

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

4-1-1971

Montana Vs. Siberia

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Montana Vs. Siberia" (1971). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 967.

https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/967

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

COPY
MONTANA VS. SIBERIA

April 11, 1971

Mr. President:

There has been a lot of loose talk in the papers recently which in effect equates the State of Montana with Siberia. The implications in these press stories are without substance and entirely unwarranted. Apart from a few superficial--very superficial--climatic similarities, there is no basis for comparison.

The whole business began when an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation became involved in an unfortunate situation in his agency. He was offered the choice of premature termination of service or assignment in Butte, Montana. He elected the former alternative over the latter. His unhappy--and from my viewpoint misguided--choice was reportedly made on the basis of a general opinion that Butte is the "purgatory" for FBI agents not in good standing. Whatever the situation involving this particular agent, the published reports on the reason for his resignation have caused reverberations up and down the Rocky Mountain states.

In Boulder, Colorado, the students at the University of Colorado rose up and declared in an article in their campus newspaper, the Colorado Daily, that people ought to send shipments of warm clothing to FBI agents who had been "exiled" to Butte. The article, which was subsequently reprinted in the Montana Standard, urged public appeals to the United Nations, to the President, to Congress and to the Governor of Montana seeking relief and assistance for the "political prisoners." The Coloradans counseled words of encouragement to the exiles and said that "with any luck they should be free by the time spring arrives in Butte next August."

-2-
COPY

Before any extreme remedies are invoked, Mr. President, it should be noted that there are two sides to this story, as there are to most. The other side of this one comes to me in the form of a letter from Mr. Leonard E. Pratt, a lamp salesman who says he was "exiled" to Butte some time ago by the General Electric Co. Mr. Pratt writes that he lives outside of town on a little 20 acre ranch that he picked up for less than \$25,000. In his spare time, he says he is forced to play golf at the new million dollar public country club, camp in Yellowstone Park, fish in various blue-ribbon trout streams, hunt big game in the fall and ski on uncrowded slopes in the winter for half the price that prevails in other parts of the country. Mr. Pratt reports that he does find time to work and that his business is good; it has to be, he says, because his boss is always threatening to banish him to New York, Los Angeles, or even Washington, D. C.

Mr. Pratt's testimony prompts us, Mr. President, to see Butte, Montana, in better perspective.

Mr. President, I have had some hesitation about placing such material as Mr. Pratt's letter in the Record because I realize that it may well lead to a massive lineup of FBI agents and other federal employees wishing to apply for exile to Montana. On reflection, and in fairness to my State and to the prospective exiles, I could do no less than to make this information a matter of public record. Persons wishing to explore the possibility of exile are invited to contact any member of the Montana Congressional delegation. I assure them that their applications will not be treated with utmost confidence but I promise that they will receive a warm welcome as soon as they set foot in the Treasure State--the land of the Bitterroot and Flathead, the Big Horn and the Blackfoot. They might even feel that they have come home at last.

COPY

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article published in the Montana Standard, March 17, 1971 and a letter from Mr. Leonard E. Pratt.

In an interview, the printed media of course exercise an editorial judgment in deciding which part and how much of that material to quote or paraphrase or ignore. The analogy with TV's time limitations, for us, is the limit on space: deciding which of the half million words of news coming into this paper each day shall be among the 80,000 we have room to print. Thus, "Vice President Agnew said last night . . . Mr. Agnew also said . . ." and so on; it is a formulation basic to both the daily paper and the televised newscast.

That bad and misleading judgments can be made by this newspaper in both our presentation and selection of such news goes without saying—or at least it did until we started doing some public soul-searching about it in this newspaper a good while back. There is, for example, a distorting effect in failing to report that certain statements were not unsolicited assertions but responses to a reporter's question. But that we do not confuse the effort to remedy these defects with a waiving of our First Amendment rights or a yielding up of editorial prerogatives should also be obvious to readers of this newspaper—perhaps tediously so by now. What we have in mind, however, when we talk of the license taken by the electronic media in the name of "editing" is something quite different, something this newspaper does not approve and would not leap to defend if it were caught doing. It is the practice of printing highly rearranged material in a Q-and-A sequence as if it were verbatim text, without indicating to the reader that changes had been made and/or without giving the subject an opportunity to approve revisions in the original exchange.

