

February 10, 1969

Health, Welfare and Education Committee HB 120, 117, 61, 99	Conference Room 1	1:15 p.m. February 11, 1969
Labor and Management HB 101	Committee Room 1	9:00 a.m. February 11, 1969
Finance Committee Joint Senate-House	Governor's Conference Room	8:30 a.m. February 11, 1969
M/V Wickersham Sailing Time	City Terminal	3:00 p.m. February 11, 1969
Lincoln Day Dinner U.S. Senator Stevens, Speaker	Baranof Hotel	8:00 p.m. February 12, 1969

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Guess moved and asked unanimous consent that the House adjourn until 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, February 11, 1969. There being no objection, the House adjourned at 2:46 p.m.

Constance H. Paddock  
Chief Clerk

February 1969

JOURNAL  
SUPPLEMENT

SENATE AND HOUSE - SUPPLEMENT NO. 2

FEBRUARY 10, 1969

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN HOWARD W. POLLOCK  
THE CONGRESSMAN FOR ALASKA  
BEFORE THE JOINT SESSION OF THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1969

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker and my distinguished friends and colleagues of the Alaska Legislature:

Once again it is a genuine pleasure for me to be with you in this chamber for what has now become an annual custom which we initiated when I first went to Washington as the Congressman for Alaska.

For the first time in the 101-year history of Alaska, under the American flag, we are in a position to solve the major problems that concern all of us in this State. Native land claims, the State's selection of lands, adequate dependable communications for remote areas and population centers alike, and equal standards of elementary and secondary education for every child in the State. I want to talk to you about some of these problems and want also to talk about a problem Alaskans share with all other Americans, the manner in which we elect the President -- the Electoral College.

When our problems are big and we have lived with them a long time, it's easy to think of the solutions as "in the future" -- The future is here.

During the last 3 months there has been a phenomenal change in Alaska politics....There is a new Governor, a new Secretary of State, two new United States Senators, new leadership in the Legislature, and, for the first time in history, an Alaskan in the President's Cabinet. That significant appointment represents a chain of influence that leads link by link from this room to the ear of the President himself. It's sobering to remember that the absence of Senator Bob Bartlett in Washington, D. C. leaves us with fewer years of experience in Congress today than we had when we became a State. But that chain of influence I mentioned coupled with our emerging recognition as a major producer of oil and gas gives us a leverage we have never known, and only a few major states enjoy. The catalyst needed to harness all this as an active force to hammer our problems into solutions is unity among Alaskans -- a coordinated drive -- a mobilization of our united efforts into a single thrust.

Let me give you a very recent and vivid example: On January 16 former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall called the Alaska Congressional Delegation to his office. He told us he had proposed to the President and that the President had agreed to enlarge two national monuments and two national wildlife refuges in Alaska, and to create an entirely new multimillion acre national monument on the North Slope. Objections were raised by the delegation. Senator Stevens spent considerable time questioning Udall about the logic of his unilateral proposal for locking up substantial additional Alaska acreage without Congressional action or an opportunity for the Alaskans affected to be heard. Secretary Udall finally made it quite clear he had called us to his office to

inform us of his decision, not to ask us for advice. Bluntly, he said the decision had been made, and if we wished to protest the action, Congress had the authority to pass legislation upsetting the Presidential proclamation, something never done in history.

The Secretary did not get his reservations and monuments, and it didn't take a Congressional bill to stop the action. We exerted whatever influence we could muster in the House and Senate and with the outgoing administration to prevail upon the President not to sign the Executive proclamation.

Other members of the House and Senate also registered strong disagreement with this "back door" method Secretary Udall was using to lock up 6.3 million acres in Alaska and over 1.2 million acres in Utah and Arizona without hearings and Congressional review. In the face of mobilized opposition President Johnson ultimately refused to sign the Udall-proposed proclamation. The upsetting thing was not opposition to the creation of these monuments, nor even the land selections involved, but the fact that Secretary Udall, without consultation or any other form of consideration beyond his own staff, decided to remove 7.5 million acres from all but the most limited use on a permanent basis. This was a wrongful usurpation of power. The Antiquities Act of 1906 which gives the President through the Interior Secretary the legal authority to act as he did is being looked at with a critical eye toward repeal or amendment. I intend to introduce legislation to amend the Act so that Congress will have to study such proposals and approve them. The main point of the story, however, is that your Alaska delegation was instrumental in frustrating the Secretary's ill-advised attempt. I think Senator Stevens is to be especially commended for his vigorous protests in this matter.

