

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 20

JULY 30, 1970, TO AUGUST 7, 1970  
(PAGES 26489 TO 27852)

This percentage is to be compared with the present import restriction on beef of 6.7 percent of domestic production. Certainly if the 1964 Meat Import Quota Law were amended to allow imports to meet the gap between the demand for lean beef and the domestic production of such beef, it would still be more restrictive than the Ways and Means Committee's tentative formula for manufactured products.

I have given expression to this in a letter to a constituent of mine, a businessman, who as a consumer, is strongly exercised about retail beef prices. I include my letter to him as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

JULY 20, 1970.

Mr. A. R. MARTINO,  
Waterbury, Conn.

DEAR TONY: Your letter of July 10, 1970 and the copy of your note of June 26, 1970 to the Department of Agriculture, have been read by me with much interest.

The hearings held by me last fall with respect to the sharp rise in the retail price of beef, to which your letter refers, show the problems facing the consumer. The adequacy of the supply of beef, including the relationship of import quotas and the consequent effect on prices to the consumer were one of the major phases of that hearing. Since then there have been, as you mentioned, revelations as to the inadequacy of domestic meat inspection and the unguarded use of antibiotics in feeding cattle, presenting dangers to consumers.

While the cattle growers trumpet their claim that they can provide enough beef to meet the demand of the American consumer, I am somewhat dubious insofar as lean beef is concerned. This is the beef that is used in combination with the fatty parts of the choice carcass for making hamburger and other manufactured meat products. The figures show that the wholesale price of beef used for manufacturing purposes is higher than it was last year. In addition, the retail price of hamburger for May, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was higher than it was last year at its highest point. All the statistics available to me with respect to prices for beef animals slaughtered for manufacturing purposes, mostly cows, lead me to believe that it is a strong reflection of an inadequate domestic supply of such beef as against the increasing demand for it. Without going into the complexities of the cow-calf and feeding industry and its time-cycle of over 2½ years, the supply of domestic lean beef cannot be accelerated without adverse effects on the production of choice beef.

The President, on June 30, 1970, performed the miraculous feat of increasing the amount of beef, mostly used for processing, which could be imported, while actually cutting back the rate of such imports. Under the 1964 Meat Imports Quota Law, the amount of meat which could be imported in 1970 without imposing a quota was 1098 million pounds, 110% of the quota. Imports for the first half of 1970 were approximately 600 million pounds, strongly indicating that the 110% figure would be exceeded long before the end of the year.

As required by law, the President imposed a quota of 998 million pounds, and in the same document, suspended it, allowing imports to equal 1140 million pounds. As 600 million pounds were already imported, the second half imports can total only 540 million pounds or a reduction of 10% over the first half of the year.

I intend to watch closely the effect of this governmental action on the retail price of beef. It may be doubted that it will prove highly beneficial to the consumer.

My reason for all this detail on the most

recent happenings in the beef picture is because of your interest in the matter. I fully appreciate your support of my work as your representative in Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
Chairman.

#### THE FARMER AND THE AMERICAN HOUSEWIFE

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the interesting comments of the gentleman from Connecticut suggested to me that the House should give a little more consideration to the bargain the housewife is now getting in the way of food, and the extent to which the farm program reduces her cost of food.

As the gentleman pointed out, it is perfectly true that the cost of food, like all other costs, is going up due to inflation. But it is also true that the American housewife is today buying food for her family with a far smaller percentage of her disposable income—actually 16½ percent—than have the people of any other nation in the world, at any time in the history of the world. That, as I see it, is the greatest compliment that could ever be paid to the American farmer and to our farm program which will come up for renewal next week.

If you take \$3.5 billion out of the farmers' income—the \$3.5 billion which he is now getting as a result of the farm program—you will add, not \$3.5 billion to the cost of the American housewife, but approximately \$10.5 billion, because every time you run an item of food through the grocery store, the cost multiplies by at least three times.