It is, for instance, presenting as a direct six-sentence quotation from a colonel, a "statement" composed of a first sentence from page 55 of his prepared text, followed by a second sentence from page 36, followed by a third and fourth from page 48, and a fifth from page 73, and a sixth from page 88. That occurred in "The Selling of the Pentagon," and we do not see why Mr. Salant should find it difficult to grant that this type of procedure is 1) not "editing" in any conventional sense and 2) likely to undermine both the broadcast's credibility and public confidence in that credibility.

The point here is that "The Selling of the Pentagon" presented this statement as if it were one that had actually been made—verbatim—by the Colonel: TV can and does simulate an impression of actuality in the way it conveys such rearranged material. Consider, again from the same documentary, a sequence with Daniel Z. Henkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. This is how viewers were shown Mr. Henkin answering a question:

"Roger Mudd: What about your public displays of military equipment at state fairs and shopping centers? What purpose does that serve?"

Mr. Henkin: Well, I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their armed forces. I believe the American public has the right to request information about the armed forces, to have speakers come before them, to ask questions, and to understand the need for our armed forces, why we ask for the funds that we do ask for, how we spend these funds, what are we doing about such problems as drugs—and we do have a drug problem in the armed forces; what are we doing about the racial problem—and we do have a racial problem. I think the public has a valid right to ask us these questions."

This, on the other hand, is how Mr. Henkin actually answered the question:

"Mr. Henkin: Well, I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their armed forces. It also has the ancillary benefit. I would hope, of simulating interest in

recruiting as we move or try to move to zero draft calls and increased reliance on volunteers for our armed forces. I think it is very important that the American youth have an opportunity to learn about the armed forces."

The answer Mr. Henkin was shown to be giving had been transposed from his answer to another question a couple of pages along in the transcribed interview, and one that came out of a sequence dealing not just with military displays but also with the availability of military speakers. At that point in the interview, Roger Mudd asked Mr. Henkin whether the sort of thing he was now talking about—drug problems and racial problems—was "the sort of information that gets passed at state fairs by sergeants who are standing next to rockets." To which Mr. Henkin replied:

"Mr. Henkin: No, I didn't—wouldn't limit that to sergeants standing next to any kind of exhibits. I knew—I thought we were discussing speeches and all."

This is how the sequence was shown to have occurred, following on Mr. Henkin's transposed reply to the original question:

"Mr. Mudd: Well, is that the sort of information about the drug problem you have and the racial problem you have and the budget problems you have—is that the sort of information that gets passed out at state fairs by sergeants who are standing next to rockets."

"Mr. Henkin: No, I wouldn't limit that to sergeants standing next to any kind of exhibit. Now, there are those who contend that this is propaganda. I do not agree with this."

The part about discussing "speeches and all" had been omitted; the part about propaganda comes from a few lines above Mr. Henkin's actual answer and was in fact a reference to charges that the Pentagon was using talk of the "increasing Soviet threat" as propaganda to influence the size of the military budget.

Surely, something different from and less cosmic than a challenge to CBS's First Amendment rights is involved in the question of whether or not the subject of such a rearranged interview should not be given a chance to see and approve what he will be demonstrated to have said. And surely this "editing" practice must be conceded—with reason—to have damaging effect on public confidence in what is being shown to have happened—shown to have been said. We agree with Mr. Salant's premise that we are all in the same dinghy. That is why we are so concerned that neither end should sink.

MONTANA VERSUS SIBERIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been a lot of loose talk in the papers recently which in effect equates the State of Montana with Siberia. The implications in these press stories are without substance and entirely unwarranted. Apart from a few superficial—very superficial—climatic similarities, there is no basis for comparison.

