, we will have to move quickly and courageously along a broad front of new policy. For long-term success, we must start by establishing national economic priorities, a step that this administration—as its predecessor—seems unable to take. Both the military and civilian budgets of the Federal Government must be ruthlessly stripped of unnecessary and wasteful spending. Then we must reorder the surviving programs according to national need so that housing, environment, welfare, and education are given a real chance to compete with defense for the budget dollar, rather than simply paid lipservice.

In my judgment, only by establishing national priorities can we begin to talk convincingly about controlling Federal spending and developing an effective fiscal policy.

A set of clear priorities will also provide a framework for the application of meaningful monetary policy. We have an opportunity to start fresh next month when Dr. Arthur Burns becomes the new chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. I urge Dr. Burns to make his own analysis of the available money supply, determine the sources of excess pressure on this supply, and then direct the Nation's banks to start channeling the flow of credit away from these problem areas and toward the regions of basic social need, such as housing. Congress signaled this approach last month when it passed S. 2577 authorizing the President to ask the Federal Reserve Board to control all aspects of credit. We would be on the way to realizing priority goals, and we would have a system of monetary controls that makes sense.

As a second fundamental action, the administration should establish and back with its full force, a set of tough wage and price guidelines. Wage and price increases of 5 percent and higher cannot be tolerated if we are ever to get back to price stability.

These are the actions I have urged on the administration and the Federal Reserve Board since last spring. How grim must the economic forecasts be before they respond?

The articles follow:

RECESSION POSSIBLE?

(By Hobart Rowen)

First, the good news: the U.S. economy will grow at a painfully slow rate in 1970, price increases will be almost as great as last year, unemployment will rise, and interest rates will come down only slightly—and late in the year at that.

Now, the bad news: the economy could slip into a mild recession, with unemployment close to 6 per cent, a decline in the real Gross National Product, and a drop in corporate profits of nearly 15 per cent.

You can choose between these two generally-held forecasts by distinguished economists. The more optimistic view is held by Keynesians such as former Economic Council Chairman Walter W. Heller and Arthur M. Okun.

The gloomier point of view comes especially from the Milton Friedman "monetarists" school, which believes that a progressively restrictive Federal Reserve Board policy has already cast the die for 1970.

But Friedman is not alone. The Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, somewhat defensively ("Recession"—Now we've said it.") and the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. agree. Both hasten to add that the recession isn't likely to be deep.

Fairly early in the year, it should be clear which of the two scenarios comes closer to the mark—and one man who will have a great deal to say about it is Arthur F. Burns, the new Chairman-to-be of the Federal Reserve Board, who takes over from William McChesney Martin at the end of the month.

Sums up a distinguished economist who neither predicts nor rules out a recession in 1970: "Any way you look at it, it will be a rough year."

For one thing, there is not going to be much relief in the areas that most closely affect the average consumer and businessman—high interest rates and high prices—because inflation has become so deeply rooted.

Some economists, such as business adviser Pierre Rinfret, go so far as to predict further rising prices, and continuation of a runaway boom psychology. Most experts disagree with Rinfret on this score, but concede that it's possible. Okun, for example, thinks that a boom is a one-in-ten shot, but says:

"Just among us professionals . . . we have to admit that we know pitifully little about how price expectations are formed and how they influence other economic decisions."

Burns' shift from the White House, where he has been Counselor to the President, might well coincide with a delicate transition to a less restrictive monetary policy.

It will depend, in part, on President Nixon's ability to present a balanced budget for fiscal 1971—a feat which apparently will require new or extended excise taxes.

Given the assurance of a steady hand on the fiscal brakes, Burns may join two dissident Fed Governors, Sherman J. Maisel and George Mitchell, who would like to permit the money stock (held virtually stable for the past six months) to grow a little bit.

In that case, Burns will have to pick up one more vote (from among Govs. Dewey Daane, Andrew Brimmer, J. L. Robertson, and William Sherrill) to achieve a majority.

