

minority leader, the acting minority leader, the manager of the bill, Mr. STENNIS, and all other Senators who made it possible to reach the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think the thanks go to those who work on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Massachusetts, to the leadership, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), and others who have assisted them in working out this matter. It is very difficult and very complex. I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) for his attitude in enabling us to get to a vote.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator, the acting majority leader, and the acting minority leader for working out the agreement. As the distinguished minority whip said there is no time which would accommodate everyone, but I think we have done the best we could under the circumstances.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am very glad we have this agreement on the ABM

vote. I think that after that occurs, this bill will move along rapidly. I know it should and that everyone will cooperate in trying to bring about the consummation of these decisions. The matter should be concluded as soon as we can, and by all means action on this bill should be completed before we think about taking a Labor Day recess.

I thank the Senator.

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon completion of the special orders for the recognition of Senators tomorrow, there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow, the un-

finished business be laid before the Senate.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 18, 1970, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OREGONIAN SAYS MANY FORESTED AREAS HAVE TO BE LOGGED TO BE SAVED

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1970

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the Portland Oregonian, one of the Northwest's distinguished newspapers, recently published an editorial which pointed out that people who talk in emotional terms about saving our forest frequently overlook the fact that in many cases these forested areas must be logged to be saved.

The editorial cites the case of a 1,400-acre tract of Ponderosa Pine on the Metolius River in Oregon which had been set aside as a natural area since the 1930's but which has deteriorated into a mess. Large trees are dying, rust and bugs are taking a heavy toll, and snags dot the area.

This deteriorated area is contrasted with adjacent managed areas which have been protected against insects and logged under Forest Service supervision.

This well-reasoned editorial is especially significant to me because I have on display in my office a series of five photographs which graphically tell the story of a managed forest in the Willow Creek area south of St. Maries, Idaho, in the St. Jose National Forest.

This forested area was logged in the 1930's, about the time that the Metolius River area, described in the Oregonian, was set aside as a natural area. When

this acreage was taken over by the Forest Service in 1938, only a few native seedlings were visible in the first photo in my series, showing the logged-over area, a sight that many people object to if they do not understand the cycle of a managed forest. In 1939 and 1942, CCC crews planted 4-year-old trees from the Forest Service nursery, filling in the blank spaces left by the natural seeding. This new growth is very apparent in the second photo, taken in 1944.

In the third photo, taken 11 years later, the hillsides are mantled with young trees. Shrubs between them provide abundant food for deer and elk. Because the earlier forest was clearcut, the new one contains sun-loving trees. The clearcutting also helped reduce the incidence of dwarf mistletoe, the parasitic problem plant referred to in the Oregonian editorial.

The fourth photo, taken 16 years after the management program began, shows a vigorous growth of new trees so large and dense that they would benefit from thinning and weeding. The last photo in the series, taken in 1969, shows a beautiful, maturing forest of the type that makes Idaho one of the most beautifully forested areas in the continent.

This series of photographs and the Oregonian editorial both make a case for multiple-use management of our forest resources. This type of management "saves" a valuable, renewable resource, and contributes to the welfare of our wildlife and to the economic welfare of man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Oregonian editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

MANAGED FORESTS

The best possible management of national forests is everyone's business, but not everyone will take the time or trouble to get the facts straight. Preservationist fanatics who seek to block logging in vast acreages of federal commercial timber talk in emotional terms, of "saving" the forests. But the fact is, in many cases these forested areas must be logged to be "saved."

Before a Sierra Club critic makes the expected rejoinder, this is not at all like saying, as an American officer was quoted as saying in Vietnam, that he had to destroy a village to save it.

Doubters should visit a 1,400-acre tract of Ponderosa pine next to the road down the Metolius River below Camp Sherman which has been set aside as a "natural area" since the early 1930s. Foresters have guarded it against fire, but have not touched it in any other way. It looks a mess. Large trees are dying. Rust and bugs are taking a heavy toll. Snags dot the area. It is unlikely that the overstory will survive more than 10 years longer.

In adjacent areas the Forest Service has permitted contract logging of trees of declining vigor to control infestation of the western pine beetle—up to 5,000 board feet per acre. This is a controlled landscape management program, also evident along the Santiam Highway, in which logging is done with rubber-tired vehicles on a snow cover, slash is burned, buried or chipped, and the more open, parklike result is a scenic stand of old growth pine.

In the same area, on a plateau above the river, another problem is being met in a way preservationists may scream about unless they listen to the reason. The villain there is dwarf mistletoe, a parasite which saps the life of conifers. The seeds of this destroyer are in berry-like fruits which, on maturity,

"explode" through the air for 50 feet or more and stick to other trees. Sometimes the mistletoe clusters reach great size, weighing hundreds of pounds. The growths which attack the trunks of younger trees will so weaken them that they will never reach maturity but will fall prey to insects and other diseases.

Clear-cutting—a practice not generally used in the "yellow-belly" pine country of Central Oregon—is the only sure, known method of getting rid of an infestation of dwarf mistletoe. Replanting with healthy stock is, of course, the necessary next step. But in the interim, complaints are expected about "desecration" of scenic forests. And there are 110,000 acres of ponderosa pine and 100,000 acres of other species among the 1,587,692 acres of the Deschutes National Forest, alone, seriously infected with mistletoe. Because of shortage of funds, it would take 10 years to clear and replant less than 20,000 acres of the infected, doomed mistletoe forest at the present rate of treatment.

This inability because of financing or other reasons to keep up with forest decay is the real problem of forest management, and it is not improved by the complaints from zealots who raise political storms about every clear-cut in the forest.

In a related situation, the Sierra Club has protested the Lucky timber sale on 13,000 acres of pine between the Cascades Lakes Highway and the Three Sisters Wilderness area. This is a regular commercial sale, but because it leads into the wilderness the Forest Service has laid down conditions for shelterwood and limited clear-cut logging which will preserve the timbered vista and provide for intensive slash clean-up.

The protest here is similar to that lodged against timber sales on the Western Cascades. The Sierra Club and some others demand "buffer strips" outside wilderness areas—in other words, an expansion of the wilderness area without benefit of congressional sanction.

As a matter of practice, the Forest Service itself provides a buffer strip by careful logging to preserve the scenic values. But it does not, and should not, permit the preservationists to commandeer the commercial forest outside wilderness boundaries. The sorry degeneration of the Metolius Natural Area shows why this should not be done. And Oregon's forest-based economy provides another sound reason for a managed, multiple-use forest.

MALE POVERTY SLOWLY FADING BUT WOMEN ARE TRAPPED

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday this House passed the equal rights amendment. As I listened to and participated in that debate I became even a stronger advocate of the need for action. After the debate, a Washington Post column by Richard Harwood which appeared July 22, 1970, was called to my attention. I think Mr. Harwood's article indicates one result of our failure to give all women equal pay for equivalent work.

The article follows:

MALE POVERTY SLOWLY FADING BUT WOMEN ARE TRAPPED

(By Richard Harwood)

The Census Bureau last week published a fresh communique on poverty in the United

States. The gist of it was that the problem is slowly going away, at least as a statistical concept.

There were roughly 40 million poor at the start of the 1960s, about 22 per cent of the American people. At the end of the decade there were about 24 million, 12 per cent of our people.

For those who like to take a happy view of these things, the numbers seem impressive. Whites and blacks, old and young have been getting out of the poverty classification at the rate of nearly 2 million a year. As a result, the "total elimination of poverty" has become something the nation can easily afford.

It would have taken only \$10 billion last year, the Census Bureau calculates, to raise the income of all poor people above the poverty line—\$7 billion for the poor whites, \$3 billion for the poor blacks.

That kind of money is peanuts in an economy generating more than \$900 billion a year. But still Congress hesitates and the modest Family Assistance Plan proposed by the administration is stalled in a Senate committee room by well-fed men playing Hamlet.

Some of them no doubt believe that if you wait another 10 years or so the problem will solve itself, that it is a self-liquidating affliction.

That notion is a half-truth at best because people who are poor have unequal capacities for self-help. The record of the 1960s proves that point.

At the beginning of the decade there were nearly 5 million poor families in this country headed by a man under 65 years of age. By the end of the decade there were fewer than 2.5 million such families. This means that if you were a poor kid—either black or white—in 1960 and lived with your father, you had a 50-50 chance of getting out of poverty by 1970.

If your father was gone, however, and you lived with your mother your chances of getting out of poverty in that decade were zero. There were as many poor families headed by women in 1970 as in 1960. Among blacks, the situation was even worse.

The number of poverty-stricken Negro families headed by women has increased by more than a third over the past 10 years. There were 483,000 such families in 1959 and today there are nearly 700,000 containing 3.8 million people. They represent more than half of the poor blacks in America. Families headed by white women contain another 3.6 million of the poor.

For these families, any escape from poverty through the workings of the private economy—slices of a bigger pie—is little more than a pipe dream. They are locked in and they will remain locked in until their children get old enough to work or until an able-bodied male joins the household.

The reason is that the private economy is not generous to women in America, and it is most especially not generous to the poorly-educated "welfare mother."

If these women had left their homes and their children to enter the labor market in 1968, if they had had the same education and training as the "average" woman in the labor market, if they had held an "average" full time job and worked an "average" number of weeks they would have enjoyed an "average" income of \$3,621. That doesn't quite get a family of four out of "poverty," which is currently defined as an income of about \$3,800 a year.

