

JOURNAL
SUPPLEMENT

SENATE AND HOUSE - SUPPLEMENT NO. 3

February 14, 1968

"Address of Congressman Howard W. Pollock
The Congressman for Alaska
Before the Joint Session of the Alaska State Legislature
Wednesday, 14 February 1968, 10:20 AM

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, My Dear Friends and Colleagues:

It is a great privilege and honor to again appear before you. This is the second time I have done so as the Congressman for Alaska. I hope that such addresses can become a tradition for your congressional delegations in the future. It is imperative, in my view, that your representatives on the national level work closely with the Legislature to achieve the programs so necessary to the well-being of our people. Yet it is often difficult to communicate over the vast distance that separates Washington, D.C. from Alaska. This address offers the invaluable opportunity for me to discuss with all of you the progress and problems of interest to Alaska at the national level of our government.

It is particularly important that I do so now, for great changes are taking place in state-federal relationships, changes of which you should be aware. Over the past few decades, it became fashionable to downgrade the role of the states in our American system. As the states struggled to raise revenue, federal programs began to bypass state capitals and go directly to the local areas. Planning and control were kept in Washington even when the expenditures and future of the states were involved. It was predicted that state governments would eventually disappear, a prediction welcomed by those who believed the state government concept to be obsolete, obstructive, and in general totally unprepared to meet the modern day needs of our people. Unfortunately, some of these accusations had a basis in fact, and the state legislatures across the country delegated more and more of their responsibilities to the national government, in the hope of receiving a greater share of the ever-increasing federal tax dollar. Even though state tax revenues have risen faster across the nation than federal revenues over the last decade, funds still fall short of needs and there are greater and greater demands for matching funds on federally controlled programs available to the state. Some states have shirked their duties by complete acquiescence to the federal government, thus casting doubt on the ability of all.

Nevertheless, the obituaries were premature. Today the most exciting government in America is the state government. Reapportionment in the older states has given new impetus to reform. Constitutions, reform governmental reorganization, and imaginative programs are again coming to be common occurrences in our states. Indeed the real leadership domestically has often come not from Washington, but from the state capitals.

These developments are being recognized. Last year the distinguished urbanologist, Daniel Moynihan, reminded those who advocate centralized control that our severe domestic problems have not been solved and cannot be solved by the Washington

bureaucracy alone. What is needed, instead, is partnership between Washington, the states and local governments, with the states being treated as important equals, not as an unwanted hindrance. I am pleased to report that the 90th Congress reversed the trend toward centralization, and returned in great measure to the state-national partnership we consider vital. The first session of the 90th Congress wrote into bill after bill the principle of partnership with the state government. I consider this to be a key accomplishment of the present Congress, and one which will lead to better, more meaningful solutions to the problems of our time.

Last year the Congress took away from the U. S. Office of Education the control of Title III in the Federal Aid to Education Act. This Title assists in the establishment of supplementary educational services. Planning and control is now in the hands of the states. The Teacher Corps was revised in a similar manner. This block-grant principle was placed in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Bill, and most importantly, in the Safe Streets and Crime Prevention Bill which passed the House. The Administration's proposal in this latter measure would have put the control of this program of aid to our state and local law enforcement agencies in the hands of the Department of Justice. The House, fearful of federal control of our police forces, put the control where it belongs, at the state level.

This action comes from a new realization that only the states are in a position to know and deal with many of the problems we face: yet, at the same time, funds must be provided by the Federal Government to hard-pressed state treasuries. In the future, this will undoubtedly culminate in the enactment of some form of revenue sharing, by which the Federal Government will transfer to the 50 states, without strings, a portion of its revenues. Many of us in the 90th Congress are strong proponents of this concept, which will further strengthen state government.

What this means is a new emphasis on state legislatures. People will look to you to enact the programs called for by these new federal laws. You will have far greater leeway than in the past to decide on what is best for Alaska. It is, of course, a great responsibility and an exciting challenge.

I know you will succeed. I firmly believe that the best place to legislate for Alaskans is in this body, and in our borough assemblies and city councils, not in Washington. You know the specific detail of our needs and desires at the state and local levels far better than Washington could ever know them. The new concept of revenue-sharing, in whatever form enacted, promises to give the state much of the funds needed without ever requiring the state to be subservient to the federal government. It is a truly encouraging development and one that will militate to the advantage of Alaska.

