EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence Day of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on October 26 the Republic of Vietnam will celebrate the ninth anniversary of her independence. On this auspicious occasion, we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Ngo Dinh Diem; and His Excellency the Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, Do Vang Ly.

At the Geneva Conference in the summer of 1954 Vietnam was partitioned along the 17th parallel. At that time, Western observers gave South Vietnam almost no chance of withstanding the challenge of Communist North Vietnam. I think it is worthwhile remembering this fact at a time when our thoughts on South Vietnam are filled with doubts and apprehension.

The situation that faced South Vietnam after the Geneva Conference was filled with many difficulties. The years of war had destroyed almost all transportation and communication, and the economy of the country had come to a virtual standstill. Political power was in the grip of the armed Cao Dai and Hoa Hao religious sects, the Binh Xuyen crime syndicate, and a number of other organized groups intent upon obstructing the development of a strong government at Saigon. There was the national army, but the soldiers were demoralized by recent military defeat and the very loyalty of the army was uncertain. Another major problem was the influx of more than 800,000 destitute refugees who had abandoned all they possessed in the north and fled southward from communism. On the credit side, South Vietnam's important assets were the firm leadership of Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem, the patriotism of the Vietnamese people, and the backing of the United States.

The independence of South Vietnam was officially proclaimed on October 26, 1954, but this event did not really alter the anticipation of a Communist takeover. It was considered only a question of time before the unstable south fell into the clutches of the Communists of North Vietman. Mr. Speaker, it happens that South Vietnam will celebrate the ninth anniversary of its independence. It means that for almost a decade now the Government and people of South Vietnam have been solving many of the problems that once threatened to destroy the country. Above all, it means that they have been successfully resisting the Communist attempts at aggression and subversion. It has been a long and terrible struggle, with a heavy toll in ravaged crops, confiscated livestock, burned homes, misery and death.

Since the Communists opened their all-out attack on South Vietnam, our country has increased both military and economic assistance and has repeatedly stated its determination to help the Vietnamese defend themselves. The United States sees the Communist attempt to conquer South Vietnam as a threat to our own security, because a Communist victory there might lead many people to believe that communism is in fact the wave of the future. The defeat of South Vietnam would increase the difficulty of defending the rest of southeast Asia and place in jeopardy the independent development of all free Asian countries.

The people of South Vietnam and their government have fought bravely against Communist aggression and subversion, and they have shown the world again that it is possible to stand up to the forces of communism. There are few people in the world today who have had to fight so steadfastly to preserve their freedom and independence as those who live in South Vietnam. They deserve our admiration, and I take this opportunity to salute them on the anniversary of their country's independence.

No. 20—New Hampshire: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to tell the Members of this House a few things about gambling in the State of New Hampshire.

In 1962, $82 million was bet on New Hampshire's race tracks. This legal activity brought into the coffers of its State treasury almost $6 million in revenue.

According to the McClellan committee hearings, illegal gambling may be roughly calculated as having been slightly under $400 million last year. But New Hampshire realized that this illegal gambling was nothing but a gangster's grab-bag. So it acted—wisely and courageously.

I have no doubt that the New Hampshire lottery, to become operative next March, will flourish as an example of financial and social realism. The vast revenues now buoying the underworld will be significantly diverted into public coffers, to the benefit of the people rather than a select coterie of crime bosses.

New Hampshire has sensibly recognized that gambling must be controlled as it cannot be eradicated. Human nature cannot be molded to fit bluenose dreams. If New Hampshire's commonsense can be contagious, it will spell out the end of gambling as a major form of criminal sustenance, for gambling must be outlawed to be a fruitful source of government revenues.

I am certain that the New Hampshire congressional delegation is fully cognizant of the many ways in which their State lotterly will benefit the State. I hope they will join in seeking to give the wisdom of their State national scope by supporting my fight for the establishment of a national lottery.

My hat is off to New Hampshire for taking the necessary action to change their State from a gamblers' paradise to the people's haven.

Educational Rhythmics for Mentally Handicapped Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, any dedicated effort to improve the lot and increase the happiness of our mentally retarded children deserves the hearty support of this body.

I have been impressed with the inspiring efforts of Ferris and Jennet Robins on behalf of these unfortunate children. Mr. and Mrs. Robins were saved during the evacuation of Dunkirk. Subsequently they came to this country and spent 22 months entertaining our servicemen for the USO. Later they became American citizens. Much of their wartime work was in military hospitals, and they were startled at the impact of certain music and dance rhythms on the mentally disturbed.

From this discovery evolved the Robins special "schools of movement," which have pioneered what has become known as "educational rhythmics" for mentally retarded children. Through the use of carefully selected music and an adaptation of classical ballet techniques and syncopated rhythms, they have created a series of imaginative body movements that come naturally to the retarded child.

They learn to tie their shoes, walk up and down stairs, brush their teeth, and perform many tasks normally beyond their capacity. The story of the success of the Robins has spread, and has created a demand for wider dissemination of their unique and beneficial methods.

The outcome has been the preparation and publication of a stirring book entitled "Educational Rhythmics for Mentally Handicapped Children," a book

designed to help the parent, the teacher, and anyone else working with these children.

One of the most touching sections is devoted to 100 unposed photographs of children reacting to the Robins method. It is exciting to see photographically how the music and movements appeal to the child's natural urge to imitate and play. The pictures again and again emphasize the actual beauty of a retarded child in its joy of movement—just where beauty is least expected. The enlightenment and happiness, the satisfaction of achievement, shows in each face.

Gentlemen, this book is a distinguished volume and a landmark in the unending battle on behalf of the handicapped child. It can do untold good. I am pleased to report that it is being placed on the shelves of the Library of Congress.

B'nai B'rith: 120th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, B'nai B'rith, the first national service organization to be founded in the United States is now marking its 120th year.