For over a century the problem of Native land claims has avoided solution. I am firmly convinced this issue will be fairly resolved during the present two-year term of Congress. The Native community, the State Legislature, the State administration, the Congressional delegation and the Department of the Interior all have varying approaches to this difficult problem. Compromise is going to be necessary by all parties to reach a fair settlement. Growing out of this issue the State has had to stop its selection of 103 million acres provided for by the Statehood Act. The January deadline for State selection of federally leased mineral lands has passed, and with it the right to further select these most valuable land areas. I have again introduced legislation to retroactively extend the time for selection. But, in the meantime, it is important that the State continue to implement a systematic method of determining land selections, so that when the restrictions are lifted the State will be ready to move with as little delay as possible.

A year ago I discussed with you the very exciting prospect on the horizon of getting an INTELSAT-COMSAT satellite ground station for Alaska. This has now become a virtual reality, for COMSAT has committed itself to the construction of such a terminal in Alaska. This is a fine beginning.

In my remarks to you last year, I also painted a word picture to demonstrate the critical need for educational TV in our remote villages of Alaska, in order that the teacher and students might be able to see and hear the finest possible lecture in

the nation projected right into the classroom, on any variety of subjects for the particular grade level involved. This would obviously provide the kind of instruction and demonstrations never before capable of achievement, and the possibilities stir the imagination.

Also, a year ago I recommended that you 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. Perhaps as a consequence, the Governor appointed a Satellite Communications Task Force, which is now in existence and operating. So, we have begun the imposing task which yet confronts us because of the peculiar communications needs and special considerations which will be required to develop an adequate communications system for Alaska.

What are our unique needs in Alaska?

Alaska is the only State in the Union that still does not have adequate long range communications tying all its communities together. There are still far too many settlements within our borders that must rely on the 2-way radio communications that unfavorable weather and atmospheric conditions can cancel out. Too many calls never get through because of over-crowded circuits, and our communication ties with other states and foreign nations still lag far behind the conveniences enjoyed by every other state. Alaska is the land Santa Claus comes from: Yet our children can't watch him on TV until January because of the two-week network delays in shipping canned shows. Elsewhere Americans can watch live direct broadcasts from the moon.

It appears to me that the most critical points we seek are these: 1) Interconnect with the rest of the United States and the world on a par with New York, Los Angeles, Sheboygan or Wolf Point; 2) Intra-Alaska point to point communications: i.e., reliable telephone communications between any two points in the State, be it Juneau or Unalakleet or Little Diomed; 3) Direct live domestic commercial television programs originating in the "lower 48"; and 4) adequate capabilities for educational and instructional TV in remote locations in Alaska.

I know we are about to have our own COMSAT ground station near Talkeetna, but that is not going to provide us with the last three communications needs, needs I have just mentioned.

You may be surprised to hear me say that today there is no overall national communications policy for the United States, nor indeed any mechanism or official entity to formulate this policy. In recognition of this situation, President Johnson appointed the Rostow Task Force little more than a year ago to explore the situation and make recommendations for filling the void and meeting the responsibilities of this Nation, not only domestically, but in the entire concept of world communications. Parallel with this, the President asked the Bureau of the Budget to make recommendations concerning changes in governmental organization necessary to implement these policies.

There is no question but that the contributions of satellite communications in the next few years will be revolutionary and will make it essential that this policy of the United States be clearly enunciated if we are to achieve the maximum benefits of

modern technology. Alaska has an enormous stake in the development of this policy. You will, of course, readily recognize that any system designed to serve the needs of just "the lower 48" will not meet the critical requirements of Alaska. Why? Because we do not have existing terrestrial capabilities for transmission of communications within the State of Alaska; nor is the creation of such a terrestrial system logical either economically or otherwise. It's obvious that we must rely upon satellite communications to provide the kind of system that we need. It is also obvious that the development of the U. S. domestic satellite communication system must include the peculiar aspects of the Alaskan situation.

Thus, I think we should push as vigorously as possible toward the development of a U. S. domestic satellite communications system which includes Alaska, and we must insure that the characteristics which are inherent in this system will provide optimum service to Alaska.

There are several major decisions which will be made this year in the United States which will directly affect our future in communications. First, the Nixon administration is now intensively reviewing the Rostow Report, and will unquestionably make recommendations concerning this report to Congress, to the FCC and to the Nation and the world in the very near future. Secondly, the arrangements under which the world satellite communications system (INTELSAT) was organized on an interim basis in 1963 will be renegotiated this month in Washington, D. C., with the 63 INTELSAT nations participating. At this conference of the Interim Communications Satellite Commission, the permanent international communications organization will hopefully be devised.