To the extent that we reduce the Government supplements to the income of the farmer we must increase the marketplace costs by at least three times that amount, because there is no way of putting the needed food on the grocery shelf without putting enough money into farm income to pay all the costs of production. If the Government subsidy is withdrawn, you can anticipate paying, not \$3.5 billion more, but some \$10.5 billion more for food next year.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY ARMY OF DUMPING OF NERVE GAS OFF CAPE CANAVERAL

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I impose upon the House at this time because of an announcement that has been issued today by the Department of the Army concerning the dumping of nerve gas some 250 miles east of Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, I am distressed to hear this news. I am very much concerned about it, and I am contacting the Secretary of Defense to ask that no action be taken to dump this gas, which is now scheduled to be dumped on the 10th of August, until the Subcommittee on Oceanography as well as other commit-

tees have an opportunity to look into it.

I have been assured by Chairman LENNON of the Subcommittee on Oceanography that hearings will be held this next week. I would urge the Secretary to withhold any action until this has been done.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE AUGUSTUS HAWKINS

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, everyone who knows him knows that when the word "Honorable" is appended to the name AUGUSTUS HAWKINS it is not merely a customary title, a politeness, an act of protocol. It is a description, a statement of fact, almost a synonym for the name itself. He is in fact one of the best men here, honest, able, compassionate, intelligent—in short, what all of us ought to strive to be. Anyone who seeks to impugn the integrity of GUS HAWKINS simply calls his own integrity into question. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois was misinformed or misquoted and will want to set the record straight on this matter.

Many of us have remarked over the past few weeks that we are especially indebted to Congressmen HAWKINS and WILLIAM ANDERSON and to Mr. Tom Harkin for their diligence and courage in bringing the situation at Con Son to the attention of the Nation. I rise today simply to reiterate my thanks to these remarkable men for bringing credit to this House and adding to the honor of their country.

#### HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY WERE A CHARADE AND A SHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WATSON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of you will agree that the gentleman in the well prides himself in trying to keep his patience, and that likewise he recognizes that we have some difficulties and everything is not perfect in the Southland. But at the same time I believe there is a point beyond which a person's patience begins to break. Further, that there is a point when a person will stand up and speak out against those who would maliciously malign the great Southland.

Mr. Speaker, in a statement this past Thursday I said that the hearings conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Minnesota were a charade and a sham. As further proof of the ridiculous and misleading nature of these hearings, the chairman just made a brief visit to four Southern communities in three States and returned with a scathing denunciation of the entire South and its education system.

Mr. Speaker, this is comparable to

someone from the South going to the Senator's home State for a few days, and not finding any Negroes in four randomly selected communities of that State, deciding that Minnesota has outlawed integration.

Now, the Senator's report upon completion of his fact-finding tour represents a personal insult to the people of the South, and it is an insult to the intelligence of every thinking American, regardless of region. It is an insult that must be challenged, and I challenge it here and now.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Senator from Minnesota to explain the real reason why he has singled out the Southern part of this country for a much-publicized tour, especially in view of his well-known record of anti-Southern prejudices. Are there not serious problems crying for solution in other areas, even the District of Columbia? Why does the Senator direct attention away from these areas as well as his own State's problems?

Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, people in this country less qualified than the Senator from Minnesota to speak on the subject of Southern education, or anything else down our way for that matter. The South is not obligated to listen to such rank insults and distorted, prejudged views of our section of the country. His voice is that of a totally discredited and outdated philosophy, and this Nation should no more heed his advice than physicists should listen to the advice of the president of the "Flat Earth Society."

It is obvious to me that the Senator is attempting to capitalize on the frustrations of people for his own political gain. Since an extended visit to the South would not enlighten the Senator because of biased views already held, it is certain that a few days tour would leave him appallingly short of information. Therefore, his brief visit was totally without probative value and can only be interpreted as a grandstand play. But in all fairness I do understand he sent a few of his staff underlings into the South, even South Carolina, to "survey" the situation—yet these people could not tell the difference between a school house and a filling station.

For generations the South has had to bear the cross of gratuitous criticism from uninformed outsiders. These breastbeaters strike holier-than-thou poses and lament conditions in the South in words revealing their paucity of knowledge on the subject. They add to their scarce knowledge certain wrong-headed notions supplied by their prejudices and go forth to propagandize another generation of their constituents in the age-old obsession of South-hating.