The whole business began when an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation became involved in an unfortunate situation in his agency. He was offered the choice of premature termination of service or assignment in Butte, Mont. He elected the former alternative over the latter. His unhappy—and from my viewpoint misguided—choice was reportedly made on the basis of a general opinion that Butte is the "purgatory" for FBI agents not in good standing. Whatever the situation involving this particular agent, the published reports on the reason for his resignation have

caused reverberations up and down the Rocky Mountain States.

In Boulder, Colo., the students at the University of Colorado rose up and declared in an article in their campus newspaper, the Colorado Daily, that people ought to send shipments of warm clothing to FBI agents who had been "exiled" to Butte. The article, which was subsequently reprinted in the Montana Standard, urged public appeals to the United Nations, to the President, to Congress and to the Governor of Montana seeking relief and assistance for the "political prisoners." The Coloradans counseled words of encouragement to the exiles and said that "with any luck they should be free by the time spring arrives in Butte next August."

Before any extreme remedies are invoked, Mr. President, it should be noted that there are two sides to this story, as there are to most. The other side of this one comes to me in the form of a letter from Leonard E. Pratt, a lamp salesman who says he was "exiled" to Butte some time ago by the General Electric Co. Mr. Pratt writes that he lives outside of town on a little 20-acre ranch that he picked up for less than \$25,000. In his spare time, he says he is forced to play golf at the new million dollar public country club, camp in Yellowstone Park, fish in various blue-ribbon trout streams, hunt big game in the fall, and ski on uncrowded slopes in the winter for half the price that prevails in other parts of the country. Mr. Pratt reports that he does find time to work and that his business is good; it has to be, he says, because his boss is always threatening to banish him to New York, Los Angeles, or even Washington, D.C.

Mr. Pratt's testimony prompts us, Mr. President, to see Butte, Mont., in better perspective.

Mr. President, I have had some hesitation about placing such material as Mr. Pratt's letter in the Record because I realize that it may well lead to a massive lineup of FBI agents and other Federal employees wishing to apply for exile to Montana. On reflection, and in fairness to my State and to the prospective exiles, I could do no less than to make this information a matter of public record. Persons wishing to explore the possibility of exile are invited to contact any Member of the Montana congressional delegation. I assure them that their applications will not be treated with utmost confidence, but I promise that they will receive a warm welcome as soon as they set foot in the Treasure State—the land of the bitterroot and flathead, the big horn and the blackfoot. They might even feel that they have come home at last.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the Montana Standard, March 17, 1971, and a letter from Leonard E. Pratt.

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

FREE THE FBI IN BUTTE

According to an article in the Boulder Daily Camera Jan. 19, an agent of the FBI was fired for writing a letter critical of its direc-

evidently, thought to be adequate, although those tracks carry Missoula's present passenger trains. The Milwaukee Road tracks between Missoula and Spokane are 29 miles shorter. But is cutting 29 miles really more efficient if it causes a 60-minute delay? No answers were given for that either.

Southern Montana was cut from service and northern Montana was included, said the publicity, because the south has much better air and road transportation while the northern points "have little other transportation available to them" than the railroad. That's true, and evidently offset the value that the southern route has much the greater population and potential ridership.

What all this boils down to is this:

1. Railpax is interested solely in connecting major population centers and in running trains between them as rapidly as possible.

2. Providing passenger train service to people living outside major population centers is a matter of no consequence to Railpax, unless the people happen to live along the route. If Seattle didn't exist, Montana would have no passenger train service at all, north or south.

3. At no point were the people being left high and dry—and their needs—consulted or considered.

What still baffles us is the economics of this thing. Speaking in Missoula on May 29, 1968, the then-president of the Northern Pacific (and now head of the Burlington Northern), Louis W. Menk, said the Mainstreeter lost \$2.1 million during 1967, the NP lost \$5.8 million in its total passenger operations.

Look at that figure \$2.1 million. It is, when one considers the vast payments the U.S. government makes on transportation, purely peanuts.

It costs about \$1 million to build one mile of interstate highway.

Assuming that the Mainstreeter's losses have gone up since then, it still would make economic sense to have the federal government pick up the losses, and perhaps spend more money to promote and upgrade passenger train service, the result will be the ger train service, than it would to utterly abolish ALL passenger train service and then turn around and have to dump millions more into highways and airports to take care of the rising needs there.