The "monetarists" argue that the only question for 1970 is: how bad will the recession be? Milton Friedman himself suggests that unemployment rising to about 6 per cent is likely, even if the Fed immediately loosens up the money supply (this because of the lag between change of policy and its impact on the economy).

A continuation of tight money, he feels, will result in an Eisenhower-style recession (1957-58) with unemployment to 7 per cent.

High Government officials, in a series of interviews with The Washington Post, acknowledge that "the possibility of a recession cannot be ignored." They are keenly aware of the possibility that Mr. Nixon may face the Congressional election period this fall with the worst of both worlds—a recession accompanied by still rising prices.

Prof. Otto Eckstein, a former member of

the CEA and a highly regarded analyst, comes down on the side of the slowly growing economy instead of recession. He points to three compelling factors:

The tax bill and new Social Security benefits will give consumers a transfusion of \$13 billion more purchasing power.

Businessmen, still operating on the assumption that inflation is here to stay, plan to spend yet another 10 per cent (\$7 billion) on new plant and equipment, despite withdrawal of the investment credit.

And finally, Eckstein makes a policy judgment: the Fed will allow the money stock to grow, rather than risk financial panic and the complete ruination of the housing industry.

Moreover, there is a strong feeling among many administration officials (also held by a minority of FRB governors) that the Fed has overstayed its strict monetary policy.

Yet, in trying to sift out the probabilities, a strong case can be made against the likelihood of a true recession, which is usually defined as an absolute drop in real GNP lasting at least six months.

It should be added that the federal government's manifest inability to exert any real control over expenditures, and Congress' freehand re-arrangement of the tax structure almost assure new inflationary vigor in the years ahead.

The tax "reform" bill is really a massive tax cut, which will stimulate consumer purchasing power all through the 1970's, and limit the flexibility of any administration—Republican or Democratic—to manage spending policy for social or even military budgets.

In order for the gloomier prospect of recession in 1970 to eventuate, these things would have to develop: a housing crisis of even more serious proportions than now exists or seems likely; consumer decisions not merely to be cautious (which now seems the case), but to retrench to a point where the savings rate tops 7 per cent; and a complete turn-around in business' announced plans for new plant investment.

If none of these more dire circumstances prevail, the slow-growth economy would result, bringing a slight reduction in inflation (say from 5 per cent to about 4 per cent); and a reduction in gain in real GNP of 1.5 to 2 per cent, compared with 3 per cent in 1969.

In other words, the Gross National Product, which advanced by about 8 per cent in 1969 to some \$933 billion, would rise about 6 per cent to about \$990 billion. And in that process, the magic symbol of the tri-dollar economy would be hoisted at some time during 1970.

Despite the magnitude of these numbers, this is a picture of an essentially sluggish economy—not one of actual recession, but of very slow growth.

It would involve a rise in unemployment from the 1969 average of 3.6 per cent to something like 4.5 per cent, and a drop in corporate profits up to 5 per cent. At best, it would be inauspicious start for the seventies, a decade bound to reflect change and social turmoil.

As for the seventies, the misplaced guesstimates for the "soaring sixties" are too fresh in mind to be over-confident about the numbers being floated for the new decade.

In the ten-year span just closed, real GNP (expressed in 1959 dollars) rose 53 per cent, or at an average of 4.3 per cent annual rate. That was considerably better than the 3.6 per cent average of the 1950's—although below what many had hoped or predicted ten years ago.

Most economists—either sucking their thumbs or programming their computers—are suggesting that the decade ahead will produce a 50 per cent gain in real terms. That would mean a GNP (in inflated dollar terms) of \$2,000,000,000,000 (two trillion) by the end of the 70's.

That would indeed seem to be the potential; but questions will arise on the distribution and redistribution of that income; on social priorities; and on the role of government in relation to the private economy.

President Nixon has already thrown out broad hints suggesting a delimitation of the role of government, and a re-emphasis on the private sector. In turn, that raises questions about the private economy's ability and willingness to divert attention from a consumer-oriented economy to achieve other goals.

