

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 23

NOVEMBER 1, 1967, TO NOVEMBER 9, 1967

(PAGES 30689 TO 32116)

used for a seacoast subsidy. By earmarking for the Great Lakes \$8 million or so of the \$200 million provided for operating subsidies by the Congress each year, we could bring U.S.-flag shipping into the lakes that otherwise would wait at the seacoast to pick up the subsidy.

Third. A set-aside of \$7,500,000 of the amount provided for military cargo shipments overall to be used exclusively for military cargo shipments out of the lakes, where a great deal of this cargo originates.

The lakes find themselves with the "chicken and the egg" proposition. Without military cargo they cannot attract American-flag vessel service, and without American-flag vessel service they cannot obtain military cargo.

The 1962 report by the Department of Defense referred to earlier stated:

Considerable savings to the U.S. government can be realized by using Great Lakes ports when additional American flag shipping becomes available.

Congress should act to make this shipping and these savings a reality by setting aside a nominal sum for military cargo shipments through the seaway.

These recommendations would cost no more than our present maritime program. They would begin to bring U.S.-flag shipping into the Great Lakes. The alternatives are: First, a takeover by foreign flags of the only shipping route that goes into the heartland of our Nation and a consequent reduction in the strength of our already inadequate merchant marine; second, the continuing shipment of Government cargoes overland to seacoast ports at added expense because of the absence of U.S.-flag vessels which, under cargo preference laws, must carry 50 percent of all Government cargoes; and third, a continuing drag on the economic health of the seaway which has only begun to operate in the black.

There are a number of other problems unique to the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway that have an impact on the volume of maritime traffic using the seaway. I want to mention these factors briefly because, although they do not directly affect the strength of our merchant marine, they have an indirect affect by cutting back on the use of the seaway and stimulating the utilization of rail transport as a viable alternative.

Perhaps the most important of these factors is the seaway season. Ice conditions presently reduce the seaway season by 4 months. As a result, shippers of year-around cargo are faced with three alternatives: First, ship by seaway for 8 months of the year and stockpile goods at additional storage expense during the winter months; second, maintain a second relationship with seaboard shipping service for winter requirements; or, third, ship overland by rail to east or gulf coast ports on a year around basis. All too often shippers choose the last alternative.

This is especially true of general cargo. A recent Stanford Research Institute study concluded that "one-third of the general cargo service area tonnage from possible seaway routing" is eliminated by the winter closing. When we add to this estimate the further fact that each

ton of general cargo passing through a port is worth \$17 to \$25 to the community while bulk cargo is worth \$5 a ton, it is easy to see what a favorable impact extension of the seaway season would have on the economy of lake ports.

Last year Congress appropriated \$30,000 for a study of the feasibility on a benefit-cost basis of keeping the seaway open through deicing techniques for a few weeks longer each year. Unfortunately, the Bureau of the Budget has not released this modest amount for expenditure. The Bureau feels that the study, which in the Bureau's words would include "broad estimates of costs and benefits," should be postponed until "better understanding of ice and snow phenomena in the Great Lakes Basin is developed." Yet a recent letter I received from the Coast Guard indicated that a study group consisting of military and civilian personnel "is considering the economic advantages and disadvantages of extending the shipping season of some east coast ports, the Great Lakes, the western rivers, and Alaska." Frankly I am at a loss to reconcile these two contradictory statements.

Virtually all of the members of the Great Lakes conference of Senators as well as a substantial group of House Members have written the Bureau of the Budget asking that the \$30,000 study be undertaken soon. Some progress has been made. A recent letter from the Bureau stated:

We will make every effort to fund the deicing study in the 1969 budget if not before.

However, I hope that your subcommittee will find the time to look into this matter in some detail in the months ahead. Significant progress in the deicing field could have a substantial impact on the Nation's maritime posture.

Legislation introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] is now pending before the Committee on Public Works to recapitalize the St. Lawrence Seaway. This proposal could have a very favorable impact on seaway traffic by stabilizing or lowering tolls and thus offsetting to some degree a Welland Canal lockage fee which will total \$1,600 per vessel for a roundtrip by 1971.

Finally, section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act permits railroads to charge below cost rates on the carriage of Government cargo. This has permitted the diversion of traffic that would normally travel via the seaway, to east coast ports. In my estimation, this is destructive pricing with a vengeance. The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the Committee on Commerce has already held hearings on proposed legislation to limit or repeal section 22. I am very hopeful that a bill will be reported by the subcommittee in the near future.