The domestic pilot project is very intimately keyed to the decisions which will be made as to the permanent international organization, for the reason that COMSAT today is the manager of the INTELSAT system and the U. S. representative in that international consortium. In my view, COMSAT has a basic conflict of interests, for we do not wish to have our domestic system made an integral part of the INTELSAT system. There would be political considerations of an international nature which might adversely influence our domestic system. On the other hand, COMSAT has been chartered to render every assistance to the development of the world system of communications.

Closely related to this matter is the COMSAT filing for the Domestic Satellite Project currently pending before the FCC. Alaska is not included in this domestic filing at this time - a point which concerns me greatly.

These major actions plus other Congressional considerations that will unquestionably arise in the course of the year make it obvious and mandatory that we aggressively pursue the interests of Alaska in the communications field.

I know I need not tell any of you that at the present time the sale of the Alaska Communications System is pending, and the outcome of that sale will very substantially affect the total communications picture in Alaska for the future.

We are vitally concerned with who purchases the Alaska Communications System and under what circumstances. I think it

obvious that a total Alaska communications system can never be evolved for telephone, television and other transmission requirements utilizing only terrestrial means. Some major decisions have to be made now. If the communications system in Alaska is to exploit the revolutionary contributions that satellite communications technology can provide, then we must insure that terrestrial long-line commercial interests do not subvert the small remote terminals capability we so sorely need. Accordingly, we must insure that in the first instance any future system incorporates this satellite communications technology.

A moment ago I said that there was no firm U. S. policy on communications. To my knowledge neither is there an overall Alaska communications policy. It seems fundamental that both the Alaska communications system and the concept of satellite communications for the future must be included in such a broad policy.

I'm sure you recognize by now that the international satellite system which will be available to us via the COMSAT ground station at Talkeetna will provide global communications primarily to relieve our heavy telephone circuit traffic to the rest of the United States; but it will not provide the commercial TV network programming nor the Intra-Alaska point-to-point communications nor the educational or instructional television we so desperately need. Under present planning that is off in the future.

Even though we have fought vigorously for and are delighted to have the COMSAT ground station, I am seriously concerned that the economics associated with the operation of this big earth terminal, and the associated high costs of utilizing the INTELSAT satellite, will unduly burden the social and commercial communities of Alaska. To say it another way, so far as Alaska is concerned, the INTELSAT system would be limited in scope, would not provide small terminal capability for the remote locations, would require considerable terrestrial relay, and would unquestionably be far more expensive to operate than a truly domestic system. Perhaps it will be possible, as a domestic experiment, for COMSAT to make special arrangements with INTELSAT to provide some of these services at substantially less than the established INTELSAT global rates.

Time will not permit me to more extensively explore all of the ramifications of this many-faceted problem. It's obvious that we must intensively pursue the full range of Alaska communications objectives, both here in Alaska and in Washington, D. C.... I don't know whether the interests of Alaska can best be served here in the State by making the Governor's Task Force on Satellite Communications a permanent agency, or whether a smaller, more technical team needs to be assigned to this task on a full-time basis, or whether there should be an extremely well qualified assistant to the Governor on communications with sufficient authority and support by the legislature and by the congressional delegation to facilitate the varying and unforeseen needs for Alaska as they suddenly arise.

The Alaskan communications specialist would be assigned the responsibility of pursuing the interests of the State within Alaska. In addition, it seems to me at this critical time that we must have a communications specialist and liaison

man in Washington, D. C., also on a full-time basis, to coordinate the complex activities concerning Alaska with the FCC, with COMSAT, with the other government agencies and industry. Many of the states have Washington offices which operate on a permanent full-time basis to handle miscellaneous tasks of special interest to the state. If we had such an office it could obviously handle this communications matter; although, I suspect that what we need at this juncture is a communications specialist and not a generalist.