But how the affluence of the 70's gets shared is a long-distance story, to which we will return later; there are more than enough problems for now to pre-occupy everyone.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 14, 1970]

A CAUTIOUS EASING OF MONEY POLICY?

(By Hobart Rowen)

We may be approaching one of those decisive points in our political history where a significant change in governmental policy coincides with and is reinforced by the arrival of a new man at the helm. In this case, the change would be economic: a shift toward a slight but positive relaxation of the tight monetary policy that has all but strangled the housing industry and resulted in the highest interest rates since the Civil War.

But this is economics with a major political impact. Democrats are already planning to pin a high-interest, price inflation label on the Nixon administration. Without some kind of relaxation of tight credit, pocketbook issues and economic recession could well top Vietnam as the No. 1 argument of the 1970 congressional campaign.

By dramatic coincidence, there is about to be a change of the guard at the Federal Reserve. Arthur F. Burns, counselor to and confidant of Richard Nixon, will on Feb. 1 shuffle a few blocks south—from Pennsylvania Avenue to Constitution—and take up residence as the new Chairman of the Board.

For 19 years that impressive seat of authority has been occupied by William McChesney Martin. The former "boy wonder" of Wall Street has since 1951 been eulogized by bankers everywhere as the very symbol of a sound American dollar, the guardian of the free enterprise system. An authentic strait-laced Midwestern conservative of unimpeachable personal integrity, Martin has outlasted four Presidents and leaves a fifth who invited him to continue.

Yet, as Martin retires, the monetary policy for which his Federal Reserve Board is custodian is the most controversial and least understood element in the U.S. economic complex. It is now generally agreed that the wide swings in the application of monetary policy in the past few years—from great ease to very tight—have themselves contributed to both inflation and recession in this country. And nobody even now is quite sure of how to manage the potent weapon of money flows and growth.

It is also generally agreed that if President Nixon can produce a balanced budget for fiscal 1971, there might be a disposition within the Federal Reserve (not without some struggle and disagreement) to relax the monetary strings. Secretary of Labor George Shultz, himself a distinguished economist, has said it is time to break the "stranglehold" on interest rates. One suspects that the Council of Economic Advisers to President Nixon privately agrees but finds it impolitic to say so.

Mr. Burns, properly, is also saying nothing. But it can be guessed that he too would be willing to take his foot off the monetary brake if the fiscal 1971 budget showed a balance. It was Mr. Burns, after all, who warned Mr. Nixon in 1960, when he was Vice President, that recession would develop unless

President Eisenhower induced a quick change from monetary and fiscal tightness. (Burns was right: Ike failed to act despite Mr. Nixon's pressure; there was a recession—and Mr. Nixon lost the presidency to John F. Kennedy.)

Milton Friedman, the dean of the "monetarists" school, has been saying for many months that growth in the supply of money—held almost at zero by the Fed—should move to a rate of 3 to 4 per cent, or about in pace with the growth of the economy. To be sure, Friedman doesn't place much faith in fiscal policy—balancing the budget—except to the degree that a balanced budget will persuade certain governors at the Fed to move off dead center.

It comes down to this:

If a balanced budget is considered essential by the Fed (and the financial community), it had best be a believable balance, free of gimmicks, which could play a role in dampening inflation. (Picking up \$1.5 billion by advancing collection of estate and gift taxes isn't likely to take much steam out of the economy.)

Above all, if the Fed feels that money policy can be eased, the shift should not be drastic.

Finally, the new direction of policy should be made highly visible, so the world will know what the Fed is doing; it would be useful if the Fed abandoned some of its traditional mysticism for clarity of purpose.

The reason for moving cautiously is plain: another swing of the pendulum all the way from tight money to easy money would only restore inflation. Yet, in recent years the Fed has almost always overreacted. As far back as May, 1958, economist Edward M. Bernstein said in the proceedings of the American Economic Association:

"A large excess in the money supply should not be allowed to develop, because under such conditions, the monetary authorities may be unaware of the magnitude of the inflation potential and unable to cope with it if the danger should emerge."

That perceptive observation is as good today as it was when written.