This problem transcends the problem of racial discrimination. The median money earnings of white women who worked full time in 1968 was \$3,731; for Negro women the figure was \$2,766.

For men of both races, the rewards of work were far greater. White men had median full

time earnings of \$7,447; the Negro median was \$4,761.

What this means is that poor men in America have some hope of getting themselves and their children out of poverty if they stick to it long enough for the private economy to slowly draw them in.

But the poor woman trying to raise a family alone is hopelessly trapped. The private economy simply will not take her out of poverty.

That is why the administration's Family Assistance Plan—or some version of it—is the only solution to her problems. The fact that the 1960s made no dent whatever in the problems of the poor women in this country is a national disgrace and it is time that the Senate faced up to it.

SOME SPRIGS OF GOOD NEWS

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1970

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, in these times, when we are beset with so many problems, perhaps we forget that some encouraging things are happening, too. We are grateful to Bill Monroe of "NBC News" for calling attention to them recently in a "Byline Report" on the "Today" show.

For many listeners, Mr. Monroe's words proved to be a tonic. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his broadcast, "Some Sprigs of Good News," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SOME SPRIGS OF GOOD NEWS

(By Bill Monroe)

In this summer of 1970, just as Americans had almost accepted the dismal idea that the news had turned permanently bad, a few sprigs of good news have appeared.

Because of an American peace initiative, which seems to have gotten some backing from the Russians, those bitter enemies, the Arabs and the Israelis, have said, all right, we'll try to talk it out. They may not succeed. But at least they're serious enough about it so that, on both sides, they're standing firm against their own extremists who don't want any attempt at peace.

In Vienna, Americans and Russians have been talking for almost four months about limiting the ominous escalation of nuclear weapons. Reportedly they're making progress.

In this country, there are signs of a more rational approach to our own deep internal divisions.

The government may not have changed its mind about some of its militant young critics but it seems to have eased its language of condemnation. It is seeking better contacts with students, with educators and with blacks.

There are reports from campuses, there are reports from black ghettos, of more emphasis on change through politics, less emphasis on confrontation by seizure, by brickbat and by rabid rhetoric. The anger is still there but the moderates are insisting on a say in how it's expressed.

In magazine articles, leaders of the anti-Vietnam war movement write of their discovery that, while most Americans may not like war, they like flag burning even less. In Chicago, a group of black men contends

openly with a powerful young street gang over who's going to speak for their community.

These are some of the signs, at home and abroad, that there is less talk this summer of tearing down the house and more talk of fixing the roof. The roof, of course, may take plenty of fixing.

But there it is, nevertheless, more hopeful news, springing up like green shoots in burned-over land. And if you're one of those human persons who tends to blame television for bringing too much bad news, we'll be happy to accept your congratulations for our recently improved performance.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, August 21 will mark the second anniversary of the Soviet-led occupation of Czechoslovakia. This outrageous violation of human rights and international law by the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact satellites abruptly halted the slow steps being made in Czechoslovakia to develop a certain measure of political liberty. At the time of this invasion the basic democratic and freedom-loving nature of the Czech people was gradually winning over the repressive and totalitarian aspects of Russian-style communism that had been imposed on that small nation. The courageous Czechoslovaks were discovering a new sense of personal freedom, freedom of political expression that we Americans take for granted. Such basic rights as the right freely to travel—also taken for granted under our Constitution—were to the Czechs a source of new found joy. Even the professional Communist leadership was slowly moving toward a form of two-party state.

All of this encouraging movement toward freedom was of course too much for the Soviet imperialists to swallow. For the Soviets, aptly called the "new czars" by their former Red Chinese allies, cannot tolerate the slightest manifestation of political freedom within their satellite empire.

The captive nations of Eastern Europe, together with the many captive nationality groups that make up the modern-day Soviet Union, comprise an empire held together by force, fear, and isolation. The Communist-militarists now in control in Moscow fear that a taste for freedom among their captive nations might well spread into the Soviet Union itself; they fear that once their young people tasted the freedoms of expression and movement that there would be no turning back to the modified Stalinism of the current regime.

So it was, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviet imperialists and their satellite lackeys struck out in fear to run roughshod over Czechoslovakia. The recent period of slow but sure Stalinization in Czechoslovakia has by now led to the total expulsion from the Communist Party of the

leaders of the "Prague spring" and has led to the reimposition of hardline Communist totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, the ruthless and illegal actions of the Soviet imperialists on August 21, 1968, when considered together with Soviet imperialism in the Middle East and Southeast Asia, holds an obvious lesson for the free world. That is that the Soviets have combined the expansionism so much a part of Communist ideology with the worst aspects of 19th-century imperialism. The product of this combination is an aggressive and powerful nation-state intent on territorial, economic, and political expansion.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently engaged in negotiations with the Soviets of the most serious nature, as are our West German allies. Perhaps some good can come from these negotiations. But the lesson of August 21, 1968, is that in dealing with the Soviet imperialists we must always be wary, and always negotiate from a position of strategic strength.

THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT FOUNDATION, INC.

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to inform Senators of the National Environment Foundation, Inc., a charitable, scientific, and educational institution which was created to act as a catalyst and prime authority in the problems of the environment which face the Nation and its people, and which may make a lasting contribution in this field.

This foundation was formed to assemble and collate, and to place into a private data bank system for the first time, all information and on-going research from Government, industry, universities, and the private sector concerning the environment and matters ecological.

As Senators know, recent testimony before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries recommended in substance that a central data bank on the environment within the Federal Government be delayed indefinitely. I am, therefore, most happy to inform the Senate that the National Environment Foundation is commencing activity along these lines, the comprehensive information from which will be made available to all interested parties.

When the accumulated data reaches such form, a foundation board of distinguished scientists with impeccable credentials in the particular fields will render findings and recommendations, both as to the acute and the long-range aspects.

Finally, the foundation will then widely disseminate this information and findings throughout school systems, the private sector, Government at all levels, universities, and other research areas.

The foundation thus becomes a prime source and authority in the environmental field, and occupies an unbiased posture somewhere between government and industry.

A basic belief of the foundation, as described to me, is that betterment of our environment will not come about by government and more government, nor through industry alone, but through a matter of national will, which in essence must be based upon the widespread dissemination of proper and correct educational information, particularly to the youth of America into whose hands the stewardship of the environment must pass.

To these ends the National Environment Foundation is committed.

Earlier this year I introduced Senate bill 3388 which would establish an Environmental Quality Administration to consolidate the more important agencies and authorities within the Federal Government, and to coordinate our basic Federal environmental quality efforts. Since President Nixon's proposed Environmental Protective Agency will establish these same ends, it is of particular interest to me, therefore, that sincere and dedicated distinguished Americans under the capable leadership and direction of Mr. Walker P. Buel, president, are uniting to engage in important environmental work through private endeavor which will parallel and benefit the efforts of Government in the critical areas of the environment.

As one of its major projects, the foundation is sponsoring Dimension U.S.A. Commitment: Environment, a major 20-city exposition tour beginning in mid-1971 in the city of Philadelphia, the birthplace of other important happenings in the history of this great Nation.

This will be the first of three such tours. The second is now scheduled into the bicentennial in 1976, also in Philadelphia, in the nature of a progress report on the environment to the American people, and the final exposition in 1980 as a review of the progress made by Government and industry and private research in this decade of the environment.

The exposition will illustrate the concern and activities of Government and industry, have a central theme, exhibit specific techniques and processes now extant, and include what is presently in the research stage and what is planned for the future.

Impact of the show will also illustrate the importance of the individual citizen's role in bettering his environment as an integral part of it.

Reasons for this exposition are twofold: First, the exposition furthers the educational aspect of the National Environment Foundation, and second, the Department of the Interior three times has been rebuffed by industry for some type of illustrative trade fair on the environment, and Secretary Hickel has recently canceled a similar show here in Washington which was well underway.

As an unbiased, nonpolitical catalyst, the Foundation is in the unique posture of being able to bring industry and Gov-

ernment together in an exposition of this kind.

In summation, these exhibits will be available to millions of people who are now somewhat confused and uninformed about what the responsible segments of Government and the Nation are doing about the problems or, in fact, that they even care about them.

Final repository of the exposition exhibits themselves, which will be kept upgraded by the appropriate industry trade associations and governmental departments and overseen by the Foundation, will be in the Nation's Capital.

It is indeed my pleasure, therefore, to bring to the Senate this brief notification of the National Environment Foundation and its major aims, aspirations, and activities.

WE MUST PRESERVE OUR OCEAN RESOURCES

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent activities regarding the disposal of lethal nerve gas in the Atlantic Ocean have focused the attention of the Nation and the world on a major problem—the preservation of our ocean resources. As I stated in the House of Representatives earlier this week, we must take positive action now if we are to prevent our waters from becoming the garbage dump of the world.

It is not idle philosophy to observe that although we tend to ignore or misuse the sea resources—as a nation and as a people—we will eventually live or die by the sea. Such a postulate takes into consideration our future utilization of the sea as a source of food, minerals, fresh water—via desalination—as well as its use as a storage facility.

Yet, in spite of such potentials, very little moneys are being spent on useful, relevant projects to enhance our understanding of this invaluable resource. For example, we know very little about the coral reefs portions of the sea—a vitally important ecological area.

