

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)

its teachings. We know that a deep and abiding religious faith characterized the patriots of the Revolutionary period. During a long and bitter struggle for independence and personal freedom our Continental Army faced heavy odds. Creasy lists Saratoga as one of the decisive battles of history because it influenced France to give the colonies vital and much needed help. But our Founding Fathers believed that God was on their side and they gave the credit to Him.

Our relatively new nation was torn asunder and almost wrecked by a civil war which statesmanship could and should have prevented. Daniel Webster urged a peaceful solution of the issue of slavery. Pleading against a resort to force, he said: "When mine eyes are turned to behold for the last time the sun in heaven may I not see it shining upon the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; upon a land torn by civil strife, and drenched perhaps, in fraternal blood!" Yet both North and South claimed God to be on their side.

It took a long time to justify the hope of Oliver Wendell Holmes: "One flag, one land, one heart, one hand, one nation, evermore!" But when the call came to carry our flag for the first time on a European battlefield patriotism was at high-tide—a half century of industrial growth had repaired the ravages of war and time had healed its wounds. When an imperialistic war in Europe threatened the survival of democracy, patriots accepted the battle cry of our Commander-in-Chief that we would fight for the protection of freedom. What a thrill our nation got when the Southern "grey" and the Northern "blue" were blended in the "dough-boy khaki" of 1917 and became the emblem of victory in our first global war. National unity, patriotism and faith in God were expressed in this appeal to victory:

"Here's to the sons of the windswept North
When they meet on the fields of France
May the spirit of Grant be with them all
As the sons of the North advance.

"Here's to the sons of the sunny South
When they meet on the fields of France
May the spirit of Lee be with them all
As the sons of the South advance.

"Here's to the blue and the grey as one
When they meet on the fields of France
May the spirit of God be with them all
As the sons of the flag advance."

Unfortunately, the Christian spirit and unselfish patriotism which had characterized our participation in World War I didn't last. We elected a President whose Chib boleth was a "return to normalcy". Idealism was succeeded by materialism and international cooperation by isolationism. Heartbroken by that trend, our World War I leader and author of an international covenant to prevent future wars said: "If our civilization is to survive materially it must be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved," said he, "only by becoming imbued with the spirit of Christ and made free and happy by the practices which spring from that spirit."

Since that warning was given we have fought two wars and are now engaged in a third one; we have military installations in 48 nations and a military budget of nearly 70 billion dollars. The primary responsibility of handling that vast program has fallen upon the shoulders of our breakfast group leader—Senator Stennis. He believes, as I believe, that there is a connection between the brotherly love and good neighbor teachings of the Bible and unselfish patriotism. He believes, as I believe, that God governs in the affairs of men and for a just cause we can call upon Him for aid. But in recent years these beliefs have been so widely and seriously challenged it becomes the duty of those whose faith has not wavered to hold aloft the torch of patriotism allied with religion.

We have never fought a war of aggression. We have resorted to war only for the protection of freedom. Some challenge the claim that we are now fighting in Vietnam in defense of freedom and there is a difference of opinion on how that war should be fought. Those are issues on which patriots may differ. But that cannot be said of draft-card burners—they are law violators; nor can it be said of most participants in anti-war demonstrations—they are protesting in an unpatriotic way against our entire social order. Some are even Communist who would rejoice in the destruction of our Government and democratic institutions. Those are groups which know not the Bible or who have repudiated God.

Knowing that patriots in our revolution who fought for freedom and patriots who fought for the preservation of one nation under God had appealed to him for help and that their prayers were answered, why should patriots doubt the power of God to help us in our present crisis.

I challenge the claim that draft-card burners and the anti-war demonstrators are speaking for the majority of the present generation. Heads of five large universities recently said that they have never had finer students. Military leaders who have seen our men in action in Vietnam say that their patriotism, their morale, their undaunted courage has never been surpassed. And what do the chaplains say. Never in their experience have those in military service been more eager to hear about God and the saving grace of Jesus Christ. In a tough war, and one in which our Nation is not united, men of the present generation in military service have met, and will continue to meet, the acid test of patriotism. But standing on the brink of eternity they want the help of God.