Governor Sherman J. Maisel (who favors a move toward a less restrictive policy) has noted that when the Fed moved toward an easier policy in mid-1968 (incorrectly assuming that the surtax would be sufficient to curb inflation), actual monetary reserves were increased by 50 per cent more than anyone at the Fed envisaged.

So what Mr. Burns will have to engineer is a delicate maneuver in which the six other governors, the five presidents (out of 12) of Regional Federal Reserve Banks and himself (who form the policy-making Open Market Committee) move modestly—and positively—toward monetary ease.

As the Martin era, with wide swings from easy to tight money and back, comes to a close, Burns might well rely on McLuhan: it is the medium that is the message. The country needs the knowledge of a policy change as much as the substance of it. At least for now.

ALL ODDS POINT TO INFLATION THIS YEAR

(By Frank C. Porter)

As it was in 1969, inflation is by all odds likely to be the most pressing problem facing the economy this year.

With consumer restiveness rising under retail price boosts averaging more than 5 per cent a year, with labor unions demanding huge catch-up wage increases, with the highest money rates in history and with some business sectors such as home building sorely out of joint, the question on everyone's mind is: How soon will inflation be eased and by how much?

Most analysts feel that any colleague with the temerity to offer an answer is a fool. Even intermittent pronouncements by Nixon administration officials that their anti-inflation policy is already taking hold are likened

to Herbert Hoover's reassurance in the early 1930's that "prosperity is just around the corner."

But Mr. Nixon is riding a better bet than Mr. Hoover. Never has the country undergone a recession without prices stabilizing or even declining (as they did precipitately in the Great Depression of the 1930's).

If the United States is not actually entering a recession, there is evidence that a substantial slowdown in business activity is already underway—one that many economists feel sufficient to decelerate the price spiral if it isn't reversed too abruptly.

Some are asking why this hasn't already produced a slowing in price escalation. And they wonder about the phenomenon of simultaneous recession and inflation.

The present price spiral is now more than four years old. The following table shows the annual increase in the Bureau of Labor Statistics' consumer price index (based on yearly averages) for the decade:

Year:	Percent
1960.....	1.6
1961.....	1.1
1962.....	1.2
1963.....	1.2
1964.....	1.3
1965.....	1.7
1966.....	2.9
1967.....	2.8
1968.....	4.2
1969 (est.).....	5.4

Whatever its causes—whether the incremental costs of the Vietnam war, federal fiscal policy and particularly the \$25 billion deficit in fiscal 1968, the shift in the Federal Reserve Board's monetary stance, the effect of finally reaching reasonably full employment, or a combination of all—the inflation has gained such momentum that it will take time to slow it down.

Meanwhile, the question that has puzzled economists and politicians for generations—whether price stability can be restored without considerable sacrifice in terms of increased unemployment—remains unresolved.

It is too early to tell but there is some preliminary evidence that this time the penalty may be considerably softened.

While industrial production has been receding the past four months, the latest figures show unemployment back at its post-Korean low of 3.3 per cent.

This conceals the slower increase in employment, the fact that more persons (particularly women and teenagers) are staying out of the work force and that the average work week has declined.

But it does not suggest that the country may be able to escape the massive unemployment that attended other cyclical downturns (about 7 per cent in 1958 and 1960). A number of reasons have been offered. The economy is becoming more service-oriented and employment is more stable in the services.

No one is predicting the end of the traditional trade-off between employment and price stability. But the trade-off may not be nearly the fearsome thing it once was.

SEATTLE NEEDS COMPETITIVE AIR ROUTE TO TOKYO

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I joined with my constituents and others of the Pacific Northwest in objecting to the final decision in the transpacific route case

last year when no combination air carrier was certificated from Seattle to Tokyo.

Last October, I so expressed my concern that there was just one Seattle-Tokyo combination air carrier in a letter to Secretary of State Rogers. Last Thursday, United Air Lines filed an application with the Civil Aeronautics Board to serve these two cities. I am pleased that United has made this application.