If Railpax means the abolition of our passenger train service, the result will be the loss of service PLUS greater expense in terms of the money we will have to spend.

Railpax, however, does not necessarily mean loss of all passenger train service on May 1. The Burlington Northern does not HAVE to quit southern Montana service. The BN can keep operating passenger trains here if it wants. It has made clear it doesn't want to, but the fact is that it can if it so decided.

We commend to the attention of the state and local governments through which the BN travels the matter of taxes. If the BN decides to terminate its trains, it obviously will be cutting the services it provides.

There is no reason the communities adversely affected could not, then, reconsider any past tax favoritism they have shown the BN in appreciation of the services the BN has rendered.

In short, get tough. The public stands to get gypped by all this, and there is no reason it shouldn't fight back furiously with every weapon it has. Taxes are about the best weapon a local community has to fight with.

BROADCAST JOURNALISM BY CBS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Washington Post's lead editorial on Tuesday, March 30, and the letter to the Post editor by CBS News President Richard S. Salant make interesting reading.

I urge Senators to read both items, since much has been said, written, aired, and defended on the subject of broadcast journalism by CBS.

I ask unanimous consent, that the editorial and the letter to the editor be printed in the RECORD.

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

CBS REPLIES TO EDITORIAL ON PENTAGON DOCUMENTARY

This letter is in response to your editorial of March 26, in which you start by calling the CBS News documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon," a "highly valuable and informative exposition of a subject about which the American people should know more," and then proceed to examine in some detail the specific editing of that film and general practices of television news editing technique.

The editorial was obviously written by one who has long labored on the editorial page—and not on the news pages.

You conclude that in some measure (not specified) public confidence and credibility are undermined by our editing techniques "innocent or not."

The question of how a news or documentary broadcast is edited is at least as important as you obviously consider it. It is precisely as important as, and possibly no more complicated than, questions pertaining to editing in the print medium (newspapers and news magazines)—the process by which any journalist rejects or accepts, selects and omits, and almost always compresses material available to him. You do not question the right, indeed the professional obligation of your reporters to do this, nor of your editors to continue the process once the reporter has done his job, nor indeed, of your senior editors to impose their professional judgment upon this same piece of work when or if it comes to them.

But you question not only our right to do the same thing, but also the methods by which we edit, and even our motives ("innocent or not"). You do not, in other words, grant us the right to do precisely what you do—and must do if you are journalists as distinguished from transmission belts.

Why?

The key to why you feel this way is spelled out in your editorial: "People who work in the nonelectronic news business know how readily they themselves may distort an event or a remark . . . these dangers are of course multiplied in the production of a televised documentary."

You are saying that good reporting—fair reporting—is a difficult business, with many pitfalls along the way, that television reporting is a more difficult business with more pitfalls. Fair enough.

Then you go on to suggest, indeed recommend, that our rules should be different than your rules, that sound journalistic ethics and the First Amendment are somehow divisible between rights granted to journalists whose work comes out in ink and somewhat lesser rights for journalists whose work comes out electronically. You say we should go out of our way to "preserve intact and in sequence" the response of those we interview. We both "go out of our way" to be fair and accurate, but we both have limitations of space, and we both seek clarity. Except in verbatim transcripts, neither medium preserves intact or in sequence everything it presents. You say at the very least we should indicate that something in the interview has been dropped. If we asked you to do this, you would properly respond that readers know, without a blizzard of asterisks, that material in your paper is edited, that these are not the complete remarks. Our viewers know it, too. And so do those whom we cover.

But most astonishing of all, you propose that we should give the subject of the interview an opportunity to see and approve his revised remarks. Is that now the policy at The Washington Post? Of course not. You know and I know that this strikes at the very core of independent and free journalism. To grant a subject such a right of review is to remove the basic journalistic function of editing from the hands of the journalist and place it—in the case of the documentary in question—in the hands of the Pentagon. I almost wrote—"tell you what, we'll do it if you'll do it." Then I had a second thought: No, we won't do it even if you should do it.