Thus, in the absence of this knowledge, we are engaged in an ironic and senseless sort of war today—man against his environment. Unfortunately, man seems to be winning and the eventual outcome could mean his destruction. Obviously something must be done—and soon—to make compatible partners of the current combatants.

The University of Miami's Field Station at Pigeon Key in the sun-splashed Florida Keys represents one of the most tangible steps taken to evolve such a treaty. Don Groves, in his August 1970 Underseas Technology magazine article, has excellently summarized the work of this vitally important university activity. I call this important article to the attention of our colleagues:

PIGEON KEY—UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI'S FIELD LABORATORY

(By Don Groves)

Ecology, now beginning to receive considerable national attention, is emerging as a major field of emphasis in university biology and urban programs. Ecology, of course, involves intensive study of all aspects of the environment, including the tropical and subtropical marine areas. In these mangrove and coral reef portions of the marine environment, various principles and processes having broad application to all living things can be investigated in such a way as to reveal an understanding of the present, an interpretation of the past and a prediction of the future.

Unfortunately, such essential studies of marine phenomena often involve long and costly voyages. Moreover, as Dr. S. R. Galler, assistant secretary for science at the Smithsonian Institution, has said: "... The lack of adequate field facilities for observing living organisms in their normal habitats over long periods of time has been one of the principal handicaps in establishing the validity of working hypotheses which describe the mediums of primary productivity, biological cycles, and other fundamentally important biological phenomena. Usually, these hypotheses are constructed from three kinds of data—laboratory data (which is now relatively reliable), collections of preserved specimens (which at present are inadequate) and field measurements (few of which have been made)..."

Recognizing these facts, the University of Miami recently obtained a 20-year lease for a field station on Pigeon Key, Fla., to conduct tropical marine studies.

Named for the white-crowned wild pigeon, Pigeon Key is a small, isolated—but accessible—3.5-acre island in the line of the Florida Keys, lying midway between the Straits of Florida and the Gulf of Mexico. The area is one of the richest in coral growths and ocean fauna in the continental United States. The island is crossed by a seven-mile bridge which runs northeast to southwest between the town of Marathon on Key Vaca and Bahia Honda Keys.

The University of Miami's Rosentiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences operated the facility for three years, beginning in 1965, as a biological research station until funding shortages curtailed operations. In 1968, the present 20-year lease was issued by Monroe County to the University of Miami. A committee representing the Rosentiel School, the medical school and the main campus, the Monroe County Commission, the Marathon Chamber of Commerce, and the Florida Keys Recreation and Conservation Society administers the operation of Pigeon Key.

The facilities on the island are available primarily to student investigators and qualified groups. Saint Olaf, Harvard, Louisiana State, Tulane, Wooster, North Carolina and Princeton are but a few of the schools that have conducted studies at Pigeon Key. The facilities are made available on a first-come, first-served basis to both male and female undergraduates, independent researchers and graduate students. (Interested persons should first contact Dr. E. H. Man, Dean, Research Coordination, P.O. Box 8293, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla. 33124.)

The Pigeon Key facilities, which are currently being refurbished, include a general classroom and laboratories with several sea water holding tanks for both small and large specimens, a dark room and a cold room. Instruction in both scuba and skin diving are offered. Living quarters for more than 50 scientists are available.

The sea around Pigeon Key provides a

magnificent laboratory. Here, for example, the properties of the water mass are sometimes oceanic and sometimes those of Florida Bay.

One of the characteristics of the bay and associated flats is the high salinity and temperature of the water during the summer months, and an associated high rate of calcium carbonate deposition. The entire area has a base of Key Largo limestone. Pigeon Key, like many of the other keys, is a promontory of this material with eroded rock shores and a covering of shallow organic duff.

The waters around Pigeon Key abound in coral growth. The cement pillings of the overseas highway are covered with growth of stony corals, alcyonarians and sponges. At the bases of rocks below the low tide zone are small clusters of the coral *Porites*, several genera of coralline algae such as *Amphiroa*, *Jania* and *Goniolithon*, and other calcareous forms such as *Peniculus* and *Halméda*.

Beyond Hawk Channel, about five miles from Pigeon Key, the Florida Barrier Reef lies parallel to the Gulf Stream. The reefs are extensive outcroppings of live corals such as *Acropora* and *Porites*, which lie inches below the surface at low tide and whose dead patches protrude above. Studies of the ecology of associated fauna such as reef fishes have been carried out in this vicinity by the staff of the Rosentiel School, and the reefs afford valuable areas for many future studies.

Besides the extensive calcareous deposits and growth, the eroded rock along the shore affords refuge to most of the typical intertidal rock-dwelling invertebrates of the West Indian region. There are also extensive banks of the turtle grass *Thalassia* lining channels and rock outcroppings, where fauna is rich and varied in tropical invertebrates and fishes. These shallows are so shoal that at low tide, they are only two or three feet below the surface and often completely bare.

Because of the extensive movement of water during the tidal cycle, Pigeon Key does not appear to be endangered by polluted waters, even under extremes of settlement in nearby keys. The larger keys in the vicinity have growths of tropical plants and halophytic forms that are protected by conservation regulations and may be used for study.

SCHWEIKER PRAISES CENTRE COUNTY LAY CHAPLAIN

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Congress to an example of voluntary action and involvement by a Centre County, Pa., resident.

Charles Schlow, of State College, has been a lay chaplain to the inmates of the State Correctional Institute at Rockview, Pa., for over 50 years. He has not only conducted religious services for inmates, but has arranged for family visits, helped inmates to secure jobs upon their release from prison, and done many other acts of kindness for the inmates.

At a time when much criticism is being made about our penal system, and about the lack of rehabilitation being done in our prisons, this example of 50 years of unselfish service by Charles Schlow helps us to keep in proper focus just what our

prisons should be doing. I think the most important thing he has done during these 50 years has been to let the inmates know that they are not forgotten, that someone cares, and thus to serve as an inspiration for the inmates to better themselves when they leave prison.

The Centre Daily Times published an article about Charles Schlow on July 9, 1970. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHARLES SCHLOW THE UNOFFICIAL BUT OFFICIAL ROCKVIEW CHAPLAIN

(By Nadine Kofman)

Last month, Charles Schlow of State College received a membership card from the American Correctional Chaplains Association in Washington—made out to Rabbi Charles Schlow.

He is the only member of that organization who is not a rabbi, but the confusion is understandable since for the past 50 years he has been a chaplain to the Jewish inmates at the State Correctional Institute at Rockview.

In 1920 he was asked by the former chaplain to assume the duties, and since that time, he has, on his own, met on Sunday mornings with a group of inmates, composed largely of Jewish prisoners, but usually with a few Protestant and Catholic men as well. The group has numbered from as few as one to as many as 14 at one time.

The Sunday services may include a prayer or a chapter reading from the Bible, but there is always a discussion around a specific theme, which may be a current events issue, a basic humanistic or religious idea or a book. He does not preach to the men.

"Religion is how you live," he says. "You don't preach to grown-up men, you've got to get them to think a little."

For one service, Mr. Schlow brought up the topic of pollution, and discussed it in terms of mind pollution.

One topic they do not discuss is their crimes.

"I never ask a man what he's done. What he did is water under the bridge," he says.

The important thing now, he feels, is to get the men to think—to get a discussion going, even to the point of argument. "To make them live outside for a minute," he says. Sometimes a guard comes in to listen.

On their own, the men read newspapers and books, which are available to them through the prison, and Mr. Schlow often lends books from his own extensive library. Recently, he supplied one man with a book on psychology.

He also sets aside time to listen to problems. Tuesdays or Wednesdays he makes individual appointments, "because a man may have something to talk about," he says. They meet informally in his office at the penitentiary, where the Sunday services are usually held.

Mr. Schlow has several files full of letters from men in the prison and men who have been released, thanking him for his help and letting him know how they are getting along.

Over the years, he has arranged for family visits and acted as liaison between the family, the prisoner and the prison. He has contacted businessmen to arrange for jobs for men so that they can be released, and agencies to help individuals after their release, and he has filled numerous special requests from men in the prison. On religious holidays he takes the men holiday food, which they cannot get at the institution.

He receives weekly letters from men at the

penitentiary, usually with the heading—"friend-advisor."

He corresponds not only with the men, but also with their families, who often write for help and information.

Due to his closeness with the men, he has been asked by inmates on numerous occasions "to take them out"—which means to meet a man at the gate when he is released, rather than have the penitentiary arrange for transportation to his bus or train for the trip home.

Until about five years ago, the system was to release a man at midnight, and Mr. Schlow would take him to his home for a meal before driving him to the station. Now that prisoners are released in the morning, Mr. Schlow usually takes them to a restaurant for breakfast before the trip.

When silver dollars were plentiful, he gave one to each man to save for a telephone call to him if the need should arise. Now, he gives the man a half-dollar.

After 50 years as a lay chaplain, Mr. Schlow has arrived at several conclusions on crime and penitentiaries.

He feels that one climate which can give rise to crime among the young is lack of rapport between a child and his parents—what he calls "dropouts from families" caused by lack of family cohesion. This, he believes, and man's "acquisitive" nature are some of the major causes of crime.

Men who have committed a crime and have served sentences for it, he says, have a difficult time, because their families are ashamed and their employers are afraid of what might happen.