The lack of competitive combination air service between Seattle and Tokyo has had a decidedly adverse effect on the Pacific Northwest area.

There is a demanding economic need for competitive service on this route, which is 1,200 miles shorter than any other route to Japan from the west coast.

For this reason, I have asked President Nixon to support our position that increased air competition between Seattle and Tokyo is urgently needed and further urged him to request the Civil Aeronautics Board to set up the procedures for a route case limited to Seattle-Tokyo in order for interested parties to be heard in hopefully resolving the determination of needs for competitive passenger certification in this market.

I feel most strongly that this is essential if we are to develop Seattle in its proper role of "Gateway to the Orient."

POLL ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the battle to reverse the trend toward the destruction of our environment is virtually a life or death battle. It became clear to me that the feelings of the people should be known on this important issue.

As my actions in Congress related to this issue affect all of California, I have mailed a questionnaire to my constituents and to a number of other residents throughout the State, seeking their views.

I shall make the results of this poll available on a broad basis as soon as they have been tabulated. The questionnaire follows:

DEAR CONCERNED CITIZEN: I am asking you, a resident of California, to participate in this survey. As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the United States Congress, I am interested in your opinions on these questions. This spring, our committee will be holding hearings in California on environmental pollution. I would very much appreciate the opportunity to present your views to the committee. (The data collected will be made available to all California Congressmen, other elected officials and the press.)

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE BROWN,
Member of Congress.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you favor proposals to ban the internal combustion gasoline engine unless it meets stringent exhaust emission standards?

2. Do you feel that the oil companies and automobile manufacturers should be required to act more quickly to solve the problems of air pollution?

3. Do you favor a Federal Regulatory Commission on Environmental Quality?

4. With 95% of the 8,000 miles of the nation's shoreline in private hands, do you favor stronger government efforts to regulate shoreline use, in order to substantially increase the amount of beach property available for public use?

5. With the state's open spaces increasingly filled by urban sprawl and unplanned development, would you support stronger government efforts to regulate use of undeveloped open spaces, including advance acquisition of land for public use?

6. Would you support a complete ban on all Federal offshore oil drilling except in national emergency?

7. Do you favor much stronger governmental efforts to educate the public as to the problems of over-population?

8. What do you consider the national priorities for 1970? (Rank by Number.)

- Education?
- Crime?
- Pollution?
- Inflation?
- Vietnam?
- Urban Crisis?
- Taxes?
- Others?

9. Do you approve of the citizens of this state being given the opportunity to express their opinions through this questionnaire?

WE ARE COMING HOME TO CONFRONT YOU

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the following letter which I wish to share with my colleagues, is an excellent example of the spirit of the fine young men who are fighting in Vietnam. We seldom hear what they think, but we frequently hear from those at home who demonstrate and moratoriate irresponsible solutions to the war.

Sergeant Wynn speaks not only for himself, but for thousands of others who are making real contribution to our country while suffering through the anti-war headlines who capture page 1 day after day.

Sergeant Wynn is now on his second tour of duty in Vietnam, by his own choice. A native of Lenoir City, Tenn., Wynn joined the Marine Corps in 1961 and served for 3 years. He reenlisted in 1965 and served in South Vietnam from April 1966 to June 1967. He received a Purple Heart when he was wounded on Easter Sunday in 1967 during action near the demilitarized zone.

The following letter was sent to the editor of the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn., November 12, 1969:

NOVEMBER 12, 1969.

The EDITOR,
Knoxville News-Sentinel,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR SIR: I am a Marine presently serving in Vietnam. Since I cannot personally contact the people who are "honoring" us with a moratorium. I would like to do it through

this newspaper in an open "letter of appreciation."

Although I take full responsibility for this letter, the opinions, thoughts and desires expressed herein have been gleaned from numerous bull sessions, reactions to radio/TV newscasts, letters from home informing us of what is happening, and from local newspapers forwarded by our families. They come from people I know, or have known, personally, from a captain with a degree in law to a private first class who is a high school dropout. The majority, however, are between 18 and 20 years old with a high school education and definite plans for the future, whether it be college, marriage, or just working to buy a new car. I think it would behoove the American people and news media to listen and take heed to what these men have to say. These are the credentials which make me think I have the first hand knowledge to write what we feel in this following "letter of appreciation."