Turning to the prospects for specific Alaska programs in Congress this year, the picture is quite mixed. I consider one of the most important tasks before us to be the funding of the Native Housing Program. The Budget has again recommended an appropriation of \$1 million. Hearings will be held before a House Appropriations Subcommittee around the end of March. With the help of the Alaska State Housing Authority and the Governor's Task Force, a full effort will be made to obtain these vital funds. This is not an easy task. In these times of massive defense expenditures and exorbitant budget deficits,

Congress is extremely reluctant to begin new programs. This was the difficulty Native Housing encountered last year. Nevertheless, I am optimistic and feel that this year we will succeed in our quest.

In this connection, I recommend for your serious deliberation and favorable consideration the essence of your Alaska House Bill 414. Introduced at the request of Governor Hickel, this Bill allocates the sum of \$1 million to match the \$10 million federal authorization. These funds will be used mainly for administration of the program. The Appropriations Committee of the U. S. Senate made clear last year that a pledge on the part of the state to pay administrative costs was essential to the appropriation. If this Bill or a similar one were enacted by the time of the U. S. House hearings in March, it would measurably strengthen our chances of obtaining the federal appropriation.

Alaska has not been fortunate in other vital areas of the federal budget prepared by the Administration for submission to Congress. You will recall that last year the Department of the Interior issued the now-famous Rampart Report. The main purpose of the Report was to recommend against the construction of Rampart Dam. Contained in the Report, however, were some of the most important proposals to be made for Alaska by a federal agency in many years. A ten-year \$50 million mineral exploration and development budget was proposed. Included was \$8 million for an Institute of Arctic Mineral Resources at the University of Alaska, as well as extra funds for the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines. \$26 million was suggested for a Fishery Research and Development Program over a period of 15 years. The proposal involved the establishment of an Alaska Institute for Fisheries Development.

I need not tell you how valuable these programs could be. Unfortunately, the proposed budget contains not a single penny to carry out any of these proposals.

Last year over the vigorous opposition of the Department of Transportation, I was successful in obtaining House approval on funds for Alaska for the Development Road and Highway Maintenance Funds. I regret to say that the Administration has not taken the hint, for again the budget proposed absolutely nothing for this program in Fiscal Year 1969.

These items are very small when compared to the total national budget: yet the benefits would be very large. Their elimination emphasizes the difficult budget situation Alaska faces, and the hard task with which we are confronted to get these vital programs funded.

We are all aware of the seriousness of our fiscal situation. The President's \$186 billion budget is an increase of nearly 60% in five years. Expenditures for the Vietnam War have increased from less than \$1 billion per year in 1964 to a current estimate of \$26 billion annually. The tremendous pressure of the federal budget has caused severe and basic dislocations in our country's economy. Interest rates are at levels not previously seen in this century. The rate of inflation has doubled in this decade, and threatens to rise further. Our balance of payments difficulties are well known. To fail to correct these conditions would be a serious dereliction of duty. This duty requires strict control of federal expenditures. Without such control, this country will flirt with financial disaster.

Given the principle that expenditures must be controlled, what programs are to be the target? That, my friends, is the most difficult task facing the President and the Congress today. The country has many and diverse needs. To cut programs designed to meet these needs will naturally draw criticism from one quarter or another. That is unfortunate; however, the alternative is worse. It is obvious that non-essential items must be eliminated, postponed or slowed, no matter how worthy they may be, until the fiscal problems caused by the War are over. The burning question, of course, is what is essential, and the answers would vary in different parts of the country. It is clear that the basic building blocks of our nation cannot be neglected at any time. Thus, education and road building must not be cut in favor of other programs, for to do that would be detracting our future. Similarly, it is obvious that severe social problems cannot be neglected. We cannot ask the poor and disadvantaged to finance the War in Vietnam by postponing a meal or losing valuable years of training. Beyond these areas, however, are funds which must be held back. The Space Program must be put into a holding position with a strict limit on new starts. Foreign Aid must be cut, with funds going mainly to those countries who are in the most danger of subversion, those who indicate a willingness to help themselves, and those who are our international friends. Troop strength in Europe should be cut to a very low level, since Europe is now perfectly capable of defending itself. Public Works projects such as the multi-billion dollar Colorado River project must be temporarily delayed, and the SST project privately financed or delayed until the end of the War.

I do not oppose any of these projects. It is simply a matter of elementary economics. We cannot accomplish every desirable project and fight a major war too. There just isn't sufficient money available.

I personally believe that because of past neglect and future promise, Alaska should be high on the federal priority list. I have fought and will continue to fight for this view. Unfortunately, not everyone in Washington shares this view, as you can readily understand. We too, therefore, have felt the cutback, and I am afraid will feel it even more in the near future.

