

U.S. Congress  
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 2

JANUARY 26, 1972 TO FEBRUARY 2, 1972

(PAGES 1241 TO 2446)

in and of itself, injustice interferes with the moral support any such system must enjoy for success.

Professor Hanks said that:

Phase II does not hold as much promise as would have been the case if a strong position had been taken at the outset to let the public know specifically just where the cost-push inflationary industrial and labor forces have been most prominent.

William R. Lambert of Brigham Young University referred to the high rate of inflation in the health services industry. "In the long run doctors' and dentists' fees seem to be the most out of line—with nationwide price movements—possibly because of limited supply and small squeeze when so much is covered by insurance. I would like to see the profession taken to task and increasing numbers be sent through more efficient schools. Regulation is ineffective; the problem of supply must be solved."

Many economists questioned the desirability of delaying welfare reform as a means of softening the fiscal impact of this new money. Others also considered the decision to cut foreign aid by 10 percent a rather "petty" response to inflation. J. Kent Pinney from Brigham Young said:

I do not approve of a 10% across-the-board reduction in foreign aid; however, I do believe certain foreign aid should be carefully reviewed and that much of our foreign aid be recommitted on a piece meal basis. That is to say, each foreign aid project should be reviewed in terms of its merits, which must be regarded both economically and politically.

The international aspects of the "New Economic Policy" elicited a rather startling consensus. While there was a good deal of trepidation concerning the possible diplomatic ramifications, the 10-percent import surcharge was accepted as a necessary bargaining tool in securing more favorable trade terms. Many noted, however, that it should not be considered a long-term solution and should be removed as soon as concessions were gained from our trading partners. The surcharge should not be seen as heralding a new era of American protectionism. The decision to "float" the dollar was viewed with near-unanimous praise. Prof. Larry Wimmer of Brigham Young University in fact called the decision to end convertibility of the dollar into gold as "the only part of the program that I believe will have a favorable result."

Few aspects of President Nixon's program drew such broad support. Taken together the economist's varied reactions to the new measures demonstrated a good deal of reservation. Few Utah professors were firmly convinced that the administration's "N.E.P." holds the key to a stable national prosperity.

#### MIKE FROME

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) inserted in the RECORD some very illuminating correspondence between the American Forestry Association, publishers of American Forests magazine, and Mike Frome, who for-

merly authored a regular column in the magazine.

The disagreement which caused Mr. Frome's departure from the pages of American Forests is unfortunate, for his incisive pen gave the readers a look at a point of view sorely needed in these days.

Tom Bell, the editor of High Country News, an authoritative outdoor and environmental biweekly in Wyoming, took due note of the developments shortly after Mr. Frome's departure from the forestry association's magazine last year.

Mr. President, because it says something about the impact of the interlocking ties between the timber industry, the profession of forestry, and the U.S. Forest Service itself, I ask unanimous consent that Tom Bell's article from the October 15, 1971, issue of High Country News be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### MIKE FROME "EXPURGATED" (By Tom Bell)

Readers of American Forests, official magazine of the American Forestry Association, will notice something different about the September, 1971, issue. It no longer carries the byline of Mike Frome.

The sure, incisive pen of one of America's foremost conservation writers has been censored from its pages. The credibility of American Forests to "promote an enlightened public appreciation of natural resources and the part they plan in the social, recreational and economic life of the nation" suffers as a consequence. Mike Frome was an asset which the magazine could ill afford to lose, and which can never be replaced.

As the environmental crisis deepens, Frome is sure to take an eminent place as one of those who correctly called the shots. For a man who started as a travel editor, he has broadened his interests and honed his concerns to become one of the most knowledgeable conservation writers of our times. The depth and clarity of his writings have served to alert the public to many of our most glaring environmental problems.

One of his readers was moved to write him (Forest Forum, American Forests, May, 1971) on several issues he had discussed. The letter writer ended by saying, "And from all your pieces I'm assured that you stand firm for the public as against the special interest concern . . ."

Such firmness was what led to Frome's deletion from American Forests. No politician or bureaucrat was safe from his censure if he felt the public interest was not being served. That included the timber industry, the U.S. Forest Service, and the head man at the Forest Service, Chief Edward P. Cliff.

It was his strong and unequivocal criticism of the latter which probably ended his long tenure with American Forests. The association between Cliff and our American Forests should be evident. Frome did not hesitate in saying on numerous and varied occasions what he and other conservationists have thought of Cliff and his relationship to the timber industry.

It should also be evident from the name of the organization that the American Forestry Association has strong ties to the timber industry. A number of the Board of Directors are representatives of timber companies, and retired or active members of the Forest Service.