We, the servicemen fighting in Vietnam, wish to give our "thanks" to those "great patriots," Abby Hoffman and David Dellinger, who are "leading" our country in the streets and alleys as Hanof's fifth column in the United States; to those illustrious statesmen, Senators Fulbright, McCarthy and McGovern, who "back" our country and its fighting men "to the hilt" in much the same way as did Caesar's friend, Brutus; to that college fraternity, the Students for a Democratic Society, which is doing so much to preserve our rights of free speech guaranteed under the Constitution, as clearly shown by their "courteous" attitude when an opponent to their ideas is making a speech; and to all the other "comrades" who are giving us so much "loyal support," wherever they may be.

We have heard and seen many of the things you have done for our country and us. This letter is totally inadequate to tell you how we feel, but through "your efforts" we may be able to soon give you our "thanks" personally. Your words and deeds are burned into our minds and we will not forget.

Some day we will be able to tell you "how proud you made us" as you tore our Flag from its staff and dragged it through the streets to burn.

Some day we will be there to listen as you tell of your "efforts" and the "hardships" you underwent to send your blood to North Vietnam while we wasted our blood on the soil of South Vietnam.

Some day we will get to tell you just how "brave we thought you were" as you stood up to the "pigs", unarmed except for bricks, bottles and bags of human waste, to burn your draft cards.

Some day we will be able to convey to you our "feeling" for your battle cry, "Hell No! We Won't Go!" which has replaced our battle cry of the past, "I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country."

The name of your game is confrontation and we are coming home to confront you in the streets, in the universities, in the courts of law, in the voting booths, in Our Country. Everywhere we meet we will remember what you have done and give you our personal "thanks."

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. WYNN.

AMERICAN OFFICER SPEAKS
ON MYLAI

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the recent Mylai publicity, I

would like to share with my House colleagues the following excerpt from the letter of an American officer in Vietnam. This dedicated fighting man says much more than I can about the progress of the war and the adversities faced by our men there.

The excerpt follows:

The NVA and the VC are hanging on, but they are not in good shape any longer. The prisoners that we are taking now state that many of their comrades are down with malaria, malnutrition, beri-beri, and many types of fungus. They state that morale in the enemy troops is very low and that most soldiers are now convinced that they cannot win. They state that many more would like to defect to our side but they are afraid of being killed if they are caught trying. The whole picture is very optimistic for us. We know that they will hit us in small groups and try to make large propaganda out of it. In fact, unfortunately our stateside newspapers are probably their best propaganda medium at present. The Mylai incident write-ups are being used verbatim in their leaflet drops. Of course our stateside papers gave very little space to the over 3000 civilians including women and children that were killed in Hue last year when the VC came in. In fact we're still uncovering mass graves up there. I surely wish the silent majority would get a little noisier.

TIMBER

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Timber," appearing in the Badger Sportsman published in Chilton, Wis., in December 1969.

I hope my colleagues will read this sincere expression of concern about a very much threatened natural resource and the effect upon our national forests of H.R. 12025 as presently drawn.

The article referred to follows:

TIMBER: LOBBYISTS EYE U.S. FORESTS—ACT MAY START VICIOUS EXPLOIT OF PUBLIC LANDS

(By John Franson)

Almost a quarter of a century ago, fervent conservationists like Gifford Pinchot fought to protect our national forest system from being raided by private interests. Pinchot and a small band of other men finally managed to designate vast portions of lands as "forest reservations".

These eventually became our national forests. Pinchot was a bitter enemy of wholesale clear-cutting and an advocate of what he called "ecological forestry" or possibly what is termed now as selective cutting.

As long ago as this seems, the private lumbering interests looked upon the public lands as a windfall for timber supply. As the years passed, large tracts of private land owned by lumber and paper companies were cut and recut. Privately owned timber supplies were wantonly harvested and exhausted. This is most evident on small woodlots of farms which are now nothing but scrub timber and brush.