We are all after the same thing: to be fair, to inform the public fairly and honestly. We do not suggest that we—or any journalistic organization—are free from errors, but nothing in the First Amendment suggests that we must be perfect, or that we are not human. And nothing suggests that if our responsibility is larger, our job tougher or our coverage broader there should be some new set of rules for our kind of journalism, as if to say the First Amendment is fine so long as it doesn't count for much. You don't seem to mind if our end of the dinghy sinks, so long as yours stays afloat.

Fairness is at the root of all this, and fairness can be and always will be debated.

But I submit that we are as careful about editing, as concerned with what is fair and proper and in balance, as rigorous in our internal screening and editorial control processes as any journalistic organization.

The job of ensuring that fairness, that balance and that sense of responsibility is difficult. It is the subject of our constant review and concern. It is not a question that can be solved by a single statement of policy or staff memorandum. It must be, and it is, the daily concern of our working reporters, editors and management.

We believe, as I have said publicly before, that "The Selling of the Pentagon" was edited fairly and honestly. Long after the useful and valuable debate on this broadcast has subsided and perhaps been forgotten we shall be editing other news broadcasts and other documentaries as fairly and as honestly as we know how, and in accordance with established journalistic practice—just as you shall be so editing.

RICHARD S. SALANT,
President, CBS News.

MR. SALANT'S LETTER

In our letters space today we print a response by Richard Salant of CBS News to our recent editorial concerning the dispute between CBS News, the Pentagon, Vice President Agnew, Congressman Hebert, and now—as it seems—The Washington Post. In time the U.N. may have to be called in, but for now we would like, in a unilateral action, to respond to Mr. Salant's complaint. We think it is off the point. And we think this is so because Mr. Salant invests the term "editing" with functions and freedoms well beyond anything we regard as common or acceptable practice. Mr. Salant taxes us with unfairly recommending two sets of standards in these matters, one for the printed press and another for the electronic. But he reads us wrong. We were and are objecting to the fact that specifically, in relation to question-and-answer sequences, two sets of standards already exist—and that what he and others in television appear to regard as simple "editing" seems to us to take an excess of unacknowledged liberties with the direct quotations of the principals involved.

Before we go into these, a word might be of use about the editorial practices (and malpractices) common to us both. When a public official or anyone else issues a statement or responds to a series of questions

tor, J. Edgar Hoover. The agent could have avoided this fate had he chosen to accept a transfer to Butte, Mont., which was described as "a purgatory for agents who have incurred Hoover's displeasure."

Now I think we have reached rock bottom when FBI agents are held as political prisoners in Butte, Mont., on the whim of J. Edgar Hoover. How can we possibly condemn the Russians for exiling writers to Siberia when American police are being shipped to a climate, environment and topography which is even worse?

To end this outrage I advocate the following:

Write your congressman. Remind him that the United States has signed the Geneva Convention, and that American captives in Butte, Mont., have the same rights as American captives in Hanoi, North Vietnam.

Write the President of the United States. Ask him what federal law authorizes an exile policy. Ask him to bring the boys home from Butte and Saigon.

Write the Secretary General of the United Nations and request an observer group be sent to Montana. Ask him to arrange safe passage and immunity from arrest for all FBI agents who wish to leave that state.

Write the governor of Montana and ask him how many tractors or how much strip mining equipment he will take in exchange for the FBI agents.

Don't bother to write J. Edgar Hoover directly. Since he will be reading all mail in the first four categories there is no point in burdening him down with any more work.

In the interim before public pressure leads to reform write directly to the FBI agents in Butte, Mont., and tell them you sympathize with their plight. Send warm clothes and old copies of the Colorado Daily Newspapers make excellent insulation and are greatly appreciated at 40 below zero. Once last winter it got to 40 below zero in Butte, Mont. . . .

When you write tell the FBI men we have not forgotten them. Tell them to keep stiff upper lip and that with any luck they should be free by the time spring arrives in Butte next August.

BUTTE, MONT.

Due to the recent adverse publicity of J. Edgar Hoover, "banning" a FBI agent to Butte, Montana, as a disciplinary action: I thought you might be interested in knowing what it is like to be banned to Butte, Montana as a G.E. employee.