With further reference to the pending ACS sale, I am personally very troubled by efforts within the Air Force to withhold any further activities concerning the COMSAT ground station until this sale is consummated. I am also very concerned that the provisions of the Air Force bid proposal for the sale of the ACS are such that Alaskans stand to be hurt very seriously in the future. The ACS facilities and franchise monopoly are priced by the Air Force at \$28 million, which is substantially more than the antiquated equipment is worth. This equipment has not been maintained for a number of years in anticipation of the sale. Also, the TD-2 line-of-sight stations (as distinct from the tropospheric scatter antennas of the AF system) were not part of the system offered for sale in the bid package, as it should have been. Additionally, the Air Force has reserved the right to exclude any government traffic on the system, although this government traffic is carried commercially in every other state of the United States. The ominous result is obvious. If any company pays an over-price for the system in order to get the franchise, and will not be afforded the government traffic, the commercial cost of service to Alaskans will be prohibitively expensive. As a matter of fact, the cost of a ground station without adequate traffic to justify its continuous use would compound this problem. Unless we have a policy-making body at the state level to integrate these complex issues, and to insure that the services provided and the rates charged are comparatively priced with services provided to other parts of the United States, I see not the bright future which is at the horizon but a very dismal one.

One point more on this subject - the opportunity to influence United States domestic policy in the field of communications is a fleeting one. Traditionally we Alaskans are an impatient people. My friends, I admonish you that we had best be very impatient now - for some immediate decisions must be made on our part. I'm sure that if we meet the challenge with vigor and determination, the results will be very rewarding economically and socially.

Schools in Alaska range from superlative to pathetic. In December Senator Gravel and I shared the chairmanship of the Sitka Education Conference that explored the needs of secondary education in the State and firmly launched the program of regional high schools. In making that decision, we took \$9.6 million originally earmarked for renovating the BIA school at Mt. Edgecumbe and utilized these funds to build the first schools and dormitories under the regional high school concept. This whole program must be expedited. No grass should be allowed to grow under our feet. Here again, the spur of a "do it now" attitude is needed. I feel strongly there will continue to be a very real need to continue the Mt. Edgecumbe facility into the future. There are currently 1150 Alaska native students going to school "outside"

in Chemsawa and Chilloco. As long as there are students who can't attend school in Alaska because there aren't enough facilities, I for one do not want to see its classrooms slip into disuse. But, even beyond that, there is a need for a major state vocational training facility for which the Edgecumbe site is ideally suited. There should be a balanced academic and vocational curriculum in all the regional high schools, but there are some trades and skills that are best taught in a specialized setting devoted to a single type of training. We have long talked about the need to insure the preservation of Native handicrafts, art forms, and languages. What an asset it would be if we could help our fellow Alaskans preserve their great heritage and at the same time use these same skills as the basis for a flourishing retail industry. There is no excuse for Alaska souvenirs to be made in Japan, or Seattle, but our tourists buy them every year.

Japonsky Bridge at Sitka is scheduled to be completed in less than 2 years. It will provide easy access to Mt. Edgecumbe. If Mt. Edgecumbe is to soon become a part of the integrated Sitka School District, and our "outside" students are to be returned and a major vocational educational complex is to be established there, then Sitka must be provided with funds to construct the additional classrooms that will be needed. Of the \$9.6 million originally appropriated or the \$19.8 million originally planned for utilization at Mt. Edgecumbe, only \$2.8 million was left to the Sitka-Mt. Edgecumbe area under the revised regional high school program. I urge your earnest consideration of Sitka for utilization of a portion of the remaining \$3 million authorized under the bonding issue approved by the voters last fall.

Over a year ago the press, some members of Congress, and even many lay political observers began to first warn then predict that the '68 election would be thrown into the House of Representatives because no presidential candidate would receive a majority of the electoral college votes. Because of the unexpected withdrawal of President Johnson and the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy, we will never be sure the race would not have ended in the House of Representatives, or even in the Senate. And this is only one uncertainty in the present system. First, there is no certainty the electoral college will choose the candidate most of the people voted for. The electors are free to vote as they choose. Perhaps the best characterization of the electoral college is a big question mark. Let's look at some of the uncertainties in detail. The present system allows a person to become president with fewer popular votes than his major opponent; grants all of a states' electoral votes to the winner of a plurality of the popular votes in the state, thereby often cancelling out all of the majority vote or all minority votes cast in the state; makes it possible for presidential electors to vote against the national candidates of their party; fails to take into account population changes in a state between census; allows for the possibility of a president and vice president to be chosen from different political parties, and finally employs an unrepresentative system of voting for president in the House of Representatives.