Industry has done as it pleased. Northern Wisconsin can testify to this. Once the entire state was slashed and cut. Then, as Aldo Leopold said, "It burned for 30 years".

Due to the foresight of Pinchot and others, the public forest lands have been mod-

estly cut for the most part. Some areas have even been declared off-limits to timbering. The selective cutting of timber on these public lands promised a sustained yield if these practices were continued—and if we did not get greedy.

Some 20 years ago the lumbering interests proposed that the federal government turn the national forests over to the states for cutting. The states promised to return the forests to the federal government for reforestation, after they had had their way with them. Conservationists defeated this effort, but it looks as though they have run the complete circle.

The public is easily confused by the tricky labels placed on certain pieces of obnoxious legislation. One pending in Congress now is called the "National Timber Supply Act." On the surface the act and its proponents seem very reasonable.

They say that a building supply shortage and a drop in lumber prices will require a greater annual harvest of timber. With most of the private holdings stripped, the lumbering interests naturally turn to the national forests.

The timber act would require that the timber harvest in the national forests be increased. Part of the profits from this increased harvest will go to a fund used "only for increasing timber yield." Thus a vicious circle of lumbering on public lands begins.

The additional money from this fund would not necessarily be used for replanting. It could be used for building logging roads through scenic sections of national forests which may now be roadless. Possibly it could even be used for inroads into previously untouched areas. Certainly it would be used for personnel increases in facilitate logging.

Not only does the proposed National Timber Supply Act threaten the public domain, but apparently it is needless legislation. The so-called "short supply" of timber is not necessarily due to a housing emergency or the demand for more lumber. This move could be a confession of poor management by the private land owners, but it is questionable whether or not an increased yield really is necessary.

In this age of technology there are many materials which already replace lumber if we were running short. On the other hand, indications are that we are not short at all. The private lumber industry is now exporting 4 billion board feet of logs and lumber a year. More than enough to meet domestic needs. Even the domestic shortage of which the lumber lobby speaks was only temporary last spring.

The lumber interests also say they need more lumber to make up for a price decrease.

Lumber prices have increased by almost one-half of what they were six months ago. The sharp drop in lumber prices last spring might even suggest that a look should be taken at the lumber inventories of large corporations. These rises and declines in lumber prices hint of a privately administered price and supply situation.

But the Department of Agriculture played right into the hands of the lumber industry—they announced sharp cuts in the price of national forest timber.

Today, the uses of our national forests vary far beyond timber supply alone. Fortunately in most cases, their management allows for intense recreational use by the American public. This, in the long run, may be their best and most cherished purpose—not timber supply.

Gifford Pinchot's idea of ecological forestry was a forest that would not only provide wood products but hold soil as watersheds, support wildlife and provide the necessary uses to man such as scenery, wilderness and the host of recreational activities that are presently enjoyed in the national forests.

Some of the Forest Service's most recent activities are disturbing enough without the

National Timber Supply Act. Lately the Forest Service seems to have acquiesced to the school of clear cutting—except they don't call it that. There is a new word in the Forest Service for clear cutting. It is called "even aged management"—a very positive sounding phrase for questionable management.

The American public is faced with reversing a trend toward "clear cutting" back to "selective cutting". The clear cutting trend has prospered in the new forestry schools many of which are influenced, promoted and underwritten by the lumbering interests.

The lumber lobby has been working hard in Washington. The House Agriculture and Forestry Committee has already favorably reported on their version of the National Timber Supply Act. The Senate seems inclined to schedule hearings. Some of Wisconsin's biggest paper industries have endorsed it. The public remains unaware of what is taking place.

Between this innocent-sounding act and the lumbering trends—the cries of "Timber!" will soon be echoing in our national forests as they never have since we fought to save them a quarter of a century ago.

OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM IN CRISIS

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, recent Court decisions ordering immediate integration to our school systems is playing havoc with our educational system.