I admit that old Butte is not much to look at, but the new homes and business are as up to date and modern as any town of its size. I don't have the opportunity to live in Butte, but I am inclined to like the wide open spaces so I live on a little ranch 26 miles from Butte. I have a nice home, horses, dogs, cats, and 20 acres for my five kids to run on, all for under \$25,000. Since my home is not located in Butte I am considered a non-resident by the new \$1,000,000 plus country club, and it cost me \$50.00 to join and \$9.00 a month to play golf on the best 18 hole golf course in the state.

When I am not golfing in the summer I can be camping around Yellowstone or Glacier Park on the weekends or along any of the many blue ribbon trout streams such as the Gallitan, Madison, or Big Hole Rivers.

When fall rolls around I am "banned" to hunting deer, elk and moose, by jeep, horseback or backpacking. If the big game hunting is a little slow I might have to take up my shotgun and bird dog and take off to the pheasant and duck hunting grounds less than a hundred miles away.

But what about those cold snowy winters you hear so much about in Montana? They are snowy all right and there are a lot of disappointed skiers and snowmobilers if it isn't. It is real hard on a fellow to have to ski from November to April on beautiful, well equip-

ped, uncrowded ski slopes, for only \$5 a day in tow fees. You may wonder if a fellow has any time to work with all of the recreation available. Well these Montanan's have been good to me up here and I have finished either first or second in sales in my district for the last three years. My boss's threat each year is, "If you don't do good this year I am going to have to ban you to New York, Washington D.C., Cleveland, or Los Angeles."

LEONARD E. PRATT,
General Electric Lamp Sales Dept.

THE VERDICT IN THE CALLEY COURT-MARTIAL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in all my years in the Senate, I do not recall such an intense expression of public outrage as that produced by the verdict in the court-martial of Lieutenant Calley at Fort Benning, Ga.

My offices in Washington and Atlanta have been literally deluged by telegrams and telephone calls from all over Georgia. I know of no better way to describe their attitude than extreme outrage. In just the past 2 days, I have received 600 telegrams, almost the same number of telephone calls, and now letters are beginning to pour in.

I plan to forward these communications, after I have answered them, to the White House to let the President know of the outpouring of outrage from Georgians that is being expressed about the Calley case.

I understand that other Senators also are receiving many hundreds of protests, and, in my judgment, I believe the President should know how deeply Americans are concerned about this matter.

RAILPAX

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, on May 1 of this year the State of Idaho will be left with virtually no rail passenger service. It is my understanding that the Union Pacific Railroad Co. has joined the Railpax system and intends to cease operations on both the east-west route through Southern Idaho and the north-south route from Butte, Mont., to Salt Lake City, Utah.

This termination of rail passenger service will be a severe blow to the economic and social well-being of the people of my State. Despite the decline in the quality of service on the trains in recent years, many people have relied upon them for transportation. The all weather capability of the railroads is of particular importance to Idaho because of the severe winter weather which we sometimes have. After May 1, Idahoans will no longer be able to rely upon the trains, however, as an alternate means of transportation in inclement weather.

The city of Portland route from Portland to Chicago via Boise has been of great economic and social value to the citizens of Idaho as well as to other east-west travelers. This route generally parallels the Oregon Trail which opened up the Pacific Northwest to settlement in the last century. It has been of importance as a rail route in more recent years.

The Salt Lake City-Butte line has also been valuable to the people of my State.

In denying a petition for discontinuance of service by Union Pacific last year, the Interstate Commerce Commission stated that the trains on this line "provide the last remaining direct rail passenger service between Butte and Ogden and the last direct through rail passenger service between Butte and Salt Lake City traversing an area which, though sparsely populated, has evidenced a marked degree of reliance on rail transportation primarily because of the peculiarities of its terrain and climatic conditions."

Members of the Idaho congressional delegation had prevailed upon the ICC to deny the petition to discontinue service between Butte and Salt Lake City on the ground that legislation was then pending to set up a National Rail Passenger Corporation. It was hoped that Railpax, if enacted, would continue this vital service.

Unfortunately, the Secretary of Transportation did not designate either the east-west route or the north-south route as a part of the basic national rail passenger system. With the exception of a stop at Sandpoint, Idaho, in the northernmost part of the State, therefore, Idahoans will not have access to rail transportation.

In response to this dire situation my colleague from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) introduced S. 1018 on February 26, 1971. Enactment of this legislation would carry out the intent of Congress, as outlined in the Rail Passenger Service Act, that the need for expeditious intercity rail passenger service within and between "all regions of the continental United States" be taken into account in designating the Railpax System. It would require that the System be expanded to provide adequate intercity rail passenger service to a major population area of each of the contiguous 48 States which did not have any large population area provided with intercity rail passenger service by the Basic System as already designated.

I am hopeful that Congress will act quickly on this legislation so that rail passenger service in Idaho will not become a thing of the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a memorial from the Idaho State Legislature urging rail service for Idaho.

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

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 106 BY STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

A JOINT MEMORIAL TO THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES REPRESENTING THE STATE OF IDAHO IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the state of Idaho assembled in the First Regular Session of the Forty-first Idaho Legislature, do hereby respectfully represent that:

Whereas, the people of the state of Idaho are separated and sometimes isolated by the mountainous terrain and severe climatic conditions and depend upon the passenger rail system as a vital link for communication and transportation within the borders

of the state and among the neighboring states; and

Whereas, loss of passenger rail service within Idaho, and between Idaho and her neighbors would have a harsh impact upon the Idaho employee and upon the economic health of Idaho in general; and

Whereas, the state of Idaho, which includes various sites of growing tourist and recreational attraction, depends upon a convenient transportation system for the continued expansion of these recreational resources; and

Whereas, the final plan for the basic national rail passenger system, which has been presented, fails to provide a single point of service to the state of Idaho and her citizens, and therefore does not recognize the needs of people located within the area stretching from the Wyoming border on the east to the Oregon and Washington borders on the west, and from Utah and Nevada on the south to Montana and Canada on the north.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the First Regular Session of the Forty-first Idaho Legislature, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring, that we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take the action necessary to insure that the people of the state of Idaho may participate in and benefit from the basic national rail passenger system and shall not suffer disadvantage therefrom by including the southern Idaho east-west and north-south routes under the system.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Transportation, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and the Senators and Representatives representing this state in the Congress of the United States.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial No. 106 that was passed by the Forty-first Legislative session of the State of Idaho.

Attest:

ARTHUR WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

MISSOURI PRISONERS OF WAR DAY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during the week of March 21 Americans came together in a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. As said at that time, the concern of Americans for the treatment accorded prisoners of war in North Vietnam would not stop when that week came to a close. It will continue until our Nation succeeds in obtaining the release of our American servicemen.

In that connection, I call to the attention of the Senate that the Governor of the State of Missouri has designated April 28 as Prisoners of War Day in Missouri and urged all citizens to reaffirm their support of these valiant men.

I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF MISSOURI

Whereas, the National P.O.W. Day Committee has designated April 28, 1971, as a national day of support for our American Prisoners of War in the hands of the North Vietnamese; and

Whereas, this amounts to a call for humane

treatment of these prisoners of war if not for their direct release; and

Whereas, we must show more concern for the plight of American prisoners of war:

Now, therefore, I, Warren E. Hearnes, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby proclaim April 28, 1971, as

PRISONERS OF WAR DAY

in Missouri, and urge all citizens to reaffirm their support of these valiant men.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Missouri, in the City of Jefferson, this 2nd day of March, 1971.

WARREN E. HEARNES,
Governor.

Attest:

JAMES KIRKPATRICK,
Secretary of State.

THE STATUS OF FORESTRY KNOWLEDGE

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, last week in Gainesville, Fla., the 15th congress of the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations met and reviewed in depth the status of forestry knowledge and the need for additional research. On Tuesday, March 23, Mr. Edward Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, shared some of the findings of the IUFRO meeting with those attending the annual Society of Foresters meeting in Washington.