This is a brief summation of the problems and potential of the St. Lawrence Seaway together with the Great Lakes. I have offered some suggested solutions that I feel would benefit the maritime commerce of the Nation as a whole. I would be willing and eager to work at any time in a joint effort to reach equitable solutions to the many difficulties I have outlined this evening.

INSANITARY CONDITIONS IN UNREGULATED OR STATE REGULATED MEAT PLANTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the legitimate and responsible element of the meatpacking and processing industry has suffered a black eye in recent months with disclosures of shockingly insanitary conditions in unregulated or State regulated meatplants, and the fact that certain portions of the American meatpacking industry still try to profit through the sale of diseased or unclean meat to American consumers.

Yesterday the responsible meatpacking industry suffered another black eye with disclosures by Nick Kotz in the Des Moines Register and the Minneapolis Tribune of the initiation of a political slush fund by certain meat industry officials. Those revelations can only intensify the public's impression that the meat industry is callous and corrupt.

The meat industry's sudden interest in the political careers of "friendly" Congressmen, coming at a time when Federal legislation regulating the slaughter and processing of meat sold to consumers is under consideration, can only lead to the conclusion in the public eye that this was a crass attempt to influence the Congress.

I would hope these revelations will spur responsible meatpackers to overcome the economic pressures they have been subjected to and come out in support of legislation which will once and for all put an end to this sordid situation by requiring the inspection of all meat and meat products. Continued silence or opposition at this point would raise a serious question in the minds of the American people as to why responsible inspected packers oppose inspection of their uninspected competitors.

I would also hope that those in the meatpacking industry who have for years favored across-the-board inspection will now speak out. I personally know of packing industry leaders who support the concept of requiring inspection of all meat, but who for some reason have remained silent throughout this debate. I would hope these revelations will cause them to speak up in the public interest.

I therefore strongly urge that the leaders of the American meatpacking industry come forward in support of legislation which will plug the gaping loopholes in the present meat inspection system.

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

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

[From the Des Moines Register, Nov. 2, 1967]
REVEAL POLITICAL FUND DRIVE BY MEAT OFFICIAL—SOUGHT GIFTS AS CONGRESS STUDIED BILL—TIMING IS SHOCKING TO LAWMAKER
(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The president of a major meat packing association opposed to a strong meat inspection law asked meat packing firms to contribute campaign funds to "friendly" congressmen at the same time Congress is considering the meat inspection bill.

The campaign fund-raising drive was called off at the demand of conservative congress-

men who share the meat industry's position on the legislation, but feared exposure of the fund drive would embarrass them and the meat industry, and lead to defeat of the industry supported bill.

HOUSE ACTION

The House Tuesday adopted a meat inspection bill designed to eliminate bad conditions by offering federal aid to states willing to improve their inspection systems. The House defeated, 140-98, the Smith-Foley bill, which would have expanded federal inspection to 6,000 plants now exempt because they do not sell across state lines.

The meat industry and congressmen who halted the fund campaign support the bill approved by the House and strongly opposed the tougher bill proposed by Representatives Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.) and Thomas Foley (Dem., Wash.).

The fund solicitation letter was sent Sept. 28 to an undetermined number of firms by L. Blaine Liljenquist, president and general manager of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., which represents about 600 meat packing firms in Western States.

Liljenquist, writing on personal stationery, asked for contributions "ranging from \$25 up to a maximum of \$99." He said the funds should be sent on personal checks made out to the order of "L. B. Liljenquist, trustee, congressional campaign fund."

Liljenquist stated the funds would be distributed in amounts ranging from \$50 to \$300 to the campaign funds of congressmen and senators.

ELECTION FUND

He said the funds would be used to help elect or re-elect congressmen of both political parties "who are conscientiously working to accomplish the following goals."

The goals he listed were: "To preserve our free enterprise system . . . to maintain a balanced budget and to reduce the burden of federal taxes as rapidly as possible, and to encourage a political climate wherein business enterprises will continue to grow and prosper."

When W. R. (Bob) Poage (Dem., Tex.), chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, learned of the letter he fired off angry letters not only to Liljenquist, but also to leaders of the other two major trade associations—the American Meat Institute (A.M.I.) and National Independent Meat Packers Association (N.I.M.P.A.).