Perhaps the most exciting prospect on the horizon is the possibility in the near future of getting an intelsat-comsat satellite ground station for Alaska. It would likely have to be located near Anchorage, where the heaviest population concentration in the state is found.

Comsat is a quasi-public corporation which acts as the manager for the 62-nation international telecommunications satellite combine known as intelsat, and in addition, votes all of the U. S. Stock in intelsat. Intelsat transmit communications commercially via satellite and intends to provide free educational TV channels for rural areas. I need not tell you there is no area anywhere under the American flag which more sorely needs the assistance of educational TV than the rural and remote areas of Alaska where our Eskimo, Indian and Aleut communities are located. Just imagine being able to turn on a channel in a small village school and see and hear the finest lecture in the nation projected right into that classroom, on any variety of subjects, for the particular grade level involved. It will not likely replace any teachers, but will assist them immeasurably in providing the kind of instruction and demonstrations never before possible. The possibilities stir the imagination.

\$13 million has been requested to construct or support 82 educational radio and television broadcasting projects. As one of the few states with no educational stations, Alaska should be first in line, and an investment in educational TV or radio transmission via satellite would be a spectacular and invaluable innovation for Alaska.

Today the cable television received by satellite is transmitted by telephone from the ground station. That's why the sale of the Alaska Communications System will interest any number of commercial bidders: but tomorrow the satellite will probably be able to transmit directly to the TV receiver in the school or home. Meanwhile, I see no technical reason why the tropospheric scatter capability of the White Alice Communication System could not relay the signals from a ground station in Alaska to the most remote village.

At the present time there are intelsat satellites fixed in orbit over the eastern and western parts of the United States, with 1200 channels available for television and instantaneous telephone and telegraph communications. Another satellite is contemplated with 12,000 channels. Just think of the exciting possibilities of an instantaneous long lines communications link with no cables, no cable maintenance, and no static interference.

COMSAT is planning a pilot program of 40 stations in two western areas, but unfortunately Alaska is not included in this program. We must, therefore, marshal all our energies to convince COMSAT that a 41st ground station, perhaps a medium powered transmitter/receiver station, should be added to the domestic satellite program and be located in Alaska. Not only should it be commercially feasible in a heavily populated area, but the possibilities for a pilot program on educational TV to our remote villages are unlimited, and the opportunities boundless for experiments in Arctic transmission via communications satellites.

It would be my recommendation to you to authorize the formation of a public or quasi-public corporation or commission of a non-political nature, whose responsibility it would be to insure that Alaska is included in any anticipated or future satellite communications networks. This organization should keep abreast of any developments in the area of telecommunications, and maintain contact with each and every corporation, foundation or governmental group (including the Federal Communications Commission) to insure that all parties are aware that Alaska is the ideal location for a satellite telecommunications pilot project, including educational programs, particularly because there is today no good domestic communications transmission in Alaska such as exists through the long lines facilities of Bell Telephone or American Telephone and Telegraph Corporation. We must not be left at the starting gate, for the decisions which are now in process vitally affect our future.

\$6 million has been budgeted for the continuation of the Sea Grant College programs of the National Science Foundation. Here again, with 41% of all the estuaries in the United States, 54% of all the general coastline, and 64% of all the U. S. Continental Shelf and its great untapped marine resources, Alaska should be first in line, but I am sure other locations are being given priorities over us by the national administration.

On this point I would like to add a word of caution and an admonition. Last year the development of a plan for a marine science center in Alaska generated tremendous controversy over the location of any new facilities -- not too unusual an occurrence for Alaska. If I may be so bold, I would strongly urge

that we present a unified front to insure that we not lose out altogether, and that any internal debate over the location be carried out in a manner that the ultimate decision can be made strictly on the merits of the best possible location. We simply cannot allow Alaska to lose out completely on a program it so desperately needs. The men who run the Sea Grant College program are most anxious to help Alaska, but they are not interested in bitter sectional rivalry and will have no part of it. Such a rivalry can only convince these men that their limited funds are best spent in some other state. I urge all Alaskans to work together to obtain these facilities for our state. All will benefit, no matter where the facilities are located if they are in Alaska. If the end result is that the facilities are located in the State of Washington or California, then we all lose.