Without minimizing the danger of another world war which could, as the historian H. G. Wells said, leave a remnant of civilization cowering behind a wind-brake or in the disease soaked ruins of a slum, I feel that the lack of patriotism evidenced by the appalling increase in crime is an equally serious threat to the perpetuity of our cherished institutions. "None can doubt" says a former president of the American Bar Association "that America faces a crisis of lawlessness with the gravest potential for disaster." Nor can this warning of half a century ago by Theodore Roosevelt be successfully challenged: "No nation ever yet retained its freedom for any length of time after losing its respect for the law, after losing the law-abiding spirit, the spirit that really makes orderly liberty." Human nature has not changed since the days of anarchy in Israel recorded in the Book of Judges when, "There was no king in Israel: every man and that which was right in his own eyes." In his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" Gibbon referred to the moral degeneracy that characterized Rome before its destruction and said that patriotism fell to such a low point mercenaries were employed for the city's defense.

It is not a mere coincidence that our criminals who are without a moral code have no patriotism. Billy Graham in commenting on the fact that Japan has the lowest crime rate in the world says that the Japanese, some Buddhists some Shintoists, are very religious and they are responding by unprecedented thousands to his message of the one true God.

While the method of dealing with criminals in Japan indicates that prompt punishment commensurate with the crime is a deterring influence, Dr. Graham feels that the good citizenship of the Japanese—their love of country and desire to promote its interest—are outward evidences of spiritual values. Patriotism cannot be bought nor criminals reformed by force. We need to reach the hearts of men through the power of the living God. In Chronicles, He gives us this positive assurance "If My people who are called by My name will humble them-

selves and pray and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land."

JOHN NANCE GARNER

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I rise today to mourn the passing of one of the grand men of Texas politics, John Nance Garner. In him was embodied the epitome of the Texas politician, tough, taciturn, and always fighting for his principles and his beloved Texas. In a remarkable career that spanned all the way from the county courthouse to the U.S. Congress, to the Speaker of that body, and finally to the Vice-Presidency of the United States, John Nance Garner was always the same, his own man. He was humble. He never forgot the past or the promise of the future.

Vice President Garner was born in a log cabin in Red River County in 1868 and was brought up there in the rugged frontier of that day. In 1902, he was first elected to Congress and served there until he became Vice President in 1933. One of the highlights of his career was his election as Speaker of the House in 1931, and in 1932 there was much talk of his being the Democratic nominee for President.

His main concern was to see that the House worked vigorously to tackle the challenge of the great depression that concerned all Americans. As Vice President, Mr. Garner served his country with candor. His views of this office were well known, but not once did he shirk the many duties that were required of him. He always served his President and his country.

After two terms in the Vice-Presidency, Mr. Garner elected to return to his beloved Texas cattle country in Uvalde, believing that the tradition of George Washington should be followed. This was Mr. Garner's farewell to politics, and in the ensuing years, he spent much time enjoying his native State, meeting her native sons, and enjoying her history. A few years ago, he turned his home into a museum of Texas history as a gift to his hometown of Uvalde, and moved into smaller quarters in the rear of the home. He continued to supervise the museums operations and remained quite active until the day that he passed on.

Mr. President, the service and the career of John Nance Garner should be an inspiration to us all. It is certainly to be wished that we could everywhere in the Nation possess his sense of duty to country and to principle. Texas has lost a beloved son and the Nation one of its most loyal citizens.

NATIONAL MEATPACKERS ESTABLISH INTRASTATE OPERATIONS TO AVOID FEDERAL INSPECTION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the plot thickens on the meat inspection issue now before the Senate Agriculture Committee. This morning's Des Moines Register and Minneapolis Tribune carry a story by Mr. Nick Kotz disclosing that Agriculture Department investigators found improper conditions at six plants operated by Swift & Co., which is the Na-

tion's largest meatpacking firm. These plants are wholly owned subsidiaries which limit their sales to intrastate markets and thus under the highly technical jurisdictional rules of meat inspection are beyond the reach of Federal inspectors. The abuses reported were derived from inspections made in 1962 and again in 1967.