Chief Cliff went into some detail in discussing the information contained in some of the papers presented at the IUFRO meeting. I believe the information should be made available to Senators who are interested in what is going on in forestry research on the international scale.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Chief Cliff's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

EARTH RESOURCES AND RESEARCH FOR PROTECTION, MANAGEMENT AND USE OF FORESTS¹

It is fortuitous that this meeting of the Washington Section of the Society of American Foresters follows the fifteenth Congress of the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations (IUFRO). Last week in Gainesville, Florida, 681 leading scientists in forestry and related fields from 59 countries plumbed the depths and charted the outermost boundaries of forestry knowledge. I decided to use the 12 plenary session papers as the basis for this keynote address.

How many times we heard it said of a person who lacks vision that he can not see the forest for the trees? The forester has prided himself for his vision of the forest as a complex system of living things and their related environment. But now we find that even this view of the forest may be too restricted.

The purpose of our meeting today is to ask this group of foresters to step back a bit further than they normally do in their day-to-day work and take a look at the world's resources. When I say step back I mean not just short steps, but as far as one must step to view the world as a whole. Socrates, about 500 B.C., suggested "that man must rise above this earth to the top of the atmosphere and

¹ Keynote address by Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, to the Society of American Foresters, Washington, D.C. Section, March 23, 1971.

beyond for only thus will he fully understand the world in which he lives." From the vantage points of space, we can see earth resources not in the sense of individual trees or forests or vegetation, but rather in the sense of an interrelated whole.

What are the earth resources brought into focus by this view? Earth is made up of the land masses, the water bodies, the envelope of air surrounding the planet, and the minerals, oil and gas lying within the crust.

Besides its physical resources, earth has biological resources, the many forms of plant and animal life that occupy the biosphere. Earth's resources also include those modified by man: his habitations, his transportation systems, and his impacts on the biological and physical attributes of the earth.

Modern society, which is steadily increasing in density, mobility, and complexity, has generated major problems in the utilization of earth's resources. Perhaps the principal element of the world's social equation is man's efforts and effectiveness in understanding his environment and in utilizing natural resources to satisfy his needs and desires. Too often in the past, man has used natural resources without understanding the place of these resources in the total environment and the impact of his actions upon this environment. From the new perspective of earth resources we, as foresters, should take a hard look to see how forestry can best contribute to the material needs of mankind and to the enhancement of environmental quality.

My address today could be taken directly from the keynote address to the IUFRO Congress. Dr. E. Martin Worthington, in his "Forestry Research and the Environment of Man," talked directly toward a better understanding of earth resources. Dr. Worthington, who is scientific director of the International Biological Program (IBP), truly has a perspective on the world's resources.

Dr. Worthington looks at forestry as having basically two different and contrasting values: One is protection, and the other is production. Both are interpreted very broadly. Under protection he includes concern for soil, water supplies, amenities, sport, wildlife, ecosystems, rare species, and gene pools. Production is also broad, but by no means is it limited to timber. It includes the great variety of forest products, animal as well as plant, and there are aesthetic and amenity products.

As we consider earth resources, the IBP, like other international scientific programs, has a close relation to nearly all resources. One of IBP's greatest contributions is the attention that it has drawn to changes, both natural and manmade, taking place in the environment. Many of these affect Forestry and Forestry Research. For not only do forests cover almost one-third of the surface of the continents, but they influence the other two-thirds and the atmosphere as well. Dr. Worthington stresses that the quality of our future decisions depends upon learning more about how natural systems operate and the impacts of alternative systems for development and exploitation on them. For example, only through a full ecosystem and analysis can we appreciate the effects of air pollution.

The effects of air pollutants do not stop after they have been registered upon the sensitive membranes of humans or upon the susceptible tissues of plants or animals. Rather, the pollutants are deposited in the ecosystem and can have other significant effects. The soil itself may be seriously polluted, such as by the increasing acidity resulting from sulphur brought down from the atmosphere by rain. The acidity alone may not be the problem, for the sulphur may destroy nitrogen fixing bacteria that are essential for plant growth.

The "implication of remote sensors for for-