With regard to our ocean fisheries resources, I had the opportunity to meet in Washington last month with a prominent and wealthy Korean businessman, K. S. Choung, of the Samyang group of companies. Chairman Choung was invited to Alaska by Governor Hickey to discuss the possibility of investing in Alaska. Korea's economy has recently been growing at the astounding rate of 12% annually. Their need for natural resources products is also strong and increasing. As a result of my discussions with Chairman Choung, Samyang Fisheries Co., Ltd. will cancel its plans to fish for salmon and king crab in Alaskan waters, as the Koreans were prepared to do this year. Instead, the company will buy these fisheries products from our Alaskan fishermen at prevailing market prices. Moreover, the Samyang group will explore the possibility of constructing a fish protein concentrate plant in Alaska, as well as investing in other natural resource products such as timber and gas. This agreement is contingent upon approval by the Korean government and the directors of the Samyang group, and upon the success of their receiving international financing for alternate business endeavors.

We have often spoken of Alaska's future as being with the countries on the rim of the Pacific. Our trade with Japan is dramatic evidence of the truth of this statement. We must, however, not limit ourselves to Japan. New ties with other developing Asian countries should also be sought. Korea is an excellent place to start, and the opportunity confronts us. In the near future, the Republic of China, one of Asia's most prosperous nations, may be another likely trading partner.

Such economic ties can be of great benefit both to Alaska and to the nations of Asia. We must welcome their interest and investment. I found the Koreans to be extremely cooperative, even to the extent of complying with our firm demands that Alaskan fishermen be protected at all times. Given the basic principle of "Alaskans First" and utilization of Alaskan labor in any areas of development, it is clear that foreign investment can be a Godsend to communities that now languish in inactivity because of lack of industry. Seward, as an example, with its magnificent port virtually unused, can again become a thriving community with such foreign investment and new industry, instead of slowly dying for lack of it. Perhaps the historic neglect of Alaska by our own government and by big industry can be compensated for in part by our neighbors on the Pacific rim.

As you know, I have just returned from the Native Land Claims Hearings in Anchorage, held by a subcommittee of the

Senate Interior & Insular Affairs Committee. The hearings were fruitful, and I am hopeful that this year we can prevail upon the Congress to enact appropriate legislation to fully resolve this most complex problem to the full satisfaction of our Native community, the rest of our citizens, our state and national governments. Then we can progress together, in unison rather than in conflict, all working together for a greater Alaska.

I was so sorely disappointed with the ridiculous result which emanated from the U. S. Court of Claims judgment in the Tlingit-Haida suit, as I am sure all of you were, and we must insure that the general Native land claims problem is speedily and equitably resolved. The paltry few cents per acre to be paid with no interest to the Tlingit-Haida community of native Alaskans after more than 33 years of legislation and litigation is an ignominious and demoralizing thing indeed. And, of course, if appeal is taken to the United States Supreme Court, it will yet be a very long time before a single penny is paid as compensation for the forests and other valuable lands taken from these fine people by the United States government. Let us avoid a like result in attempting to resolve our remaining Native land claims.

A congressman's job, of course, is far broader than just the representation of his own constituency. Indeed, the world has now become his problem. The Congress, more than any other legislative body in the world, deals with issues affecting every person on earth. If possible, to carry out his responsibilities properly, a congressman must necessarily view first hand the programs and policies America carries out overseas. It is true that a few members may like to conduct their congressional investigations and inspections in Paris or similar places. While this makes for good press copy, it is hardly typical. Most members are conscientious, dedicated, hard-working servants of the people.

It was my good fortune during the recent congressional recess, between the first and second sessions of the 90th Congress, to travel to southeast Asia and Antarctica on special congressional committee assignments concerning specific areas of responsibility for these committees. The Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries, of which I am a member, is vitally concerned with the problem of vessel congestion in the ports of South Vietnam, and with cargo pilferage and concomitant safeguards against it, with the handling of disciplinary matters concerned with Merchant Marine personnel, and with Coast Guard activities in Vietnam. My other committee, Interior & Insular Affairs, has as one of its responsibilities, cognizance of the numerous projects and activities in various scientific disciplines in the Antarctic.