Despite the fact that the Congress is trying to determine what policy it should pursue in protecting the public against unsanitary and unwholesome meat, the Nation's largest meatpacking firm has refused to disclose how many of its plants are exempt from Federal inspection, either in response to inquiries from Members of Congress or similar inquiries from newsmen.

It would appear that Swift & Co. is pursuing its policy of owning subsidiaries which operate in a fashion to escape Federal inspection so that they might better compete with nonfederally inspected meatpacking plants. This practice apparently permits them to resort to practices which save them money and which would never be tolerated if they were under Federal inspection. The losers, of course, are the American consumers who buy unwholesome meat or meat stuffed with cheap additives, such as water, cheap meats, or other inexpensive fillers, which are at best worthless to the consumer.

This disclosure, in my opinion, obliterates the argument that the only thing that prevents States from adopting adequate standards and appropriating sufficient funds for adequate State inspection is the mere absence of financial resources. It is now quite apparent that some of the largest meat packing firms in the country purchase or establish intrastate meat plants to avoid Federal inspection and thereby reduce costs for what they regard to be important competitive reasons. Thus, it becomes perfectly apparent that while we should offer to help the States by sharing the costs of adequate inspection, we must also insist that standards comparable to those of Federal inspection be required for all meat sold to consumers of this Nation.

I have been advised that the Swift Co. has declined the opportunity to testify before the Senate Agriculture Committee. I hope they will reconsider. It is now apparent that we must shape a measure in the Senate Agriculture Committee to assure that all meat sold to the American consumer is wholesome and unadulterated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Nick Kotz, referred to above, be printed in the Record.

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

CITE POOR CONDITIONS IN SWIFT PLANTS—SIX INSANITARY FACILITIES NAMED IN 1962—FAULTS ELIMINATED, FIRM SAYS—MEAT INDUSTRY SHOWS SIGNS OF WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT A STRONGER MEAT-INSPECTION BILL
(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Agriculture Department investigators have reported finding improper conditions in at least six plants operated by Swift & Co., the nation's largest meat packing firm. None operated under federal inspection.

The reports were contained in 1962 and 1967 nationwide surveys made to determine conditions in some of the 14,000 meat packing plants that are not under federal inspection.

Swift, which reportedly handles 4 billion pounds of meat annually, operates 61 federally inspected plants and an undetermined number of intrastate plants not subject to federal inspection.

SWIFT SILENT

Swift officials have declined to tell either The Register or Representatives Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.) and Thomas Foley (Dem., Wash.) how many of its plants are exempt from federal inspection because they do not sell across state lines. The Agriculture Department also declines to reveal this information.

Swift officials have said only that 98 per cent of the firm's slaughtering and 90 per cent of its processing are under federal inspection.

The department's 1962 and 1967 reports are being cited by congressmen pushing for expanded federal meat inspection or improved state inspection.

In the department's 1962 survey, five of Swift's intrastate plants were cited for improper conditions, mainly relating to sanitation. They were located in San Antonio, Tex.; New Orleans, La.; Richmond, Va.; Orlando, Fla., and Jacksonville, Fla. The Jacksonville plant has since been closed.

A Swift & Co. spokesman declined to comment Tuesday on whether the inspectors had accurately described conditions existing in the plants at the time of the inspections. He also declined to reveal the number of locations of Swift plants not under federal inspection.

The Swift spokesman, informed of the plants to be referred to in this story, issued the following statement:

"Swift and Co. thinks it both unfair and less than factual to base a news story and/or a plea for current legislation on conditions alleged to have existed five years ago in its meat packing units, when such conditions no longer exist.

"According to this story, unsatisfactory conditions were reported in 1952 in five Swift and Co. units, yet every one of these units has been greatly modified in the last five to eight years through the company's continuing program of upgrading facilities and installation of new and efficient equipment.

"For example, completely new sales units were built in both Jacksonville and Orlando, Fla. Furthermore, no meat processing is done in the Richmond, Va. unit.

"The only current government inspection report referred to in the story is the Swift Phoenix sales units, which was just built and equipped in 1966. While the inspector might have been critical of a few housekeeping matters, this facility is modern in all respects."

YEAR 1967 SURVEY

The Agriculture Department did not release to the press or to Congress names of the plants cited in the 1967 survey. However, informed sources have identified one plant in Phoenix, Ariz., as being operated by Swift.

W. F. Bonilla, the Agriculture Department investigator who made the inspection, wrote of the Swift plant, in a July 31, 1967, report:

"This plant is a wholesale meat jobber and conducts smoking of hams. It is under the state of Arizona meat inspection system. The building is new, but facilities are inadequate. Working areas are crowded.

"General sanitation is poor throughout. Smokehouse area is cluttered with storage of boxes, paper, bags, etc. Over-all sanitation could be greatly improved. No sterilizers in the working areas. Wooden tables are in use. Equipment is inadequate(ly) sanitized."

The Agriculture Department did not begin to make public the 1962 reports until last summer.

RICHMOND PLANT

In a September, 1962, report, the USDA inspectors reported on a Swift plant in Richmond, Va., which cuts and grinds meat, smokes cured pork parts and manufactures sausage. (The plant now only distributes meat.)

The report stated, in part:

"The meat grinder bearings had much encrusted putrid material which would readily result in bacterial contamination of the ground meat. Sausage was hung on unclean aluminum smoke sticks and no attempt was made to clean the sausage mixer.

"Some beef cuts hanging in the cooler showed evidence of sollage while in transit and had not been reconditioned by removing soiled portions. Other insanitary conditions noted were ceilings with leaks dripping on exposed meat causing serious contamination.

"Some cockroaches were observed in the curing cellar where exposed meat is handled and stored."

In a September, 1962, report on a Swift plant in New Orleans, La., the federal inspector noted "there is no control over trichina" and "no control in the use of such 'restricted items' such as nitrite and aureomycin."

RUSTY BARRELS

The inspector also noted "rusty barrels" used to hold meat products and meat boning boards that "were old and caked with fat and meat juices, cracks and deep knife marks."

In a September, 1962, report on the Swift plant at Orlando, Fla., the inspector noted that a loading dock door was covered with green mold, even though the plant was newly constructed. He also described the freezer as being "overcrowded, without proper aisles."

In another 1962 report, the inspectors devoted four pages of remarks to conditions in a large Swift plant at San Antonio which the inspectors said slaughters 640 animals in an eight-hour day.

Among conditions noted were:

"As a result of inadequate (handwashing) facilities, we noticed in the bacon slicing room after a girl picked up the product off the floor, she then handled edible product without washing her hands.

"... On the killing floor, the hands of the hog brisket splitter and hogheaders were heavily contaminated with blood and hair due to infrequent washing of hands.

MEAT CONTAMINATED

"Numerous carcasses and tubs of meat were observed to be contaminated with drippings from the ceiling. Paint, scale, rust and plaster were scalding down from the walls and ceiling on the product through the plant.

"At least 50 hogs split and headed with no attempt made on the part of the house employees to clean their hands and knives from the contamination of blood and hair.

"Improper work-up of offal—upon inspection the offal was found to be grossly contaminated with fecal material, metal filings, hair, hide, dirt, etc. . . He [the state inspector] felt that all of the offal should be condemned; however, he took no action.

"Inspectional procedures were inadequate. Although we were told that all diseased animals were suspected (marked with a suspect tag) . . . upon visiting the pens, it was noted that two animals with epitheliomas had not been suspected. Head inspection was done in a haphazard manner.

"A majority of the hogs contained a great number of 'beater, wounds' on them which were grossly contaminated with tub water and hair. Other hog carcasses were found to have large chronic wounds on them.

HAM DEPARTMENT

"... In the ham processing department, the inspector had no way of determining whether or not hams came back to 'green weight' after pumping and smoking.

“ . . . Condemned product was not tanked under supervision.

“ . . . In general, the plant was operating beyond capacity. In all departments, products were stacked on tables so high that at times they fell on the floor.”

A number of other large national firms also operate both federally and non-federally-inspected meat packing plants. In a Register survey several months ago, all the largest national firms except Swift were willing to discuss the number of and location of their intrastate plants.

Several sources in the meat packing industry have explained that some of the national firms feel they have to operate some non-federally-inspected plants to meet strong local competitors in particular states.

The national firms were publicly united in opposing a bill that would have expanded federal inspection to cover the 8,000 now exempt plants which gross more than \$250,000 annually.

WEAKER BILL

After first opposing any legislation, the major meat packing association decided to support a weaker bill, which offers federal aid to states willing to improve their own inspection system.

The weaker bill passed the House and is now in the Senate. The strong bill, sponsored by Foley and Representative Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.), was defeated.

DR. RICARDO VALLEJO SAMALA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to ask that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 665, H.R. 2275, and at that time it is the leadership's intention to ask that there be a time limitation of one-half hour on the bill and all amendments thereto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 665.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2275) for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of a half hour on the bill and all amendments thereto, the time to be equally divided and controlled between the majority and minority leaders or whomever they may designate, and that the usual rules apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who has the first amendment?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield all the time on this side to the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH].

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

“Sec. 2. (a) In each State (other than the States of New Mexico and Hawaii) which is entitled in the Ninety-first Congress or in any subsequent Congress thereafter to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled ‘An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives’ (46 Stat. 26, as amended; 2 U.S.C. 2), there shall be established a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative.

“(b) When such districts have been so established within any such State in accordance with the decennial census of the United States taken in 1960, such districts shall not be altered before the results of the decennial census of the United States taken in 1970 are available unless alteration thereof is required by a statewide special census of the United States conducted before 1970 pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954 (71 Stat. 481, as amended; 13 U.S.C. 8).”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As I understand, the unanimous-consent request applied to a certain bill. As I understand, the request has now been changed. I have not seen the proposal, and I may have some objection to the unanimous-consent agreement. I should like to have the Chair state what the agreement is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the request for unanimous consent was for one-half hour on the bill itself and all amendments thereto, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And any amendments thereto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And any amendments thereto.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I offer as an amendment in the nature of a substitute amendment No. 436, which is at the desk. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

“In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress or in any subsequent Congress thereafter to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled ‘An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives’ (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Tennessee offering his

amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BAKER. It is my intention to offer the amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment in the nature of a substitute is straightforward and simple. It is to adopt the language of the original, amended Senate version of the redistricting bill relating to the prohibition against election of Representatives to the U.S. House of Representatives at large.

The measure makes no other provision. It has nothing to do with gerrymandering. It has nothing to do with compactness. It has nothing to do with census. It strictly provides in a straightforward manner that when there is more than one Member of the House of Representatives from a State, the State must be districted, and that the Members may not run at large.

This, as I said previously, is the language of the Senate version adopted in June of this year. This, I am told, is essentially the language which was proposed by Representative CLELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee as long ago as 1951. This is substantially the language that was adopted by Congresses dated from 1842 until very recently.

Mr. President, this measure makes no exceptions. The conference report, if one recalls, excepted from the provision which prohibited elections at large the States of New Mexico and Hawaii. This measure does not exclude any State, and therefore, of course, does include New Mexico, Hawaii, and all of the other States.

My amendment differs in material respects from the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] in that, as I understand it, Senator BAYH's amendment has certain restrictions on how frequently the State legislature may reapportion.

I believe that my amendment is the most straightforward and direct and simple way to get at the most urgent need in the entire field of redistricting, and that is to prevent the several States of the Union from being under the threat of having their Representatives to the U.S. House of Representatives stand for election at large.

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

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, is it not true that it was this point which stood in the way of approval of the conference report which was agreed upon on June 28 of this year and referred to the House? It was found that it did not include a prohibition on election at large, and it was that point which caused the recommitment of the full conference report to the conference so that they could rework it to include that point.