This celebration with its Biblical connotations—120 years being the lifespan of Moses—underscores B'nai B'rith's devotion to perpetuating the traditional moral values that underlie our Judeo-Christian heritage.

From its earliest days, B'nai B'rith has undertaken works of philanthropy, community service, and youth education. In the latter field, it met an urgent need by sponsoring the Hillel Foundations which provide religious and cultural centers for Jewish students on 247 campuses.

B'nai B'rith's work in the field of human relations and civil liberties is well known. Its Anti-Defamation League, founded in 1913, has pioneered to eliminate discrimination in employment, housing, and the like, and to promote intergroup harmony.

B'nai B'rith organized the first disaster relief for the victims of the Baltimore flood of 1868. It established a free employment bureau in Chicago, and manual and technical schools in Philadelphia and New Orleans, mobilized relief drives for victims in the Chicago fire and the San Francisco quake. During the Civil War, B'nai B'rith conducted a recruitment drive of its own, outfitted a Jewish company and cared for the families of the company's soldiers. B'nai B'rith began with a contribution of $60, and today it is a great service organization which spends millions in programs for youth activities, education, social work, and vocational training.

Of great significance is the fact that these accomplishments are the work of a widespread voluntary organization. Such a group has the imagination, flexibility, and vitality to adjust old causes to new needs. Our democratic society flourishes when civic and charitable work is carried on through service groups like B'nai B'rith. B'nai B'rith has rendered valuable service not only to the Jewish community, but to our entire Nation.

I salute B'nai B'rith as it celebrates its 120th anniversary this month.

Czechoslovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, October 28 marks the beginning of a most glorious period in the modern history of the Czechoslovak people. Forty-five years ago on that day the Czechoslovak National Council in Prague proclaimed the independence of the Czechs and Slovaks and the establishment of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. That historic event marked the culmination of the centuries-old struggle which these sturdy and stouthearted people carried on against the overlords of their historic homeland. This national goal was attained as the result of ceaseless determination to work for its realization and also partly as the result of devoted, wise, and persevering leaders headed by the late great Thomas Masaryk.

The rebirth of the Czechoslovak Republic soon after the First World War also highlighted most startling revolutionary changes in the heart of Europe. The polyglot Austrian empire was shattered; imperial Germany was no more, and at the time there seemed to be no danger from any direction to freedom and peace in this part of Europe. The Czechoslovak people took full advantage of this auspicious circumstance, and with the aid of their friends abroad, in a relatively short time they succeeded not only in rebuilding their wartorn country, but made it a model democracy in central Europe where peace and freedom reigned. The country's economy was put on a sound basis, politically its stability seemed assured, and it became a prosperous, progressive state. But this happy state of affairs did not last long; Czechoslovaks enjoyed their hard-won freedom for only 2 decades, for the catastrophic events beginning in 1938 proved most disastrous to them. First, their country was dismembered, then they were robbed of their freedom, and with the beginning of the last war their fate was in the hands of ruthless Nazis. And we all know what has been their lot since the end of the war, especially since 1948, when they were forced to submit to Communist totalitarianism.

Throughout their long and turbulent history these people had not lost sight of their national goal, and they attained it in 1918. So today, even when suffering under an implacable and unrelenting totalitarianism, they are not downhearted, they are not in despair, but are confidently looking forward to the day when the chains which now hold them in check will be shattered and they will once more regain their freedom. I say this confidently because I have known many of these fine and hardworking people in my own State in California, especially in San Francisco where they have domiciled for generations and where they have proved themselves a real and indispensable asset to our community as loyal, industrious, patriotic, and gallant citizens of this great Republic. On the 45th anniversary of the Czechoslovak Independence Day, I join hands with these Americans of Czechoslovak descent and solemnly observe the anniversary of that historic event.

H.R. 333, a Bill To Lift Antitrust Immunities From Labor Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a good deal of mail lately concerning H.R. 333, a bill which amends the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Norris-La Guardia Act, and Taft-Hartley Act so as to lift antitrust immunities from labor organizations. By far the great majority of these letters have been in support of this bill. Yet I have received other letters which condemn this bill and similar attempts to curb union monopoly power. These letters reveal certain misconceptions about the nature and effect of my bill.

First of all, my bill would not eliminate health and welfare benefits or pension plans. International unions and brotherhoods could continue to administer such plans, providing, of course, that these benefits could not be withheld as a lever to regain control of collective bargaining activities. If the large national and international unions did not see fit to continue these benefit and pension plans, they could be taken over and administered by the local unions on the basis of contributions received from local members. All benefit, pension, and strike funds must come ultimately from the local union member anyway, and if these contributions went no further than the local union, there is less likelihood that they would be diverted to pay for marble palaces in Washington and black Cadillacs for union leaders.

By the same token, sick leave pay, vacation pay, and overtime pay would not be eliminated. These and other issues would be negotiated by the unions with each individual company, neither having an unfair advantage in size or power over the other.

It is further charged that H.R. 333 would destroy craft unions, replacing

them by industrial unions. This is not true. The Landrum-Griffin Act specifically states:

> It shall not be an unfair labor practice under subsections (a) and (b) of this section for an employer engaged primarily in the building and construction industry to make an agreement covering employees engaged (or who, upon their employment, will be engaged) in the building and construction industry with a labor organization of which building and construction employees are members.

My bill does not amend the Landrum-Griffin Act, and, as a consequence, bargaining in the construction industry is not affected by H.R. 333.

These and similar attacks on my bill are merely attempts to divert attention from the central problem—the overweening power of big unions. They are red herrings drawn across the path of rational examination—see the "International Teamster," January 1963, page 25.

Union leaders, of course, deny that their power is excessive. They point to such large corporations as A. T. & T., which has net assets in excess of $24 billion, or Standard Oil of New Jersey, with $10.5 billion in assets, or General Motors, with $8.8 billion. In comparison, they say, all unions, national, international, and local, had combined net assets of only $1.3 billion—1960 figures.