I made comprehensive reports to each of my standing committees on the results of my committee assignments in Vietnam and Antarctica, and I would be happy to provide copies to any of you who would request them. I know there are many conflicting views about whether we should be in Vietnam or not, and as many conflicting views about the kind of progress we are making in this most unpopular war in our nation's history. Let me only say about the former that right or wrong, we are today deeply committed in this ugly war that everyone wants to end. In my humble opinion, we no longer have the option of withdrawing unilaterally with honor. This would be a psychological defeat of monumental proportions which would seriously and most adversely affect the Pacific crescent of free nations around

China, and would substantially alter the balance of power in the world in favor of the Communists. Concerning the latter, let me say that little more than two years ago South Vietnam was on the very brink of surrender and total collapse, although the people in the United States didn't seem to know it. The armed intervention and assistance by the US has unquestionably brought South Vietnam back along the slow, torturous road toward reasonable stability and eventual victory, and with it social and economic development which the nation has never before experienced.

There is no question but that the successful presidential, legislative and local elections, and the inauguration of the new national government were serious political defeats for North Vietnam and the V.C.

Notwithstanding the major offensives launched by the Communists in the last few weeks, their losses have been staggering and are in truth fantastically disproportionate to our own or those of the South Vietnamese. My first-hand impressions are that we are decisively winning the military war, and Hanoi knows it, although I fear we have a great deal yet to do to win the psychological and political aspects of the war outside of Vietnam. Hanoi desperately depends upon dissension and anti-war demonstrations and disillusionment in this country with the slow progress of the war. This is Hanoi's only hope for eventual victory, and we must not allow that to happen.

While in Vietnam I had the opportunity to view the operations of one of the most critical aspects of the war -- the Pacification Program. The program is under the military, and is identified as the Civilian Operations and Revolutionary Development Support, or CORDS. It is C.I.A. sponsored. The 59-man cadres of Vietnamese are recruited in the villages and sent to Vung Tau, southeast of Saigon, for special training as a team, after which they are returned to the city, village or hamlet to perform the civic action programs.

The program not only provides security, which is vital to the establishment of local government, but it also provides political organization and involvement of the people, initiation of economic and social activity at the hamlet level, and coordination with and utilization of the province governments and officials who were elected by the people.

We met members of the Combined Action Platoons, or CAP, which have the responsibility and objective in the villages and hamlets after they are taken from the enemy, to search out and destroy the Viet Cong, protect public security, maintain law and order, protect the friendly local government, organize local intelligence, participate in civic action, and conduct propaganda against the Viet Cong. Once these CAP platoons have substantially accomplished their mission, the area is ready for the Civilian Operations and Revolutionary Development Support teams I spoke of earlier that have the objective of establishing local administrative governments. The process is tedious and the program new, but it holds great promise as the means of creating a network of uniformly-structured local governments that can continue with stability after the American military forces have departed. It must succeed, for pacification and governmental and economic organization at the village and hamlet level is where the war has to be permanently won.

This is a fantastically difficult process for reasons which are not fully understood in this country. In the early years of the Communist insurgency from 1960 - 1965, the so-called Communist National Liberation Front, or NLF, systematically and ruthlessly wiped out an entire class of Vietnamese villages -- the local leadership. These were government officials, schoolteachers, religious leaders or simply individuals who were respected by the people. The NLF had the most to fear from such persons because they were the natural leaders and most likely to oppose the Communists. Many villages by 1966 were virtually depopulated of their natural leaders, who are the single most important element in any society. It will take years to repair this tremendous damage to Vietnamese village society. It is this calculated genocide over six years that makes pacification and reconstruction of the villages so difficult.

In the course of our extensive travels in South Vietnam, we flew by Marine helicopter to an area south of Da Nang in the I Corps area to Hoi An, a provincial capital. At Hoi An we talked with the Combined Action Platoon personnel and with the Vietnamese members of the CORDS cadre and their American military advisors, to discuss the effectiveness of their programs in an area not yet sufficiently pacified or cleared of Viet Cong. The discussions were enlightening, and the enthusiasm pronounced. As we departed Hoi An and flew over the hamlet of Thanh Nam, another Marine helicopter in the air with us was shot down over the hamlet by the Viet Cong and destroyed, with all persons aboard losing their lives. Although we didn't know it at the time, immediately following our departure Hoi An was heavily attacked by the Viet Cong, and was besieged for three days. Quite by luck we missed this vicious attack by only a few minutes. Many of the persons we were talking to minutes earlier were killed. It brought the war very close to home.

Our time will not permit me to discuss Antarctica other than very briefly. However, I want to mention that there are many research projects and experiments in many disciplines of science being conducted at various locations on the Antarctic continent.

The Antarctic is the coldest, windiest, highest and driest continent on earth. Its average elevation is 7000 ft., most of which is solid ice and compacted snow accumulated over thousands of years. It is a veritable snow desert with an average snow precipitation on the great continental plateau of only 4 inches. The lowest temperature ever recorded was at Vostok, a Russian station, where it hit -126.9° F on August 24, 1960. The continent has active volcanoes and mountains that reach as high as 16,860 feet.