Let's take a look at a few concrete examples: the relationship between the popular vote and the electoral vote is such that a candidate could win the popular vote of 11 heavily populated states and 1 lightly populated state by a slight margin and lose in 38 of the 50 states, yet still win the election, having

less than 25% of the total popular vote cast in the country. Several elections have underscored the fact that the number of electoral votes may be drastically unrelated to the popular vote. In 1960 Nixon received 34.1 million votes, Kennedy received 34.2 million votes. Yet, Nixon got 219 electoral votes while Kennedy got 303. In every election millions of popular votes are cancelled out at an intermediate stage and are never reflected in any electoral votes. In 1928, for example, 2.08 million democratic popular votes in New York and 1.06 million in Pennsylvania failed to yield even one Democratic electoral vote. In 1924 John Davis received 136 electoral votes in the states where he garnered about 2,000,000 popular votes, but no electoral votes for another 6,000,000 popular votes in states where he lost. History is full of examples of our present system's inadequacies.

All the inadequacies are not in the present system. Should we switch to a simple direct vote of all the people, and name the man who wins president, we will be simply exchanging one set of injustices for another. All the emphasis would switch to the handful of states with most of the population clustered in big cities. The U. S. Chamber of Commerce came right to the point when it said about 2/3 of the states would lose relative influence. In short, a party would concentrate its efforts in the major population centers where success would mean a majority of the popular vote, no matter what the vote in the rest of the nation. Given a strong win in the nation's 11 major population centers, the rest of the country combined could not effect the election outcome. All areas of the country should share in this selection, not just a few populous areas. This fact also makes it highly improbable 2/3 of the states could ever be convinced to ratify such an amendment. Direct election would also take from the smaller states the advantage of the 2 electoral votes accorded each state regardless of size, corresponding to their equal representation in the Senate. I also hold we would see a breakdown of state influence. For example, it would be Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego, not California that would be courted by political interests.

The proportional system would also give a state a number of votes equal to its members in the House and Senate, and then divide them to reflect each candidate's percentage of the popular vote in the state, carried to 3 decimal places. This would remove the distortion of the unit rule, but it would make it possible for any small party to appear on the final tally sheet, and this would encourage splinter parties, even though the chance of their winning would be out of the question. This would eat away at the effectiveness of the 2-party system, and make final determination of the official vote extremely difficult and time-consuming. Can you imagine splitting a vote to .003 of a percent?

I have filed a joint resolution which I feel will protect the original guarantees to the sovereign states in the national complex while at the same time resolving the obvious basic shortcomings of the present electoral system. My resolution retains the concept of the electoral vote, but does away with the electoral college. Under the provisions of the resolution, each state would have a total number of electoral votes equal to the total number of senators and representatives to which the state is entitled in Congress. It would be the

responsibility of each state legislature to divide the state into a number of electoral districts equal to the state's number of representatives in congress. The measure provides that the winner of a plurality of votes at the district level would receive the one electoral vote for the congressional or electoral district, instead of the present "winner take all" system at the state level, while at the same time providing two additional electoral votes to the candidate with the greatest statewide vote.

In electing the president and the vice president, the voter would cast a single vote for both the candidates as the "presidential candidacy". The electoral votes for each state would be automatic according to the votes cast, and the results of the popular vote and electoral vote would then be transmitted to the president of the senate as at present, but would be reported by district and by state.

The presidential candidacy which receives the greatest number of electoral votes in the nation would become president and vice president, provided the candidacy also receives 45% or more of the popular vote.

Under my proposal only three times in our history would a runoff election have been necessary. 15 of the 37 presidents have received less than a majority of the popular vote. Eleven of the 15 received between 45 and 50 percent. One, President Lincoln, received only 39.7% but he was not on the ballot in ten states. The figure of 45% would render remote the likelihood of having to resort to the contingency procedure. In the event that the candidacy did not receive at least 45% of the popular vote, a runoff election would have to be held between the two candidacies which received the greatest number of electoral votes.

The runoff election would be conducted in the same manner as the general election. The candidacy which then received the greatest number of electoral votes in the runoff election would become president and vice president of the United States. The bill would provide for the right of a candidacy which qualifies for the ballot in two-thirds of the states to appear on the ballot in all of the states and the District of Columbia. This would prevent repetition of the election situation of 1860 when the name of Abraham Lincoln was left off the ballot in ten states, or the situations of 1948 and 1964 when the voters of Alabama were not afforded an opportunity to vote for the national candidates of the Democratic party because of the device of unpledged electors.

My friends, we are at a crossroads in the history of our nation, and the collective decision that is made in the Congress must be one that will merit the concurrence of two-thirds of the membership of the U. S. House of Representatives and of the Senate, and then receive the blessings and ratification of three-fourths of the sovereign states of this nation. If an electoral system is devised which gives cognizance to the right of each state to work its will and retain its sovereignty within the larger system, then ratification is altogether capable of achievement, and the nation will become stronger in the historic process. If the electoral system is not universally fair and acceptable, it will be foredoomed to certain failure. The fateful decision is in the hands of Congress, and I ask the blessings of Almighty God in our difficult deliberations.