"Mankind is the worst group to his fellow man; they don't forgive," he says.

As to penitentiaries as a method of rehabilitation, he says, "penitentiaries are not a cure—jails are not for human beings. There's no such thing as rehabilitation. You can't rehabilitate a man; he rehabilitates himself. Punishment has never erased the will" to commit a crime.

Of his work at Rockview, he says that he goes to let the men know that they are not forgotten by their religious community. "You can't do much," he says of his efforts, "but be there and show you're interested."

His role at the penitentiary is largely that of a teacher—his first profession.

Born in Russia in 1886, he attended Central High School in Philadelphia, the only secondary school in the country which awards a bachelor's degree at graduation. He attended his high school's 128th reunion—they have a two year—in May. After earning a BA at Central, he attended the School of Pedagogy in Philadelphia and received his teaching certificate. He then earned a BS degree at the University of Pennsylvania.

He taught for five years in the public school system and seven years at the vocational technical school, both in Philadelphia, teaching courses in English, history, chemistry and math. For two semesters, he taught vocational education courses to teachers at the University of Pittsburgh.

In 1919 he came to Bellefonte and opened a store. He branched out with a store in State College in 1925, sold the Bellefonte store and maintained the one in State College for 40 years.

During World War II, he and his wife, Bella S. Schlow, who died in 1957, held parties on the lawn of their home every Sunday, for 100 Army Air Corps Cadets who were in training at the University. In 1954 Mr. and Mrs. Schlow were given a citation for their efforts by the Nittany Squadron Air Force Association.

In 1964 Mr. Schlow was presented a plaque by the State Correctional Institution at Rockview for his years of service to the institution.

The Pennsylvania Municipal Authority Association presented him with a plaque for 20 years of service to the Borough of State College Authority in 1966. He is a member

and has been since its founding, of the Borough Water Authority, from which he stepped down as head two years ago. He was a councilman and served as president of Borough Council for a number of years.

In 1958 he donated a building on W. College Ave. for the founding of Community library, the Bella S. Schlow Memorial Library, which has since moved to E. Beaver Ave.

He was advisor to Phi Epsilon Pi fraternity for many years.

Mr. Schlow is currently a director of the State College Federal Savings and Loan Association, a member of the P'nai B'rith of State College and Bellefonte, the Friends of the Library, the Bellefonte Elks Club, of which he is a former exalted ruler, and the Masonic Order of Bellefonte.

At the present time, he says, his chief hobbies are "enjoying laziness, reading and raising tomatoes."

TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, 9 weeks remain in which the President presumably will accomplish the 50,000 phase four troop withdrawal from Vietnam he announced June 3. On August 13, there were 406,050 troops in Vietnam. The President's October 15 goal is, apparently, 374,000.

I favor the policy of withdrawing troops, but the pace of the withdrawal is too slow. I remain concerned that our withdrawal from Southeast Asia is linked to factors such as Vietnamization which are beyond our control.

I have other concerns. Has our withdrawal of troops been accompanied by a comparable scaling down of our military efforts in South Vietnam?

Are we trying to do too many of the same things with fewer troops?

I am deeply concerned about the American troops remaining in the war zone. My concern has been increased by a letter I recently received from a fellow Minnesotan. He forwarded to me a copy of a letter received from a company grade officer in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this young officer's view of the Vietnamization program may be too narrow. The experience of his battalion may be unique. But if his experience has wider application, my fears about the present policy in Vietnam are deepened.

The letter follows:

JUNE 14, 1970.

Thank you very much for the letter. Needless to say I was very surprised and happy to receive it. I must admit it has been quite a long time since I've seen or talked to you, about nine months would be a good guess. Many things have happened to me in that nine months, good or bad I'm not really sure, but at least up to this point I'm still around to remember them. People say "War is hell" and how correct they are, but once a person actually becomes physically involved in it they seem to take a little different view on things. I know I have! I've seen death, I've faced it, and of all things I'm an officer who is in charge of young men that fight very bravely for something they don't really un-

derstand, nor do I. Maybe I should clarify something before I go on. I'm not complaining or bitching for myself, I knew what I was getting myself into when I went to OCS. It's just that I've seen so many things happen over here that seem so completely worthless and yet they have cost so many lives. Just a couple of examples. The people of higher rank that run this war do it on the most part from behind a desk. Obviously we can't have all the rank and authority out in the field—what I'm trying to say is that these people move companies of men around like people moving pawns on a chess board. This may be ok at times when they have the support to cover them, but as this happens the support is not there to give. Because this does happen some of our companies have been nearly completely torn apart. The companies in our battalion have been in heavy contact for the last two months. Because of this our company strengths are now down to about sixty people. This may not sound as bad as it really is, so here comes the rest. We are not getting the replacements to cover the people that have been killed and wounded. Oh, we get a few every now and then but nothing like we need. There are no officers coming into the battalion until Aug. or Sept. Right now we have no company out in the field that has the required amount of officers. At present we have three company commanders out there with less than sixty days left in the country. None of them had planned on becoming CO's. My turn will probably come in about three weeks. I guess I'm writing this to you because I know you are a powerful man both politically and otherwise. The only reason I'm telling you some of these things is because I know you and I just wanted to express myself to someone other than my father. One question: How do you explain to some PFC over here why he's risking his life for some war that is obviously not being fought to win?, yet the bullets still make a person very dead when hit in the wrong place. You'd probably say we're over here helping out until the ARVN's get strong enough to take over for themselves. If so, then how do you explain that when we've worked with them every time we have had contact we are the ones shot at and not the ARVN's, and yet these small, inefficient people try to run over us to get the hell out of the area when we come under fire.

This will probably come as quite a shock to you getting a letter such as this—if so I'm very sorry, but at times I do get very bitter about some things that happen over here.

Well thanks again for the letter and I hope you like the watch. Maybe we could have a nice long discussion when I get home. Politics from you and war from me and how they can possibly fit together.

Thank you for reading this letter.

Sincerely,

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

CXVI—1842—Part 22

ONE-THIRD OF THE NATION'S LAND

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1970, the Public Land Law Review Commission presented its final report to the President. Since 70 percent of Utah's area is owned by the Federal Government, I was delighted to serve as a member of the Commission whose work will have an influence on the future of the West for decades to come.

General agreement was achieved among the members of the Commission, and there is little dissent reflected in its report. While I do not necessarily accept all the details of every recommendation, I certainly do approve of the general thrust of the report. It is my earnest hope that the administration and the Congress will cooperate to make significant progress in implementing the report in the near future.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article by Thomas J. Cavanaugh found in the August 1970 issue of the American Beef Producer, and the remarks made by Mr. Paul S. Rattle before the State Advisory Board to the Bureau of Land Management, August 10, 1970, at Cedar City, Utah. Both items give excellent brief summaries of the Commission's report.

The items follow:

"ONE-THIRD OF THE NATION'S LAND"—THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE IN

(By Thomas J. Cavanaugh)

(NOTE.—Thomas J. Cavanaugh is the general counsel of the Public Lands Council, with offices in Washington, D.C. From 1961 to 1969 he served as Associate Solicitor for Public Lands in the Department of the Interior and was assistant to Elmer F. Bennett, general counsel of the Public Land Law Review Commission.)

One hundred and thirty-seven recommendations have been made by the Public Land Law Review Commission (PLLRC) which, if translated into new legislation and administrative practices would provide an almost totally new body of public land law.

Most of the recommendations are in the form of general statements of policy. The details of implementing legislation or administrative regulation have not been provided. Furthermore, in some instances the language of the recommendations and supporting text is of such a general nature that it may well generate considerable argument over its interpretation.

Commission chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, D-Colo., has repeatedly said the report must be read as a whole and this is certainly true. Almost each one of the eighteen chapters—containing specific Commission recommendations—suggests some public land policy modification which would directly affect all major users—and particularly grazing permittees.

Grazing permit holders will be interested in chapter six, entitled "Range Resources." Recommendation 44 near the end of the chapter says: "Fair market value—taking into consideration factors in each area of the lands involved—should be established by law as a basis for grazing fees."

The text material supporting Recommendation 44 is important and should be carefully examined. For example, the material explains "fair market" value for public graz-

ing land is not necessarily the same as the value of private grazing land. According to the PLLRC, fair market value is the price which would be paid for public land grazing, given all of the advantages and disadvantages of grazing domestic livestock on public lands. The Commission does not attempt to list the advantages and disadvantages of grazing domestic livestock on public lands. The Commission does not attempt to list the advantages and disadvantages of grazing on public land because they are easily identifiable.

The question of an allowance for permit value in fixing grazing fees is not answered very clearly. In the final version of the report, the Commission recommends an equitable allowance be offered to current permittees in establishing fees. But the PLLRC did not supply the basis for computing the allowance.

STABILIZING TENURE

The Commission favors greater stability of tenure and to accomplish this suggests permits be valid for a fixed statutory term; the conditions which will trigger use changes be spelled out precisely; and the permittee be compensated when permits are cancelled to satisfy other public uses. Furthermore, the Commission says, to whatever extent possible, the kinds of public uses for which a permit may be cancelled should be clearly spelled out in the permit.

Another interesting recommendation contained in the section on tenure suggests—whenever practical—rangeland be allocated on an area basis with the permittee being required to maintain specific range conditions regardless of the number of animals grazed. The adoption of this recommendation would mean that, in most instances, there would be no upper limit on the number of animal units which could be grazed each month under a permit, as long as the permittee maintained the range in accordance with the conditions of his permit.