At a time when divisiveness is deplored by liberals and blamed on conservative attitudes and actions, professional South-haters foster and cultivate the rankest and most blatant divisiveness in this country. The Senator's tirade against our section of the country is the same old political demagoguery reminiscent of Thaddeus Stevens days over a century ago.

What the Senator called an investigation of three Southern States was in fact the typical whirlwind tour which is a requirement for anti-South propagandists prior to the periodic unleashing of their prejudices. The investigation is designed to lend credence to whatever the objective is. The southern evils which such investigations reveal and the repressions which are typically discovered are in fact attitudes and beliefs long-harbored in the mind of the South-hater currently holding forth in the other body.

The question begs: Why must we of the South endure any longer charades unethically described as investigations and political attacks piously couched in moralistic tones?

If honesty will not silence the likes of the Senator from Minnesota in their criticism of the South, it would seem that the plight of their own citizens would.

I direct his attention to rampant crime which is largely a Northern problem. I direct his attention to epidemic drug addiction which is almost exclusively a problem of States outside the South. I direct his attention to the proliferation of pornography which originates outside the South and which threatens to contaminate our area. I direct his attention to large-scale race riots which are predominantly a northern and western problem and not one of the South. I direct his attention to organized crime which is strangling life from his and many other sections of the country.

Senator, your people need help. Get to work on your own problems!

Senator, it is easy to see now what motivates you. Is it that you direct attention elsewhere, so your people will not become too alarmed about their lives and conditions? That will not "wash" any longer. Senator, I advise you to get on your not-so-white charger and return to face the very real problems of your own area. Certainly your political fortunes are not contingent upon your vilification of the South.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. I yield to my distinguished friend and leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina.

I want to add this. I read this so-called report by the junior Senator from Minnesota. It emanated only from a politically sick mind, a frustrated mind, an ambitious mind, who would stop at nothing to fan the seeds of sectionalism and racism to further his own political gain. He is one of those whom Vice President AGNEW aptly referred to as playing Russian roulette with the safety and security of this country.

I would say as Roosevelt once said: Plague on his house and plague on him. That is not fitting to be said of one who calls himself a Senator of the United States.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

As usual, the gentleman has said it more directly and eloquently than I.

#### NAFEC FACILITY ONE OF WORLD'S FINEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SANDMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to several glaring inaccuracies in a report filed with the House by the Government Operations Committee. This report, dated July 16, 1970, contains findings affecting the Federal Aviation Administration in its development of an air traffic control system. These deficiencies exist on page 30 and page 56 of the report. The erroneous findings are used in an attempt to justify the recommendation of a phaseout of the research and development work presently performed at the National Aeronautics Facilities Experimental Center near Atlantic City, N.J., and the transfer of these functions to the former NASA facilities at Cambridge, Mass.

Whoever gave the committee this information is grossly in error. It could be that he is trying to revitalize the white elephant at Cambridge rather than make an improvement in the whole system itself. At any rate, let me point out some of the inadequacies. The facility at NAFEC to start with is one of the finest of its kind in the world. The physical plant at the air field is capable of testing all kinds of aircraft regardless of size. No such facility as this exists at Cambridge, Mass. The electronics equipment installed at the field is in tiptop condition, the result of millions of dollars already expended by the Federal Government. The hangers at this installation rank with the very best we have. In fact, improvements to these facilities have been constant and have kept them up to date.

When a report says that the research and development facility at Atlantic City is woefully inadequate, it would be a good idea to point out exactly what the inadequacies are. The report does not point to these at all. It is only in the third paragraph on page 30 that a feeble attempt is made to disqualify what exists at the Atlantic City facility. It points out that the barracks are of World War II vintage. This may be so, but the barracks referred to are a tiny part of the entire installation and have very little to do with the overall efficiency of the operation. The report goes on and says:

The rural location deprives young engineers and technicians of the opportunity to attend colleges and universities to advance their technical capabilities. Philadelphia, the closest metropolitan area, is too far away for day-after-day commuting.

This assertion leads me to believe that whoever supplied this information to the committee did not even visit NAFEC to start with. For the committee's information, the Atlantic City Expressway that connects this area with Philadelphia facilitates 70 miles per hour traffic. The Atlantic City Expressway Authority invested some \$60 million in this excellent highway, none of which was Federal money. It takes exactly 40 minutes