President Charles A. Connaughton is Northwest Regional Forester for the U.S. Forest Service. Vice President Lloyd E. Partain

is Assistant to the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service. Both serve in the Department of Agriculture. Connaughton succeeded Paul M. Dunn, a former vice president and now a consultant to the St. Regis Paper Co.

Frome candidly says, "I was shut out by the Forest Service and the timber industry which dominate the AFA."

Uneasiness developed about a year ago when Frome led a rising crescendo of protest over Forest Service policies. It was then that he was asked to submit his copy for editorial censorship. When Frome declined to submit his copy, his column was prefaced by a disclaimer. The disclaimer told the reader, "Mr. Frome's views are his own and do not necessarily reflect the policy of The American Forestry Association."

When Frome's pen continued to assiduously dissect Forest Service policies in regard to clear cutting, serving the special interests, and the unresponsiveness to public concern, he had sealed his own fate in the magazine. The die was cast even as such damning reports as those by the Bolle Committee and the Wyoming Study Team came in.

His column was originated—"To express the independent voice of the public" and was not to be subject to editorial whim.

Executive Vice President William E. Towell wrote Frome that it appeared he did not want to adhere to AFA policies. When Frome wrote in reply asking for a clarification of AFA policies, he received no answer.

Frome's column appeared in the pages of American Forest for the last time in August, 1971, issue. There was no mention or notice of its demise. Similarly, no mention is made in the September issue.

Letters from many members of the AFA have already asked what happened to the monthly column. They will receive little consolation from the lame excuses of the AFA hierarchy.

#### CHILDREN

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, on January 31, the New York Times carried an excellent article by two outstanding experts in the field of child development and early childhood education. The article entitled "The President and the Children" by Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, of Cornell University, and Dr. Jerome Bruner, of Harvard, is an accurate and distressing account of the vital need for substantive day-care opportunities for the nearly 6 million preschool children whose mothers are working.

Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in my remarks.

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

#### THE PRESIDENT AND THE CHILDREN (By Urie Bronfenbrenner and Jerome Bruner)

Two weeks before Christmas, the President vetoed the Child Development Act of 1971. In doing so, he stated: "Neither the immediate need nor the desirability of a national child development program of this character has been demonstrated." The needs of the nation's children, the President proclaimed, would be adequately met by his own proposed legislation H.R. 1.

As specialists concerned with the care and development of the young, we must take strong issue with the President on both counts. The President asserts that unlike the vetoed legislation his own bill will "bring the family together." But if we examine the provisions of H.R. 1 it becomes clear that it

is far more likely to break the family apart. Thus, the President himself speaks of the bill as "my workfare legislation to enable mothers, particularly those at the lowest income levels, to take full-time jobs." In effect, the bill forces mothers, especially single mothers, to register for full-time work or job training or else be stricken from the welfare rolls.

Such provisions can only increase the pressure on poor and near-poor families to deliver their young into compulsory day care. In point of fact, this is a "put-them-to-work-bill," not a child development bill.

Unlike the legislation vetoed by the President, H.R. 1 does not give the mother freedom of choice. Nor is there adequate assurance of standards for quality child care services. Surely, such a prospect raises the spectre conjured up in Secretary Richardson's ill-considered words of condemnation for the vetoed Child Development Act of 1971, when he speaks of "shoddy, second-rate baby bins in which children were stored away, neglected or abused." H.R. 1, moreover, makes no provision at all for children of the millions of working families who are just above poverty line (\$4,000 to \$7,000 income for a family of four). Finally, with apparently only \$360,000,000 in new money allocated in the first year for child care services in the Administration's bill, the number of additional children who can be served is only about 5 percent of those in actual need.

Given these woefully inadequate and destructive features of the Administration's bill, it is painful to recall the hope-giving words of the President less than two years ago, when he proclaimed "a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life."

At a time when we should already be seeing fruits of this commitment reflected in the lives of the nation's children and their families, we are told that there is "neither immediate need nor the desirability of a national child development program." Such a statement seems to us incomprehensible in the light of the available facts. Here are some of them:

In 1971, 43 percent of the nation's mothers worked outside the home. In 1948 the figure was only 18 percent. One in every three mothers with children under six is working today. In 1948 the figure was one in eight. There were more than 4.5 million mothers with children under six who were in the labor force last year.

In 1971, of all mothers of children under six, 10 percent—1.3 million of them—were single parents bringing up children without a husband. Half of these mothers also held down a job.

Mothers in poor and near-poor families are much more likely to be gainfully employed, partly because so many of them are heads of families. Among families in poverty, 45 percent of all children under six were living in female-headed households; in non-poverty families the figure was only 3.5 percent. In two-parent families where the husband earned \$10,000 or over, only 20 percent of the mothers worked; where the husband earned less than \$7,000, 35 percent of the mothers worked. These women work because they have to.