Furthermore, they argue, only a third of the nonagricultural work force is unionized—unions being not yet significant in retail and wholesale trade, services, Government employment, finance, and the white-collar occupations generally.

On the surface, these are plausible arguments, yet, in a sense, cash assets and membership rolls are irrelevant to the issue of union power. A comparison of union financial assets with those of the giant corporations obscures differences in basic character and purpose. The function of the labor union is merely to represent workers at the scene of their employment and negotiate labor contracts acceptable to a reliably determined majority of them. A corporation, on the other hand, must invest in productive facilities costing billions of dollars to erect, and equip, millions of dollars a year to maintain and improve and replenish—an investment representing billions of dollars of built-in risk that must hold itself together through competitive sales and pay its taxes and expand its plants and refine its methods and pursue all manner of research in order to serve the public, its only source of revenue and perhaps eventual reward—see Maurice R. Franks, "What's Wrong With Our Labor Unions?" The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., New York, 1963, pages 117–118.

Union strength, then, is strategic rather than quantitative. Union membership is concentrated in key industries: steel, coal, automobiles, construction, public utilities, communications, and transportation; and the power of such unions to disrupt the orderly processes of the economy and to damage the general welfare in the pursuit of their objectives is as awesome as these numbers suggest. The economic power of even the largest business organizations, subject as they are to a variety of legal and economic restraints, is as nothing compared to the power of the great international unions.

Unionism's power derives from the fact that the economy of the United States is a highly differentiated, complex, and interdependent system in which the cessation of only one activity or the breaking of only one link in the chain of production and distribution—if the interrupted function be a crucial one—can put a substantial part of the economy out of commission, if not paralyze it completely. Significantly, unions have succeeded in establishing control over just such crucial points in the economy. Moreover, the union rule that picket lines are not to be crossed, regardless of the merits of a particular strike, places strategic power in the hands of even the smallest union.

It is needful to point out at the same time that the strike itself, justified or unjustified, by no means represents the major harm that unions can inflict on society. It is the settlement which follows the strike, or even the settlement reached in lieu of a strike which may impose the harshest burden on society at large. Strikes end, their disruptions are temporary if severe, but the settlements which follow them may cause permanent distortions in factor and product markets yielding chronic unemployment, diminished rates of private investment and thus of growth, lessened international competitiveness and balance-of-payments problems. The occurrence of any one of these developments, and a fortiori where several are taking place simultaneously, diminishes the social dividend and contracts the economic alternatives open to producers and consumers. In sum, the community suffers a reduction both in its material welfare and in freedom.—Patrick M. Boarman, Union Monopolies and Antitrust Restraints, Labor Policy Association, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1963, pages 10–11.

Unrestrained union power, then, has an adverse effect upon the economy. What effect does it have on the individual union member?

With nationwide master contracts negotiated by the national union officers directly with their national counterparts in the corporation, it is clear that local unions in most mass-industry organizations no longer do their own bargaining on major issues. There is thus a widening gap between the rank-and-file member and the collective-bargaining process. He no longer has any significant control over the men who negotiate his wages, hours of work, and working conditions. Just as the corporation has had the effect of depriving ownership of decision-making, so big unions deprive the rank-and-file of similar privileges. My bill would correct this by providing that no union could represent employees of more than one company for purposes of collective bargaining.

H.R. 333 is not an attempt to put unions in an inferior position vis-a-vis management. It merely seeks to restore the balance which outmoded laws have tipped in favor of big unions.

Our Government prosecutes as a monopoly the A. & P., whose stores handle about 6 percent of the Nation's food supply, which must keep its prices competitive with those of tens of thousands of other stores, and which is without power to make anyone go hungry.

Yet, the Government does nothing, and it can do nothing, about the Teamsters Union, whose members handle not a small fraction of the Nation's food supply but virtually all of it; which can, without fear of substantial competition, raise the cost of food almost at will, and which has the power to shut off our entire food supply and make us all go hungry.

Clothing manufacturers may not lawfully conspire together concerning their dealings with suppliers—that is, contractors—or to fix their own selling prices on the basis of uniform labor costs, but they may lawfully conspire with a union to fix their suppliers' principal charges, to determine with what suppliers each will do business and what suppliers can do business at all, and to price their own products according to uniform, arbitrary, and even fictitious labor costs. And they do just that.

If any combination of soft-coal operators had the power to reduce the output of coal or to stop it for even a few days in order to raise prices or keep them high, the Government could enjoin them and prosecute them, even though they never used the power, and it doubtless would. If they used the power, their victims could sue for triple damages. But the Mine Workers Union may reduce output or stop it altogether. No one can move against them under the antitrust laws or under any other law for having the power. And, even when they use the power, only the Government can move against them, and it only when they have brought us to the brink of a national catastrophe.

Steel companies may not lawfully conspire together to fix suppliers' costs or prices, or their own costs or prices, or their customers' costs and prices. But James MacDonald, a labor monopolist, for reasons of internal union politics or interunion rivalry, and no other, may regulate labor costs in the iron mines, in the steel mills, and in hundreds of shops in scores of industries that use steel; and in the process he may close all the mines, all the mills, and all the shops, paralyze our economy, and force the Government to meet his terms.

Businessmen may not conspire together to put a competitor out of business, or to raise his prices, or to limit the territory in which he will sell his goods, or to exclude his goods from the market, or to use wasteful, expensive methods and techniques, or to block progress, but they may, through a labor union, do indirectly what the law forbids them to do themselves, notwithstanding that the adverse effects upon the public are the same in one case as in the other.