Poage left no doubt that he believed the fund raising letter would be construed as being connected with the controversial meat inspection legislation.

Poage, in a letter to Liljenquist, to A.M.I. President Herrell Degraff, and to others, on Oct. 6, said:

"To say that I was shocked by the contents of this letter at this time is indeed an understatement. Without raising any question of the propriety of any association to engage in legitimate political activities, I must point out that wide circulation of such a letter, no matter how well-meant, obviously endangers the standing of the whole meat industry.

DEEPLY EMBARRASSING

"Furthermore, I am sure you can see that no matter how innocent this solicitation may have been intended, it is absolutely impossible to disassociate it from the pending meat inspection legislation. It could prove to be deeply embarrassing to all members of Congress who are trying to deal honestly and objectively with the problems of the meat industry before Congress."

Poage wrote that he had conferred about the letter with three other members of Congress. Each was a key supporter of the bill passed by the House and supported by the meat industry, and opposed the Smith-Foley plan.

Those with whom Poage said he conferred are Representatives Graham Purcell (Dem.,

Tex.), chairman of the subcommittee which considered the meat inspection bill; Page Belcher (Rep., Okla.), ranking Republican on the Agriculture Committee; and Catherine May (Rep., Wash.), ranking Republican on the subcommittee.

Poage wrote that the three congressmen agreed with him "that this project (fund raising) should be abandoned immediately."

Poage said he had demanded that Liljenquist rescind his letter and refund any contributions, and added that he would insist no action be taken on the bill until Liljenquist replied.

OTHER ASSOCIATIONS

"I can only hope that this project has not gone so far as to bring possible discussion of the subject to your embarrassment and to the embarrassment of members of Congress."

He also asked the other two associations to send him a letter categorically repudiating the fund-raising campaign.

In another letter to Liljenquist, Poage strongly indicated that one of his principal concerns was that the fund-raising letter would be used to defeat the meat-industry bill, and to aid the Smith-Foley bill.

Wrote Poage: "I think that when you have considered it, you will recognize how this action could be misinterpreted in the hands of any self-appointed critic."

Poage wrote that he didn't want to tell any group how to run its business or politics but added that when matters concern the Agriculture Committee:

"We feel that we would like to be like Caesar's wife and we know of no way in which needed and desirable legislation can be passed as long as its passage would give those who wanted to discredit the committee the opportunity to allege that funds were being collected to buy votes of the committee at the very time a highly controversial bill is before us. The bill, of course, affects your interest and the interest of every meat packer in the United States."

OPPOSED ANY BILL

Originally, the three major meat packing associations were opposed to adoption of any meat inspection bill. However, the meat industry changed its attitude after The Register, followed by other newspapers and Ralph Nader, published Agriculture Department reports showing unsanitary conditions in hundreds of non-federally inspected plants. Then, Purcell and others convinced the industry to support the Agriculture Committee bill or face enactment of the Smith-Foley bill.

Liljenquist replied to Poage on Oct. 11. He agreed to stop the solicitation and return any funds so far collected in order to avoid "any misinterpretation of our objectives."

Liljenquist wrote that he was acting as an individual, that the funds were to be used in the 1968 campaign, and added:

"There was not any thought of relating the funds in any way to the meat inspection legislation, and no effort has ever been made, or would ever be made, to influence a vote on any measure before the Congress. We were raising funds at this time only because our 1964 fund was depleted."

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS RAISED

He said less than \$500 had been raised this year, and about \$1,800 was collected in 1964 "from individuals contributing small amounts."

Liljenquist stated that the congressional campaign fund, of which he is trustee, came into existence in 1964.

Added Liljenquist: "The funds have been used to help elect a few members of the House and Senate who are striving to balance the budget, stop inflation, and serve the best interests of our nation."

Liljenquist wrote that labor unions "have been the most active in this activity (fund

raising)" and said "it is just as important that businessmen become equally concerned about the way our country is governed."

In his original letter soliciting contributions, Liljenquist wrote that he would report annually to a three-man committee. The committee members, all executives of meat packing firms, were listed as:

Douglas N. Allan, James Allan & Sons, San Francisco, Calif.; Paul Blackman, Acme Meat Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; and Wade Parker, Pacific Meat Co., Inc., Portland, Oreg.

TOLD HOW

Also in the original letter, Liljenquist gave detailed instructions how various types of firms should legally make their contributions.