The Commission would abolish the uniform fee system now used by the Bureau of Land Management and turn instead to a variable system much like the one used by the Forest Service. Criteria for determining the fee schedule for a certain area would be variances in operating and economic situations, and differences in the quality of the public land and forage yield.

Throughout the Commission report the "dominant use" theory is developed. This idea would require that the public lands be examined and designated as being chiefly valuable for one particular use. The lands would then be further designated as being in an area of "dominant use" for principal value identified. Other uses would be permitted but would be subordinate to the dominant use and, if a choice between competing uses had to be made, the dominant use would prevail. Thus, grazing would be the dominant use in areas which are identified as being chiefly valuable for grazing. Other uses could be subordinated in these areas to the point of being excluded, if necessary, to preserve the grazing value of the lands. Such a system of classification would be practical and realistic substitute for the present "multiple use" classification system.

While the Commission does recommend the wholesale disposition of some grazing lands, it is doubtful the criteria suggested by the Commission would result in any substantial sale. The lands to be disposed of would have to be chiefly valuable for livestock grazing, have a few or no other uses which would not be equally realized under private ownership, and disposition must not complicate the management of retained lands.

Concerning range improvements, the Commission states investments should be shared between the government and users based on the identifiable benefits to each. To pre-

vent double charging, however, the Commission believes that the user should be credited with his investment when he pays his grazing fee.

While grazing lands are being identified, those which are frail and deteriorated should also be recorded, said the Commission. Lands which are identified as frail and deteriorated would be classified as unsuitable for grazing—and grazing would be prohibited.

Wherever possible, the Commission hopes a balance between competing uses of public land can be achieved, and one which is fair to all. The Commission was sensitive to the thorny access problem. It indicated solution of the problem would be largely dependent upon public understanding and acceptance of reasonable ground rules. Unfortunately, meaningful ground rules are very scarce. The Commission recommended the government should assert control over access, which, while avoiding unreasonable interference with authorized livestock use, would also prohibit ranchers from unreasonably restricting public access.

The PLLRC recommended existing eligibility requirements should be retained for the allocation of grazing privileges up to recent levels of forage use (calculated by the permit holder's obligated use at the average level of actual use during the last five-year period). Forage which becomes available beyond this level would be subject to reallocation to new applicants at public auction. Present permittees as well as other ranchers in the area would be eligible to purchase the additional grazing privileges. The PLLRC did not explain just how this would work in an area in which there would be no upper limit on permitted use so long as the permit conditions as to range maintenance are observed.

The Commission also suggests there should be more flexibility in public land grazing policy and one way to achieve this would be to allow grazing privileges to be fully transferable upon request of the permittee.

And finally, the Commission states the same grazing policies should be uniformly applicable to all federally owned lands.

The body of the report in which the recommendations appear comprises 270 pages and, of course, it is not possible to detail each recommendation. It is possible, however, to highlight some of the other recommendations, which, if adopted will have the greatest impact on the user of public lands.

IN LIEU PAYMENTS

Since the founding of the Republic, the fact that federally owned lands are not subject to state and local taxation has been a source of frustration and concern in areas of heavily concentrated public lands. The Commission found present systems of shared revenues amount to much less than the revenue state and local governments would receive if the Federal lands were subject to taxation. Because the report recommends the retention of most federally owned land, the Commission believes the United States should reexamine its relationship to the states and local governments. The Commission has recommended, therefore, that payments in lieu of taxes be made to state governments. Because certain benefits are received by the state and local governments from federally owned lands within their boundaries, the Commission does not recommend that the public lands be taxed at full equivalency. Instead, it recommends a public benefits discount of not less than 10 percent and not more than 40 percent. The valuation of federal lands for tax purposes would exclude improvements. Also, payments would be made to the state governments on the assumption that the legislative process in each state would provide an equitable reallocation to local governments.

The immunity of the Federal government to suits against it has also been a matter of frustration. In its chapter on Trespass and Disputed Title, the Commission recommends the modification of this doctrine to

permit quiet title actions against the United States. Further, the Commission advocates the doctrine of "adverse possession" operate against the United States where there has been a good faith occupancy for a substantial period of time. In land title suits brought by the United States, the Commission would permit citizens to assert defenses which have not heretofore been available. Reliance upon the acts of a government employee, even though unauthorized, could be a defense in such a suit under the Commission recommendations.

To reduce the number of title disputes, the Commission urges an intensified survey program be undertaken to locate and mark the boundaries of all public lands.

Finding the homestead laws and Desert Land Act to be obsolete, the Commission recommends they be replaced with new authority for the sale of public lands for intensive agriculture when that is the highest and best use of the land. State governments would have the right to certify or veto the potential agricultural use of public lands but only according to the availability of state water rights.

Lands would be sold for agricultural purposes only when a market demand exists in the area and then only at market value. Artificial restraints on the allocation of public land to agriculture, such as acreage limitations, farm residency requirements, and the exclusion of corporations as eligible applicants, should be removed according to the PLLRC report.

FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITATS

Of more than passing interest to ranchers are the chapters on fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation.

The "dominant use" theory appears again in this chapter with the Commission recommending that public lands be reviewed and key fish and wildlife habitat zones identified and formally designated for such dominant use.

The Commission believes that Federal officials should have authority for final land use decisions affecting fish and wildlife habitat and populations on public lands. However, they would not be permitted to take action inconsistent with state harvesting regulations except when overriding national need is discovered.

For the privilege of hunting and fishing on Federal lands, the Commission believes there should be a reasonable charge which, however, would not be a substitute for the licensing functions of the states.

Almost buried in the text of the fish and wildlife chapter is a sub-recommendation which probably will not bring joy to the hearts of ranchers. For the most part, the Commission believes wildlife population control should be left to natural mechanisms. To accomplish this, the Commission states it is convinced that predator control programs should be eliminated or reduced on Federal public lands. Elimination of these programs, in the opinion of the Commission, would assist in the reduction of the population of some game species, most notably deer and elk, to levels consistent with the capacity of the natural habitat to support them.

While the Commission believes that recreational use of public lands should help pay the cost of maintenance and management, it does not believe pricing should be used to ration such use. The PLLRC recommends a general recreation land use fee for a nominal amount. Rather than employ pricing as a control method, the Commission recommends recreation be regulated to minimize conflicts with natural conditions and other public land uses.

As to areas which are likely to be most suitable for intensive recreation use, the Commission appears to favor more state and local control either by outright conveyance or lease of the areas to the state and local governments. Such transfers would be made

only in conformance with an approved statewide recreation plan.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Commission believes, should be given the power to review recreation programs for the public lands administered under general multiple-use policy and disapprove of them if they do not conform with statewide recreation plans.

ACCESS RECOMMENDATIONS

The treatment of the "access" question in the chapter on outdoor recreation is most important to ranchers.

Recommendation 86 states: "Congress should authorize a program for acquiring and developing reasonable rights-of-way across private lands to provide a more extensive system of access for outdoor recreation and other uses of the public lands."

What is being recommended is, of course, that the land management agencies be supplied with funds for the purchase of rights of way.

In addition, the Commission recommends the agencies be given statutory authority to require public land lessees to grant reciprocal rights-of-way across their private lands in cases where, because of topography, relief, or geographic conditions, the landowner controls key access to significant areas of public land. The Commission cautions, however, such authority be exercised with careful consideration of the rights and privileges of the landowner. Also, the government would finance and maintain the access road or trail.

Land exchanges are dealt with in the chapter dealing with disposals, acquisitions and exchanges.

General exchange authority should not, according to the Commission, be used for the acquisition of major new Federal units. Instead, major new acquisitions should be accomplished only with specific Congressional approval.

On the other hand, with non-major acquisitions, Congress should express its feelings that proposed exchanges be accomplished where this can be done without detriment to federal programs or without excessive cost. This recommendation stops short of suggesting that the exchanges be mandatory, and keeps discretionary authority with the Secretary of the Interior. In addition, the Commission would make state exchanges discretionary rather than mandatory, as now.

Under the recommendations, all classes of real property interests would be subject to exchange with authority to equalize value differences with cash. It is, however, suggested there be a limit in the range of 25 percent of an exchange transaction which could be satisfied in cash.

Additionally, the Commission recommends as a general rule, within each department, all federally owned lands should be subject to exchange, regardless of agency jurisdiction and geographic limitation.

Throughout the report the Commission demonstrates a concern for maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality. In the chapter on environment the PLLRC made the following recommendations: mandatory hearings on proposed public land projects with respect to environmental factors at the request of the states or the Council on Environmental Quality; recognition of environmental quality as an important objective of public land management; and classification of public lands for environmental quality maintenance and enhancement. Getting to the heart of the matter, however, the Commission recommends public land agencies be required to qualify the use of public lands on compliance with appropriate environmental control measures. It is conceivable, under this proposal, a grazing permit could be conditioned to prohibit the shipment of livestock grazed under the permit to a feedlot determined to be in non-compliance with state or local environmental quality standards, even though the lot might be located some distance from the permitted area. As

the report states: "This recommendation is premised on the conviction that the granting of public lands rights and privileges can and should be used, under clear congressional guidelines, as leverage to accomplish broader environmental goals off the public lands."