We flew to Plateau Station where the elevation is 11,900 feet, but in this frozen desert the atmosphere is an equivalent of 14,000 feet. This is truly a psychological challenge for man to survive in solitude in a most hostile environment. We visited the geographic south pole, from which point one can only travel north. There the elevation is 9,200 feet. The bright sunshine warmed the weather to -60° F the day we were there. At Byrd Station the prize sought by a scientific team is the data from a deep-core ice drilling project which reaches back thousands of years into the history of the world's climate.

We inspected ice cores to depths of 5,300 ft., from precipitation that fell at a period estimated to be 19,000 years B.C. At 150 ft. was very porous ice formed from precipitation that fell at the time of the birth of our nation in 1776. At 850 ft. was much more compressed and more transparent ice from the year Christ was born. Each of us was given a vial of water from a portion of this ice which had been melted -- water fresh and pure that existed at the time Christ was on earth.

The Antarctic ice cap, which covers the continent, is a great dome of ice in some areas up to 16,000 ft. thick, covering 95 - 98% of the continent and containing 9/10 of all the fresh-water ice in the world. It has been estimated that if this mass of ice were to melt, the ocean level throughout the world would rise 120-150 ft.

As for my own role in Congress, I can truthfully say that it has indeed been the most exciting and satisfying experience of my life, and I have never been busier. There have been exhilarating victories and extremely disappointing defeats. The work never ceases, for there are always major issues to be debated, important programs to be pushed, and vital needs for Alaska to be championed.

While New York has 40 congressmen and California 38 (with another 7 projected because of its increased population), it is my unique duty as one member out of 435 to alone represent one of the 50 sovereign states -- our beloved Alaska -- in the U. S. House of Representatives. It is an awesome responsibility and an enormous task, but I dearly love it and wouldn't trade it for any job I've ever had.

I am sincerely grateful to the people of this great state for selecting me to sit in their behalf in that august body, the U. S. House of Representatives, which has many times been called the greatest deliberative body in the world, the temple of democracy.

It has been my great privilege in my brief tenure in Congress to have established a meaningful rapport with my congressional colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and believe I have gained their confidence and respect. For this I am humbly grateful. Also, in deepest humility, I am aware that my committee assignments and other offices to which I have been elected or appointed are unprecedented for Alaska.

Incidentally, during the First Session of the 90th Congress, a record number of over 20,000 bills were introduced, yet only 250 were signed into law. 245 times in the House members were called upon to be recorded "Yea" or "Nay" on votes, and there were at least as many non-recorded votes, and many more quorum calls.

In closing, I wish to express my deep appreciation for this opportunity to address this Joint Session of the Alaska House and Senate once again, and to thank you for your courtesy and kind attention.

We all have much work to do. Let's be on with it. God love you and keep you.

HOUSE JOURNAL

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

FIFTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

Juneau, Alaska

February 15, 1968

Twenty-Fifth Day

Pursuant to adjournment, the House was called to order by Speaker William K. Boardman at 10:05 a.m.

Roll call showed all members present except Messrs. Strandberg and Westdahl. Mr. Stevens moved and asked unanimous consent that Mr. Strandberg be excused on state business and that Mr. Westdahl be excused from a call of the House for this day. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

The prayer was offered by the Reverend Harold K. Dawson.

The Chief Clerk certified as to the correctness of the journal for the twenty-fourth day, February 14, 1968 and the Senate and House journal supplement No. 3. Mr. Stevens moved and asked unanimous consent that the journal and supplement be approved. Mr. Kerttula objected. Mr. Kerttula withdrew his objection. There being no further objection, the journal and supplement were approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

A message, dated February 14, 1968, was read stating the Senate has passed SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 31 and the same is transmitted herewith for consideration. SJR 31

A message, dated February 14, 1968, was read stating the Senate has passed COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 207 and the same is transmitted herewith for consideration. CSSB 207

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTIONS

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 31 by Brady SJR 31

Relating to making it mandatory that all aircraft manufacturers report aircraft and engine discrepancies and malfunctions to the Maintenance Analysis Center in Oklahoma City

was read the first time and referred to the Commerce Committee.

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 207 by the Local Government Committee, entitled: CSSB 207

"An Act limiting the frequency of elections for the incorporation of boroughs; and providing for