There are nearly six million preschool children whose mothers are in the labor force. Of these, one million live in families below the poverty line (e.g. income below \$4,000 for a family of four). An additional one million children of working mothers live in near poverty (income between \$4,000 and \$7,000 for a family of four). All of these children would have to be on welfare if the mother did not work. Finally, there are about 2.5 million children under six whose mothers do not work, but where family income is below the poverty level without counting the many thousands of children in families above the

poverty line who are in need of child care services, this makes a total of about 4.5 million children under six whose families need some help if normal family life is to be sustained.

In closing, we can only repeat the first and principal recommendation of the President's own White House Conference on Children a year ago. By an overwhelming vote, the delegates recommended that "the Federal Government fund comprehensive child care programs, which will be family centered, locally controlled, and universally available, with initial priority to those whose needs are greatest. These programs should have sufficient variety to insure that families can select the options most appropriate to their needs. A major educational program should also be provided to inform the public about the elements essential for quality in child care services, about the inadequacies of custodial care, and the importance of child care services as a supplement, not a substitute, for the family as the primary agent for the child's development as a human being."

If the President will not act to meet this need of the nation's children and their parents, the people and their elected representatives must do so.

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, freedom is an indivisible thing. Where the desire for freedom, individual or national, is threatened, restrained, or curbed, men everywhere suffer a great loss.

Fifty-four years ago, on January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine proclaimed their independence, their desire to be free, in Kiev a year later all the Ukrainian territory became an independent sovereign state.

Tragically, this independence, this Ukrainian freedom was shortlived as the Soviet Union, ignoring the desires of the Ukrainian people, stepped in to suppress and continue to suppress every expression of Ukrainian nationalism and culture.

There are more than 45 million Ukrainians whose civil rights—especially freedom of religion and freedom from antireligious propaganda—are under constant and increasing attack. The Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches in the largest non-Russian nation within the U.S.S.R. have been ruthlessly suppressed. As well, intellectuals and cultural leaders are being hounded at every turn.

On the eve of President Nixon's forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union, I trust he will keep the question of Ukrainian freedom uppermost on his mind. So many of America's most loyal and dedicated citizens have a Ukrainian heritage. We owe them a deep debt of thanks for the strengths which they have added to our Nation. We also share with them great concern for the independence and well-being of the Ukraine.

#### INTERNATIONAL TEENAGE STUDENT EXCHANGE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as we are too well aware, we are living in an age of widespread conflict. The mass media bring to our consciousness every day new evidence of struggle between human beings all over the earth.

And so we do well today to pause and celebrate those many quieter efforts through which people of different countries come to know one another, appreciate the values of other cultures, and have an opportunity to develop mutual respect and affection.

Such an effort is youth for understanding. Because this program is headquartered in Ann Arbor, I take particular pleasure in calling attention to it. The teenagers who participate in this person-to-person exchange will hopefully bring to tomorrow's world a greater degree of understanding among the peoples of our ever-smaller planet.

#### TV CAMPAIGNING

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, with the onset of another national political campaign, the American TV viewer will once again be bombarded with thousands upon thousands of political "spots"—short political advertisements which may or may not be informative, may or may not be accurate, but will certainly be carefully structured by media wizards to change or reinforce voter attitudes in predetermined ways. Although S. 382, which was recently enacted into law, brings about a number of long overdue reforms in campaign financing and spending, efforts by myself and others to include restrictions on TV spots in the legislation proved to be unavailing. For that reason, we may see more slick, misleading spots this year than ever before.

Recently I was made aware of several developments which may help to curtail this costly form of video pollution. Mr. Anthony Martin-Trigona, president of the Illinois Consumer Council, has filed a petition before the Federal Communications Commission asking for an amendment to FCC's rules under which all radio and television political commercials would be required to be at least 5 minutes long. Mr. Martin-Trigona also asks that political advertising be guaranteed access to prime time television audiences. The 5-minute restriction has already been implemented by WGN-TV in Chicago and several other progressive broadcasters.

The 5-minute restriction received additional support in an excellent article by Mr. John E. O'Toole, president of Foote, Cone & Belding Communications. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. O'Toole's article, which appeared in the December 27, 1971, issue of Advertising Age, and Mr. Martin-Trigona's petition be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NO POLITICAL TV MESSAGES LESS THAN 5 MINUTES, O'TOOLE URGES

(By John E. O'Toole)

Recently I found myself in Washington, D.C. in an earlier and more innocent era, that might be the last place you'd look for an ad man. But in the balmy autumn of 1971, many of us were there at the cordial invitation of the Federal Trade Commission.

Washington is a city from which has been heard, in recent months, a lot of commentary about our business, which might make the most hardened of us reluctant to tell our kids what we do for a living.