These oddities and others like them in our laws present one of our most important and most pressing problems if our system of free enterprise and our system of free collective bargaining are to survive. My bill, H.R. 333, represents, I think, the best approach to a solution of these problems. Such an approach has been supported by thinking people for many years. As long ago as 1950, Gustav Peck, senior specialist in labor for the Legislative Reference Service, concluded his report to Congress on "The Application of Antitrust Laws to Labor Practices Harmful to Market Competition" in the following way:

In consequence, it would appear from this perspective that inclusion of restrictive labor practices within the scope of jurisdiction of the antitrust laws would not encroach upon labor organization and bargaining any more than upon corporate organization and bargaining in the productive process, but would prevent the monopolization of commerce, the exclusive control of supply of commodities, or the use of unreasonable restrictions upon the market. The public interest as defined in the antitrust laws would then include both industry and labor to the end that genuine competition in the market for production should prevail. (Hearings, U.S. Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, "To Protect Trade and Commerce Against Unreasonable Restraints by Labor Organizations", Feb.–Mar, 1950, p. 16.)

I believe it is time we acted.

Tweter: The New Sweater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, with the wonderful assistance of the Small Business Administration, we of my district were proud to welcome into York County the Huntley Knitting Mills. The mill now employs over 400 people and the citizens of York and the surrounding community are most happy to have the industry there and have welcomed the personnel and the new shot in the arm that this concern has given to the economy of York and the area.

Now, Huntley Knitting Mills have presented to the sports-loving population a new, exciting, and revolutionary sweater, called the Tweter. It is made of 100 percent Orlon acrylic in big, bold stripes, and I quote from a recent advertisement which is most attractive:

Destination: Any place that's wild and wonderful. The latest rage of the student body. An absolute discourager to winter winds in the grandstand * * * cozy "togetherness" on an evening's walk. Get hep and "in step" with the season with a genuine collegiate Tweter.

I salute Huntley Knitting Mills and its bright new innovation in casual wear. I am proud to represent a district in which the industrial effort is always forward.

I wish for Huntley Knitting Mills every success in this and other innovations.

Representative Edna F. Kelly, of New York, Successfully Opposes Effort in United Nations Committee To Open League of Nations Treaties to Accession by Red China and Other Non-U.N. States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New York, Congresswoman EDNA F. KELLY, long recognized as one of the outstanding experts in the Congress in the field of foreign policy and international affairs, has further distinguished herself and brought honor upon this House by her success in presenting the U.S. position in a highly controversial issue in the United Nations' Sixth, or Legal, Committee.

Mrs. KELLY—one of the few Members of the House of Representatives ever accorded such responsibility—was chosen by President Kennedy to serve this fall on the U.S. delegation to the 18th United Nations General Assembly. As a ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Europe, Mrs. KELLY brought to this assignment a fine grasp of the complexities of international affairs and an ability we have all seen demonstrated many, many times, in cutting through the window-dressing language to get to the key points of an issue.

She has now proved that this ability to push aside the nonessential elements to get to the heart of a controversy can be put to very good use in behalf of her country in the deliberations of the United Nations as well as in the Congress.

The Sixth, or Legal, Committee of the U.N., on which Mrs. KELLY has been representing the United States, handles questions relating to international law, treaties, conventions, and other international agreements. In addition, she has been handling before other committees of the U.N. General Assembly items dealing with atomic radiation, outer space, and enlargement of U.N. bodies, among others.

AMENDMENT VOTED DOWN 42 TO 38

The issue on which Mrs. KELLY successfully led a fight to uphold the U.S. position, over strong opposition from the Communist bloc and others, arose in connection with the proposed opening for participation by new nations of some of the old League of Nations treaties still in effect and serving a useful purpose, such as the one on counterfeiting. An amendment was offered to permit accession by any state. This, as Mrs. KELLY ably pointed out in a speech in the Committee on October 18, would have included not only those new countries which are members of the United Nations, but Red China and East Germany, or other non-U.N. states.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I am submitting the text of the remarks made by Congresswoman KELLY on this highly controversial issue. But first, I want to add that Mrs. KELLY's fight on behalf of our country to prevent Red China and East Germany to come into treaty relationships with the United States and other free nations through this subterfuge resulted in victory. The vote on the proposal was 42 to 38, in our favor with 10 abstentions. And yesterday, a new formula was adopted under which no non-U.N. state could accede to any League of Nations treaty without the approval of the General Assembly. All of us, I am sure, are proud of the manner in which Mrs. KELLY represented our Nation in this important matter, and thus I am sure there will be widespread interest here in reading the text of her U.N. address, as follows:

STATEMENT BY EDNA F. KELLY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE LEGAL (SIXTH) COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON THE QUESTION OF EXTENDED PARTICIPATION IN GENERAL MULTILATERAL TREATIES CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, OCTOBER 18, 1963

Mr. Chairman, as chapter 3 of the report of the International Law Commission indicates, an examination of the substance and utility of open-ended multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations is needed. Such an examination should determine which treaties are still in force and hold interest for states and what action may be necessary to adapt them to contemporary conditions. Draft Resolution L. 532 wisely calls for such a study but does not, in the meantime, delay opening for extended participation the multilateral treaties involved. Certain of the treaties, especially the Convention and Optional Protocol for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, may be of immediate interest to states and should be opened for accession. As indicated by Interpol and as proved by recent accession by the United Kingdom, the treaties concerning counterfeiting remain useful and contemporary.

Perhaps there are other multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the League which are not, however, of interest to states or which are useful only if adapted to modern circumstances. The procedures set forth in the nine-power draft resolution is a simple and expeditious method of determining the usefulness and adaptability of such treaties. If they are no longer useful, no further action is necessary. If, on the other hand, certain of the treaties are currently outdated but are adaptable to contemporary circumstances by substantive amendments the protocol of amendment procedure suggests itself. In accordance with Resolution 24(I), the General Assembly, between 1946 and 1953, approved seven protocols which made necessary amendments of substance and replaced old participation clauses with clauses opening them to accession by new nations.

A substantive examination of the treaties should not, however, delay extended partici-

pation if certain states wish to accede immediately. The treaties should be opened to accession now. As the International Law Commission points out in its report, the original parties to such treaties intended them to be open for accession. The procedure for extended participation proposed in the nine-power draft resolution provides a simplified and efficient method of achieving the object of extending participation in useful treaties.

Such a procedure is not, in the view of the U.S. delegation, open to objection. The parties, by voting for the resolution, may consent to opening such treaties for extended participation. As stated before, the participation clauses of the treaties indicate an intention to make them open ended. What is involved is a simple adaptation of the participation clauses to the fact that the League of Nations has been succeeded by the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, let me turn now to the two amendments L. 533 and L. 534. The United States regrets that a highly controversial political issue has been injected into the consideration of extended participation in multilateral treaties.

The amendment proposed by Ghana and others, contained in document L. 533, would request the Secretary General to invite "any state" not otherwise eligible to become a party to these treaties to accede thereto by depositing an instrument of accession with the Secretary General. On the other hand, the amendment tabled by Australia, Greece, and Guatemala, in document L. 534, would request the Secretary General to invite "each state member of the United Nations or of a specialized agency" to accede to the conventions. The United States strongly supports this latter amendment and hopes that the members of this Committee will vote in favor of it.

The Under Secretary, Mr. Stavropoulos, has previously explained to the Committee the extremely difficult position in which the adoption of an "all states" formula would place the Secretary General. As Mr. Stavropoulos has pointed out, unless the Secretary General is given precise directions by the Assembly, he would be put in the untenable situation of having to decide which entities that are not United Nations members should be invited to become parties to these treaties. Let me illustrate his difficulty by an example which is less embarrassing to those in this room than others I could cite. Suppose we had adopted this resolution a year ago. Would the Secretary General have been obliged to communicate it to Katanga? I could multiply examples. But what I have said demonstrates that the amendment of Ghana would impose upon the Secretary General the making of a political decision of a highly controversial and acutely embarrassing nature. The Secretary General quite rightly wishes to avoid this political function. If the supporters of the amendment proposed in document L. 533 really would like to spend some weeks discussing which entities, not members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies, are states, then they should say so. Otherwise, they should withdraw their amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this highly charged political issue cannot be decided by the Secretary General. It cannot be decided by the Sixth Committee. The Sixth Committee has no competence to determine, or business in attempting to determine that, for example, the so-called Peoples' Republic of Korea is a state. This is no more a question for the Legal Committee than for the Secretary General.

Every year, since the beginning of the United Nations, there have been proposals that all states should be invited to adhere to United Nations treaties or to participate in United Nations conferences. No such proposal has ever been accepted. The General Assembly has uniformly followed the principle that United Nations treaties and United Nations conferences are open to participation only by members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

We should follow that principle in the case now before us. The purpose of the nine-power draft resolution contained in document L. 532 is to welcome participation in League of Nations treaties by the great number of new states which have achieved their independence since the demise of the League. Those new states are virtually all members of the United Nations. They are participating here in the work of the General Assembly and in the work of our Committee. The amendment of Australia, Greece, and Guatemala will make possible their participation in these treaties if they desire to participate.

On the other hand, we doubt that the draft resolution, if amended as Ghana and others propose, would be acceptable to many of the members of the League who are represented here—and whose assent to this resolution is necessary, as stated in operative paragraph 2 of the resolution. We believe that most of these former members of the League would not be willing to accept this resolution if it implied that, whether they like it or not, they would be required to enter into treaty relations with entities which they do not recognize as states. Adoption of the all states formula would thus destroy the chance of implementing the underlying resolution. Indeed, adoption of the all states formula would effectively negate the possibility of participation by any of the newer states members of this organization, and our consideration of this agenda item would have been fruitless.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we urge the members of this Committee to vote against amendment L. 533 and to vote in favor of amendment L. 534.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Market News Service Problems Solved by Secretary Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a number of my colleagues have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials and news stories warning of dangers in the Agriculture Department's expansion of the Federal-State Market News Service. As a member of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, I looked into this matter and I am happy to report that Secretary Orville Freeman has agreed to solve the three problems which the press has been highlighting.

Last August Secretary Freeman announced that farm market information which the Department collects will be directly available to anyone who wishes to lease facilities from the telephone service. In announcing the new service, Secretary Freeman said the Department must reserve the right to cancel the service to any subscriber who misused it. This raised the fear of censorship if the Department could cancel the service as retaliation against a newspaper or farm organization which happened to disagree with the Department on some political issue. Because the announcement of the new service stated that various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases also would be sent on the market news wire, a number of newspapers warned that Government press releases sent over the new system would make it a propaganda function instead of an information service. Others warned that the Agriculture Department would be in competition with some private organizations which now pick up the Department's market information, edit it, add other facts, and wire the information to private subscribers.

I am happy to report that Secretary Freeman has agreed to solve each of these three problems. He explained that the right of cancellation was necessary to prevent speculators who subscribed to the news service from adding false market quotations as part of the Federal report. Secretary Freeman has now agreed to surround this right of cancellation with safeguards to prevent its use as a tool of censorship. Before any action will be taken, he said, a subscriber facing cancellation will be able to file a written statement or have a hearing on the proposed action. The proposed findings will be issued and the subscriber will have 20 days to file an answer before any ruling could be issued. Even after that, Secretary Freeman said, the subscriber facing cancellation would have his day in court, for the Department's action will be subject to judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act.

On the question of the new market news service becoming a Government news agency, Secretary Freeman said that the various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases will only be market quotations on purchases of commodities for the school lunch and surplus food distribution programs. On the question of competition with private organizations which now disseminate farm market information, Secretary Freeman agreed that the new system will not provide specialized service which now can be purchased from private organizations. These organizations identify various products and producers, thus making it possible for persons using the services to have more detailed information on farm market facilities. Secretary Freeman said the new Agriculture Department service will not identify producers or products, but will only carry the standard market quotations which are now available in Washington and at other Agriculture Department offices throughout the Nation.

I am confident the results which I am able to report to you would not have been possible unless the Nation's press had highlighted the situation. These developments prove once again the necessity for a free press able to analyze

and criticize the Government and for a continuing fight for the people's right to know the facts of government.

Following is Secretary Freeman's letter spelling out the conditions under which the news service will operate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1963.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: This is in further reply to your letters of August 22 and September 24 enclosing editorials on the expanded use of the Federal-State market news leased wire system.

As you know, the arrangement for individual use of the leased wire circuits was requested by agriculture producers and distributors who make extensive use of market information. The Department acted only after discussions with the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and after a request for public comments which resulted in overwhelming approval of the plan for expanded use of the existing leased wire system.

The editorials commented on whether the Department's authority to cancel the Market News Service could be used as a device for censorship. I can assure you that safeguards surrounding the Department's authority for cancellation make this impossible.

The Department must reserve the right to cancel service to an individual solely as a safeguard against false reports being issued which are identified as official Federal-State market news quotations. This administrative remedy is needed because there is no Federal statute which prohibits the false or fraudulent use of Federal-State market news reports. For example, in our opinion, intermingling data from various sources and ascribing them entirely to the Federal-State Market News Service, if practiced by a subscriber, should be stopped or the service should be canceled in order to protect the interests of producers and marketers who rely on the integrity and authenticity of official Federal-State reports.

An agreement in effect for several years between the Department and the PAM News Corp. which distributes market news to private subscribers, requires the corporation to separate the Department's official market reports from other market information. This agreement also reserves the right of cancellation.

In the unlikely event that it became necessary to exercise the Department's authority to cancel service under the market news leased wire system, the Department would follow the established procedure for withdrawal of voluntary fee services, such as inspection and grading, which are also provided under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. The procedure gives the respondent the opportunity to file a written statement—or, if he wishes, have an oral hearing—to show cause why the service should not be withdrawn. Next, the respondent must be served with a proposed suspension order including tentative findings and conclusions, specifying the suspension period and providing 20 days to file exceptions. Only after ruling on the exceptions can the Agriculture Marketing Service issue a formal suspension order for the specified period.

This procedure, set forth in the Department's AMS Instruction 910–1, provides administrative safeguards against any abuse of the authority for cancellation. In addition to the internal procedure the Department would follow if cancellation were necessary, the action is subject to judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act. This act provides, among other things, that the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law and shall set aside any agency actions found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, contrary to constitutional right, or for other specified reasons.

The editorials pointed out that the Department's announcement of the expanded Market News Service stated it would carry various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases of importance to marketers. No general press releases or U.S. Department of Agriculture policy statements are carried on the leased wire circuits. We occasionally send administrative instructions during idle circuit time. The releases of importance to marketers refers to announcements giving the quantities and prices of commodities purchased for the school lunch or food distribution programs. Such information is carried as part of our market news program because they have at times a direct bearing on the market for the particular commodity.

The editorials commented on whether the expanded Market News Service will include identification of specific producers, thus competing with any private market information service. The dissemination of such information is prohibited by Department regulations, and it could not be made available under the new system. Section 536b (5) and (9) of title I of the Department's regulations prohibit publication of—

"(5) Information and reports furnished by dealers, manufacturers, associations, or others covering quantities of commodities processed, purchased, or sold during prescribed periods and the prices paid or received therefor."

* * * * *

"(9) Information furnished voluntarily by individuals or firms, relating to their farm or business operations, for use in making statistical analyses as a foundation for official estimates and reports."

I hope this has provided the information which the subcommittee desires. If you have further questions, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

The Death of the President of the Ogden, Utah, Branch of the NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a leader from Utah in the civil rights movement has been killed while carrying out his public responsibility. His death occurred on October 18.

Detective Sgt. Marshall N. White, an 18-year veteran with the Ogden Police Department, was shot and killed while searching a home for a prowler.

Mr. White was President of the Ogden branch of the NAACP.

His life and death reflect the dual demands of American citizenship for individual rights and responsibility. Rights without responsibility is anarchy; responsibility without rights is tyranny. Mr. White gave full devotion to both.

Mr. White's life was taken while he was in the service of his fellow citizens, preserving law and order so that men and women living in freedom would be safe in their pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

His life added merit to the causes to which he dedicated himself.

Ohio Electric Co. and Rural Electric Cooperatives Join in New Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Ohio Power Co. and the rural electric cooperatives of Ohio are joining in a new generating project that will provide hundreds of additional jobs in our coal industry as well as the inexpensive electric power needed for continued development and expansion of Ohio industry.

The Ohio Power Co., and Buckeye Power, Inc., the latter a subsidiary of Ohio's rural electric cooperatives, will build a jointly owned, major electric powerplant.

The steam-electric station will have an initial generating capacity of 1,230,000 kilowatts and an ultimate capacity of 2 million kilowatts. Even initially, the plant would be the largest in Ohio and require an investment estimated at $125 million.

The new station will be named the Cardinal plant after the State bird of Ohio. It will be built on the Ohio River adjacent to Ohio Power's existing Tidd plant, at Brilliant, south of Steubenville.

Construction is expected to start immediately, with ground breaking to take place next Monday, and initial operation is scheduled for mid-1966. The plant will be operated entirely independently by a new corporation to be formed and jointly owned by the Buckeye group and Ohio Power.

The announcement was made jointly by Owen T. Manning, president of Buckeye Power, of Columbus, and Donald C. Cook, president of American Electric Power Co. and of Ohio Power, of Canton, in a press conference here attended by Governor James A. Rhodes. Ohio Power is one of six operating electric utilities in the seven-State American Electric Power System.

The announcement by Manning and Cook said:

Because it encompasses new concepts in the electric utility industry, not only in its engineering and design but in the fact that here, for the first time, a major electric generating facility will be jointly owned by an investor-owned utility and member-owned electric cooperatives and financed entirely by funds obtained from the private money market. Also, plans call for the plant to be tied in to the transmission systems of six of the State's principal utilities, which will transmit, under contract, the cooperatives' portion of its power generation to the co-ops' transmission systems, substations, and load centers.

These utilities, in addition to Ohio Power, are: the Cincinnati Gas & Elec-

tric Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., the Dayton Power & Light Co., the Toledo Edison Co., and the Marietta Electric Co.

Virtually all of the bulk power supply needs of Ohio's co-ops today are purchased from the State's investor-owned utilities. This supply would be taken over by Buckeye Power sometime after completion of Buckeye's new plant facilities.

Howard Cummins, Buckeye general manager, emphasized that the co-op's investment in the Cardinal plant, through Buckeye power, is being financed by private sources, since their equity and net worth are now sufficient to attract private capital. The 30 co-ops in Buckeye Power serve about 135,000 electric customers in 74 of Ohio's 88 counties, according to Cummins.

Announcement of Ohio Power's proposal to the co-ops for their joint ownership and operation of a major plant was made in late 1962 and has been under study since then.

According to A. N. Prentice, vice president and general manager of Ohio Power, the new Cardinal plant will burn an estimated 3 million tons of coal or more per year in its initial two units. Virtually all of it will come from mines in eastern Ohio and the Wheeling Panhandle area of West Virginia, Prentice said, adding that this fact alone would "provide a tremendous economic impact" on the two-State area.

This supply of coal, Prentice estimated, would require the employment of approximately 500 miners, in addition to scores of other workers in the transportation and allied fields. He added that 3 million tons of coal were the equivalent of a 40,000-car railroad train extending 300 miles—or the distance between the Cardinal plant and Indianapolis.

The studies, planning, design, and negotiations for the new plant have been actively underway for close to 2 years, under the direction of Philip Sporn, retired president of American Electric Power and Ohio Power and now chairman of the AEP System Development Committee.

In discussing the new plant, Sporn described it as representing an entirely new stage of development in the history of power generation technology. It will be ultramodern in concept and design and will initially house two 615,000 kilowatt turbine-generator units, which in themselves will further advance the frontiers of the generating art. Each unit will be of tandem design, with all sections of its turbine—the high-, intermediate-, and low-pressure elements—as well as the generator, all revolving on the same single shaft 200 feet long. They will be the largest single-shaft turbine-generator units in the world. The electrical generators themselves will also be the world's largest and will be water cooled.

The units will operate under steam conditions of 3,500 pounds per square inch pressure and a temperature of 1,000° F., with double reheat temperatures of 1,025° and 1,050°.

When in operation, Cardinal is expected to achieve a new low in steam-electric production costs, brought about by a combination of the units' anticipated generating efficiency and the entire plant's projected capital investment cost of about $100 per kilowatt of capacity. At 1,230,000 kilowatts, Cardinal will be Ohio's largest power station—with a capacity about 15 percent greater than that of the present largest plant, the Ohio Valley Electric Corp.'s huge Kyger Creek plant at Cheshire, also on the Ohio River.

The new plant will be complete in itself but will be located only several hundred feet south of Ohio Power's 220,000-kilowatt Tidd plant. The location, on the west bank of the Ohio, until recently was the site of the AEP system's 500,000-volt Tidd transmission test project, where high-voltage research was carried out during the period 1947–52 to pave the way for many of the Nation's major transmission lines of today.

The plant will be interconnected with, and backed up by, Ohio Power's six other major steamplants, as well as those of its affiliated utilities throughout the AEP system.

The co-ops were organized in the late 1930's for the specific job of building power lines to Ohio's unserved rural areas, where only 18.8 percent of the State's farms had such service. The first pole set anywhere in the Nation by an electric co-op was in Ohio—near Piqua—on November 14, 1935.

During the intervening years, the co-ops and the investor-owned utilities have made electric service available to all Ohio farms, of which 99 percent are now served. Member co-ops of the Buckeye organization have built over 30,000 miles of lines that deliver power to approximately 135,000 customers over roughly 65 percent of the State's land area. Much of this expansion has been with the aid of 100-percent loans from the Rural Electrification Administration.

A list of the Ohio rural electric cooperatives follows:

Pioneer Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Piqua, Ohio.

Delaware Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Delaware, Ohio.

Inter-County Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Hillsboro, Ohio.

Marion Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Marion, Ohio.

Holmes-Wayne Electric Co-op., Inc., Millersburg, Ohio.

Belmont Electric Co-op., Inc., St. Clairsville, Ohio.

Midwest Electric, Inc., St. Marys, Ohio.

Paulding-Putnam Electric Co-op., Inc., Paulding, Ohio.

Licking Rural Electrification, Inc., Utica, Ohio.

Darke Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Greenville, Ohio.

Union Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Marysville, Ohio.

Tuscarawas-Coshocton Elec. Co-op., Inc., Coshocton, Ohio.

Lorain-Medina Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Wellington, Ohio.

Morrow Electric Co-op., Inc., Mt. Gilead, Ohio.

North Central Electric Co-op., Inc., Attica, Ohio.

South Central Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Lancaster, Ohio.

Tricounty Rural Elec. Co-op., Inc., Napoleon, Ohio.

Logan County Co-op Power & Light Association, Inc., Bellefontaine, Ohio.

Butler Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Hamilton, Ohio.

North Western Electric Co-op., Inc., Bryan, Ohio.

Firelands Electric Co-op., Inc., New London, Ohio.

Carroll Electric Co-op., Inc., Carrollton, Ohio.

United Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Kenton, Ohio.

Guernsey-Muskingum Electric Co-op., Inc., New Concord, Ohio.