More than 25 years ago, an average-sized Alaskan with the humble friendliness of a servant, went to Washington as a congressional aide. When he returned home for the last time this past December, the greatest of his colleagues in both the U. S. House and U. S. Senate came with him. Many men are called great. Few are. I happen to think Bob Bartlett was one of the few. I should be used to the fact by now that Senator Bob Bartlett has passed to his reward, but I have caught myself on several occasions walking or driving home late thinking how much I would like to talk this subject or that one over with Bob. I wonder what he would have said. There is a verse in Matthew we all know that Bob gave me a greater understanding of, even though we never discussed it. It reads: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." His humility and lack of "complicatedness," combined with wisdom and good humor, earned him respect and loyalty. It made little difference if individuals were stationed above or below him in the scheme of things. As a result, he did have a kind of possession, control and access to the good things in the world around him. That kind of greatness in a man, not to mention the public service his political career became, deserves a special kind of recognition.

As a result, I would like to propose that a special commission be established here at the state level, to arrange for a statue of Bob Bartlett to be placed in Statuary Hall of the Capitol building in Washington, D. C.

It is a rare honor to be eligible for such recognition, and I feel it would do both our late colleague and his state deserved honor. The total cost of the project must be borne by the state. As a result, a commission should be established to handle the design, casting and transportation of the statue. In Washington we will arrange for Congress to authorize the appropriate ceremony for installation of the statue in the capitol. Meanwhile, I salute the memory of this great Alaskan, Senator E. L. "Bob" Bartlett.

All the veterans in this chamber know that after a while every legislator comes to the realization that his business is solving people's problems. The ones that come in letters, the ones brought to your attention by headlines, those you observe, those told to you in person by constituents or fellow legislators -- some big, some small, but none unimportant - this morning I've tried to concentrate my focus in that area that is the essence of our lot as legislators. My purpose has been to admonish and impress you with the very real fact that Alaska problems are more solvable today than they ever have been, or maybe will ever be again. If we can't clean the decks of the major old lingering problems in the next two years of our legislative terms, possibly we never will; there will be new problems to be sure, but the old ones should pass into the history books. The key to our joint success in this business of solving problems is wound up in 11 words once jotted on a piece of paper by Longfellow. I leave them with you this morning. "All your strength is in your union, all your danger is in discord." My friends God love and keep you, and give you wisdom in your deliberations.

# HOUSE JOURNAL

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
SIXTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

Juneau, Alaska

February 11, 1969

## Sixteenth Day

Pursuant to adjournment, the House was called to order by Speaker Jalmar M. Kerttula at 10:03 a.m.

The roll call showed all members present except Messrs. Borer, Croft, Fink, Haugen, Hohman, Moses, Ray, Sackett and Tillion. Mr. Sassara moved and asked unanimous consent that all absent members be excused on official state business. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

The prayer was offered by the Reverend Hollis Bryant.

The Chief Clerk certified as to the correctness of the journal and Senate and House Supplement No. 2 for the fifteenth day, February 10, 1969. Mr. Guess moved and asked unanimous consent that the journal and supplement be approved. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

## COMMUNICATIONS

A letter dated February 10, 1969, was read, from the Chief of Police, James P. Wellington, City of Juneau, to the Honorable Jalmar M. Kerttula, regarding City parking regulations.

A memorandum dated February 11, 1969 was read, from Marine Transportation, informing all Members on details of reservations etc., for the proposed ferry trip on the M/V Wick-ersham.

## REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

The State Affairs Committee has had HOUSE BILL NO. 73 (appropriating to the Office of the Governor) under consideration and a majority of the members of the committee recommends it do pass. The report was signed by Mr. Hillstrand, Chairman, and concurred in by Hillstrand, Boardman, Banfield, McVeigh, Holm, Schwamm, Moses and Orbeck. Not concurring was Chance who had no recommendation.

HB  
73

HOUSE BILL NO. 73 was referred to the Finance Committee.

The State Affairs Committee has had HOUSE BILL NO. 36 (relating to the Legislative Audit Committee) under consideration and a majority of the members of the Committee recommends it do pass, with the following amendment:

HB  
36

amendment No. 1 by the State Affairs Committee:

Page 1, line 22: Delete all of line 22 and insert:  
"one member from each of the four  
judicial [MAJOR STATE ELECTION] districts"