As a part of the section of the report on land use planning, the Commission proposes a comprehensive review of the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964. In addition, the PLLRC recommended a complete review of all existing withdrawal to be completed within ten years. Those not renewed at the expiration of this period would terminate. In order to continue a withdrawal, it would have to be renewed under procedures which would require detailed justification, public notice and the opportunity for public comment, and public hearings. Large scale withdrawals would be limited to congressional action and a time limit of six months would be imposed.

Almost certain to be resisted by the land management agencies are some of the Commission proposals for involvement of state and local governments in the planning process. To give these governments an effective role in agency planning, the Commission would require that federal plans be submitted to them for comment and that such plans conform to state and local zoning. In addition, the Commission recommends that Congress provide by statute the federal action programs may be invalidated by court orders upon adequate proof that procedural requirements for planning coordination have not been observed.

Many proposals are made in the report for increased public participation in the decision making process. One such proposal is that statutory authority be provided for public land citizen advisory boards. Unfortunately, the Commission does not spell out the extent of authority it believes these boards ought to be given.

FOREST SERVICE

The Forest Service, the Commission recommends, should be merged with the Department of the Interior into a new Department of Natural Resources. Many people believe that just such a plan of reorganization has long been under consideration and the Commission report may well furnish the final impetus necessary to effect such a proposal.

Concerning water rights, the report does not recommend abandonment of the implied reservation doctrine but does recommend that it be clarified and limited by Congress. A reasonable time, the report states, should be provided within which federal land agencies would be required to ascertain and give notice of their projected water requirements for the next 40 years for reserved areas.

Also, Congress was recommended to establish a procedure for determining the reasonableness of the quantity of water claimed by federal agencies. Procedures would be established which would require future withdrawals and reservations to contain a statement of prospective water requirements and to express reservation of such a quantity of unappropriated water. Finally, the Commission would require the payments of compensation where the utilization of the implied reservation doctrine interferes with uses under water rights vested prior to the 1963 decision in *Arizona vs. California*.

The report contains many other recommendations and suggestions for future public land policy which are of interest and concern to the livestock industry. To discover these, the entire report, both specific recommendations and the text, must be read carefully. It must also be read as a whole since much of the material is interrelated.

The introductory material in each chapter and the explanatory material which appears with each recommendation were carefully and deliberately drafted and contain much of the real "meat" of the report. There can be no real understanding of what the

Commission did without reading this material.

The report was completed after five years of intense study and the expenditure of almost \$7 million. It is backed up by 32,000 pages of contractor and staff study documents as well as additional thousands of pages of comments from the land management agencies, conservationists and industry.

The report is a "consensus" report. Not all of the members of the Commission agree with all that is said in the report or with all of the recommendations. In those few instances where individual commissioners disagree strongly with a recommendation, their views are recorded in separate statements. Nonetheless, the report received generally strong support from the Commission members.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION SUBMITS ITS REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

(NOTE.—Comments to the Bureau of Land Management State Advisory Board by P. S. Rattle, Utah Mining Association, representative to miners to the Board, August 10, 1970, at Cedar City, Utah.)

State Director Bob Nielson has asked me for comments on the Public Land Law Review Commission's recent report, such comments to be oriented in particular toward my area of interest—the minerals industries.

After almost six years and the expenditure of over \$7 million, the Public Land Law Review Commission on June 23 submitted its Report to the President and to Congress. The Report, which is some 342 pages in length, is available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., at \$4.50 per copy. It contains 18 statements that the Commission lists as "basic concepts and recommendations for long-range goals," 137 specific recommendations that are numbered and over 200 unnumbered, supplemental recommendations that appear in italics.

The report is titled "One Third of the Nation's Land" and I am compelled to comment that over 90% of this land is located within our western states. Over 70% of the land in Utah is federally controlled. Some of the recommendations in the report of interest to the mineral industries are as follows:

The Commission recommends that the policy of large-scale disposal of public lands be revised and that, in the future, disposals be made only to achieve maximum benefit for the general public. As another basic principle, the Commission states that the United States shall receive full value for the use of the public lands.

In its recommendations regarding mineral resources, the Commission states that federal policy "should encourage exploration, development and production of minerals on the public lands and that mineral exploration and development should have a preference over some or all other uses on much of our public lands." However, Congress should continue to exclude some classes of public lands, such as national parks, from future mineral development, but federal agencies should make mineral examinations which will provide reliable information on lands recommended for exclusion as well as those where mineral activity is already excluded.

The Commission recommends that the Mining Law of 1872 be modified to establish a system which incorporates the desirable features of this Act as well as the leasing laws. "Unless a public land area is closed to all mineral activity, we believe that all public lands should be open without charge for nonexclusive exploration . . . However . . . different conditions should prevail if the prospector desires an exclusive right," or if significant surface damage may result.

In this regard, the Commission recommends the following:

"Whether a prospector has done preliminary exploration work or not, he should, by

giving written notice to the appropriate federal land management agency, obtain an exclusive right to explore a claim of sufficient size to permit the use of advanced methods of exploration. As a means of assuring exploration, reasonable rentals should be charged for such claims, but actual expenditures for exploration and development work should be credited against the rentals.

"Upon receipt of the notice of location, a permit should be issued to the claimholder, including measures specifically authorized by statute necessary to maintain the quality of the environment, together with the type of rehabilitation that is required.

"When the claimholder is satisfied that he has discovered a commercially minable deposit, he should obtain firm development and production rights by entering into a contract with the United States to satisfy specified work or investment requirements over a reasonable period of time.

"When a claimholder begins to produce and market minerals, he should have the right to obtain a patent only to the mineral deposit. ~~with one right to utilize surface for production.~~ He should have the option of acquiring title or lease to surface upon payment of market value.

"Patent fees should be increased and equitable royalties should be paid to the United States on all minerals produced and marketed whether before or after patent."

Additional and clarifying Commission recommendations—

In regard to legal requirements for the discovery of valuable minerals: "Federal land agencies are poorly equipped to judge what is a prudent mining investment, and this issue should be closed when the mineral explorer is prepared to commit himself by contract to expend substantial effort and funds in the development of a mineral property."

State claims: "Congress should establish a fair notice procedure to clear the public lands of long-dormant mining claims."

Uniform federal requirements: Discovery work required by state law often serves no useful purpose. "Federal statutes should fully prescribe uniform methods."

The Commission also recommended that legislation be enacted to authorize legal actions by the government to acquire outstanding claims or interests in public land oil shale subject to judicial determination of value. It also urged that some oil shale public lands be made available now for experimental commercial development by private industry.

The Commission recommends that the Forest Service be merged with the Department of the Interior into a new Department of Natural Resources.

As a parallel to the consolidation of public lands programs in the executive branch, the report recommends a consolidation of congressional committee jurisdiction over public land programs into a single committee in each house of Congress.

A major chapter of the report is devoted to "Public Land Policy and the Environment." The report states that "those who use the public lands and resources should be required by statute to conduct their activities in a manner that avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts, and should be responsible for restoring areas to an acceptable standard."

As to withdrawals, the Commission recommends that "large scale limited or single-use withdrawals of a permanent or indefinite term should be accomplished only by act of Congress. All other withdrawal authority should be expressly delegated with statutory guidelines to insure proper justification for proposed withdrawals, provide for public participation in their consideration, and establish criteria for Executive action."

Rep. Wayne N. Aspinall (D-Colo.) is chairman of the Commission and chairman of the House Interior Committee. He has indicated that his committee intends to hold

hearings in 1971 on legislation designed to implement the Commission's report.

Probably no single group of public land users will agree fully with the findings and recommendations of the Commission. They will agree with some, but not all of this work. The mining industry generally views with favor most, but not all, of the Commission's recommendations.

It is significant to note that the Commission was directed by the Congress to present recommendations to the President and Congress with respect to the retention, management and disposition of the public lands, excluding the Indian reservations. Except for a limited number of administrative changes that might be made by governmental departments within the framework of existing law, none of the Commission's recommendations can become effective until the Congress passes the necessary legislation. It is in this area where I identify the problems of the future.

When the Commission was established about six years ago, there seemed to be the feeling that, after a period of study and review, the group could arrive at a set of relatively firm, clear-cut, black and white objective recommendations to guide the legislative efforts of Congress. I am told that fairly early in the Commission's work, it became apparent that because of the complexity and interrelationship of existing public land uses, laws and policies, plus the potential pressures of the future, that clear-cut, black and white recommendations would frequently not be possible. We see this condition in the final report: In many cases we find what appears to be a firm, clear recommendation in one sentence only to be followed in the next sentence by modifying exceptions. Similarly, many of the basic recommendations are not and could not be clear-cut. Thus, there is enormous room for interpretation within the scope of these recommendations. The individual reader is provided the opportunity of wide latitude in his evaluation of the meaning intended.

But to make these recommendations effective, we still must have laws—legislation—passed by the Congress. And because of the interrelationship of the different land uses and existing land laws and in light of current public concerns, this legislation will be difficult to arrive at. To complicate issues we will have self-centered legislation proposed through the workings of special interest and pressure groups—such as yours and mine—plus the workings of practical politics and bureaucratic pressures in government.