For example, he wrote: "If your company is incorporated, you can make personal contributions to a political campaign fund even though the company in which you are an officer and stockholder has contracts with one or more agencies of the federal government."

"If your company is unincorporated, you should contribute to the fund only if your firm is neither negotiating nor performing a contract with any agency of the federal government at the time of your contribution."

Three officials of the American Meat Institute responded to Poage that their association was in no way involved with the fund-raising campaign. They agreed with Poage that the fund-raising letter was highly improper.

The A.M.I. officials, who share Poage's view in support of the committee bill and in opposition to the Smith-Foley plan, strongly expressed concern that the letter could endanger the bill they favor.

"STUPID ACTIVITY"

A.M.I. Vice-President Alec Davies, the organization's Washington lobbyist, wrote to Poage and described the fund-raising letter as a "most unfortunate, ill-timed and utterly stupid activity initiated by an official of a regional trade association in the meat packing industry."

Davies said further: "In the 33 years I have been in and around Washington, including my 27 years with the A.M.I., I have seldom been more amazed and shocked as I have by this matter."

"I can only hope with you that it will in the short run not endanger the passage of needed and meaningful amendments to the meat inspection act that you and your committee have recommended to the Congress."

"Those changes included in the Purcell (committee) bill are endorsed by both the American Meat Institute and other livestock and meat organizations."

A.M.I. President Degraff indicated in his Oct. 9 letter to Poage that Poage was holding up action on the bill because of the fund-raising letter.

ACTION DELAYED

It was at about this time that the House Rules Committee declined to act on the bill when most congressmen thought it would. It has been reported that Poage, for unexplained reasons, had asked the Rules Committee to delay action on the bill.

Wrote Degraff: "We in A.M.I. are distressed that the good work done thus far by the committee on agriculture should be placed in jeopardy by the thoughtless action of one person."

"Nevertheless, we feel that your decision temporarily to postpone action is a wise one inasmuch as revision of the federal meat inspection act is much too important to be decided in an atmosphere of suspicion and recrimination."

"As you know, the American Meat Institute has endorsed H.R. 12144, the Purcell bill, which has been favorably reported out of the committee. We believe it is a good

bill and one that will contribute to the ability of the meat industry to serve the public more effectively.

"We trust that developments described in your letter will not unduly hamper its consideration, but we would certainly defer to your judgment and would not wish to press for congressional action at a time when there might be an opportunity to misjudge the attitude of the meat industry generally."

GRAVE MISTAKE

Degraff said the fund campaign "was a grave mistake," even though it might have been done with no improper motive.

"Under the circumstances," said Degraff, "and considering the position of the individual [Liljenquist], one could scarcely avoid the inference that at least some segment of the meat industry was involved and that influence on pending legislation might be one of the prime objectives."

B. F. Gray, chairman of the board of A.M.I., sent a telegram to Poage repudiating the funds letter and assuring him that A.M.I. was not and would not be involved in such an endeavor since it is completely non-political and non-partisan in its activities.

A Senate Agriculture subcommittee is scheduled to hold hearings soon on the meat inspection issue.

According to informed sources, some persons in the administration and the meat industry briefly considered taking the House-passed bill directly to the Senate floor Wednesday in hopes of getting the bill approved quickly.

Such a maneuver would have headed off an opportunity for supporters of a stronger bill to build their case for full hearings.

Senator Walter Mondale (Dem., Minn.) will spearhead a drive in the Senate for approval of a stronger bill. Mondale has proposed legislation that would bring all meat packers under federal inspection, but permit individual states to continue inspection of intrastate plants if the states come up to federal standards.

Mondale said Wednesday of the House-passed bill: "It simply does not do the job of providing the American people adequate protection against the sale of diseased or contaminated meat or meat products."

"The consumer has a right to be protected against bad meat and the House-passed bill does not provide such protection."

RETIREMENT OF WARD AND DORIS ANN BOWDEN AS PUBLISHERS OF MONROE MONITOR AND SULTAN VALLEY NEWS, SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASH.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, recently Ward and Doris Ann Bowden retired as publishers of the Monroe Monitor and the Sultan Valley News, both weekly newspapers in my home Snohomish County, in Washington.

His longtime editor, Howard Voland, and Mrs. Voland have purchased the properties from the Bowdens. Besides operating his newspapers, Ward Bowden has served for many years as Secretary of the Washington State Senate.