Hancock-Wood Electric Co-op., Inc., North Baltimore, Ohio.

Buckeye Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Gallipolis, Ohio.

Washington Electric Co-op., Inc., Marietta, Ohio.

Adams Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., West Union, Ohio.

Lake Erie Electric Co-op., Inc., Kelleys Island, Ohio.

Southeastern Michigan Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Adrian, Mich.

Ohio's first electric co-op (Pioneer) was also the first in the Nation. It was organized in 1935, with construction started on November 14 of that year. Ohio's last co-op, Lake Erie, was organized in 1949.

Co-op lines have been financed to date by 100 percent loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The total borrowed to date is $72,372.571. Payments on the principal amount to $30,454,299—approximately $3 million of which has been paid ahead of schedule—and the debt outstanding to REA amounts to $41,918,272.

Starting with "zero" figures in 1935, Ohio's co-ops today have: 30,000 miles of power lines in operation; 134,967 consumers receiving service; annual sales totaling 942,168,639 kilowatt-hours, and an average of 6,981 kilowatt-hours sold per consumer.

Ohio Rural Electric Cooperatives, Inc., with headquarters at 4302 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, was founded in 1941. It is similar to a trade association functioning to solve mutual problems in power supply, safety, employees' insurance, legislation, scholarship program, supply of construction materials, warehousing, membership education, power-use education, legal problems, public relations.

Its officers are: President—Foster Scott, Chandlersville, Ohio; first vice president—Frank Clay, LaRue, Ohio; second vice president—Lloyd Leatherberry, Carrollton, Ohio; secretary-treasurer—Howard Mosier, Haviland, Ohio; executive manager—Howard Cummins, Columbus, Ohio, and counsel—John W. King, Columbus, Ohio.

Buckeye Power, Inc., with headquarters at 4302 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, was organized in 1959, and is owned by all Ohio electric cooperatives for the purpose of generation and transmission of electric power to member co-ops.

Its officers are: President—Owen Manning, Coshocton, Ohio; vice president—Charles Wyckoff, Piketon, Ohio; secretary-treasurer—Powers Luse, North Baltimore, Ohio; executive manager—Howard Cummins, Columbus, Ohio, and counsel—John W. King, Columbus, Ohio.

The Buckeye group's engineering consultants are Southern Engineers, of Atlanta, Ga., and Loeb & Eames, of New York City.

Ohio Power Co. is one of six major operating companies comprising the American Electric Power System.

In its 15,400-square-mile service area, Ohio Power provides electric power for 485,000 customers. This area embraces parts of 53 counties in a broad belt across north-central Ohio and a wide area in the central, southeastern, and southern sections of the State. Population of the area is approximately 1,750,000.

To serve its customers, Ohio Power maintains a staff of approximately 3,700 employees. General offices are in Canton, with division offices located in Steubenville, Canton, Coshocton, Zanesville, Newark, Portsmouth, Tiffin, Findlay, and Lima. Offices and service facilities are maintained in 31 other cities and towns.

Ohio Power operates six steam-electric generating stations on the Ohio and Muskingum Rivers. Their combined power-producing capability is 2,900,000 kilowatts. These plants, plus 10 other major plants and several smaller ones, give the AEP system a generating capability of 7 million kilowatts—largest of any investor-owned electric system in the Nation. In addition to this capacity, Ohio Power has available for its customers backup generation from 19 other utilities with which the AEP system has interconnections.

The company operates more than 4,000 miles of transmission lines ranging from 23,000 to 345,000 volts, the latter being the highest in general use in the Nation. To carry electricity from transmission substations to the customers, Ohio Power operates more than 17,000 miles of distribution lines.

Ohio Power's history dates back to 1883 when the earliest predecessor companies came into being. Throughout its 80 years of existence, the company has pioneered many technological advances which have become standards for the industry.

Ohio Power is the Nation's 10th largest investor-owned electric utility company from the standpoint of sales of electricity, approximately 14½-billion kilowatt-hours having been sold in 1962. While Ohio Power sells more electricity than any other Ohio electric company, it ranks third in revenues received from electric sales and third in the number of customers served.

To provide its customers with electric service, Ohio Power has a net capital investment of nearly $700 million. This amounts to about $1,450 for each customer served and $200,000 per employee. During the past decade, Ohio Power has invested an average of $42 million per year for the expansion and modernization of its facilities.

Ohio Power's six major powerplants, their locations and capabilities follow:

Muskingum River plant, Beverly, Ohio, 888,000 kilowatts; Philo plant, near Zanesville, 497,000 kilowatts; Tidd plant, Brilliant, Ohio, 220,000 kilowatts; Philip Sporn plant, Graham Station, W. Va., owned jointly with Appalachian Power Co., 1,100,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 816,000 kilowatts; Kammer plant, Captina, W. Va., owned jointly with Ormet Corp., 675,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 305,000 kilowatts; and Windsor plant, Power, W. Va., owned jointly with West Penn Power Co., 300,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 150,000 kilowatts.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thy word is written in the very framework of the universe; Thy image is stamped at the very core of our being. It is Thy voice which, if we have but ears to hear, soundeth in the experiences which sing and sob and sigh across life's changing scenes.

Discarding every mask and disguise of pretense, which, alas, too often we wear before the face of man, we come praying that the fretful fears that film our sight may be cast out by a love that takes the dimness of our souls away.

In the vision splendid of divine Fatherhood and of human brotherhood, may we dream our dreams, fashion our lives, enact our laws, build our Nation, and plan our world until this shadowed earth, which is our home, rolls out of the darkness into the light and it is daybreak everywhere.

We ask it in the name of the One whose life is the light for all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 24, 1963, was dispensed with.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, with statements in connection therewith limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW AND WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be permitted to meet during the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Wednesday of this week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Fred M. Dean, 1450A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code, to be lieutenant general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS, THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations, placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Marine Corps and in the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.