Students, without regard to race, creed, or color, are the actual victims of the disruptive situation which faces our school boards.

School officials find themselves at mid-term with an insoluble problem of transferring students and faculty from school to school without orderly planning. Courses of study begun under one teacher in one school setting, are to be changed

without regard for the harm this will do to the student.

Parents, students, and the general public are justifiably upset.

We have made every effort within the Congress to pass legislation which would alleviate this situation and allow for orderly processes. I have called on the Attorney General to point out that many of our school districts face a crisis that local boards simply are unable to solve. I have pleaded that the Justice Department utilize every means to help our local officials in this regard.

I call upon the courts to recognize that there are differences in the various school districts and that each should be judged on its own merit and not a summary order which does not take into regard the children in our schools.

Regardless of what can be done, education has suffered and will suffer because of the ill-advised actions of the courts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 20, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine and doeth them, will be like a wise man who built his house upon a rock.—Matthew 7: 24.

Eternal God, who art the refuge of the humble and the strength of the faithful, help us to realize more than ever that the only firm foundation upon which our Nation can build safely is a true faith in Thee and in a real devotion to moral and spiritual values.

May the security of our American way, the survival of our democratic spirit, and the support of our free institutions find inspiration in the assurance of Thy power, Thy wisdom, and Thy love.

Each day may we keep ourselves committed to Thee whose love never falters, whose light never fades, and whose life never fails. Thus may we face this day with courage and faith knowing Thou art with us always and all the way.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 477. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on Thursday, January 22, 1970.

THE PRESIDENT'S PRIMARY OBJECTION TO THE HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

(Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the President's primary objections to the HEW appropriations bill is that it contains some \$400 million in excess of his budget request for grants to schools in federally impacted areas. The additional funds for this program are highly questionable, as shown by the recent report of the Battelle Institute which was commissioned by Congress to study the impact aid program.

The Battelle study found that the current program overcompensates many districts, allowing them to maintain a higher level of education with less local effort. In many cases these overpayments go to wealthy school districts: for example, some \$5.8 million in impact aid went to the richest county in the Nation in 1968, while the 100 poorest counties received only a total of \$3.2 million.

The study also noted that impact aid tends to frustrate State policies designed to equalize educational opportunities. Since impact aid payments cannot be taken into account in making State equalization payments, States must use their scarce funds to double pay districts with Federal impact, instead of being able to use those funds where the gap between educational needs and financial resources is the greatest.

Certainly, pouring more money into this program will only create greater inequities for the many school districts in the country in which the need for financial assistance may be just as great or greater, but which do not receive support.

INTERNATIONAL CLERGY WEEK

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, almost 27 years ago the lives of 678 men were snuffed out by a single tragedy—the torpedoed sinking of the troop transport *Dorchester* in the cold waters of the North Atlantic off the coast of Greenland.

Sadly, the ship was only 90 minutes from its destination, but within 27 minutes 678 of the 904 men on board were lost in the iceberg waters of the North Atlantic.

Included among the group on the ship were four chaplains—a priest, a rabbi, and two ministers. They, too, lost their lives, but the manner in which they fell to death was unusual and has an interesting story. Briefly, I would like to share with you some facts of that fateful venture.

These chaplains went down with their ship because they had given their life jackets to soldiers who lost theirs in the confusion or had left them below deck.

Meanwhile, with utter disregard for self and having given their own life jackets away, the chaplains stood hand in hand, praying to God they served for the safety of those men who were leaving the sinking ship in fear and terror.

Appropriately, I feel, the delegates to the Civitan International Convention in Dallas, Tex., on June 27, 1962, adopted a resolution honoring the clergymen by asking the respective States to set aside and program a week each year to be known as International Clergy Week.

In my home State of Tennessee last year, the Governor proclaimed the week of February 3 as Clergy Week.

In view of this action, I feel it is only fitting that this Congress pass a joint resolution calling on President Nixon to proclaim the week of February 3 as International Clergy Week in the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced such a resolution today to accomplish this goal.

FAILURE OF THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC POLICIES

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)