In a recent edition of the Monitor, Howard Voland wrote an excellent editorial on the many contributions made by Ward Bowden to his communities. The editorial, Mr. President, tells much of the life of the smalltown editor and what he does to make a better life for all the citizens of his area. Highway development, a new hospital, and expansion of the big Evergreen State Fair at Monroe are just typical of the kinds of

projects that Ward Bowden put his type-writer and energies to work on. The Monroe and Sultan communities are much better for the 25 years that the Bowdens gave them.

Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to present the editorial for the RECORD, as Ward Bowden is a friend of many years. He and I attended public schools together in Everett, Wash., graduating from Everett High School.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Your Former Publisher" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Monroe (Wash.) Monitor,
Oct. 5, 1967]

YOUR FORMER PUBLISHER

With your indulgence we're going to talk about the Ward Bowden you lost as your publisher last week.

When we first met him more years ago than we like to remember he was garbed in striped union overalls, as unpretentious as our Uncle Sam slopping the hogs on his Illinois farm. Today, he is unchanged, still in his striped union overalls at times, yet in the intervening years he has risen to remarkable heights as a publisher and stands as a man of considerable stature in Washington State government.

Thinking back over the years we remember him taking eggs or honey in lieu of subscription money. We remember him chatting with the president of the United States, United States senators and many other notable men at the national and state level.

His accomplishments as an editor and publisher, along with his devoted wife, Doris Ann, have been many and varied.

We can remember his newspapers doing much to bring about completion of the Monroe-Bothell cutoff, making the Evergreen Fair what it is today and bringing to Sultan the modern district offices of the State Department of Natural Resources.

Probably his greatest single undertaking of merit was his work toward the formation of Snohomish County Hospital District No. 1.

It was Ward Bowden's idea and it was Ward Bowden's newspapers that spawned, nurtured and promoted the successful change over for Valley General Hospital. This, as well as his other endeavors of community service, stand to his lasting credit.

Ironically, not once to our knowledge in his near quarter-century as an editor and publisher has he received a single award, yet time and again lesser accomplishments have been extolled and honored. This was for one reason: his modesty never allowed him to subscribe to the philosophy that he had to (in effect) request a plaque or a certificate for the accomplishments of his newspapers.

The Ward Bowden many of you knew is a hard-nosed businessman but there was another side we saw many times. Never once, if he had knowledge, did a subscriber lose his subscription because of financial difficulties—he picked up the tab and has done it through the years.

He was an aggressive editor and publisher. That aggressiveness cost him not once, but several times. Once he published a story that offended an advertiser. It cost him in excess of a thousand dollars. His deep-seated belief in democratic government and a free press made that decision, as well as others.

In losing him as your publisher, the valley has lost the services of the most knowledgeable man in government in the Skykomish Valley, if not Snohomish County.

All said and done, Ward Bowden is going to be missed, most especially by the guy who has inherited his publications.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

SUPPLEMENTARY SLAVERY CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the business before the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Executive L, 88th Congress, first session, the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the Supplementary Convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

DAY OF SHAME FOR U.S. SENATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it seems to me, as one who has spoken on the Senate floor urging U.S. ratification of the human rights conventions more than 165 times during the first session of the 90th Congress, that is, this year, I regard the Senate's voting today on only the Supplementary Slavery Convention with distress—and I might say with deep distress—in fact, with a sense of shame for this great body.

Mr. President, this is a sad day for human rights. It is a black day for the Senate. But it is the beginning, not the end, of the fight.

Every Senator in this body is going to have a chance to go on record on these human rights conventions. At a later date, when we have had the chance to inform Members of the Senate more fully and directly what is at stake, I intend to offer as an amendment to other treaties, both the Convention on the Political Rights of Women and the Convention on Forced Labor.

Every Senator will have a chance to vote yes or no, up or down, in public on these conventions.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has had more than ample opportunity to make a record on these conventions. Indeed, both these conventions—Political Rights of Women and Forced Labor—have been before the committee for over 51 months.

A special subcommittee was appointed to hold hearings on these three human rights conventions. The subcommittee did hold hearings and reported favorably all three conventions to the full committee. As I have done before, I commend the subcommittee, under the able leadership of Senator Donn, for its prompt and responsible action.

But now this is a fight which can only be made in this body, because, as is well