As I mentioned earlier, Representative Wayne Aspinall of Colorado is chairman of the Public Land Law Review Commission and, in addition, chairman of the House Committee on the Interior. Rep. Aspinall hopes to hold hearings next year on legislation designed to implement the Commission's report. Perhaps the Interior Committee will consider proposing the extension of the Commission's work, this time directed toward preparing recommended legislation to accomplish the goals that the Commission has suggested in its report.

We in Utah were most fortunate in being very ably represented on the Public Land Law Review Commission. The vice chairman was Byron Mock, an attorney in Salt Lake, well known to many of us, who has a tremendous background and experience in land law. Our own Representative Larry Burton was a member of the Commission and a wide variety of specialists from our Universities at Salt Lake and Logan contributed substantially to the studies of the Commission. This names but a few from our state who were active in this project. A complete list would include many in this room tonight.

Perhaps we can hope that the Commission's recommendations will serve as a springboard for sound legislation to estab-

lish meaningful direction in the management of our public lands. It would be a pity if this tremendous work became but another dust collector in the libraries of our country.

Bob Nielson tells me that there are about 5000 different laws that now govern the administration of our public lands. In addition there are thousands of administrative rulings and court decisions that establish the framework for land management, all dating back for over 100 years. One could hope that there is a better way!

THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIAN INVASION

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 21 freedom-loving people everywhere will be saddened again by the memory of one of the blackest marks in the world's more recent history—the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia by the military forces of the Soviet Union and its satellites. This date will mark the second anniversary of the Soviet-led invasion of a small and peaceful nation, whose citizens are still living under the oppression of complete Soviet domination. In Czechoslovakia August 21 will be commemorated as the "Soviet Day of Shame."

In addition to the endless personal suffering brought to the Czechoslovak people, the Soviet aggression and occupation was a direct violation of the United Nations Charter provisions prohibiting all members from the threat or use of force against the territorial sovereignty or political independence of another state. The continued Soviet presence in Czechoslovakia constitutes still another heinous crime against the right of the Czechoslovak people to freedom and self-determination.

As our thoughts turn once again to this tragic violation of human rights, it is the profound hope of those of us privileged to live in freedom that through our expressions of support the brave people of Czechoslovakia will be strengthened in their rightful quest for freedom and self-determination.

Because of continuing support for this goal of freedom for the people of Czechoslovakia, I have joined with several of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in sponsoring a concurrent resolution on their behalf. This resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 718—clearly indicates our condemnation of the brutal aggression against the Czechoslovak people, our deep concern over the continued oppressions suffered by them, and our conviction that certain steps should be taken toward helping the Czechoslovak people to obtain their freedom. The resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 718

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the intervention in Czechoslovakia in 1968 by the military forces of the Soviet Union and its satellites

Whereas the intervention in Czechoslovakia by the military forces of the Soviet Union,

in 1968, contravened the independence of sovereign states and the Wilsonian doctrine of self-determination; and

Whereas such intervention is in violation of the United Nations charter which states that "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial sovereignty or political independence of any state"; and

Whereas such intervention is further evidence of the perpetuation of colonialism as practiced by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the agreement in Moscow between representatives of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union was reached under duress; and

Whereas the continued occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union is another crime against the rights of the free people of a small country to determine their own destiny and aspirations; and

Whereas the people of Czechoslovakia are not resigned to the oppressive plans of the Soviet Union, and continue to resist and reject Soviet domination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, with respect to the Soviet Union and those states which participated in the intervention in Czechoslovakia, the President should take such steps as may be necessary—

(1) to prohibit the extension of any Government trade credits or guaranties to any of the intervening states;

(2) to prohibit sales, either for dollars or local currency, and grants under any title of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any of the intervening states;

(3) to suspend all commercial air traffic between the United States and the Soviet Union; and

(4) to express support for the people of Czechoslovakia (as they commemorate August 21, 1970 as the "Soviet Day of Shame") in their efforts to achieve the withdrawal of the troops of the Soviet Union from Czechoslovakia.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United Nations and other international organizations, should take such additional steps as may be necessary to end as quickly as possible the continuing intervention in Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union.

CONCERNED OVER INACTIVITY ON LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great concern to me that after more than a month of consideration of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 it has yet to be voted on by the House. Unless the measure is given the highest priority so that discussion of the bill may be completed, Congress may adjourn without action on the reform bill. This would be a great tragedy.

The American people are looking to Congress to make reforms that are badly needed, and needed now. I therefore urge that the appropriate officials take prompt action to see that this first comprehensive reorganization bill to be considered by Congress since 1946 is scheduled for debate so action may be taken on it this year.

THE ECONOMICS OF SCARCITY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, John E. Ray III, executive vice president of Union Camp Corp., recently delivered an outstanding address in my neighboring State of Georgia. I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the people of the country a very careful study and reading of this great address:

THE THIRD FOREST AND THE ECONOMICS OF SCARCITY

It's sort of ironic for me to address you in such a bountiful state as Georgia and after a fine and filling lunch because what I plan to talk about is the Economics of Scarcity, the very real Economics of Scarcity that the forest products industry is approaching right now.

Economics of Scarcity! That's a phrase we haven't heard very often for 30 years or more. It sounded strange to me too when it first came to mind as I was preparing this talk. Here we are producing and consuming more forest products and in greater quantities than ever before in the history of man—576 pounds of paper and paperboard per American capita and an annual total of 43.7 billion board feet of lumber and plywood.

Yet the Economics of Scarcity is, I believe, not only accurate but—to use today's popular adjective—relevant in describing our current situation.

Now our current standard of living is fabulous compared to, say, the hard times of the thirties. But even the depressed thirties would have appeared luxurious to the people of Elizabethan times. And Elizabethan conditions were beyond the wildest dreams of people who lived a thousand years earlier. And so on back to what Thomas Hobbes called the "nasty, brutish, and short" life of primitive man.

The point is that scarcity is relative. Our current levels of consumption may seem like anything but scarcity by previous standards. But we don't live by or derive our feelings of well being from previous standards.

Let's look at it another way. Suppose we were forced back to the consumption levels of ten years. Suppose, on a per capita basis, we had only 433 pounds of paper at our disposal, and 17 per cent less lumber and plywood. We would, I'd venture to say, feel very deprived, very much up against it.

And yet that's precisely the kind of retrenchment that could lie ahead of us. Let's examine some trends.

Presently there are about 2½ acres of woodlands for every person in the United States. Based on population growth projections and the erosion of forests to make way for airports, highways, housing developments and other manifestations of urban spread, by the year 2000 there will be no more than 1½ acres of forest land per American—and at Union Camp we're very much aware that that's only one pine growth cycle away.

That's a major element of scarcity developing . . . in the form of a shrinking supply base for our raw materials.

There are scarcities developing too in the means of production for transforming the raw materials into forest products. The scarcity of labor to tap pine trees, for example, has seriously weakened the gum naval stores industry. Georgia, which produces 85 to 90 per cent of domestic output, has seen this product group go down during the soaring sixties from \$25 million to less than \$9 million.

In the prime forest product area of pa-

per—where for a long while now we've grown accustomed to talking and thinking in terms of overcapacity—the situation has suddenly reversed itself. Tight money, the traditionally low return on the huge outlays required for new mills and papermaking machines, and, most fundamentally, the increasing difficulty and cost of acquiring backup resources of wood and water have reduced the oncoming increments to production potential very significantly. In 1969 only 2.7 per cent was added to existing papermaking capacity. Compare that to the average annual increment of 4.6 per cent for the rest of the sixties. And current industry plans call for a continued lowering of that average.

It comes as a shock—it happened so quickly—to realize that the problems ahead will more likely be in the area of supplying paper demand rather than creating demand to absorb production capabilities.

Turning to lumber, a scarcity situation could be shaping up there as well. If deferred demand breaks through the tight money bind, we could be heading towards the near-term needs of 2.5 million new housing units a year specified by Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney. In 1968—not a boom year but more typical than 1969's depressed construction level—we started 1.5 million new dwellings and produced 43.7 billion board feet of lumber and plywood. Applying straight percentage increases, meeting new housing needs at a 2.5 million level will require production of 73 billion board feet of lumber and plywood.

How did it all happen? Why, after 25 years of plenty, are we abruptly up against limits not only in our wood supply but in resources which have heretofore seemed limitless such as usable air and water?

The answer, I believe, is that, over the past generation, we've become a nation of voracious consumers. We eat more, buy more durable and non-durable commodities, use more services, and enjoy more luxuries than any nation in history. The average American uses almost 200 pounds more paper and paperboard than the average Swede who ranks next in per capita consumption and about nine to ten times as much as the average Russian who thinks he's coming along right well. Two-car American families are commonplace and some of our biggest cities are faced with the incredible problem of how to deal with abandoned cars, cars that people just walk away from when they break down. We consume so much that merely getting rid of our total refuse has become a major task.

Still it's a good life and I'm sure all of us would like to see continued improvement in living standards. With the accent on consumption, however, it's difficult to get across the problems of producers and ways of solving them.

But that's exactly what we have to do. By one tree growth cycle from now, demand for forest products is expected to double. And for the South, according to the Southern Resources Forest Committee, the rise will be even greater with wood usage going up 2.3 times current levels.

How do we go about combatting the pending Economics of Scarcity in the forest products industry?

If we define Economics of Scarcity as a situation in which supply fails to keep pace with demand, a course of action emerges. We have to accelerate supply.

