

Editorial Page

Caught In A Squeeze

President Johnson did not talk much of "frugality" in his budget message to Congress. The \$99.7-billion budget is the highest in history and \$5.3 billion higher than anticipated revenue. Congressional critics contend the deficit has been understated.

The President was caught in a squeeze, partly of his own making. He had announced plans for starts next fiscal year on the major elements of his "great society" program. Likewise he had announced intentions of cutting excise taxes. Both goals collided head-on with built-in increases for existing programs and departmental requests.

The President's fiscal 1966 budget probably is transitional more than anything else. He has included the start on his domestic great-society plans, but in a minimum way,

while the outlays for defense and some other programs that have drawn such heavy funding in recent years are beginning to dwindle.

By the time next January arrives and Mr. Johnson presents his next budget, his implied hope is that military and other expenditures can be held level or be reduced more—thus providing more margin for funding the domestic programs. The administration obviously has no plans for reducing the debt.

A major unknown element is the condition of the economy. Most experts think it will continue good throughout 1965, though not as booming as 1964, with the last six months being the softest period.

Obviously the President is waging that the economy will continue to grow, to an extent that by January, 1966, he will not be in more serious budgetary trouble.

Profit For All

The figures are in, and it seems that American corporations earned a record profit of \$32 billion last year. This is good news for everyone, whether he knows it or not.

It is good news for stockholders, who received dividends of \$22 billion. It is good news for the Treasury, which taxed the profits and which taxed them again as dividends.

It is good news for those who hold jobs in business, because profits make jobs more secure. Anyone whose security is tied to insurance, private pension funds and such can feel good, because a large part of the dividends paid went into such institutions.

Businesses invested ten billion of their earnings rather than paying them out to stockholders. The results of this will be many. New plants and stores will spring up around the land, offering new job opportunities and

more pleasant working conditions. New products will be offered, making life easier, more rewarding or more healthful.

This high level of re-investment indicates business confidence in the economy, and it also assures business activity as the money is spent on construction and other job-producing activity.

Ten billion dollars seems like a lot of money, but it wasn't nearly enough to finance all the expansion business planned to do. So additional billions in depreciation write-offs were reinvested. And corporations borrowed from banks, insurance companies and other sources to pay for even more growth.

The continuation of high profits and business confidence are necessary elements in our future economic growth, and offer the greatest promise for reducing our remaining backlog of unemployment.

DON OAKLEY . . .

Indestructible Giants

Few things stir the admiration and natural pride of Americans like the California redwoods — those majestic trees that may soar as high as 30-story buildings and live for thousands of years.

Ancestors of these noble trees were contemporaries of the dinosaurs and once covered vast areas of the continent. Because of climatic changes, the redwoods we know are confined to a narrow coastal belt in Northern California. They grow nowhere else on earth.

Today we are warned by many voices that the redwoods are disappearing. The U.S. Department of the Interior urges the establishment of a Redwood National Park before one of its spottiest remnants — the last redwood is cut down 10 years from now.

At the same time, three large redwood lumber companies are spending \$75 million on new pulp mills. This seems strange when there won't be any trees

by 1975. Or will there?

It is estimated that the redwood forest encountered by the first white men covered some two million acres. Today, after a century and a half of logging, settlement, road building and deliberate attempts to convert forestland into pasture, there remain according to a U.S. Forest Service survey, 1,971 million acres—or almost the original amount.

Of this, 107,000 acres are preserved in 23 state parks. Other public agencies own another 100,000 acres, leaving about 1.7 million acres of commercial forest.

(The redwood should not be confused with the giant sequoia, another species, which is entirely protected in parks.)

Timbermen view the redwood as the nearest thing to the school. Not only does it produce huge quantities of superior and versatile wood, but it is disease-resistant and extremely fast-growing. It reaches

es maturity not in 1,000 years but in less than 100.

The redwood is virtually unfailable as well. When one is felled, a dozen young ones sprout from its roots. Redwoods over six feet in diameter are growing in West Coast areas cut to the ground by the Russians in the early 1800s.

Later settlers found that cut-over, burnt-over, plowed-over and grazed-over land would persistently reforest itself.

The redwood is, in short, a renewable resource, no more in danger of extinction than Kansas wheat or Texas cattle. Because of modern forest management, they may actually be more usable redwood trees than there ever were.

Nevertheless, there are only a limited number of virgin redwoods standing uncut in commercial forests. Some of them undoubtedly should be brought into the park system. Indeed, 8,000 acres of prime virgin timber are being voluntarily withheld from logging by private owners, pending park acquisition.

Opponents of the national park plan point out that 25 percent of the finest of all the original redwood groves are now in state parks and that many of them remain undeveloped for tourists. Some communities, dependent on the lumber industry, would suffer financial hardship if extensive tracts were removed from commercial use. Surely a reasonable balance can be struck between the material and spiritual needs of today and those of future generations.

Thoughts

Labor Department reports that 23 million man-days were lost through strikes last year, down from 24 million in 1964. It may take a crash program to persuade them.

Eighty percent of motorists don't use seat belts, despite their proven safety value. It may take a crash program to persuade them.

U.S. marriages, on a downward trend since 1945, started to nearly two million in 1964. Well, gals, now do you believe in Leap Year?

The Prisoner



RALPH de TOLEDANO . . .

Unfair Labor Tactics

The National Labor Relations Board, presumably the impartial arbiter of labor-management differences, has ruled that a company which truthfully reports to its workers during collective bargaining with the union is guilty of an unfair labor practice. The NLRB, moreover, takes a dim view of any company which does not

Alphonse and Gaston its way through negotiations.

The most recent bit by the NLRB has been the General Electric Company, and I have written at some length on this subject. In supporting GE

against the NLRB—and against James Carey's International Union of Electrical Workers—I seem to be on the side of the angels. The Washington Post, whose fervid support of labor is proverbial, agrees that the NLRB violated the First Amendment and made its job of collective bargaining in its recent ruling that the IUE

to much for him. Carey's tactics. The quotations could go on indefinitely, for it is his practice to threaten mayhem when he finds things going against him. My concern, however, is not with any specific labor leader. If this is the kind of leadership the IUE wants—and if the AFL-CIO feels that Mr. Carey is a spokesman for responsible unionism—it is none of my business.

But the question remains: How and why does the National Labor Relations Board sanction this kind of unionism? In the GE case, the NLRB examined all of management's

acts, found no single one of them improper, added up a series of proper acts—and convicted the company of unfair labor practices. This defies logic and confounds the law. Even more astounding is that the NLRB can close its eyes to the threats of a James Carey, finding nothing wrong with them.

As every Washington correspondent knows, there have been repeated charges that the NLRB, a quasi-judicial body, is manipulated by the labor movement. This is passionately denied, and should be the subject of a very careful investigation by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Neither the denial nor the charge should be lightly set aside. Back in the late 1930s and through to the early 1940s, the American Federation of Labor complained bitterly that the NLRB was openly prejudiced in favor of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

FULTON LEWIS JR. . . .

Ex-Sub Commander Pushes Nuclear Navy

WASHINGTON—As commander of the nuclear submarine Nautilus, William B. Anderson made naval history by guiding his revolutionary craft under the polar ice cap from Pearl Harbor to London.

As a freshman Congressman, seven years later, Commander Anderson will press the fight for a nuclear-powered Navy. The Tennessee lawmaker, in a recent speech, explained why:

"The Navy stands now on the threshold of a historic change-over. The Nautilus and her successors and the dramatically powerful Polaris-fired submarines are a tremendous force in being. Nuclear Task Force One, after its circumnavigation of the globe, appears to be the prototype for the ships that will make our Navy the most powerful and adaptable the world has ever seen."

In seeking new funds for nuclear-powered vessels, both underwater and surface, Anderson will likely tangle with Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. The Pentagon chief has previously vetoed the production of nuclear vessels, citing their "exorbitant" cost.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy once summoned McNamara for Congressional testimony to explain his adamant opposition to a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. The committee members unanimously found McNamara's position to be inconsistent, misleading, illogical, exaggerated and mistaken.

Rep. Anderson notes that nuclear carriers are but three per cent more expensive in construction than conventional vessels. "An atomic-powered craft is, of course, much more effective than a conventional carrier," he argues. "There are few Americans who would not be willing to invest this additional three per cent in order to avoid dependence on obsolete, second-hand ships for the defense of this country and the security of the world."

That view is shared by two of the most powerful men in Congress. House Armed Services Chairman Mendel Rivers of South Carolina and California's J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy.

PHIL NEWSOM . . .

Anti-Taylor Drive Launched By Buddhists

Notes from the foreign news cables:

Taylor Go Home: More "Taylor go home" signs are likely to be seen in Viet Nam. U. S. Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor was the subject of a successful propaganda

agony by the Buddhists last week to help win their real objective — the ouster of American-backed Prime Minister Tran Van Huong. The Buddhists cancelled their anti-American drive when Huong fell, but their student allies in Hue already have announced they want Huong out of the country. Now that the Buddhists have seen how successful such tactics can be, they may try it again to achieve other objectives.

Crises of "Yankee go home" and "down with U. S. imperialism" also will continue to sound in the Philippines. Leaders of recent protest rallies calling for an end to Philippine-American ties have announced they will continue their demonstrations in front of the U. S. Embassy until their demands are fully met. Manila Mayor Antonio J. Villegas has stated through a spokesman that he will not block the "free and peaceful" expression of their

story of Stuhldreher's death properly carried. Rice's game to the story of the 1924 Army-Navy game.

"Outlined against the blue-gray October sky, the Four Horsemen rode again."

"In dramatic roles they are known as Famine, Pestilence, Destruction and Death."

"They are only allies. Their real names are: Stuhldreher, Miller, Crowley and Layden."

Moore recalls it was a place of destiny that created the Four Horsemen. In 1922 Notre Dame had a powerful football team. He weighed in at about 200 pounds. In a Butler game he broke a leg. Elmer Layden, the star end, was replaced. The combination meshed immediately. The faster Layden gained more ground than the car, and the faster back. The Four Horsemen were off—and running.

"Add of running 'disarmament' back. The Four Horsemen were off—and running."

Stuhldreher, 6'5". It couldn't be. Must have been a typographical error.

There have been signs recently that Secretary McNamara may now be willing to permit the production of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. But Anderson and others in Congress seek Administration approval of an entire fleet of nuclear-powered ships. The former Nautilus commander argues:

"We cannot afford to deprive ourselves of our potential power merely because it appears today to be a little more expensive. What side rule can measure the value of life and liberty?"

A defector from Castro Cuba has told of the heroics of U.S. Air Force Major Rudolph Anderson, the U-2 pilot whose unarmed craft was shot down during the Cuban missile crisis.

Major Anderson obtained the first "hard" information provided that intermediate-range ballistic missiles had been brought into Cuba. His plane was downed by an S-2 aircraft-missile on Oct. 27, 1962.

The Cuban defector, Carlos Aguilar Ochoa, has revealed the details of Maj. Anderson's death. Ochoa saw the American plane crash in flames near Banes, then witnessed a Cuban militiaman violently kick the pilot. Castro officials then spat upon the body.

Residents of the area watched in tears. Farmers removed their hats in a sign of respect. They took debris and scattered portions of Anderson's uniform to keep as a remembrance. "I myself took several parts of the fuselage, which are well hidden in Cuba," Ochoa said last week.

Three leaders of the Congolese rebel army recently visited Castro Cuba to confer with top-ranking Communist military men. The anti-French guerrillas included Placide Kikongo, bureau chief of the rebel Ministry of Defense.

Congolese leader, Johnstone Umba, lauded the Cuban revolution as "an example" of what the Africans should do. He assured his hosts that the names of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara were as well known in the Congo as those of Patrice Lumumba and Antoine Gizenga.

PHIL NEWSOM . . .

Anti-Taylor Drive Launched By Buddhists

feelings. Communists are known to have participated in the demonstrations which began as a result of the deaths of Philipinos shot by U. S. sentries in restricted areas.

U. S. Says No Thanks: The United States disapproves of Nationalist China's efforts to send troops to South Viet Nam as the Republic of Korea is doing. Informed sources said Washington quietly told Nationalist China's government that Nationalist troops in Viet Nam would help Communist China's chances to intervene in the civil war. Eleven Nationalist Chinese military advisers went to Viet Nam last year and it is understood that some Nationalist military engineers are helping the Vietnamese build roads and airstrips. But no Chinese expeditionary force similar to the 2,000 South Korean troops being readied for Southeast Asia is planned.

Underground Testing: Expect British Prime Minister Harold Wilson to take up with President Johnson the possibility of extending the nuclear test ban treaty to at least include the bigger underground explosions. British diplomats think that while little can be done in the foreseeable future in the way of East-West accords, there may be just a chance of some advance in the field of nuclear "disarmament."

This involves the possible broadening of the test ban treaty and restrictions on the spread of nuclear know-how and weapons.

Underground Testing: Expect British Prime Minister Harold Wilson to take up with President Johnson the possibility of extending the nuclear test ban treaty to at least include the bigger underground explosions. British diplomats think that while little can be done in the foreseeable future in the way of East-West accords, there may be just a chance of some advance in the field of nuclear "disarmament."

This involves the possible broadening of the test ban treaty and restrictions on the spread of nuclear know-how and weapons.

Underground Testing: Expect British Prime Minister Harold Wilson to take up with President Johnson the possibility of extending the nuclear test ban treaty to at least include the bigger underground explosions. British diplomats think that while little can be done in the foreseeable future in the way of East-West accords, there may be just a chance of some advance in the field of nuclear "disarmament."

This involves the possible broadening of the test ban treaty and restrictions on the spread of nuclear know-how and weapons.

Underground Testing: Expect British Prime Minister Harold Wilson to take up with President Johnson the possibility of extending the nuclear test ban treaty to at least include the bigger underground explosions. British diplomats think that while little can be done in the foreseeable future in the way of East-West accords, there may be just a chance of some advance in the field of nuclear "disarmament."

This involves the possible broadening of the test ban treaty and restrictions on the spread of nuclear know-how and weapons.

Underground Testing: Expect British Prime Minister Harold Wilson to take up with President Johnson the possibility of extending the nuclear test ban treaty to at least include the bigger underground explosions. British diplomats think that while little can be done in the foreseeable future in the way of East-West accords, there may be just a chance of some advance in the field of nuclear "disarmament."

This involves the possible broadening of the test ban treaty and restrictions on the spread of nuclear know-how and weapons.

Underground Testing: Expect British Prime Minister Harold Wilson to take up with President Johnson the possibility of extending the nuclear test ban treaty to at least include the bigger underground explosions. British diplomats think that while little can be done in the foreseeable future in the way of East-West accords, there may be just a chance of some advance in the field of nuclear "disarmament."

This involves the possible broadening of the test ban treaty and restrictions on the spread of nuclear know-how and weapons.

Underground Testing: Expect British Prime Minister Harold Wilson to take up with President Johnson the possibility of extending the nuclear test ban treaty to at least include the bigger underground explosions. British diplomats think that while little can be done in the foreseeable future in the way of East-West accords, there may be just a chance of some advance in the field of nuclear "disarmament."

This involves the possible broadening of the test ban treaty and restrictions on the spread of nuclear know-how and weapons.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Donald and I have lots in common . . . his parents are bugging him to get married, too!"

Almanac

By United Press International Today is Tuesday, Feb. 2, the 33rd day of 1965 with 332 days to follow.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The morning star is Mars.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Violin virtuoso Jascha Heifetz was born on this day in 1901.

In 1933, President Eleanor Roosevelt announced that the U. S. Seventh Fleet would no longer block Chinese Nationalist ships from Formosa against the mainland.