Generally speaking, there are two broad roads to this goal. One is through greater utilization of our wood resources.

Georgia has made remarkable advances in this direction. During the sixties, while state pulpwood production went up about 35 per cent, the use of chips, sawdust, and other formerly wasted wood residues rose 250 per cent. That's had the impact of adding more than a million acres to Georgia timberlands. And, going by national and regional trends, it's reasonable to anticipate at least a doubling of current usage of wood residues over the next tree growth cycle.

I'm proud to say that Union Camp has contributed to Georgia's record. Our Savannah mill was the first in the state to use chips and pine slabs and today residues provide 21 per cent of our pulping needs.

We're also pursuing another form of increased utilization through two new Chip-N-Saw mills, now under construction in Georgia, which will enable us to process into lumber smaller diameter logs than was previously possible.

These and other utilization measures—like recovering more wood fiber in the pulping process—will help. But the most effective, direct approach to augmenting supply is by the other road . . . by increasing wood yield per acre.

That's where the Third Forest comes in. I'm sure most of you are as or more familiar with the idea of the Third Forest than I am . . . and that's a very good reason for me to clarify my use of the concept. The First Forest is the original virgin timberland, the forest primeval, and the Second is the Forest that replaced it according to the random forces of nature alone. The Third Forest is the scientifically managed Forest, the one in which we—businessmen, public servants, and interested citizens—play or can play a role.

I'm going to site figures that don't sound like much in themselves, but you have to realize that they are the backbone of our contribution—as people involved in the forest products industry—to the present peak in living standards. And what might read like slight changes in yield are reflected as thousands of tons of paper and millions of board feet of lumber.

Here again, Georgia shines. For the South as a whole, average annual forest yield per acre is 4 cords of wood. Georgia averages 25 per cent more or half a cord per acre.

As might be expected, companies in the forest products business do better. At Union Camp, for example, on our Georgia acreage we average .7 cords of wood per acre per year. On our best tree farms, under absolutely optimum conditions, we manage an annual acre yield of 2½ cords.

There's tremendous room for improvement in wood yield. But, by the nature of the slow-growing beast, that means sustained, consistent effort . . . continued research in growing bigger, more densely fibered trees and accelerating their growth; sharpening techniques of site preparation, seeding, fire and disease prevention, and harvesting efficiency.

Union Camp, for one, expects to be getting one to 1.2 cords of wood per acre average by the end of the seventies. Now, I realize that our company puts more time and money than most landowners into growing more wood. After all, it's a major aspect of our business. So I'm not suggesting our goal as a general standard to be achieved over the next ten years.

What I am suggesting is that we aim for that kind of average yield for the South by the year 2000, by the end of this beginning the growth cycle. If we could by then attain a 1.2 cords average per Southern acre—with the progressive state of Georgia showing the way with a 1½ cords yield—and if we could generalize that same tripling rate of advance nationally, we would offset the 40 per cent shrinkage that will have taken place in our base of supply. We will be able—with the help of the increased utilization of wood I mentioned before—to provide the greater number of Americans living then with the 800 pounds of paper and paperboard each is projected to consume, to supply their increased lumber requirements, and, in short, meet the double demand on forest products brought on by continuously improving standards of living and communications.

I don't think that kind of increased yield is an unreasonable expectation. State and federal forestry agencies and forest products companies will, of course, continue their efforts in that direction.

But the real hope of improvement lies, I'm convinced, in the private sector of the forest economy. Simply because so much can be done there.

Take this state, for example. Seventy-eight per cent of Georgia's timberlands are privately held . . . by some 200,000 farmers and businessmen. Fifteen per cent is owned by industry and the remaining seven per cent by federal, state, and local government. Business and government, we can assume, utilize progressive methods of silviculture and so get better than average wood yield. That means that the private sector—about 20 million acres—is producing somewhere under the half cord average for Georgia as a whole.

How can we help to beef up yields of private holdings? One way is to continue and step up what we have been doing . . . spreading the message of good forestry practices.

Our Georgia Forestry Commission does itself proud along these lines. With its assistance in fire fighting and prevention, and its counseling of private landowners on advanced cultivation practices, it ranks with the best public agencies in the nation.

The Future Farmers of America is another group that is doing its share. It is helping to bring an awareness of the importance of trees and increasing know-how and interest in forest cultivation into the classrooms. That will certainly have long-run beneficial impact on private land yields.

And business, including Union Camp I'm happy to say, is actively spreading the word. Like other forest products companies, we have been and are educating everyone who will hold still long enough, cooperating with all other groups in the field, and distributing free seedlings to landowners, youth groups, and others.

These and other educational activities have helped and will continue to help importantly increase yield in the private sector.

Another area that is definitely worth investigating is that of incentives. I would point out that, while industry had been installing improved silviculture practices for years before 1944 when timber production became eligible for capital gains treatment, that incentive did provide much added impetus to such programs. I would suggest that a more equitable ad valorem tax structure applied to forest lands would greatly encourage improved wood yield. I'm sure too that incentives can play a role in important special areas—such as hardwoods cultivation—where very little has been done and which involve inordinate expense for private enterprises or individuals.

It's interesting to note that the Third Forest started during a time of plenty. Companies were improving their forests and wood production 30 years ago, simply as good business practice, with no thought of imminent scarcities. Fortunately, with the help of public and private groups, a good start was made towards the higher wood yields we will need in the future.

Today with wood resources showing their limitations in the face of overwhelming growth in demand coupled with an eroding supply base, it is not too much to say that the Third Forest is as essential to the future progress of the forest products industry as the cotton gin was to the development of the early textile industry.

And I suspect the Third Forest will work in the same way. Just as volume production by the cotton gin put pressure on finding ways to pick cotton—and, incidentally, on increasing cotton yield per acre—so the Third Forest will generate pressure on the means of production.

Take, for example, the trend I described before in the slowed growth of new paper production capacity. If an increased flow of raw material is forthcoming from our lesser acreage, ways will be found—through equipment and processing advances, assuming that additional mills will not be feasible—to produce the greater quantities consistent with demand growth.

In housing, to take another example, production methods applied to the new factory built, modular homes indicate that 20 per cent more dwellings can be built from a given amount of lumber and plywood.

But again, whatever private enterprise can do is based upon the growth of the Third Forest. And that's a cooperative effort, entailing business and individuals, public and private organizations.

That brings up other resources which have become worrisome. Previously I mentioned useable air and water.

I'd like to make some remarks on them from a different viewpoint than that taken by the current chaotic concern. I find some very strong analogies between the need to combat pollution and the need to combat scarcity through the Third Forest.

I could say that the forest products industry has demonstrated concern with pollution long before it became a publicized problem. I could say that my company has spent \$10 million over the past decade on preventing pollution and that we're continually upgrading our anti-pollution equipment and techniques.

All that is true, but it's beside the point. It's talking defensively and in no way induces a productive approach to the problem.

In reality, like the imminent scarcity of wood resources, the idea of air and water being in "short supply" has developed suddenly. It has taken us by surprise. Let's admit it. How many people really thought ten years ago that there might be limitations to these resources?

Let's also admit that we are all guilty. The consumer through his wants—and I dare say needs—for automobiles, paper, appliances, and most everything else; the producer through his desire to make a reasonable profit by satisfying these needs; the garbage-generating citizen is guilty; so is the tourist passing through; so is the Communist and the Capitalist, the Democrat and the Republican. We can all cry "Mea culpa!"

Once we get beyond the finger-pointing stage, we can think clearly. Like the Third Forest, combatting pollution of our elements is a collective project. It goes beyond the single company or the single industry, beyond the single state. It's as ridiculous to put a company out of the competitive running by laying on an exorbitant expense for pollution control as it is for a company to argue that it should continue to pollute air and water because it can't afford to install anti-pollution equipment. We don't even find general agreement as to what the most effective pollution control entails.

Conserving our air and water resources is at least a regional problem with strong federal overtones. It requires intensive, broad-based, coordinated action.

Despite the role of villain assigned to us by some groups, industry can be counted on to do its share. Looking at the forest products area, industry has certainly proven its cooperative, responsible attitude. Most companies have over the years, and despite satisfying ever rising consumption, planted millions more trees on the timberlands under their jurisdiction than they've cut down. Industrial woodlands have consistently promoted the multiple use concept, providing hunting, fishing, and other forest recreational opportunities to more people than ever before.

Those of us who are concerned with growing forests and producing forest products stand at the interface between rising demand and the resources needed to supply it. I think we're in excellent position not only to satisfy greater consumption but also to expand the productive conservation of these resources.

SENATE—Tuesday, August 18, 1970

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee that Thou hast given us this time in which to live, and in serving this Nation, to work for the betterment of the whole world. Grant us wisdom and strength for this day.

We thank Thee for all who through many generations have labored in this place and have brought strength and healing to the Nation.

We give Thee special thanks for Thy servant, Frederick Brown Harris, and for the sense of Thy presence he brought to this Chamber. We thank Thee for his Christian manhood and his church statesmanship, for his steadfast ministry

of prayer and pastoral care, for the mysticism and poetry of his utterance, for his fidelity to truth and his espousal of righteousness, for his piety and patriotism, for the warmth of his friendship and the radiance of his personality.

May the mantle of his gentle and good life fall upon each of us. In sacred memory help us to love Thee more ardently and to serve Thee more faithfully all the days of our lives.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts: