

Under this arrangement with the Mexican Government, when communities have expressed a need for braceros to supplement the work force during the fruit or vegetable harvest season, when restaurants or other public places have discriminated against Mexican or people of Mexican ancestry complaints have been made. The restaurants, the swimming pools—even the beauty parlors—have had to cease the discrimination before the braceros were permitted to be brought to the community. The Mexican Government has been very alert. When such discrimination has been found it has moved in and stopped it.

In my judgment this is a clear precedent for what we would do in title II of the civil rights bill. This is what is being done in areas where the Mexicans are used under the bracero program. The precedent is available. The Constitution is being honored by this kind of prohibition against discrimination.

Those who feel that private property gives unlimited license to use only need look at all the regulations property owners now face to know that property ownership, as with liberty, does not give unlimited license to immorality.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator has made a very interesting series of comments in the address he has given to the Senate. The Senator and I, from both sides of the aisle, are joined as sponsors of the so-called title II. As I have listened to our colleagues, I have been inclined to the belief that the provisions of the Constitution, with respect to the amendments which were adopted after the War Between the States, remove any question of the constitutionality of title II, at least so far as I am concerned.

As my friend knows, the legislation we have introduced grounds its constitutionality not only on the amendments to the Constitution, but also on the commerce clause.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Exactly.

Mr. KUCHEL. My friend makes an excellent point. I congratulate him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I appreciate the statement made by our distinguished friend from California. I am proud indeed that from the Atlantic, where I am proud to reside in New Jersey, to the Pacific, the great State of California, represented by the senior Senator from California, our hands extend across the country united on this fundamental principle of justice.

A family weary after a long ride through the day and through the night who cannot find a bed in which to sleep, even though there are vacancies on the way, certainly is receiving one of the greatest wrongs and injustices I can imagine. If that family cannot eat, it multiplies forever the sin.

I thank my friend again.

ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in accordance with the previ-

ous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in executive session, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, September 20, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 19, 1963:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

George L. Mehren, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 16: 19: *I would have you be wise unto that which is good and guileless as to what is evil.*

Almighty God, grant that we may be impelled by noble and altruistic motives in every plan that we are proposing and considering for the solution of our national and international problems.

Our own conscience severely rebukes us that there are frequently such variances and inconsistencies between our profession and our practice, between our promise and our performance, and between our creed and our conduct.

Inspire us daily to validate and authenticate the reality and glory of democracy by our loyalty and desire to manifest the splendor of its ideals and principles.

May we be numbered among those, who, in these perilous and troubled times, are seeking to orientate their minds and hearts to the spirit of our blessed Lord, who went about doing good and sought the welfare of all mankind.

Bless us now as we pay tribute to one of our colleagues who dwells with Thee in the eternal home.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE HONORABLE LEON H. GAVIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN, Representative in Congress from the 23d District of Pennsylvania, was a fine Congressman and a fine citizen. He will not be with us in person anymore. But his good works and good influence will last.

LEON was a man who cared. He believed in many things. And when he believed he did not equivocate. He spoke out boldly, earnestly, and clearly. Once he had made up his mind it was not

necessary to ask him twice where he stood nor why he had taken that position. He cared and he dared.

Our friend was a diligent worker. From the time he was first elected to Congress November 3, 1942, just about 21 years ago, he was always on the job in his committees, on the floor, on inspection trips and back in his district reporting and learning.

And our late Congressman was a successful man. He may have personally been most proud of his activities on the Armed Services Committee and Conservation Commission, but he will be best remembered by a grateful citizenry for his labors in behalf of flood control, clean water, and recreational areas. No man living or dead did quite so much as he did to promote these fine objectives all up and down the Allegheny River basin. I know perhaps as well as anyone how intensely he felt on these matters and how diligently he worked to achieve them. People throughout western Pennsylvania and all down the Ohio River can be thankful that he lived and worked successfully to prevent floods, to reduce water pollution, and to provide at the resulting installations good recreational facilities.

Long after he may be forgotten millions will live secure from the fear of devastating floods, millions will enjoy the benefits of better water, and millions will enjoy wholesome beauty and recreation because he cared and worked for these ends. As one of the beneficiaries I say to him a solemn, "Thank you," on behalf of all of us.

To LEON's immediate family and relatives I say only what they know and feel. They can well be proud that LEON H. GAVIN was one of them. They knew him and loved him better than we did only because they knew him better than we did. We bid him a prayerful farewell, proud, and happy that he was one of us—a splendid colleague. You, his kin, can be even prouder and happier that he was one of you—a fine citizen, a fine father, a fine husband, and a fine man. God be with you.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I will be very happy to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the tragic loss of our colleague and my close personal friend, LEON GAVIN.

The Nation can ill afford to lose men of LEON GAVIN's caliber. He possessed attributes of character that every man can envy.

He was loyal; he was sincere; he was courageous; and he was dedicated to the security of the Nation.

He was elected to the House of Representatives on November 3, 1942. When he passed away on Saturday, September 14, he was the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation.

He was a man who believed in his convictions, and never deviated from them. When the Armed Services Committee was formed in January of 1947, he became a member of that committee. I soon learned that the security of our

Nation and the welfare of our Armed Forces came uppermost in his mind. There was not a single tinge of partisanship in his approach to national security matters.

I relied heavily upon his advice and counsel in the many matters of legislative concern that came to our attention during the past 16 years. He met his responsibilities in the committee and on the floor of the House in an outstanding and conscientious manner.

I can say with sincerity that LEON GAVIN contributed greatly to the building up, and the maintenance of the greatest military force for the preservation of peace that the world has ever known.

He knew from personal experience the futility of war, but he also knew the urgency and wisdom of being constantly prepared for war, so that it can be prevented. He knew that our strength, and the maintenance of peace, went hand in glove together.

The men and women who serve in our Armed Forces will be forever indebted to him, for he was one of them.

He knew the rigors of military life, having served in the 51st Infantry, 6th Division, during World War I.

And I think he would want me to repeat his concern for the men who live in the mud and dust, and are exposed to the rain, the heat, and the snow, while they are performing the never-ending task of defending our Nation.

He served his congressional district, his State, and his Nation with distinction, with honor, with enthusiasm, and with wisdom.

He also found time to be active in wild-life preservation, and to become a great student of the War Between the States. Hardly a week went by that he did not come into my office with a book in hand about some incident of that tremendous conflict.

The Congress of the United States is a greater institution because of LEON GAVIN; but it is poorer today because of LEON GAVIN's passing.

I extend my most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Gavin and her family. They have lost a husband, a father, and grandfather—the Nation has lost a champion of the American way of life, and a loyal son.

I have lost a close, personal, true friend.

It is indeed appropriate that LEON GAVIN was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery among those with whom he served and loved so well.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of LEON GAVIN we have lost not solely a colleague. We have lost someone who cannot be replaced. He has left a void in our hearts that no one can fill. He was a man of determination and drive, of conviction and courage, an ardent advocate of what he believed; and so vigorously would he argue his case that he would impress one as being wholly unyielding.

But underneath this seemingly bluntness there was a humility, a compassion,

and a heart of gold. He was endowed with a deep affection for his fellowmen. His generosity and kindness was without limits. He was always thinking of others.

One of the pages remarked to me a few weeks ago that the page boys considered Mr. GAVIN one of their favorites. He was never demanding but always understanding. He always expressed an interest in them personally, treated them as members of his family and not simply messenger boys in his hire. It is my understanding that periodically he would instruct the cloakroom lunch counter to give all the pages some kind of a treat.

All this bespeaks the man who is no longer with us. It says more than I can possibly say as to the kind of man he was—kindly, generous, compassionate, unselfish.

LEON took justifiable pride in having been an infantry sergeant in World War I, and I would guess that he was one of the best sergeants that Army had. When one reflects on it, LEON typifies what we generally consider a good sergeant as being. He had a commanding appearance. He had a bombastic way of speaking. He could be austere and determined. But beneath all this there was a deep affection for his men.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania served over the years with me on the Armed Services Committee. He occupied the seat next to me. No one was more regular in attendance at committee meetings. His assistance to me personally and his contribution to the work of our committee is beyond measure. His contribution to the deliberations of the House as a whole is beyond measure.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a truly fine and a truly great man. I have lost one of my best friends. I extend my very real sympathy to his family.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the majority leader [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my friend from Pennsylvania and his colleagues from his State, and our colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services and all Members of the House, in expressing my personal sense of loss over the death of our late and beloved colleague, LEON GAVIN. The House of Representatives will not be the same any more since LEON has left us.

Over the years he endeared himself to every Member of the House. He was a man of singular characteristics—great ability, independent mind, deep convictions. Strong in his views, he nevertheless had a deep sense of humor. At times he was a regular actor. He was an outstanding and dedicated Member of the House. He was a Christian gentleman. He was my friend.

LEON GAVIN was a fine Congressman who served his country well. He worked tirelessly toward the development of the resources of his own State and district, but he worked even harder for a strong and free America. We shall long remember him and his good deeds.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Gavin and his children. May his soul

rest in that peace of God which passes all understanding.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when one loses a close and dear friend, a colleague with whom he has been associated for 21 years, it is difficult to find the words one wishes to use to pay tribute to that fallen brother. So I find it difficult today to say the things I would like to say about LEON GAVIN who traveled this way and stayed awhile and made this House of Representatives a greater legislative body, and this country a better Nation, because of his having been here.

LEON GAVIN was a man, not only of great courage, as he demonstrated in World War I and in his service here, but also one of very strong convictions, a man who would not do anything his judgment or his conscience told him was not in the best interests of those he represented and so well served.

I recall many things, as they flood back across my mind, of the days gone by and of our association together.

Mr. Speaker, I remember LEON taking the floor of the House and making many a statement on behalf of legislation in which he believed, or in opposition thereto, as the case might be. I also recall his more human side, his ability to do something most of us could not do, of how he made his annual address every year to make famous his district as the home of the groundhog at Punxsutawney, if I can pronounce the name correctly. That particular groundhog became a national symbol, if you please, so everyone in America not only knew of him, but also knew of LEON GAVIN and his great and deep sense of humor. Perhaps those annual talks he made on Groundhog Day showed to us one side of LEON GAVIN that most people did not know and did not see. His deep sense of humor, as I said a moment ago, his ability to express himself in a homely way about common things that mean so much to a great many people, who might hear his talk quoted on the air, or read about it. Yet his abilities went further.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, as has been said here by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of that committee; and by the minority leader on that committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], LEON GAVIN contributed much to the strengthening of the defenses of America.

Mr. Speaker, he served here through difficult times, and two wars. His experience in World War I made him a better legislator, the type of legislator to whom all of us could turn, and *did* turn, from time to time for information and for advice in connection with those things so vital to the defense of America.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that LEON GAVIN, while he will be missed from among our midst, will live on in the memory of all of us, in the history of this great Chamber, and in the annals of the forward march in this great Republic.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the death of LEON GAVIN the House has indeed sustained an irreparable loss. He was my friend, and he was my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services. It was a great privilege to serve with him on the great subcommittee of which I have the great honor to be chairman. He was the ranking minority member of that subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, LEON GAVIN was one of the great Americans in every sense that this word connotes. He was a man who was keenly interested in the welfare of our American fighting men. He jealously guarded their rights, and he fought tirelessly for their welfare. LEON GAVIN fully earned the confidence and respect of every one of the Members of this great body. His passing will leave a void that will not be filled in the distant future.

I am certain, however, Mr. Speaker, that LEON GAVIN needs no words of praise from me. His life and the words of his deeds will be amply documented on the pages of history of this great body. The monuments that are his and the monuments erected through and by his magnificent service in this Congress are now built into the very fabric of our way of life and the freedoms with which we are endowed.

Mr. Speaker, he was an authority on the history of the War Between the States. He knew practically everything about this unfortunate event in our history. One of the great characters in this struggle was a favorite of LEON GAVIN—Stonewall Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, when Stonewall Jackson lay mortally wounded he is alleged to have said these words:

Let us cross the river and rest in the shade.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that LEON lies in Arlington Cemetery, that he rests on the other side of the river in the shade with other heroes of another era and of another day.

Mr. Speaker, in the words of Robert Louis Stevenson:

Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, LEON GAVIN was my friend. He was a man of sterling worth, he was a great patriotic American and a gentleman of the highest order. I remember well when he came to the Congress. I had been here a few years. I learned to know LEON GAVIN as a hard hitter, yet a man with a big, good heart. I learned to know his heartbeats.

I spoke to LEO on last Thursday right here in the House. We had a nice visit. Little did I suspect he would leave this life just a few days thereafter.

LEO was the kind of fellow who never complained, yet we know how he had many days of suffering during the past few years. He was a brave soldier, a top

sergeant in World War I. I always called him the "top soak," which he liked.

I shall miss LEO, as will all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I join with my colleagues in the fine things that have been said about this great and good man.

May the same God who took LEO GAVIN to his heavenly home give his family strength to bear the great loss they have sustained.

God rest his soul.

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

Mr. CORBETT. It is my pleasure to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for 21 years LEON GAVIN served with distinction, with ability, with courage, and with sincerity in this great body. By designation of this great body he held several important public positions of trust, getting experience which he quickly developed into expertness in the use of the machinery of the House of Representatives in the considerations both in committee and on the floor of the House.

During those years a very strong, close, and personal friendship developed between my dear late friend, our colleague, and myself, a friendship which I valued very much. It was only a day or two before his untimely death that we were chatting and engaging in a pleasant conversation, such as anyone always had when talking with LEON GAVIN.

In any cause to which he was dedicated and interested in, he was intense in fighting for the things in which he believed. For example, in the field of conservation he made and leaves behind him an outstanding record.

In 1954 the Izaak Walton League, the National Park Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute, jointly gave LEO a plaque for his championship of the National Park System. He was the second ranking man on the Republican side on the important Committee on Armed Services. During the period he served, many serious questions came before this committee, and the Congress of the United States in connection with the national interest and with the national defense of our country, and with reference to holding back and rolling back the vicious and evil forces of international communism. History will show that LEON GAVIN was always fighting and voting for those bills and those appropriations that made America strong, and that will enable our great country to take its position of leadership during this trying period in the world's history.

He was a man of independent views, a man of strong convictions, a man who voted as his judgment and his conscience dictated.

He leaves behind him a record that has now become an integral part of the history of this great body. He also leaves behind him a record that will be a great consolation to Mrs. Gavin, their two sons, and their daughter.

We come here and we serve for a period of time, in accordance with the will and the wishes of our constituents. We represent a spirit, each and every

one of us, and we leave, whether by retirement or, as in the case of our late friend, through death. The spirit of our service is left behind and becomes a part of the atmosphere and the history of this body, and the spirit of LEON GAVIN's service has enriched this body and enriched the history of this body.

He leaves behind him a contribution that will always be recorded in the legislative pages of the Congress of the United States. He was a man who thought directly and talked directly, who expressed his views. You knew where he stood. He was a man possessed of nobility of character, a man who evidenced by his utterances and his actions his intense love of his fellow human beings.

I have been enriched in my life by knowing LEON GAVIN. I am sure all of my colleagues who served with him either in this Congress or in past Congresses have also been enriched. We are better men and women because we knew and served with such a noble-minded gentleman. Physically he has left us, but the spirit of LEON GAVIN remains with us. He will always be an integral part of the atmosphere and the history of this great Chamber.

Mrs. Gavin and her sons and daughter derive consolation from the knowledge that he believed in the truth, spiritual and otherwise, and that LEON lived up to what he believed in. I know they will derive great consolation from the knowledge that he dedicated himself to God and country, and that it will be a solace to them in the years that lie ahead.

To Mrs. Gavin and her sons and daughter, Mrs. McCormack and I extend our profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was not until Monday morning, when I arrived at the Capitol, that I learned of LEO GAVIN's death on Saturday.

My reaction was one of disbelief. This just could not be.

And yet I realized in the next moment that this tragic news must be accepted and that a fine friend and great American was suddenly no longer with us.

It was my pleasure not so very long ago to speak in Oil City, LEO GAVIN's hometown.

On that occasion it was evident to me that the people he represented in the Congress so diligently and ably for so many years held him in highest esteem and had for him the deepest affection.

For those of us who knew him here, this was not hard to understand.

Our departed colleague is reported to have described himself as a "sort of maverick." I cannot vouch for the accuracy of that report. But I can say that, if this was the case, he was the most helpful maverick I ever knew.

The short biography **LEE GAVIN** offered for the Congressional Directory speaks volumes for his inherent modesty. It tells us that he was a Republican, an Army sergeant in World War I, that he was married and had a family, and that he served continuously in the House of Representatives from the 78th Congress to the present.

He must have been a great sergeant: tough, two-fisted, but with the most wonderful sense of humor a man could possibly possess.

He carried these same fighting qualities to his career in the Congress—and that same genius for rib-tickling comments that endeared him so very much to all of us on both sides of the aisle.

LEE GAVIN was a man genuinely loved by all who knew him, and he was held in highest regard here in the House of Representatives for his significant contributions as an experienced, dedicated, hard-working member of the Committee on Armed Services.

His presence in this Chamber will be sorely missed, and to his wife and family I offer my deep sympathy in their sudden bereavement.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Pennsylvania has suffered two losses within the last several months, one a Democrat and one a Republican, both distinguished Americans; first the dean of the delegation, Tad Walter, whom we on our side of the aisle all loved, and now **LEON GAVIN**, whom all of us on both sides of the aisle loved.

For nearly 20 years it was my privilege—and a great personal pleasure—to know, to work with, to admire and to respect **LEON GAVIN**.

He was, as we in this body say, "a Congressman's Congressman." He typified, in carrying out his responsibilities, the best in our congressional traditions. His unceasing diligence, his fairness and courtesy to all regardless of party, his eternal questing for the truth, his jealous regard for the prerogatives and the prestige of the House of Representatives—these qualities won him the respect and the high regard of all the Members of this House.

And these qualities also endeared him to the people of the 23d District of Pennsylvania. Time after time they sent him back to Washington with overwhelmingly majorities. They knew a good man when they saw him, they selected him as their spokesman, and they backed him up year after year. He never let them down.

We, and the people of his district, will miss **LEON**, but as we say our farewell, we remember that service—service to one's generation and service to one's country—is the noblest crown of life. Service—dedicated, unselfish service—certainly was **LEON GAVIN**'s crown.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I arise to join in the

tributes being paid to our beloved colleague, **LEON H. GAVIN**. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1942 and has served his State and Nation well and continuously since that date. His 21 years as a legislator attest his devotion to our great Nation and well-being of its citizenry. He was motivated by the highest principles of representative government, of which he was a part. He translated his belief in the fundamental principles of democracy into actions which benefited his Nation, his State, and his constituency.

I express my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife and to his children for the irreparable loss which they have sustained. With a sad heart, I join them in mourning his passing and extend to them my sincerest condolences and prayers that the good Lord may lighten their heavy burden of sorrow and that they may get much comfort from the remembering of his dedication to those principles of good government, to which he was such a firm adherent.

Pennsylvania has suffered the loss of a famous son, and the people of his congressional district have suffered the loss of a devoted and forceful advocate in the halls of this great body.

It is my devout prayer that he may find peace, rest, and eternal reward in his heavenly home.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker—
The clock of life is wound but once,
And no man has the power
To tell just when the hands will stop—
At late or early hour.
Now is the only time you own:
Live, love, work with a will.
Place no faith in tomorrow, for—
The clock may then be still.

Little did any of us realize when we last saw **LEON** that his clock of life would be stilled so soon.

I was not privileged to know him as a younger man, but from what I have learned from colleagues, here was a man who actually did "work with a will." Pugnacious in the cause of right, he simply refused to take "no" for an answer. The highest tribute I could pay to **LEON** would simply be to say he was a good public servant, rendering devoted services to his congressional district, his State, and his Nation.

All of us want to remember him as a true friend, a man of courage, a two-fisted fighter but always displaying the human touch, an open mind and a warm heart.

No man is indispensable. The earth will continue to revolve on its axis, the sun will rise and set, the tide will ebb and flow but every Member of this House will miss the influence of **LEON GAVIN**.

My sincere sympathy to Mrs. Gavin and the family.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with **LEON GAVIN** on the Armed Services Committee for a number of years. Ours was a pleasant personal

friendly relationship, which enabled me to observe in him the many fine and unusual qualities which endeared him to his colleagues and to his constituency and earned his repeated reelection. **LEON** was a sincere man of strong character, intense conviction, and of great tenacity in his pursuit of those convictions. He will be especially missed by those of us on the Armed Services Committee, and I join with my colleagues in expressing a feeling of personal loss and my sympathy to his family.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to join in this tribute to the memory of **LEON GAVIN**. **LEON** and I came to Congress at the same time. He was a genuine and honest person and was endowed with an especially keen sense of humor. His true character, however, I think is pointed up in his biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory. It was his modest choice to have it contain less than five sentences and yet it includes the words as has been referred to here many times today: "during First World War served as sergeant in the 51st Infantry." One knows how proud of that service as a sergeant he was. As my sons have reminded me—"sergeants have more authority." Certainly not that **LEON** wanted to dominate—except for justice and fairness and progress and Godliness and the good of all of us. He will always be all that a real and lovable "old sarge" means in its true sense. May God receive him and bless his soul forever. My wife and Mrs. Gavin have been friends for many years and she joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Gavin, their two sons, their daughter, and the entire family.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in one of the great eulogies of history it has been said that the evil which men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones. This could not apply to **LEON GAVIN**. There was no evil in him to live after him. The good that he did certainly was not interred with his bones but lives after him to remind us of the person who did live and who contributed so much to his country.

His booming voice has been silenced, but the beat of his great heart will continue to echo in the ears of those of us who now live and who are privileged to have known him. Those of us who were privileged to know him and to serve with him shall never forget him. For many years **LEON GAVIN** served on the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services of which I was chairman. For the last 4 years he sat at my left hand as the ranking minority member of that committee. Wherever **LEON GAVIN** was present there was electricity in the air. He was stimulating, dynamic, and most effective. You could never forget having known **LEON GAVIN**.

The additional words I could utter now could in no way enlarge upon that

which has already been said about him today in this body, so I merely pause to pay this simple and humble tribute to the memory of a man who had no evil but who had great capacity for good.

To Mrs. Gavin and his family and to his loyal Pennsylvania constituency may I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania stands bereft today of one of her most stalwart sons, this House has lost one of its most distinguished Members, and our delegation has witnessed the passing of a dynamic figure whose place in our midst can never be filled.

Our uncertain world of today has seen too few of his fearlessness and there are too few among us who care to invite the attacks of predatory interests by standing for the right as our late colleague was wont to do, even if he had to stand alone. Beneath the bluff exterior of this dedicated public servant you found a heart of gold and an infectious sense of humor that drew to his side a host of friends who never had to apologize for or explain his legislative or private actions.

It was my great privilege to enjoy LEON GAVIN'S confidence and he often reviewed with me his plans and aspirations which centered largely in the betterment of his district and the welfare of his friends and loved ones. Thus it was that when he came under recent attack by certain newspapers because of his stand for what he felt was right he displayed a sensitiveness that bordered on bewilderment that his years of service should be so quickly forgotten.

We shall mourn the loss of this good friend and in the years that may be left to us we shall recall our association with this shining exemplar of courageous public service based on honest convictions. His belief in a life beyond this vale was firmly established and we are divinely persuaded that he rests in a sunnier place where we shall all meet again those who have traveled on ahead. To his beloved wife Susan we extend our heartfelt condolences and to her and the other members of his family we offer our solicitude as they face a way ahead now darkened by this sad event.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our departed friend, LEON GAVIN.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to these tributes and I have been struck by the fact that so many in the remarks have captured the personality of the real LEON GAVIN. He was a forceful man, he was a fearless man. He was a just and capable man. He made a tremendous contribution to the welfare and security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, LEON GAVIN did a good job on the committee of which he was a member, one of the most powerful and most important in this body, the Committee on Armed Services. His interests ranged beyond that. In my work

on the Committee on Appropriations, and especially on the Defense Subcommittee, I found him always helpful, always interested, and always concerned about the problems of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for us all, but we can take pride in the fact that this man has left a heritage to the House of Representatives and to his family which will endure into future days.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WHALLEY].

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to pay respects to our departed friend and colleague, LEON H. GAVIN. I feel privileged to have been able to have had him as my personal friend.

LEON GAVIN served his district and his Nation for many years with honor and distinction. His influence, and the warmth of his friendship extended far beyond the borders of his congressional district.

We shall feel his loss keenly, but can take comfort in the realization that, during his 70 years on this earth, LEON GAVIN lived a rich and full life, characterized by unselfish service to others.

I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in extending deepest sympathy to his widow and to the members of his family.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON].

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in a final tribute to a very great and distinguished American—a man who served with honor in the House of Representatives and commanded the respect of every Member of this body. With the passing of LEON H. GAVIN, Mr. Speaker, I find that there is a void in the U.S. Congress which will be difficult to fill. During my few years in this body, as compared with the 21 years that LEON GAVIN served his Nation in these halls, I have never found a more honorable friend or a more devoted public servant. He was devoted completely to his Nation, his State, his district, and to his family.

I served with LEON GAVIN on the Armed Services Committee, where he was second ranking minority member—and outstanding champion of the enlisted men of the U.S. armed services. The military posture of this country today is the better for his dedication and hard work.

On many occasions, he and I would hold friendly feuds concerning the respective qualities of our home States—California and Pennsylvania. But I never once lost respect for this man who was a giant among men—both physically and mentally.

He led the fight for his constituents and his untimely death came before the completion of an important project he had championed for his district, the Allegheny River Reservoir Dam. We here in Congress will long remember LEON GAVIN. We will miss him. And, the Nation will miss his clear-sighted knowledge and devotion as a public servant.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I learned with inexpressible shock of the death of my good friend and neighbor, LEON GAVIN. We lived in the same neighborhood here in Washington and saw each other quite often. Our service in this great House has paralleled more than two decades. Naturally, I came in contact with him at home and here on the floor of the House.

Over the years we have served together I learned to recognize him as a Member of this body who had a deep interest in the welfare and preservation of this Nation. He stood quietly but firmly for the security of our country as a ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services. He carried forth the principles of other Members of Congress from his great State of Pennsylvania in recognizing the need and fighting for the preservation of our natural resources. He was a man of great influence.

Mr. Speaker, I found LEON GAVIN to be a man of splendid character, interesting and jovial to be with. I shall miss him, as others in this body shall miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I express my deep sympathy to his family and his friends on the sad occasion of his passing.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a man who served with me on the Committee on Armed Services for some 14 years and with my father on the same committee for several years prior to that time.

I have traveled all over the world with LEON GAVIN. He was a diamond in the rough, a man who gave and asked no quarter in debate. On many occasions I know of the tremendous defense he made of the U.S. Army in the Committee on Armed Services to make certain that the mistakes made in World War I would not be repeated in the event that our country was engaged again in armed conflict.

Although he gave and asked no quarter, Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any man who had a bigger heart than LEON GAVIN. He was a pleasant man to travel with, he was an understanding individual. I considered him a real friend, not only on these trips but also as we sat together during my eight terms in the Congress on the Committee on Armed Services.

The country has lost a forceful representative, all of us have lost a good friend. I extend to his wonderful family, in whom he had such pride, a heartfelt expression of condolence.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Congressman LEON GAVIN was a man of solid personality—a strong, determined advocate in debate and a staunch supporter of legislative program proposals in the field of conservation and public improvements in depressed areas.

He was faithful to his party and yet made his own determinations in matters affecting the public interest.

He was a realist, practical and understanding of the problems of his people. He was kind and considerate of the rights of others and fought for principles to protect their interests.

He was a fighter at heart and loved to enter into spirited debate. His whole life interest was centered in his legislative work. As a dedicated Member of the House in the 20 years of his service he developed superb faculties of discernment and strongly voiced his position in the simple terms of the philosophers of old, colored by the earthy experiences of life itself. He spoke straight out, mincing no words and sparing none once he made up his mind that he was right.

He was a fearless public servant whose high integrity bespoke his honesty of purpose to service his district with a deep sense of loyalty to their needs and attitudes.

A great man has left us—the void he left is great—we of the Illinois delegation lost a loyal friend, a true statesman, and a powerful leader in our support.

The State of Pennsylvania has lost a great personage of high statesmanship and influence in this body. The Nation has lost a great patriot and public servant.

We send our heartfelt condolences to his lovely widow, Mrs. Susan Gavin, and his beloved family. May the Lord bless him and reward him with heavenly bliss.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I first became acquainted with LEON GAVIN shortly after I came to Congress about 13 years ago. About 11 years ago I became a member of the Committee on Armed Services and from that time on had been very closely associated with him. I found him to be a dedicated man, a man who never compromised on his principles, who always fought for what he believed to be right.

There are many fine things I could say about Mr. GAVIN, but one of the greatest is we have never had a man in this Congress who showed a more continuing interest in the welfare of the enlisted man in our armed services. I do not recall any legislation coming before the Committee on Armed Services where he did not take a special and leading interest in the welfare of the enlisted man. He could be compared in many ways with Ernie Pyle, the great writer of World War II, who glorified the enlisted man in the service. That was an outstanding characteristic of LEON GAVIN.

We who knew him well knew that with all of his seriousness that he had a keen sense of humor.

He was a very dear friend of mine. He was held in the very highest of respect by his colleagues. He was a man of character and a fighter for America.

We in the Committee on Armed Services will miss him in committee and all of us will miss him on the floor of the House. While I never knew his family intimately, I do know of his great devotion to them and know that they knew they had a very devoted husband, father, and grandfather.

All of us will miss LEON for a long, long time.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following gentlemen may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD: MESSRS. FULTON of Pennsylvania, MILLIKEN, SCHWEIKER, KUNKEL, WEAVER, McDADE, and AUCHINCLOSS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a real feeling of personal loss to learn of the passing of my good friend, Congressman LEON GAVIN, of Pennsylvania. I join with my other Pennsylvania colleagues in paying tribute to our longtime friend and outstanding dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation. We are all sorry to learn of the sudden passing of LEON GAVIN, who has faithfully served the Congress and his district for 21 years.

LEON GAVIN was an example for those of us who worked with him, as a man strong in his beliefs, dedicated, patriotic, and determined in his convictions.

Not only have we Members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation lost a close friend and colleague, but the whole Congress will miss LEON GAVIN, who had attained the second ranking position on the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives where he had served so patriotically and effectively. As a veteran of World War I and who served during World War II in the Congress, and continuously since that time, LEON GAVIN worked and fought for a strong defense of our good country.

I express especially to Mrs. Susan Gavin, as well as her two sons, William G. Gavin of Falls Church, Va., and Attorney John R. Gavin of McCandless Township, Allegheny County, Pa., and daughter, Mrs. Gordon Gudmestad of Seattle, Wash., my sincere sympathy in their sorrow and my deepest personal regards.

We friends will certainly miss LEON GAVIN, and his cheery, hearty greeting as he entered any delegation or committee meeting, "At ease, men, I was a private once myself." Such warm hearted and loyal friendships are really worthwhile, and LEON was a fine Congressman and a fine friend.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great shock and a profound sense of loss that I learned of the sudden death of my colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN.

During my years in the House of Representatives I came to admire and respect "LEE" GAVIN as one of the outstanding members of the Pennsylvania delegation. His life was one of dedicated public service—to his district, his State, his country, and the Committee on Armed Services on which he served so ably.

The people of the 23d Pennsylvania District have lost a real public servant and a friend in "LEE" GAVIN. He will be sorely missed by them, as well by his many colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the House where he served so many

years. To Mrs. Gavin and to his family I offer my sincere sympathy.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of sorrow that I learned of the death of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable LEON GAVIN. His constituents, his many friends in the Congress, and the people of Pennsylvania have suffered a great loss in his passing.

His unflinching devotion to duty and his dedicated service to his district, his State, and his Nation will be sorely missed. The intelligent guidance and helpful advice which he willingly gave to his younger colleagues have endeared him to many.

LEON GAVIN's unselfish leadership as head of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation will not soon be forgotten. For me, it has been a distinct honor to serve as delegation secretary under his able chairmanship.

His family and countless friends may always take comfort in knowing that LEON GAVIN has left a deep mark on the world he served so well. Claire and I extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Gavin and her family.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, never have I been more deeply shocked and grieved than when the news of the sudden death of my tried and true friend, LEON H. GAVIN, was flashed on the television last Sunday afternoon.

We had been good friends ever since LEON's first election—to the 78th Congress. In all that time, I can never remember any disagreement with him on any subject other than the friendly arguments one has here in the House in respect to differing viewpoints on legislation. But LEON was a broadminded man. You could differ with his views and opinions without fear of marring your personal relationship in even the slightest degree.

LEON was a sturdy individualist. He studied legislation carefully. He reached his own independent conclusions. He always acted for what, in his judgment, were the best interests of the Nation and the State and his district. Few people have ever worked more strenuously for the welfare of a district than did LEON for his. There are many memorials to his efforts now dotting the 23d District of Pennsylvania. In any projects or matters affecting the welfare of the State of Pennsylvania, LEON was always a leader in the battle to obtain them.

LEON was the dean of our delegation on the Republican side. He was the eighth ranking Republican in the House. For many years he had been a distinguished and valuable member of the great Committee on the Armed Services. At the time of his death, he was the second ranking Republican member. He took a tremendous interest in his committee work. He contributed greatly to the building and maintenance of the defense of our Nation in many ways through his activities on that committee.

LEON was always ready to assist a friend. I can recall many instances when he willingly and enthusiastically cooperated with me in helpful ways. He had unbounded energy and a keen sense

of humor. I will always remember the way he would come into our delegation meetings with the announcement, "At ease, I was a private once, myself."

The Nation, the Congress, the State of Pennsylvania, and in particular, the 23d District and his countless friends have suffered a great loss.

I am saddened by the loss of his warm and understanding friendship, but I am thankful for having once possessed it.

To his wife and family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Mr. GAVIN the Pennsylvania delegation, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Nation have lost a distinguished leader who ably served his country.

His loss will be particularly felt in northwestern Pennsylvania. We of Pennsylvania have closely observed his concern for the welfare of his constituents and the conscientious manner in which he handled problems facing the Nation.

He was a sincere, dedicated public servant whose election to the House 11 times indicates strongly the confidence and faith his constituents placed in him.

Mr. GAVIN, through his long tenure in office, gained a thorough knowledge of the operations of Government. His advice and counsel since I became a Member of Congress have been invaluable to me.

Mr. GAVIN had a deep interest in conservation work. He consistently fought for adequate funds for the development of forests and the fish and game resources on public lands. For his interest in this field he was presented a national award for distinguished service.

In his services as a member of the House Armed Services Committee he championed a strong America and showed a sympathetic interest to the problems and welfare of members of the armed services and veterans.

Who could forget his pride in being a sergeant of World War I. Many times when he would stride into the Pennsylvania delegation meetings where he served as dean and chairman, his top sergeant voice would boom out: "At ease men—do not stand up; I was once a private myself."

The warmth and vitality of this long-term Congressman was and is an inspiration to all of us who follow in his footsteps.

It is with deep regret that I express my sympathy to Mrs. Gavin and the members of her family.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House to extend my deepest sympathy to the family of Congressman LEON GAVIN.

Knowing LEON was to me a great privilege. He demonstrated qualities of leadership and a tireless devotion to his district, to the Congress, and to the Nation. Perhaps more important than all of these, LEON possessed rare qualities of kindness. This, more than the tremendous record of his accomplishments, will remain with me always.

LEON "fought the good fight, he finished the course, and he kept the faith." We shall all miss him deeply.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am much saddened by the untimely death of our colleague, LEON GAVIN, who represented the 23d District of Pennsylvania. He came to Congress the same year that I did and I always had a deep respect for his judgment and was honored by his friendship.

He called himself a sort of a "maverick" and indeed it is a fact that he asserted his independence not only in his thinking but in his actions. However, there is no doubt that people admired him for this quality and although he may not have agreed with you, he bore no ill will and there was no rancor in his heart. He was blessed with a constructive and keen sense of humor which he used on occasions to emphasize an argument and it would make a definite impression on his hearers. His remarks on Ground Hog Day were looked forward to by his colleagues and although his subject was always the same, there was nothing trite or repetitious about what he said and it was a delight to listen to him.

There were few men that I have known who had a greater spirit of patriotism or love for America than LEON GAVIN. He was a devoted citizen and had no patience or tolerance for any theory of government or ideology which would weaken the fundamental principles on which our Nation was founded. He was an inspiration to all with whom he came in contact and an example for all Americans in the honor and respect he gave his country.

His death leaves a void in the Congress which will be hard to fill but the memory of this great man will linger long in the hearts of those who knew him and the effectiveness of his unselfish and ardent spirit will last through the ages.

I extend my sincere sympathy to the members of his family who suffer greatly in this bereavement and I bid them take heart and comfort in the knowledge that he was a "true and faithful servant" who has attained a rich reward.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I join my fellow Members of Congress in paying tribute to the memory of a most esteemed colleague, LEON GAVIN.

In his long and distinguished career of public service, LEON GAVIN was notable for his dedication and perseverance. Determined to achieve that which he believed to be right, he worked hard and successfully for the welfare of his home State, and the Nation as a whole.

My deepest, heartfelt sympathy is offered to his family. May God's blessings sustain them in their loss.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I share the regret that has been expressed by my colleagues over the death of our colleague, LEON GAVIN. It is a very genuine regret. Here indeed was a man. His service was outstanding. We served together for a longtime. I knew him better than most. I think he was absolutely fearless in his approach to the problems before the Congress.

Here was a man who gained and held the respect of his colleagues even when he differed with them. We knew that he spoke, in his vigorous and straight

forward manner, from the heart; that he was sincere. Here was a man who loved his America, who stood up for it, who fought to preserve and protect its institutions, and who gained a great name by his devoted and unselfish service. A strong voice is gone; a strong leader is gone; a sincere and devoted American is gone. In LEON GAVIN'S death, the Nation has lost an able and articulate spokesman for good and sound government.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart indeed, as well as with a sense of shock and deepest grief that I learned of the sudden, unexpected death of my very dear friend and esteemed and admired colleague, Congressman LEON GAVIN, of the great State of Pennsylvania.

Only a few days ago I talked with him at some length in the House and in the House restaurant, but as usual, he appeared to be hale and hearty, extremely vigorous, and in good health. He looked exceptionally well, and in his characteristically lively, forceful manner, exchanged views with me on a number of pending public questions and controversies presently before the Congress.

When I left him, little realizing it was our last talk, he cheerfully wished me a good weekend and remarked that he looked forward to seeing me Monday. So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I am shocked almost beyond expression, and touched as I have seldom been by word of his truly untimely and unanticipated demise.

LEON GAVIN was one of the greatest Americans I have ever known. He was a patriot in the best sense of the word—dedicated to his country, and to the cause of free, democratic government. In war and in peace, he enthusiastically and courageously demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to the principles of our Nation and the American way of life.

He was a man of very strong convictions which he did not hesitate to express. He was a man of great humane quality who had deep feelings for his fellow man and the people of the rank and file of our citizenry. He was the true friend of the people, their stalwart champion and eager servant.

In his work on the House Armed Services Committee, which he performed with great diligence, sincerity, and high purpose, time and time again he made it clear beyond any doubt that he was not only very well informed concerning the needs but absolutely committed to meeting them promptly and efficiently in the interest of the national security and a well rounded, effective national defense. As a fellow member of the committee, like all colleagues, I greatly admired him.

His extensive experience in military action during World War I, in which he made a distinguished record, gave him a deep insight into the problems of the armed services and enabled him to make particularly valuable contributions to the deliberations and work of our committee.

Endowed with great natural ability, impeccable character, high ideals, devotion to lofty principles and an eagerness to serve his district, State and country,

LEON GAVIN has left us all a legacy of able, devoted public service which will long remain an inspiration.

He will long be remembered in this historic Chamber for his rugged Americanism, his profound love of freedom, his able, dedicated service, his outstanding patriotism, and the depth of his compassion for the inarticulate, the poor, helpless, and the needy.

In the passing of LEON GAVIN, a devout and God fearing soul, I have lost a dear and valued friend. The House has lost one of its most able and zealous Members. His district has lost an outstanding representative, and the Nation has lost a loyal and devoted patriot and public servant.

My heart goes out to his bereaved family whom he loved so dearly—his gracious helpmate and wife, Mrs. Gavin, his loving sons, their families and all his dear ones, whose loss is so great, so poignant and so deeply felt.

I hope that in this great sorrow that has come to them with such crushing suddenness that the good Lord will bring them true reconciliation, strength, consolation and peace, and I hope and pray that our beloved and cherished friend, LEON, may find everlasting surcease and rest in his heavenly home.

Mr. SCHNEEBELL. Mr. Speaker, the dean of our Pennsylvania Republican delegation, LEON GAVIN, was a friendly, lovable, and dedicated legislator. Since the beginning of this year, when he was elected our delegation chairman, LEON brought our group together much more closely as a unit by his sympathetic leadership and we shall certainly miss him on the floor and as presiding official at our biweekly meetings. He worked hard at building our group into a harmonious unit and he was most cooperative with each of us in the delegation.

LEON took his legislative responsibilities most seriously and he was ever trying to determine his proper course of action. He was dogged in his objectives, as was noted in his recent success in having secured approval for authorization for the Kinzua Dam project in his congressional district. He had many odds and disadvantages to overcome in achieving this success but he was relentless and driving until he finally succeeded.

LEON enjoyed tremendously his work as a Congressman and he was rightfully proud of his many accomplishments in behalf of his ideals. We shall miss him and his beneficial guidance and counsel in the future. Mrs. Schneebell and I extend our deep sympathy to Mrs. Gavin in her grief and sorrow resulting from LEON's sudden and tragic passing.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to me, and to my staff, on learning of the untimely passing of Congressman LEON H. GAVIN.

Mr. GAVIN was in his 21st year as a Representative of the 23d District of Pennsylvania. He was second ranking minority member of the House Committee on Armed Services, and dean of the Republican delegation from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN was deeply interested in flood control and devoted his untiring efforts toward the completion of an im-

portant project for the construction of the \$100 million Allegheny River reservoir dam in Warren County, Pa. His great interest in wildlife was indicated by his acceptance as a House representative on the National Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

LEON GAVIN was one of the first Members I met when I became a Member of the 86th Congress. Because our offices are adjacent, a close friendship and warm relationship developed between us and members of our staffs. He was helpful to me in setting up my office and his staff has been very cooperative with mine.

LEON was not only my colleague, but a close personal friendship existed between us. His loss will be keenly felt by not only his constituency but by the entire membership of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Gavin, his lovely daughter, and two sons for the great loss they have sustained. May God grant him peace everlasting.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the sudden death of our colleague, LEON GAVIN, who was dean of the Pennsylvania Republican congressional delegation.

I knew LEON through the years of our service in the Congress as a sincere friend and gentleman who, although on the opposite side of the aisle, was always ready to cooperate whenever he thought the case was just or whenever the action would be of benefit to our country and State.

He represented the 23d District in northwestern Pennsylvania with conscientious ability. He was elected by comfortable majorities for 11 terms, which is evidence of the esteem in which he was held by his constituency.

He was the second ranking minority member of the House Armed Services Committee. He served that committee and this Congress with distinction.

He was a good man, a sincere, earnest, able, and hard-working legislator. He will be missed, not only by this Congress but by the State of Pennsylvania and the Nation. To his widow and his children who survive him, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, once more we gather in the hushed atmosphere of this room to speak softly but sincerely of a colleague whose voice has been stilled by the firm hand of our Maker. There is a certain amount of regret in our hearts as we rise in eulogy; regret that our departed colleague is not present to hear what we say; regret that many of our words were not uttered long ago.

LEON GAVIN walked up to me in this very Chamber the Thursday before his death. We had our usual friendly chat and the subject turned to the problems of maintaining good health. I was pleased to hear that LEON apparently had none of the problems that face others. He remarked that he had never felt better. His words were sadly recalled 3 days later as the flags were lowered to half-mast in his memory.

We will miss LEON GAVIN's dedication to the principles of good government.

We will miss his devotion to his country and to this legislative body. We will miss his vast experience as a lawmaker.

Ground Hog Day will never be quite the same without his pertinent remarks on the subject.

We will long remember his forceful and persuasive voice as he faced this body, a voice that could and often did put a certain amount of fear into the hearts of his listeners. Unless you knew LEON GAVIN well, you might not perceive the quiet, thoughtful personality within.

Our sincere sympathy is extended to his family in their hour of sorrow. We, too, will miss LEON GAVIN, an American statesman who gave his full measure to the preservation of the freedoms he held so dear.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with the death of LEON GAVIN, the House of Representatives has been deprived of a dedicated, able, and conscientious Member.

The State of Pennsylvania and his Congressional district have lost a public servant whose entire political career was distinguished by the highest sense of duty and service.

Those of us in this House who were privileged to know him well have lost a valued friend and a wise colleague.

His family, to whom we all extend our heartfelt sympathies, have lost a devoted husband and father.

LEON GAVIN was his own man. His stand on public issues was dictated by his head, his heart, and his conscience. This independence was an inspiration to all of us and a source of the profound respect in which we all held him.

LEON GAVIN is dead, but he has left us a rich heritage.

He has left this House a better place as a result of his 20 years of service here.

He has left his country a stronger nation, especially as a result of his keen interest in conservation and his work on the Armed Services Committee.

And he has left to each of us a noble gift indeed—the memory of a man whose life exemplified the highest ideals of honor and integrity.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join our colleagues on this sad occasion in paying tribute to our departed friend, the late LEON HARRY GAVIN, Representative from Pennsylvania.

It was my privilege to meet LEON soon after I became a Member of the 83d Congress. We represented different regions of this great Nation. We were members of different political faiths and we never served together on a committee of the Congress, but we became good friends and I cherished this friendship.

This was a man who was dedicated in the service of his State and his country. I had the deepest respect for his ability, for his knowledge and for his long and effective service in the House of Representatives.

I know that the people of Pennsylvania have lost a noble son. Our Nation has lost one of her finest citizens and most able legislators.

To Mrs. Gavin and her children, I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I note today the passing

of one of our dear friends and colleagues from Pennsylvania, LEON GAVIN.

It was my privilege to have served with him during his 21-year career in the House, and I shall long retain fond memories of our association.

Over the years LEON GAVIN earned the respect and esteem of every Member of this body. He was a man of immense character; more so, he was a man of his word. His dedication and determination were well known to his colleagues as well as to his constituents who reelected him on 10 consecutive occasions. He was an ardent partisan, but an independent voter, and he cherished his independence.

It is said that a man is best judged by those with whom he works. I think I can speak for the whole House when I say that in the estimation of his colleagues, LEON GAVIN was a fine man.

We are all a little poorer with the loss of any valued item, but we are poorer still with the loss of a good friend.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in expressing admiration for the life and works of our late colleague, LEON H. GAVIN, I want to recall that during this—my first term—it was my privilege to have my office next door to his in the Longworth House Office Building.

Mr. GAVIN was cordial and friendly to me as well as to others with whom he came in contact. A legislator of courage and conviction, he expressed his considered views articulately, both on and off the floor of the House of Representatives. He gave modestly the benefit of his wisdom, gained from a lifetime of experience and adherence to the highest principles.

The spirit and the wisdom of LEON H. GAVIN, esteemed and long-time Member of Congress from the 23d District of Pennsylvania, will live on—in the Halls of Congress and in the memory of his colleagues. The respect and praise expressed on this occasion can attest in only a small measure to the high esteem in which we have always held him.

In joining in these expressions of respect for my friend and colleague, the late LEON H. GAVIN, I want also to communicate my deep and heartfelt sympathy to his beloved widow and children.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today there is a void in this historic Chamber and in our hearts is the pang of a personal grief. It is difficult to understand the pattern of life. Only on last Thursday as I was coming through the tunnel to the Capitol I was charmed, as I have been on many occasions during many years, by the heart-warming voice of LEON GAVIN in greeting of a colleague and a friend. He seemed in the full vibrancy of life and there was no indication in his manner or his appearance that it was the last time I was to hear a voice that long association and warm friendship had endeared to me. I was shocked when I heard of his passing in a radio news broadcast on Sunday.

LEON GAVIN was genuine in everything that he did and he was genuine in every word that he uttered. There was nothing artificial about LEON GAVIN. Affectation was foreign to his nature. I shall always remember him as a great American who in high public office lived up

to the tradition that a public official is a public servant.

I shall always remember his speeches from the well of the House, his ringing voice, his employment of plain and understandable words, his ardor, his so apparent sincerity in his convictions. In the seven Congresses in which I have served with him I cannot recall a single occasion when the Speaker had to call the House to order because the Members were not listening.

In his passing I have lost a beloved friend and I shall miss him sadly. I share in the grief of his wife and children, and to them I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our colleague and good friend LEON GAVIN touched me with deep sadness.

It was my privilege to have his friendship and counsel during my entire service in the House of Representatives, and this association is one that I will always treasure.

LEON GAVIN was always an eager and able participant in the legislative proceedings of this Chamber, and he was held in the highest regard by the Members of this body. As both a person and a legislator he will be sorely missed.

Mrs. McIntire joins with me in extending heartfelt sympathy to the members of the Gavin family.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness today that I join other Members of the U.S. House of Representatives in paying tribute to the life and the service of the late, the honorable, and the beloved LEON HARRY GAVIN, who so ably represented the 23d District of Pennsylvania in the U.S. Congress. To his family and his legion of friends, Mrs. Hemphill and I extend our deep and continuing sympathy.

It was not my privilege to know Congressman GAVIN intimately. Like so many others, I only knew him through his appearance and his work here on the national scene. He was a man of honor, and a source of aggressiveness. He was determined and he was dedicated. All of us recognize that he strictly attended to the business of the Congress, especially the business of the Armed Services Committee on which he was so valuable a member for so many years.

We can take example from him. Example of service and dedication and dignity. I would hope that his family and friends find comfort in the reflection of a useful life lived by a man who was truly a great American.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I learned of the sudden passing of our distinguished and beloved colleague, LEON H. GAVIN of Pennsylvania, for he was my good and old friend.

For 21 years, LEON GAVIN served faithfully and well in the House. He represented a mixed industrial and farming area in northwestern Pennsylvania and, unfortunately, died before the completion of a project in which he was greatly interested and which consumed much of his interest and effort—the \$100 million Allegheny River reservoir dam now being constructed in Warren County, Pa. He

was the second ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee and the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation. He was a sincere, hardworking Member whose bright bits of levity occasionally lightened the arduous proceedings of this body.

LEON GAVIN was a kind and friendly man without malice who devoted himself to the interests of the people of his home community and to the welfare of our country. He will be greatly missed by all of us who were privileged to know him and to serve with him. I extend to Mrs. Gavin and to his sons and daughter my deep and heartfelt sympathy on their great loss. I hope that they will find consolation in the thought that LEON had a long and active life and leaves behind a rich heritage of public service.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of my respected colleague, Representative LEON GAVIN, of Pennsylvania's 23d District.

Representative GAVIN was dean of the Republican delegation from Pennsylvania and was highly respected by all Members of Congress of both political parties.

I have known LEON as a very good friend ever since I came to the Congress. His cordiality, good humor, and dedication to public service made him a justly revered friend and an outstanding Congressman.

I join all of his colleagues in offering my condolences to Representative GAVIN's family.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues in expressing deep sorrow and regret over the passing of a revered and valued Member of the House.

It was my great privilege to serve with LEON GAVIN on the House Committee on Armed Services. There, and on the floor of the House, I came to know and respect this man as a loyal and distinguished public servant; as a courageous American dedicated to the ideals of our country and to those policies which he believed would enable us to achieve and maintain our greatness.

"Sarge" GAVIN, with his voice and bearing, brought the image of the first sergeant to the Halls of Congress. He was proud of his well-earned nickname and responded to it with zest. His comrades of World War I and his colleagues seldom could remember LEON—it was always "Sarge," and it stuck. The U.S. Army has lost a devoted and loving advocate. His support of the "GI" was unceasing. "Sarge" GAVIN's colorful presence in the House where he served so faithfully for so long leaves an enormous void. But the legend of "Sarge" will be remembered wherever "dogfaces" and "doughboys" get together.

Mrs. Cohelan joins with me in extending our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Gavin and their children.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in my 15 years of service in the Congress, I have never known a more conscientious, more dedicated, hardworking Congressman than LEON HARRY GAVIN. He gave his life in the service of his country. From the time he was a soldier in World War

I, he fought for a strong national defense; he was a great statesman, and America is a more secure nation as a result of his dedication, patriotism, and outstanding service.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in deepest sympathy to his devoted family.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I feel a real sense of personal loss in the death of my friend, LEON GAVIN.

He was a dedicated, working Member of the House. Beneath his brusque exterior and his readiness to fight for what he believed to be right, all of which led me to affectionately address him as "Scrap Iron," there was a warm and friendly heart. Members of the House will miss his presence and will not soon forget him.

I join with my colleagues in extending sincere condolences to Mrs. Gavin and the other members of his family.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked, along with other Members of Congress, to learn of the death of LEON H. GAVIN.

Ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have known him quite intimately. Through the years I have appreciated the assistance and advice he has so generously given me.

I was particularly fortunate in obtaining his advice on matters dealing with the Military Establishment. He devoted so much time and energy to this field and was truly expert in it.

His loss will be deeply felt in the House of Representatives, his community, and in our country.

I offer my heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to learn of the passing of my friend and colleague, the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN. The State of Pennsylvania, as well as the entire Nation, has lost one of its most outstanding citizens.

It was my privilege to serve with LEON on the House Armed Services Committee for many years. I have never known a more dedicated and patriotic American and I am certain that, through his effective and untiring efforts as a member of the committee, he made many lasting contributions to the defense of the country he loved so well.

LEON GAVIN will be greatly missed by his colleagues in the House and I know the people of his congressional district will find the task of replacing him a difficult one indeed.

To his devoted wife and other members of the family, I extend deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues this afternoon in paying my deep respect to our distinguished former colleague, LEON GAVIN, whose sudden death last Saturday night was a great shock and loss to all of us.

LEON was a hard-working and conscientious Representative, an outstanding citizen, and a credit to his State and to the Nation. Since his election to Congress in 1942, his service to the people of his district won for him their utmost faith and confidence, which was evidenced by the overwhelming majorities with which he was continuously returned to Congress.

LEON GAVIN was particularly interested in conservation, and had been honored nationally by the National Parks Association, the Izaak Walton League, and other organizations and societies, for his great work in this field.

We shall miss him greatly, and I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep sadness in the loss of my good friend, our colleague, LEON GAVIN. Since coming to the Congress 5 years ago I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving with LEON on the great Committee on Armed Services. I had come to have a high regard for his integrity, for his outspoken courage, for his independence, and for his dogged persistence in behalf of those causes in which he deeply believed.

As one who had served in the Army in World War I, LEON GAVIN was always an effective spokesman in our committee for the Army, indeed more particularly for the hard-working, plodding, unsung rank-and-file infantryman who really wins the battles and wins the wars, even in this mechanized and computerized age of ours. Even with the growing complexity of sophisticated and automated weapons systems, LEON GAVIN never let our committee or those representing the Department of Defense who appeared before us forget that after all we needed to look out for the men whose courage and whose willingness to run risks really provided the core of our military preparedness.

Mr. Speaker, GI Joe lost a real friend and champion in the passing of LEON GAVIN, and we too in this Congress have lost a dear and a thoughtful and a devoted colleague. I only hope that as a result of my own years of association with LEON GAVIN perhaps something of his concern for the man who wears the pack, the man who carries the rifle, the man who walks and climbs instead of riding—the so-called little man, whether it be in military operations or in any other field of human endeavor—has rubbed off on me and that in that committee which LEON loved so devotedly and which he served so effectively we can all join together in the months ahead to carry on the fight that he had come to make so distinctively his own.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing the sense of loss that the Congress and the Nation have suffered in the death of LEON GAVIN. It was my privilege to serve with LEON on the Armed Services Committee.

As the second ranking minority member of that committee, he made a lasting contribution to the security and well-being of our country. He had a great sense of responsibility both to his constituents and to the Nation as a whole, and he always applied his vast experience toward the solution of the difficult issues before our committee.

He will be missed by all of us, and I want to express my sympathy to his family, even while assuring them that the impact of his dedication to principle will always remain among us.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our colleague, LEON GAVIN,

deprives the Congress and the House of one of its most effective Members. Likewise it deprives the Nation of one of its most devoted and patriotic citizens.

LEON GAVIN was always in the forefront of any legislative issue involving the defense of our country and he was an ardent and vigorous debater. Also in matters of interest to his country, his State, and his legislative district he never failed to actively fulfill his responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, all Members on both sides of the aisle respected LEON GAVIN and held him in real esteem and affection.

Certainly, our departed colleague will be greatly missed and fondly remembered in the years to come.

His death is a real loss and I join his friends and colleagues in expressing profound regret. A great legislator, a good citizen and a genuine and good man has gone to his reward.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Pennsylvania and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late colleague, LEON H. GAVIN, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whose sudden death has saddened us all.

Congressman GAVIN has had a long and distinguished career of service as a Member of this body. He was an important and well respected and esteemed member of the Committee on Armed Services. He was a gentleman of integrity and character who served honorably and well his district, State, and Nation.

I knew LEON GAVIN as a warm friend and colleague. During my early years of service in the House, I lived in the same apartment building with Congressman GAVIN and we began a friendship at that time which continued through the years.

I know of his great fight to secure approval of appropriations to have built in Pennsylvania the great Allegheny Dam. He fought tirelessly for the things he believed to be best for his district and State—and I admired him for his great work and dedication. He was a great American and will be greatly missed.

I extend to Mrs. Gavin and to the other members of his family an expression of my most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of loss that I join with my colleagues in mourning the death of LEON H. GAVIN. His death on Saturday at the age of 70 was a severe blow to me, and he will be sorely missed in this House where he served so long and so notably.

Not only was his death a shocking blow to all who knew him but also to those whom he served in the greater State and Nation. I say this because LEON GAVIN spoke for the entire Nation as well as for the district he represented in northwestern Pennsylvania.

A distinguished Republican in the House, and the second ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee, LEON GAVIN was not a rubber stamp for any man, and often voted against the wishes of his party if he felt that a particular issue was not in the best interest of the Nation.

Congressman GAVIN impressed his colleagues in many ways, Mr. Speaker, and was a great source of inspiration to the younger Members of this body.

A dedicated wildlife expert, and the House representative on the National Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, LEON GAVIN fought diligently for a sound national wildlife program. I personally benefited from his warm and gracious advice on numerous occasions.

On a working basis, it would be hard to imagine a more genuine man, and daily meetings with him were a thing of great joy. His wit was precious, and he was a serious man. This is a rare distinction in times like these. He will be greatly missed, and I want to extend my deepest sympathies to his wife and three children.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened last Sunday when I learned of the passing of our colleague, LEON GAVIN. I wish to extend my sincere sympathy to our colleagues from Pennsylvania on this great loss, which all of us share with them.

I recall when LEON GAVIN came to the House. We had mutual friends in my hometown of Trinidad, Colo., who had known LEON in Pennsylvania. This gave us a common interest and I soon learned to appreciate his many sterling qualities. We had many pleasant visits and I always enjoyed talking to him.

LEON GAVIN was a sincere and dedicated public servant. He was most diligent in looking after the interests of his people. He was enthusiastic about any work in which he was engaged. There was never any question as to where LEON GAVIN stood on issues considered by the House.

I liked LEON and I am going to miss him. His passing is a distinct loss, not only to his district, but to his State and the entire Nation. He was an able and efficient legislator, and served in this body with great distinction. LEON GAVIN was a patriotic American, and a champion of constitutional Government.

I extend my deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Gavin and the children.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, LEON GAVIN was elected to the 78th Congress. He and I entered Congress together and I have known him quite well throughout the time he served in this body. For a number of years both of us have been members of the House Armed Services Committee. These associations have given me an opportunity to become well acquainted with him and to understand and appreciate his many outstanding qualities.

LEON GAVIN was an honorable man. He was an uncompromising enemy of graft and corruption in any form and was one of the leaders in the House in opposition to waste and extravagance in the operation of the Federal Government.

LEON was a fighter and a very articulate advocate of principles of good government which he espoused. At the same time, he was very humble and took more than a passing interest in the little things in the lives of the people with whom he was associated. He was indeed a beloved character who fought the good

fight and achieved and deserved the plaudits, the admiration and respect of all his colleagues. I extend to the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, LEON GAVIN was my friend and I shall miss him. All of us shall miss him and that makes our sorrow all the more poignant.

I have many enjoyable memories of association on the Committee on Armed Services and although our political views differed we were drawn together by virtue of the fact we were both World War I veterans. This was a strong tie.

It was my good fortune to travel to Europe on more than one occasion with Mr. GAVIN. We were both interested in history, particularly that of World War I. We visited several of its battlefields and cemeteries together.

Like you, I shall miss LEON GAVIN but I am the better for having known him and to have considered him a personal friend.

Mrs. Miller joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Gavin and his family.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grief at the loss of a friend. LEON GAVIN, of Pennsylvania, who so ably represented the 23d District, which adjoins mine in New York State, is gone from this Chamber.

LEE GAVIN served in the 6th Division in the First World War. He was always a "top sergeant" who exhibited a bulldog tenacity to his principles which were so greatly admired in this House. His was a deep commitment to his district. Few Congressmen can match his record of devotion to public works. He worked tirelessly to advance the development of his area, searching out and grasping onto those ideas which could help the people of the 23d District. It was with a sense of duty, for example, that he opposed to the Area Redevelopment Administration amendments this year, and he was tortured by the necessity to vote "no" on this program which might have brought some superficial assistance but which, in the long run, he felt, was unwise.

As this House knows well, he was an energetic and dynamic proponent of the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania. I was against the construction of the dam until all possible alternatives were explored. LEE GAVIN was a stalwart and worthy opponent. On several occasions Congress heard his impassioned plea for Kinzua. I can hear his voice rising now in righteous indignation.

LEE GAVIN was a strong and vigorous legislator. Perhaps more important, he was an effective Representative.

To us who were his colleagues, he was a warm and generous friend, with a gentle and wry humor. He is gone but his district and this House cannot forget what he has done, and what he was.

May God give his family the strength to endure their loss. They have our sympathy. May God also grant this House more men like LEON GAVIN.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to me to learn of the sudden

and unexpected passing of my longtime friend and colleague, the Honorable LEON GAVIN, of Pennsylvania.

It is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to him. He long will be remembered in these Halls of Congress for he was, indeed, a man of deep convictions, a man of courage and determination. As second ranking minority member of the House Committee on Armed Services, he continually worked for the welfare of the enlisted men of the U.S. Armed Forces.

LEON GAVIN's life was dedicated to public service. The people of his district, of his beloved State of Pennsylvania, and of the entire country will surely miss the able leadership of our departed friend. To his wife, his sons, and his daughter, I extend my heartfelt sympathy upon their great loss.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentlemen referred to above.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 23

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader if he can give us the program for next week.

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

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are no bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia to be considered on that day.

However, there will be taken up five travel authority resolutions from the Committee on Rules, as follows:

House Resolution 510, Committee on the Judiciary.

House Resolution 514, Committee on Agriculture.

House Resolution 515, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963, which will come up under a closed rule with 8 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, we have finished the legislative business for this week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House

adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very fortunate, particularly at this time of the world's history, that we have as Vice President of our country, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. The Members of both branches of the Congress are very proud of the Vice President, who has served in both branches of the Congress, beginning his public career on the national level in the National House of Representatives. He ably cooperates with President Kennedy, with great ability and loyalty, in the conduct of our country's affairs. On several occasions, he has represented our country abroad, as an ambassador of goodwill; there is no one who surpasses him from the United States.

Vice President JOHNSON has just returned from a trip abroad, during which time people of the several countries he visited received him with enthusiasm and friendship. His recent trip abroad was a great success in the national interest of our country.

In my remarks I include a splendid and interesting article entitled "Johnson Again Able Ambassador," written by Gould Lincoln, and appearing in the Washington Evening Star of September 17, 1963.

JOHNSON AGAIN ABLE AMBASSADOR

(By Gould Lincoln)

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON'S goodwill tour of the Scandinavian countries, from which he returned today, has been a

major success, judging by the warm receptions accorded him, Mrs. Johnson, and their daughter, Lynda Bird. The tour, which was proposed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk with President Kennedy's approval, came at an excellent time. The nuclear test ban treaty had been negotiated and hailed as a step—a first step—toward lessening of world tension, particularly between Communist Russia and her satellites and the nations of the West. It was part of the Vice President's mission to stress again the need of the West to keep its guard up—to maintain unity of purpose and defense against any possible Communist aggression. This meant a strengthening of NATO—not a weakening, not a time for complacency and letting the guard down.

Not since the Vice President's historic and successful trip to West Berlin in August 1961, a week after the Communists had sealed off, with wire and wall, East Berlin from West Berlin, have the Vice President's talents been used more effectively. At that time the West Berliner's morale was at a low ebb, and so was that of all West Germany, fearing that Britain, France, and the United States might be lessening their determination to maintain the freedom of West Berlin. Mr. JOHNSON gave them the reassurance they needed, along with a pledge that this country would live up to its promises to the people of West Berlin. And at the same time President Kennedy sent the Vice President to West Berlin, he ordered 1,500 additional U.S. troops to join the 11,000 already in that city. A million West Berliners turned out to welcome and to cheer the arrival of the Vice President. At one point, he hopped out of his automobile and walked briskly along for five blocks, shaking hands with the West Berliners and stopping to kiss babies.

RENEWS U.S. PLEDGE

It was with the same friendly handclaps that the Vice President met the thousands of Swedes, Norwegians, Finlanders, and Danes who greeted him on his arrival in their countries on the last trip. His last visit was to Iceland before his final flight back to the United States. The tall Texan has an attitude for making friends, and winning the confidence of people. While the trip was not made under such dramatic conditions and during such stress as was his visit to West Berlin 2 years ago, it nevertheless had its value, at a time when there has been much suggestion that United States and Britain were inclined to ease off, to let the nations of Western Europe look to themselves. As he did in West Germany and West Berlin, the Vice President pledged again and again the willingness of the United States to fulfill 100 percent its obligations.

Geographically, these Scandinavian countries border or are close to Soviet territory to the north and west of Russia. Their cooperation, in case of need in any crisis with the Communists, would be valuable. They are in position to block the straits leading into the Baltic Sea, Russia's way out by water to the North Sea and far reaches of the Atlantic. In the past, these countries have not had an opportunity to see and welcome a Vice President of the United States, and it was a good stroke, diplomatically as well as realistically, to send Mr. JOHNSON among them.

SAMPLE OF REACTION

A sample of how the Swedes felt about his visit is contained in an editorial appearing in Ny Tid (Social Democratic) published in Goteberg, which reads in part: "The Swedes can feel proud now that for the first time they are paid a visit by a Vice President of the United States. The Gotebergers also feel proud as the program provides room for a quick visit to their city. Since we are not allied with the United States (Sweden remained neutral in the last World War) there

are hardly any urgent reasons for either President Kennedy or his alternate to control on the spot the tenure of our relations. When, nevertheless we receive a visit it probably is because we mean, or are considered to mean, something in the world. LYNDON JOHNSON has been given a much better reception in the Swedish press than Nikita Khrushchev, both when the latter cancelled his visit after the press attacks and when some newspapers now want him to cancel it anew." The editorial spoke highly of Mr. JOHNSON'S abilities.

In Denmark, the Vice President called for continued NATO defense efforts, and he voiced the same plea in Norway. He impressed on their leaders the need for being on guard in periods of relative relaxation—such as that which may follow the ratification of the test ban treaty. He received assurance on their part.

The Vice President discussed many other questions of interest, like shipping and trade. He still has his report to make to the President, which he is expected to do promptly.

MARCH ON THE STATE CAPITOL IN MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, last night I called upon the President and the Attorney General, in their conference today with Martin Luther King of Atlanta, to request that the ill-conceived and contemplated march on the State capitol in Montgomery be abandoned.

The morning press reports that members of the so-called Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is arriving in force in Birmingham. This is a time for outside agitators to stay out of Birmingham and out of Alabama.

Practically everyone in Alabama deplores the deaths caused by the recent bombings in Birmingham. The Governor of Alabama and all law enforcement officers of the State, county, and city governments are doing everything within their power to bring those guilty of these crimes to justice. All of these agencies are diligently working with the FBI in an all-out effort to solve the crimes. Generous rewards have been offered by the Governor of the State, by other local governmental agencies, as well as by organizations and individuals.

It is most regrettable that there are some who will exploit this unfortunate and tragic occurrence. Looking for a scapegoat is going to do no one any good. Some of the Negro leaders are criticizing Governor Wallace and charging him indirectly—by his actions—with the responsibility for these crimes. He has, of course, been no party to such, and I am sure he deplores this occurrence as much as anyone in the State. The Governor's fight for segregation in the schools has never advocated violence in any form; and, if responsibility is to be placed, it can be placed more on the continual influx of outside agitators to Birmingham and to the whole State.

In the city of Montgomery, the capital of the State of Alabama, the two races

are living in peace and harmony, and the citizens of both races there do not approve of this senseless march.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes a statement can be technically accurate and yet totally misleading.

I regret to say that the President of the United States made such a statement last night in his address to the Nation on pending tax legislation.

I quote the President's statement:

In fact, there are fewer Federal civilian employees today than there were 10 years ago.

That statement is technically accurate.

As of July 31 of this year, there were 112,088 fewer Federal civilian employees than on January 31, 1953.

As a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee let me relate the rest of the story which the President did not tell.

At the low point of Federal civilian employment during President Eisenhower's administration, the figure was 315,267 below the 1953 total when Mr. Eisenhower took office.

At the end of Mr. Eisenhower's term in January 1961, the net reduction in Federal civilian employment for his 8 years in office was 280,667.

As of July 31 of this year, after 2½ years of Mr. Kennedy's New Frontier, Federal civilian employment has increased 168,579 to the total of 2,537,353.

President Kennedy did not tell the American people that last night.

Let us keep the record straight.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT INTERVENTION IN THE NORTHEAST AIRLINES CASE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is of more than passing interest to note that the Civil Aeronautics Board has told the Justice Department to get out of the Northeast Airlines case.

Justice Department intervention in this case has all the earmarks of the improper type of interference with independent regulatory agencies that was deplored by various Democrat political figures, notably in the Sherman Adams-Goldfine case, the problems of personal contacts with FCC Commissioner Richard Mack, as well as similar activity in other regulatory agencies.

Congress deplored that activity, and properly so. We should be even more

concerned now that Justice Department power should be used in the manner it is being used in this case.

It is understandable why some New England legislators would be interested in the future of an airline based in that area. However, it seems incredible that Justice Department intervention would be sought or that Attorney General Kennedy would permit Justice Department intervention. We can hope that the CAB action stops it.

BRACERO CASUALTIES IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a horrible, tragic accident occurred in my district, just outside my hometown of Salinas, 2 days ago. Twenty-nine men lost their lives, four more may die; a number more were seriously injured.

The accident was so stunning and so grievous that people in my district could do little more than convey genuine, although almost totally inadequate, condolences to the bereaved families, friends, and associates of these men. Of course, no reference hereinafter made by me applies to or refers to a colleague. I certainly do not impugn the motive or interest of any colleague for being concerned with this accident. Many Members of Congress have demonstrated a genuine concern and appreciation for the individual bracero.

However, there will be ghouls and demagogues outside of Congress, so crass, so insensitive, so depraved, they will attempt to make personal, political capital out of this tragedy. Even while some men hover perilously near death, while some men still cling tenaciously to life, while others are dying; these base exploiters will stoop to misrepresentations, false claims, and distortions concerning the accident, to achieve their miserable goals. When a cause lacks merit, the advocates often resort to misrepresentations of facts and distortions of the issues. If an objective is so weak, if arguments are so unpersuasive that a terrible accident, death, and grief must be wrenched into the debate, all decent people will have cause to be ashamed, if not nauseated by the methods.

The only circumstance of this particular accident which distinguishes it from other such horrendous accidents is that most of the dead, dying, and injured are braceros—Mexican nationals working temporarily in this country under Public Law 78 as supplemental farmworkers. This simple, singular circumstance may be an open sesame for some evil minds to exploit the sudden death, misery, and grief for political and economic profit, without scruple or decency. Such crass reaction would be unthinkable if the dead were schoolchildren, football players, Boy Scouts, GI's, or art dilettantes.

In a belief that all of my colleagues in the House want to make their decisions on fact rather than emotion, that they seek the truth and abhor taking advan-

tage of death, pain and sorrow, I want to report my findings concerning this shocking accident. I know the area where the accident occurred. I have talked with reputable reporters who were on the scene, the TV photographer who took the ghastly pictures you have seen, officials of the California Highway Patrol who worked this assignment, the county coroner and some others. Reconstruction of the events leading up to the accident and the facts of the accident itself, with absolute certainty, is humanly impossible, but the consensus now is as follows:

The farmworkers were returning from work in a celery field; some were domestics, most were braceros. Their bus, not a truck, accommodated 69 passengers—although only 60 were aboard. The bus was a late model, well constructed, properly equipped, in good condition and met all the rigid California State safety regulations. Although I have not read the regulations of all other States relating to labor buses, I believe no other State has more rigid safety and comfort requirements than California.

The bus was being driven by a legal resident of the United States—a "greencarder"—not a bracero. The driver held a valid California chauffeur's license and was duly qualified to drive the vehicle.

The bus was approaching U.S. Highway 101 about 8 miles south of Salinas, on a private grade crossing of the Southern Pacific Railroad at 4:27 p.m. The weather was clear and daylight. The windows of the driver's cab appeared to have been open.

There may be a conflict of evidence regarding whether the bus stopped momentarily or stopped completely and then proceeded onto the railway tracks.

The diesel engine of a northbound Southern Pacific freight train struck the bus midcenter of the passenger section, at an approximate speed of 65 miles per hour. The tremendous impact draped the bus over the front end of the train, dragging it a half mile before screeching to a stop. Debris and bodies were strewn the distance. The train was not derailed. There was no fire.

Twenty-two were found dead at the scene; four more were dead on arrival at nearby hospitals in Salinas; two died during the first night; one succumbed yesterday; four are still critical.

The driver, miraculously, was uninjured. He is being held in the county jail charged with felony manslaughter. As gross as his negligence may have been, I have only the greatest pity for him. His punishment has already been enormous. His remorse cannot be measured or appreciated by any other man.

What more can a person say about such a sad, horrible event. My pity for the driver, my grief and condolences for the survivors and the families and friends of the deceased is exceeded only by my anger and contempt for those who may attempt to use this accident for their mean political or economic purpose or benefit.

In my district where the farmworker, whether domestic or bracero, is appreciated, respected, treated decently, and fairly paid, we are just as sorry and sad

for the Mexican as for the American citizen.

I am disgusted to nausea to report the following remark—not by a Congressman or public official—relating to the multiple deaths: "Well, there will be at least 28 more jobs for Americans." The blatant crudeness and falseness deserves no comment. Another remark: "This ought to scare some of those 'wetbacks' from coming to this country." This is a shamefully crass remark, which I loathe to repeat, but which needs to be reported.

Many of us who know something about these labor buses want to refute the accusations that they are unfit for men and that the passengers are treated like animals. These are the same buses which are often borrowed to transport our Boy Scouts, Little Leaguers, church students. We have as much concern for the safety of our Boy Scouts, our Little Leaguers, and our church students and our farm workers as any other community.

In spite of a myriad of general and specific laws and regulations of the governmental agencies and of the practices of the farming and food processing industries, designed to insure the safety and comfort of all farm workers, some accidents are certain to occur. In spite of the most diligent efforts, the most prudent conduct, the best equipment, and the most modern safeguards, accidents will occur involving airplanes, trains, school buses, and labor buses. We are grateful that the number is small.

Any future argument that we should abandon the bracero program because of one unfortunate accident, even though caused by the gross negligence of one man, will employ the most tortured and wretched logic.

Any such demagogic logic, exploitation of grief, or wrenching of profit from tragedy, would have outlawed soccer in England—some 20 players—a whole team—died in an airplane crash in Yugoslavia—football in California—where our own San Luis Obispo Cal-Poly football team was killed in an airplane accident in Toledo, Ohio, in 1961—and where perhaps even more negligence was involved—public schools in Greeley, Colo.—where some 26 youngsters were killed in an almost identical accident just 2 years ago—U.S. Army—where some 16 POW's were killed in a bus returning from work in a sugar beet field in Michigan in 1945—the Atlanta, Ga., Art Association—where over 100 Americans were killed when an Air France charter crashed in Paris less than 2 years ago.

I do not recall anybody being so perverted, so insensitive, so crass as to exploit these other tragedies. I am certain that every Member of Congress will reject and shun any future attempt to convert this tragic accident into an argument against an extension of the bracero program.

If this great tragedy had to occur, and I do not pretend to understand God's will, perhaps it is well that it occurred in my district. Adequate hospital facilities, three; ambulances, many; blood, free—American Red Cross—doctors, nurses were available. Doctors, nurses, aids worked around the clock. The grim work of the California Highway Pa-

trol required doubling of many assignments. The officers and deputies of the sheriff and coroner performed admirably. The news media discharged their obligations well. I believe the governmental agencies which investigate and evaluate this accident will report that the community responded magnificently to the worst tragedy in California bus history. Lives were saved, grief was cushioned, pain was alleviated. Not every rural, farming area in America could respond so adequately, professionally, or sympathetically.

This is the worst tragedy for our community since our National Guard unit—one of the first to be called to active duty in World War II—was almost completely annihilated at Bataan.

Regardless of this horrible tragedy, in spite of the future mouthings of demagogic ghouls, and even though the true facts of this accident will be intentionally and wilfully distorted and misrepresented, the bracero will still be eager to return, to work and live temporarily, in the Salinas Valley where the climate and working conditions are good, wages are high, facilities, food, and lodging are excellent, and the farm laborer is appreciated and respected for his work and for himself.

"Slave law" is an expression often seen in some newspapers which is false and maliciously inflammatory. Show me where or when in the history of mankind that free men knowingly and willingly, time after time, climb fences, swim rivers, risk imprisonment, to work at wages of one-half of what we pay in California for only a few months of the year. Facts refute the mean charges. Reiteration should not give credibility to erroneous statements.

"Indenture servitude" is another such misused expression. "Indenture" means an agreement in writing. There is little practical difference between a Public Law 78 contract and an agreement by organized labor with management—except that the agreement pursuant to Public Law 78 requires that the wages be increased whenever the domestic wage increases—not simply at the end of a term. We all enter into agreements of employment. Public Law 78 is not servitude or bondage—because these men can return whenever they wish—some do.

Most of them, however, want to return to California, year after year. The Mexican Government has no problem of recruiting—only of selecting and allotting. There have been riots in Mexico by applicants who were denied the right to come here as braceros.

The words have an emotional, inflammatory ring, but they are false by definition, fact, and practice. It is a travesty that the mere repetition of falsities give them currency.

In some areas there is an adequate supply of domestic farm labor—in some places there is a surplus, perhaps. No proponent of Public Law 78 denies this. But another more obvious fact is that in many places, especially at harvest time, there is a great shortage of domestic farm labor—such a shortage that enormous amounts of crops would spoil

without a supplemental supply. My area is one of the latter. We welcome the domestics from other areas—we do everything practical to recruit them. We hire every single jobseeker. Nevertheless we still have a desperate under-supply of domestic farm labor—and have had since the 1870's.

We look forward to the time when we will no longer need the bracero or any other imported worker. In spite of yeoman effort, that time has not yet come in our area, nor in many other areas of major agricultural production in the United States.

Public Law 78 provides nicely and fairly for both areas and situations. Where there is an adequate supply of domestic labor—there are no braceros. If a single domestic wants a job—bump the bracero. But where it is impossible to obtain adequate domestic farm labor—then permit the bracero to enter temporarily under close supervision. To most persons who analyze the facts and conditions, this seems fair and reasonable.

Incidentally, inventions and developments by the farming industry in our area have permitted other areas to mechanize and eliminate the bracero.

If the farmers in any area of the United States do not need braceros, they are not required to use them. Such area should be glad for itself, but should not try to deny the program to farmers in other areas who need them desperately.

For months I have been soliciting suggestions for a practical, reasonable substitute for the bracero program. One suggestion is that we permit all of the braceros to immigrate to the United States, without restriction, as permanent immigrants and residents. I am unashamedly opposed to this suggestion. We need temporary, supplemental labor in agriculture only. In other industries, we have much unemployment, underemployment, and borderline between employment and unemployment especially in the unskilled and low-skilled jobs.

These employed, underemployed and unemployed do not transfer to stoop labor on farms for many reasons. However, the bracero is a bright, energetic, industrious, ambitious worker and, after the first harvest, he would very quickly transfer to another industry—service, building, manufacture, or transportation—and would create the worst panic imaginable among the present workers in these industries.

Furthermore, I believe we should revise our immigration laws, but not just in favor of the Mexican nationals.

One other point which I really do not need to make. Sometimes the underdog needs defending even if by a friend. The braceros who come to our area, and I doubt that they are different from the braceros who come to other districts, are not ignorant. They might not speak English when they arrive, but this is not the only manifestation of ignorance. They have many of the characteristics which we most admire—a deep religious faith, devotion to their families, industry, ambition, brightness, honesty.

I recognize that it is difficult for the United States and Mexico to prevent Mexican nationals from coming into the

United States illegally without the brazen program. The reason is simple—the natural, economic and social demands on both sides of the border are so great that unrealistic laws invite breach. Another virtue of Public Law 78 is that it practically eliminated the illegal Mexican entrant or "wetback."

I have taken this time—not to criticize—only to present some facts and to urge all of my colleagues not to permit an unfortunate, tragic accident to affect their judgment until the official reports are available. We should be extending our genuine condolences rather than ghoulishly digging around lifeless or anguishing bodies for mean political propaganda.

All the circumstances of this accident are being thoroughly investigated by six separate agencies. Nothing will escape these local, State, Federal, and international investigators. I request unanimous consent to include the official reports of these agencies, when completed, in the body of the Record.

FAR EAST POLICY

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in the Washington Post on July 28, 1963, that newspaper accused our colleague from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] of appointing himself Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East.

What aroused the ire of the Washington Post editorial writers was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to cut off foreign aid to Indonesia unless the President declared that such aid was in the best interests of the United States.

It seems that we now have a third Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East.

This morning the Washington Post published another editorial on the subject of Indonesia. The Post proposed that the Government of the United States recall its Ambassador from Indonesia, suspend all foreign aid to Indonesia, lay plans for "forceful and immediate responses to the present situation" by related agencies of our Federal Government and, in essence, get ready for a possible war in that troubled part of the world.

It is interesting to note that the Post is now advocating exactly the same policy for which it so harshly criticized the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] less than 2 months ago.

Perhaps the Post's "September Song" reflects a greater maturity and a greater understanding of world affairs than was present during the "Lazy, Hazy, Crazy Days of Summer." Let us hope so, and let us hope that the Department of State attains the same realistic evaluation of a serious situation.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the editorials which appeared in the Washington Post on July 28 and September 19 follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 1963]

INDONESIAN AGGRESSION

In a generation more given to order, the behavior of the Indonesian mob that burned the British Embassy in Djakarta would have been regarded as just occasion for the severance of diplomatic relations if not for a declaration of war.

Disregard of the properties and decencies and amenities of international conduct has been repeatedly forgiven and condoned in new countries where the maintenance of order seemed genuinely beyond the power or genius of the Government. It can hardly be passed over lightly in a country which has had every opportunity to establish order and which now has every capacity to enforce order in its own capital.

The British would be right to summon home their Ambassador. They will be justified if they sever diplomatic relations. The Government at Djakarta either countenanced this disorder, and is thereby guilty of a calculated offense, or it occurred in spite of it, in which case the Government is convicted of a degree of incompetence so great as to make the maintenance of normal relations impracticable.

The Indonesian Government commenced with the high hopes and support of much of the free world. An exceedingly rich economy, an amiable and industrious people, great natural advantages for a maritime power all combined to make it likely that the new country would be viable economically, progressive socially, and stable politically. These hopes and expectations have been increasingly disappointed by a regime that has done its best to sabotage its own interests and to conceal its gross incompetence by external military adventures clothed in clouds of sheer demagoguery.

The outcry against Malaysia puts a powerful case into the hands of those who said at the time of the West Irian dispute that in Indonesia there was arising an aggressive, expansive, insatiable military power bent on constructing a new colonialism in its own area of the world. That new colonialism now seems likely to have all the evils of the old colonialism plus an inability even to confer order upon the hapless people who fall under its tyranny.

Whatever Great Britain does, the Government of the United States ought to call its own Ambassador home and restudy its own relations with a regime that grows less and less responsible. In the meantime our aid program should be suspended. And while our Ambassador is in this country for consultation, the related agencies of government ought to lay their plans for other forceful and immediate responses to the present situation and to prepare contingently for military measures which alone seem to hold any prospect of containing Indonesian aggression. We seem to have largely solved the problems of the old colonialism, put in train solutions to the problems of neo-colonialism, only to founder on the challenge of a new colonialism as odious as its predecessors.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1963]

SHOWING SUKARNO

Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, a Michigan Republican, has appointed himself "Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East." He is annoyed with President Sukarno, of Indonesia, and has decided that the House Foreign Affairs Committee should declare war by stopping all military and economic aid to that country. Initially, the committee voted down Diplomat BROOMFIELD, but in an unfortunate reversal the House unit

tacked on the amendment that would require President Kennedy to make an invidious finding before any help went to Indonesia.

Mr. BROOMFIELD's views on southeast Asia policy are interesting, and deserve to be heard. But the results of congressional dictation of foreign policy, which has already caused so much mischief in our relations with Poland and Yugoslavia, demonstrate the wisdom of our Founding Fathers in making the conduct of diplomacy an Executive function, carried out with the advice and consent of the Senate. The first virtue of a diplomat is patience, a trait not in excessive supply on the House floor, and a kick at Sukarno at the very moment when there is more moderation in Djakarta is not in the national interest.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES—VICTIM OF A GOVERNMENT-CREATED MONOPOLY

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, free enterprise is the essential basis of our entire economic system. To protect it from the abuse of monopoly we have antitrust laws, and we have a Justice Department charged with their enforcement. It is not only the best interests of business that are served by the prevention of monopoly and the encouragement of healthy competition, but also the best interests of the public.

The danger of monopoly becomes no less great when it is created by decree of a Federal agency. But the CAB has done just that in its recent decision to remove Northeast Airlines from its south-of-New York routes and leaving vital air corridors in the hands of only two airlines. Worse yet, when the Department of Justice petitioned to intervene, stating that "the traffic statistics, the decision of the Board, the clear intent of Congress, the firm policy of the Federal Aviation Act, all clearly demonstrated that the east coast Florida market, one of the richest in terms of profits and the largest in terms of passengers, must be serviced by at least three carriers," the CAB refused to let them participate in the arguments over reconsideration.

The Justice Department's statement that the immediate monopolistic value if a third carrier is not allowed to continue in the east coast market would be worth \$4 million in profit to National and \$6 million to Eastern—clearly more than adequate to support any third carrier in this market—apparently did not interest the CAB either.

Mr. Speaker, this is a ridiculous situation—one agency acts in direct violation to a Federal law and the department responsible for the enforcement of that law must ask permission to intervene, and then stand idly by when the permission is denied. A situation such as this, with two agencies of the Federal Government in head-on collision creates confusion

and impairs confidence in good government.

I have therefore introduced legislation providing that the Attorney General may intervene or take an appeal from a final order of any U.S. agency if the agency's decision would reduce competition or create a monopoly. Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of immediate action of this legislation to avoid the dire effects of monopoly and reduce competition on Northeast's southern routes.

The principle involved is a vital one to our free enterprise system and the practice is of vital importance to the economy of New England. If Northeast is knocked out of competition by the CAB decree and if there should be another strike on Eastern, people in New England would be virtually unable to travel to Philadelphia, Washington, and Florida. Congress might then be faced with another situation such as the railroad strike when we were forced to legislate a solution in violation of the principles of free collective bargaining.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS OR GOVERNMENT CONTROL?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there are several bills pending before this body, including two of my own, to prohibit the Federal Government from competing with private wire services engaged in dissemination of news or other information.

My bill, H.R. 8341, is directed specifically to the Department of Agriculture, which already is engaged in such an activity through its New Market News Service, established last August 1 without any statutory authority, as far as I have been able to determine. This bill has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

My other bill, H.R. 8214, would prohibit any department, agency, et cetera, from disseminating news by wire in competition with private wire services. It has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The Agriculture Department news service is being vigorously opposed by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, and many individual newspapers throughout the land have voiced their editorial opposition to it. They consider it an unwarranted and highly improper intrusion by the Government into a field which always has been, and should continue to be, reserved to tax-paying American free enterprise.

The objections which have been raised quite properly warn that the entry of the Government into the news wire business could lead to complete Government control and censorship of the news. As has been pointed out by ANPA, such a

development is inherent in the Agriculture Department's own statement that it will deny its market news service to any subscriber at any time for alleged "misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when in its sole judgment such cancellation is desirable."

In commenting on the market news service, Editor & Publisher, the trade magazine of the newspaper publishing business, said in an editorial:

This is a dangerous precedent and should be suspended immediately. A Government, or official, news agency is the last thing we want in this country. It would lead to attempts by other Government agencies to enter the same area and this particular endeavor would put the Government in the censorship business in odious form.

The Government has no more business in this area of news dissemination than it has in the ownership of a newspaper, radio, or television station.

The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that the new Market News Service makes available "public information on commodity markets through a system of leased wires linking over 200 farm markets and marketing regions." Then he went on to say that "the Government receives no revenue for this, nor does it add to the budgetary costs of the service."

Even if it were possible for such an activity to be carried on without cost to the taxpayer, the Secretary has unwittingly underscored the very objections which have been made to his new project. He is supplying Government-source news to private subscribers without cost to them; they get it "for free" from Orville Freeman. All they have to pay is the wire charges of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., whereas they have to pay the Associated Press, United Press International and other wire services for their news gathering services. Certainly the private subscriber would like to receive news for nothing, but where does that leave the private enterprise wire services which pay reporters to gather this news, which pay taxes, which go about their business at no expense to the taxpayers?

If there are some who see nothing sinister about the Government being in the news-dispensing business, who do not fear the establishment of an American Tass, let them consider the Department of Agriculture's own defense of its new wire service. In a printed brochure, USDA stated that:

All circuits carry a variety of additional marketing information, as it is available, on crop and livestock production, storage holdings, meat production, and various USDA news releases of importance to marketers.

This is a clear acknowledgment that the Department has embarked on a program of spoon feeding its news to the public—news as the Department of Agriculture sees it. Commenting on this, the American Newspaper Publishers Association has said:

This clearly provides the apparatus whereby Government officials will select the information they want to make available, put it in the form of news releases and move it on the Government-leased news wire. This apparatus becomes a propaganda agency and, instead of promoting greater access to pub-

lic information, as the Secretary of Agriculture has claimed it will, it stifles inquiry of Government officials who, as public servants, are supposed to answer inquiries from members of the public who are paying the cost of operating the Department of Agriculture.

To those who see nothing sinister about the Agriculture Department's trial balloon news wire service, let them also consider a recent proposal by Commissioner Loevinger of the Federal Communications Commission. In a speech made soon after the balloon was launched, he complained that the Nation's private wire services are not geared to production of the spoken word, only to that of the written word and that, as a result, radio and television stations are not being properly served by them. He further complained that the broadcast stations are not devoting sufficient time to broadcasting news and implied that this was due to the poor quality of the news as received from the private wire services.

And what was Mr. Loevinger's solution for this "problem?" He proposed that FCC licensing authority be used to force the radio and television stations of the country to establish a news service of their own to replace the Associated Press and United Press International. Let it not be forgotten that the Federal Communications Commission, of which Mr. Loevinger is a member, holds life and death power over the Nation's radio and television stations through its licensing and relicensing authority. Its proposed new wire service could become a sort of kissing cousin to Agriculture's new Market News Service. Of course, we would not dream of thinking that FCC would deny relicensing of any radio or TV station which failed to utilize the proposed new wire service, or which did not devote as much time to news broadcasts as FCC would like, or which failed to include in its newscasts stories in which the FCC or some other department or agency of Government had a particular interest in pushing. It is unthinkable that at relicensing time the FCC would consider how favorably or how unfavorably to the political administration in power the station handled its newscasts—or is it?

Another development with some relation to Agriculture's news wire venture is the application pending before FCC by Western Union and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. for approval of an increase in the rates they charge the wire services and the Nation's press. In the course of recent hearings on this application, executives of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the Associated Press, United Press International and other news organizations predicted that higher rates would bring curtailment of service and widespread cancellation of service. They said that newspapers in many communities stand to lose services they can barely afford now. This, they said, would constitute a curb on the free flow of information.

Of course, the rate increase application may be expected to receive FCC consideration solely on its merits. But if it is approved and, as is contended, many newspapers will be forced to cancel their

wire service contracts, we may fully expect the Government to step into the breach and provide news on its own wires without cost.

If Agriculture's "trial balloon" is permitted to remain aloft, there will be a headlong rush by other departments and agencies of the Government to get into the act. In the words of Editor & Publisher:

The excuses of "public demand" and "precedent" can be used to justify any excursion into this field. What about all the businessmen who want more and faster reports from the Department of Commerce? Financial institutions want better information from the Treasury, don't they? Shouldn't Health, Education, and Welfare have better contact with public and private health officials? All of these agencies, and others, could justify their own "news service" on the same grounds as the Department of Agriculture.

Once all the departments and agencies have their own wire services, the probable next step would be to coordinate them into a Department of Information, or, more realistically a Department of Propaganda.

Exactly 3 weeks after the "trial balloon" went into ascendancy, on August 21, President Kennedy ordered the establishment of "a unified governmental communications system—NCS. It shall be established and developed by linking together, improving and extending on an evolutionary basis the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies."

Could this be the forerunner of the Department of Propaganda?

If the President's sole motive in issuing this order is to provide communications facilities for all the many Government agencies at maximum efficiency and minimum cost, it is a laudable move. However, in the words of the American Newspaper Publishers Association:

This step emphasizes a point we have made earlier in our objections to entry of the U.S. Department of Agriculture into the news wire business; that is, future expansion of the service could easily lead to a complete national news wire. When the USDA wires are unified with wires of the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, etc., it is then a short step to a national news agency of the type which exists in some other countries, including Russia's Tass.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman stated in a recent news conference that he was "very confused" by the controversy that has arisen over his New Market News Service. I suggest that the committees of the House to which prohibitive legislation has been referred conduct hearings, which I am sure will clear up the confusion in Mr. Freeman's mind. Let the House and Mr. Freeman be given the opportunity to hear the representatives of America's great free press and its wire services on this subject. Let the threat to press freedom and the American people's "right to know" which is implicit in the Governments' growing influence in the preparation and distribution of news be spread on the records of this body, and let the Congress be given a chance to deal with such threats in appropriate manner.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which would remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits.

At present each beneficiary may earn as much as \$1,200 per year without any reduction in old-age survivors insurance benefits. If a beneficiary exceeds this limit, his benefits are reduced by \$1 for every \$2 of annual earnings between \$1,200 and \$1,700, and by \$1 for every \$1 of annual earnings in excess of \$1,700.

Retention of the maximum permissible income provision keeps many older people from working, thereby stifling their initiative, and depriving the Nation of valuable skills and productivity. Thus, the stultifying effect of present social security income restrictions sadly prevents many of our older citizens from bettering their own situations and leading more satisfying lives.

In addition the current statutory provisions cause real hardship for those individuals over 65 who must work to supplement their social security benefit payments. And perhaps the most practical reason for eliminating the maximum income requirements stems from the fact that it is complicated and very difficult for the ordinary person to understand.

Seventeen of our colleagues in the House are cosponsoring this bill. Thus, while the Congress has as yet taken no action in removing the income limitation requirements, perhaps the strong and concerted interest shown by an increasing number of House Members in this regard should prompt favorable consideration of the measure at an early date.

MINE SAFETY AND ECONOMIC DISTRESS IN COAL REGION AREAS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague and friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman JOHN DENT, in discussing the question of mine safety and problems in coal region areas.

I commend him on his excellent presentation on this subject on the House floor yesterday. I agree that mine safety is of major importance. I feel, too, that related problems also require the attention of the Congress as well as the local communities.

It was my privilege to accompany Mr. DENT and two other distinguished colleagues of the General Labor Subcommittee on an inspection tour of several small coal mine operations in the anthracite region of eastern Pennsylvania, including the site of the Sheppton mine disaster. The other two Representatives on the inspection tour were the gentleman from Illinois, ROMAN PUCINSKI, and the gentleman from New York, CHARLES GOODELL.

The purpose of the inspection was to evaluate firsthand the advisability of making the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act applicable to mines employing 14 or fewer workers.

The General Subcommittee on Labor is currently considering legislation to amend the Coal Mines Safety Act and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and other Members spoke at greater length on this important matter yesterday. As Representative to the Congress from the area where miner Louis Bova lost his life and where David Fellin and Henry Throne narrowly missed losing theirs, I am quite concerned about the problem of mine safety. Saving human lives is a matter of major importance to every Member of this Congress.

But just as important as the problem of safety regulations for small mines is the need for congressional action in attacking the basic causes of economic distress in the coal regions, and the cause of some of many mine accidents.

It is the lack of jobs and opportunity in the coal regions that causes men like Bova, Thorne, and Fellin to risk their lives in unsafe mine holes in order to eke out a living. Unemployment in the coal regions of our Nation is the highest in the country. It has run above 10 percent of the work force in the two coal-area counties I represent, Northumberland and Schuylkill, for many years. It is even higher in some coal counties in West Virginia and Kentucky.

These conditions exist because local and State governments—and the Congress—in times past did not take the necessary steps to insure against the senseless exploitation of land and resources that has produced the current problems.

Experts in these matters point out that coal areas have declined for two reasons: the discovery and utilization of new energy fuels, and automation. New machines which do the work of 10, 20, or 100 men, have taken the place of those men in the mines remaining in production.

These economic changes, in coal as in hundreds of other areas, have had revolutionary effects on our social fabric. They have drastically changed educational and skill requirements for employment. Today's worker must be a skilled worker, able to handle the machines that the age of automation is producing with more and more abandon. No longer can a young worker expect to find a secure and respected position unless he has earned at least a high school diploma.

Adjustments flowing from automation and the revolutionary changes in Ameri-

can technology have exacted a heavy toll in hardship and dislocation. More than 4 million Americans are at this moment facing the misery and anxiety of unemployment, parttime employment, and substandard existence on inadequate income.

And this toll will grow heavier as the technological revolution accelerates unless we develop and put into effect without delay a comprehensive program to deal with these radical changes in our economic and social life.

I urge the Congress to give serious attention to expanding existing programs and enacting additional needed legislation to combat the serious economic problems existing in the coal region areas.

Existing programs, already approved by the Congress, which require additional support include the area redevelopment, manpower development, and training, water pollution control and small business administration programs.

Of unique interest to the coal industry and the millions who depend on it for a livelihood, are efforts by the U.S. Office of Coal Research to revitalize the industry by research on new uses for coal. Secretary of Interior Udall's recent announcement of a \$9.9 million contract to a Pittsburgh Coal Co. to determine if it is economically feasible to produce gasoline from coal on a large-scale basis, is a hopeful sign.

Congress should continue giving its support to such research. Although automation has eaten away many coal industry jobs, new commercial uses for this important mineral could result in needed employment in coal-producing areas. Not only would mine employment increase, but thousands of new jobs would be created in new processing and related industries.

These efforts have been successful in bringing new hope, new industry and new jobs to coal region areas. Measures currently before the House to increase ARA funds and liberalize the Manpower Training Act will be even more helpful in providing the economic stimulus that long-neglected areas of the country require.

Congressman JOHN BLATNIK's legislation, H.R. 7351, to provide an additional \$900 million for the emergency public works program is also needed. Emergency public works grants to coal region communities in my congressional district have not only built needed public facilities and performed such useful services as controlling water pollution, they have created hundreds of jobs. Local citizens have told me, time and time again, that emergency public works grants to build sewer systems, for instance, have been essential in bringing new industries to their communities.

Although there are several proposed pieces of legislation to stimulate economic growth in the country and coal region areas, two deserve special mention. One, of course, is President Kennedy's tax bill, which the House will consider next week. The other is legislation introduced by the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman SICKLES. This is H.R. 7935, a bill creating a Joint

Federal-State Commission on Appalachia, whose function will be to formulate a comprehensive plan of resource and economic development for the entire Appalachian region, which includes Pennsylvania, Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia.

President Kennedy has already recognized the regional nature of the problem of economic distress in coal areas with his creation of the joint Federal-State committee for the Appalachian region last spring. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who was appointed Under Secretary of Commerce in March, is chairman of this study committee which is in the process of drafting legislative recommendations to help alleviate the chronic economic distress in Appalachian States. Under Secretary Roosevelt's comments on the problems of the region are worth repeating:

This chronically underadvantaged economy dramatically demonstrates why Appalachia looms so large as the Nation's key developmental problem area. There is need for urgency in grappling with the vexing problems that beset this region. With the full-scale cooperation of private business, State governments and the many resources of the various branches of the Federal Establishment, I am sure we can marshal the wisdom and sound counsel needed to bring forth a plan of action that will point the way toward reversing the recent trends and give the people of Appalachia new hope and new promise for strong growth in the decade ahead.

I am looking forward to the recommendations of the President's Committee as, I am sure, are the representatives from all distressed coal region areas.

So far, I have talked exclusively of the Federal programs needed to combat the problem of lost productivity and wasted manpower. But the States have not sat still, waiting for the Federal Government to move. I am especially proud, of course, of Pennsylvania's efforts to stimulate economic growth.

Under the administration of Gov. David Lawrence, Pennsylvania created an Industrial Development Authority to attract new industry to the State. In conjunction with community and regional development authorities, PIDA has successfully helped finance the construction and settlement of hundreds of new businesses in the Keystone State, producing thousands of jobs.

Governor Lawrence also proposed a far-reaching land and water resources development program, designed to reestablish Pennsylvania as one of the major tourist attractions in the Northeast. Governor Scranton has made this a bipartisan program by supporting efforts to gain public approval for the \$70 million bond issue that this project, known as Project 70, will require. State voters will cast their ballot on the measure in a November referendum.

If approved Project 70 will preserve and improve Pennsylvania's notable landscape by helping finance local and regional parks, and water conservation and wildlife protection programs. Assisted by Federal funds, Project 70 money will be used to acquire and convert land

into new opportunities for outdoor leisure and recreation. The project will not only increase Pennsylvania's already ample attraction as a tourist goal, it will help attract more industry and more jobs to the State.

My visit to the Shepton mine and my experience in dealing with coal region problems have convinced me that Congress must not delay in facing its responsibilities to the unemployed there and throughout Pennsylvania and the Nation. Our Nation is the wonder of the world because of our great wealth and unsurpassed standard of living. A country that can afford to stockpile billions of dollars of excessive nuclear weapons and foodstuffs, must not neglect the very real problems of poverty, wasted natural resources, lost manpower and productivity.

The Nation cannot afford to continue this senseless waste in real wealth that runs into untold billions of dollars.

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an excellent editorial on this subject which was printed in a recent issue of the Shamokin (Pa.) Citizen.

The editorial follows:

IMAGINATIVE REMEDIES FOR COUNTY PROBLEMS

Many people in the local area seem to be giving a lot of thought to the problem of redevelopment in the coal regions and in the county, and they have suggested some remedies which lie within the realm of the possible.

Some years back, Dr. John Linnet began his public campaign to create a tourist site in the coal regions by utilizing the Glen Burn Colliery and mines as the central attraction. Taking off from that point, some other local residents have suggested to the editors of this newspaper some tie-in possibilities concerned with outdoor recreation and the tourist industry—it ranks emphasis because of the multimillion dollar income that Pennsylvania derives from tourists.

Arguing that the concept of a collapsible dam on the Susquehanna River may become a reality in the Sunbury area, some county residents believe that a residential and recreational area is just waiting to be developed in the area from the end of Sunbury, down through Snyderstown and Elysburg, to Catawissa and up to Riverside. What these people envision is the development of a ski slope and winter sports area along the ridges and mountain slopes in this valley, an area which would tie in with the existing fine facilities for summer recreation already built in this area. These people argue that the county thus has a natural unit to develop from the Glen Burn Colliery right up to the river, making our land a year-around mecca that could make money.

Added to this grand idea of a tourist area in this county is another plan which many of these same people believe would rebuild the stripped out land and produce another future source of income. Since the coal region was in the past also a site for a rather thriving lumber industry, the idea is that the stripped land could be reforested and become the source of woodpulp and low-grade lumber, both of which are now in great demand and will continue in limited supply for decades to come. Proponents of this plan maintain that the reforestation project would not only restore the beauty of the now blighted landscape, it would also create a resource which, through scientific management, would be a source for many new jobs.

In this respect, they point out that there is a distinct possibility that lumber, pulp, or

paper industries could or would locate in the county if the wood growth stock were improved. Estimates place the volume of wood resources in the county at a yield of about 60,200,000 board feet and approximately 550,000 cords of poletimber material. This isn't as much good timber for lumber as may be desired, but putting emphasis on the development of timberlands could double this potential in the next 5 to 10 years, the argument runs.

How could this be done?

Well, local initiative and effort are the first two ingredients required to get anything stewing. Grants from the ARA for technical studies of wood resources and soil are a real possibility, as is financial assistance in the development of recreational facilities on public lands.

Right now, several counties related to the Susquehanna Economic Development Association (SEDA) are developing overall economic development plans which inventory resources of the county as a whole and which outline the problems and the solutions to problems which can be developed on a communitywide and on a countywide basis. This type of county plan is being urged by Federal officials in charge of economic development as the model for future planning.

And there is need of real thinking on the part of our citizens which sees the potential of this great county. There are riches and resources that surround us which not too many of us really see as tangible assets.

One of these assets, according to some imaginative local residents, is the deep strip pits which could be used as a possible site for a manmade lake. These people claim that one or two of these deep pits could be located which are fed by springs that could be the source of water for a lake. Careful planting of the area around the manmade lake then could make a picnic area, and the lake could be used for boating, swimming, and water skiing. Those who advance the plan point out that this solution has been used effectively in certain soft coal areas and has restored the natural beauty of the land.

That there are great natural assets in this county is beyond question, but what gives us hope for the future is the fact that many people are now taking the first imaginative steps to find ways to put those countywide assets to use.

THE TRAGEDY'S AFTERMATH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, charges are being made that law and order are breaking down in Alabama. Nothing is further from the truth.

The recent bombing is deplored by the people of Alabama, probably, more than by any other people in the world. Prayerful Alabamians hope that the despicable, recent, brutal attack of a church in Birmingham will end in the apprehension, prosecution and punishment of those who are guilty.

I can assure you that Governor Wallace is using every means at his command to see that the guilty are apprehended. Ridiculous charges are being made that Governor Wallace is responsible for the dastardly bombings. Nothing is further from the truth.

I assure you Governor Wallace is a Christian who believes in law and order. I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., dated September 17, 1963.

THE TRAGEDY'S AFTERMATH

It is all but impertinent to remark the appalling thing that has happened in Birmingham, because the crime speaks for itself with such eloquent hideousness. The murder of children at Sunday worship is beyond the adequacy of words.

We trust that whoever is responsible for this tragedy hates Alabama and its people, black and white. For he has done them an injury that will not heal in a long time and which is almost certain to generate evil complications.

Unfortunately there are those who will be able to exploit the event from a variety of motives, ranging from money to political advantage.

The one thing above all others that would prove most effective in averting more tragedy is the apprehension of the murderers. That would instantly reduce the fiery pressures.

Fortunately there is some hope that this will come to pass. For every available agency and influence is at work.

A squad of FBI bomb experts is at work. They have been welcomed to the State and are as one working with State, county, and city police in the crucial manhunt. Generous rewards for information have been posted.

Meanwhile local and State authorities have made it plain that all necessary forces will be made available to maintain order.

This, we believe, is all that could possibly be done at this point. Dillinger himself did not have the honor of a more generously equipped and determined posse than the Birmingham bombers.

In the course of this many wild things are going to be said about Alabama by fanatical agitators and eastern politicians of the kind to which Truman alluded.

They are more interested in Alabama violence than that in North Carolina or Illinois for certain obvious reasons.

The floor of Congress is the most potent of platforms for defense against such slanders and distortions. We trust that our Congressmen and Senators will be heard from when the JAVITS and POWELLS get going.

BRACERO DEATHS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a disaster is a strange thing. Sometimes we get excited and concerned when some spectacular accident or great calamity takes place, but sometimes we do not. I suppose that in this tense world there is a limit to the number of things one can be excited about because otherwise we might all go insane.

This week there occurred the greatest and most tragic highway accident in the history of California. I have not detected much excitement about it. Maybe highway disasters are so common that this is one of the things that we relegate to the category of clucking our tongues and saying, "Too bad."

Twenty-eight Mexican braceros were killed in that accident, and another 35 were injured, about half of them critically so. Yet despite the awful magnitude of what happened, we restrict ourselves to saying, "too bad, but these things will happen." There is no demand for tighter safety regulations, no demand for better drivers for bracero transports, and I guess not even a demand for safety devices at the railroad crossing where the transport was struck by a freight train.

Why is there no outcry?

Perhaps it is because nobody really cares about those 28 dead men, because nobody knew them, at least nobody in this country. They will not be missed except back some place in Mexico that we will never see.

We do not care about those dead men at all, because they were not really even men, but only commodities. They show up on the rolls of the importing association as being 28 short today. Since the inventory of this human commodity is short, no doubt orders will soon go out for replacements from the wholesaler at the border.

In the 18th century there were slave ships that crossed the oceans regularly, bringing in cargoes of laborers. They say that you could smell a slaver before you could see it, but I do not know about that. Naturally some of these slavers would be lost from time to time, driven on the shoals by some vagary of the winds, or drifted there through some human error, just as that truck drifted in front of the train this week.

But nobody got excited when a slaver hit the shoals or went down with all hands aboard, because nobody knew or cared about the humans who died. Lost slaves were just a lost cargo, a lost commodity that required replacement as soon as possible.

Nobody knows or cares too much about those dead and maimed braceros, either, because they are—or were—just another commodity lost in transit.

This is the evil of the bracero system. Those were not men out there on that railroad track, but just another shipment of slaves lost in transit. Who is to care? They are easily replaced.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there is no outcry about this accident because nobody really cares, and nobody really cares because the bracero program is just another form of indentured service.

But some of us care, and we want to see the traffic in human lives ended. If we need more laborers to harvest our crops, then let us bring in men, not commodities. Let us not import indentured servants, but let us admit free men.

SAVING RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill intended to save railroad passenger train service in this country by repealing section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act. While this proposed legislation would apply to passenger trains throughout the Nation, I have taken this step because of developments this week in my own district of Rhode Island, where action by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad in seeking to eliminate passenger train service required by hundreds of commuters has brought forcefully to my attention the serious lack of adequate protection for the public interest which now exists in Federal legislation dealing with railroad passenger train abandonments.

Section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, which Congress enacted in 1958, now permits any railroad to discontinue any train on its own initiative and with but token regard for the interests of the public using it. In fact, under this law, all that a railroad has to do in order to eliminate a passenger train—even if it has been ordered to keep that train running by the State regulatory bodies concerned—is merely to post a notice, and if the Interstate Commerce Commission does not act to stay that discontinuance within 15 days, that train, no matter how necessary, is automatically eliminated. Prior to the 1958 enactment, the regulation of passenger train service was left entirely in the hands of the State railroad commissions, who were close to the problem and were able to better determine the true extent of the need for trains in the circumstances prevailing in the areas affected. My bill would return control over passenger trains to the State agencies.

Since the enactment of section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1958, the Interstate Commerce Commission has permitted the elimination of no less than 246 passenger trains and allowed the curtailment of service on 10 others. Most of the trains involved in these applications were either trains which the railroads had been ordered by State commissions to continue, or were trains which they believed the State commission would deny them permission to discontinue and so the application was filed under section 13a which preempts the rights of the State commissions in this matter.

The New Haven Railroad, which on Monday filed notices with the Interstate Commerce Commission that it would end three more passenger runs on October 21 under the section 13a provisions, has not hesitated to abandon other trains previously. No less than 18 trains have been abandoned by the New Haven as the result of previous actions under this provision of law, which has now been in effect for 5 years. Certainly that is a long enough time for any railroad which might have been unfairly prevented from taking off a train for which there was no longer a justifiable need to have acted. In my opinion, the kind of discontinuance the New Haven is now seeking in announcing plans to eliminate train 508, which runs from New London to Boston and is the morning commuter train

across southeastern Rhode Island into Providence, is an abuse of the section 13a provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. I am sure that Congress never intended that it should be an instrument to deprive businessmen and commuters of a means they have used for more than 70 years of getting to work in the morning. But that is exactly what the elimination of train 508 as proposed by the New Haven management would mean to the hundreds of commuters who use this train weekly.

Protests by State railroad commissions against this kind of abuse since 13a was enacted have been of no avail. In view of the fact that the railroad industry as a whole is now trying to seriously curtail many aspects of railroad service through mergers and other means, I believe that the public inevitably will continue to suffer from the lack of adequate protection which section 13a affords to consideration of its need for continued passenger train service. Under this provision, for example, the public is denied a right to appeal a train's discontinuance to the courts, although the right to appeal an order to continue a train is nevertheless reserved for the railroads. Section 13a, while permitting such unappealable discontinuances to take place, does not even require a public hearing before a train may be eliminated, since whatever hearings are held are left solely to the discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission, an agency in Washington which has long been accused of being "railroad management minded."

Even if a hearing is held, however, the railroad seeking to remove a train does not have to justify such action. Rather, under section 13a, the public must prove that the continuance of the train would not be an undue financial burden on the railroad, although such proof can only be secured from the books of the railroad itself. Moreover, if a hearing is held, section 13a permits the railroad to withhold from interested parties all material needed to prove that continuing the train would be an "undue financial burden" until the day of the hearing. In view of these provisions which favor the railroads at the expense of the public using the passenger trains, experience has shown that section 13a makes it virtually impossible for the public or even the ICC to prevent a railroad from eliminating a passenger train if it is determined to discontinue.

Section 13a also places unreasonable time limits upon the ICC in dealing with proposed passenger train discontinuances. For example, the Commission must render a final order in each case within 4 months of the original discontinuance date set by the railroad or the operation of the train or trains involved will cease automatically. Such an arbitrary and unreasonable time limitation prevents the ICC from giving adequate consideration to the public's side of the case.

The National Association of State Railroad and Utility Commissioners has regularly, at each of its conventions since section 13a was enacted, adopted a resolution calling upon Congress to repeal this provision of the 1958 Transporta-

tion Act. In some years, the resolution has been adopted unanimously. I point out that the men who took this action are the commissioners in each of our 50 States who day in and day out are concerned firsthand with railroad problems in their area. When every one of these commissioners thinks section 13a should be repealed, Congress should certainly heed their warning.

I am particularly disturbed that the New Haven Railroad, which is now in bankruptcy—not because of inadequate use of its facilities, but because of gross mismanagement, as ICC studies have shown—should seek to eliminate a daily commuter train which clearly is still being used heavily by the public. Because of its weakened financial condition, the New Haven in recent years has been a railroad which has been given far more than its share of special concessions and outright aid by the State and Federal Governments. More than \$6.5 million in tax relief and maintenance assistance has been given to this railroad in recent years by the States of New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and the Federal Government has been a rich benefactor of this carrier. Within the last 10 years, the U.S. Treasury—meaning the general taxpayer—has had to pay off a total of \$26,481,000 in loans it guaranteed for the New Haven on which the railroad defaulted. The first big payment was \$11,781,000 in 1961, which represented the U.S. Government's guarantee of a loan made in 1955 under the Defense Production Act. Since that time, the carrier has had additional loans in a total amount of \$35,659,400 guaranteed under the Transportation Act of 1958, and of this amount, there has already been a total default of \$14,700,000 paid by the U.S. Government to meet its loan guarantee obligations.

Thus, it is clear that the amount of State and Federal aid which the New Haven Railroad has received in recent years is very substantial. This aid was forthcoming because the State and Federal Governments recognized that the passenger and commuter services provided by the New Haven are indispensable and must be continued. In fact, a committee representing the Governors of the four States I have previously mentioned and Mayor Wagner of New York City in 1961 warned the New Haven trustees that the carrier could lose the tax relief it has been granted if its contemplated abandonments of trains are "of such magnitude as to curtail service or otherwise jeopardize the railroad's financial position." The committee, formed in 1960 to help the New Haven with its financial problem, referred with "apprehension" to an announcement by the trustees that they were even then studying plans to eliminate branch lines and passenger service.

Thus, there can be no question of the fact that the New Haven management has accepted State and Federal aid in a very substantial amount with a clear understanding that essential passenger and commuter train operations must be continued. Yet, despite the huge subsidy it has accepted, it now seeks to abandon

train 508 on the very flimsy ground, it seems to me, that it allegedly lost \$48,000 on its operations last year. I am quite frankly skeptical of that claim, and I am particularly skeptical of the figure on the amount involved. Railroad accountants are granted tremendous latitude in the allocation of expense items between passenger and freight operations, and I am aware that many railroads in applications to abandon a train have cited figures which usually include overhead and maintenance costs which continue even after that train is abandoned. In any case, a loss of even the full \$48,000 claimed on this particular train would be a small amount for the railroad to absorb in recognition of its obligation to provide the public with service it needs in return for the more than \$26.4 million which the Federal Government alone has paid this railroad outright to keep such commuter service running. Any train like 508, which hauls more than 100 passengers a day, is still capable of meeting expenses under proper management, and it still is needed by the public.

Mr. Speaker, the Providence Journal of September 18 carried an editorial in which it pointed out that train 508 is more than just a train. It is, the editorial declared, "a state of mind." I ask unanimous consent to conclude my remarks by having this editorial printed in the RECORD at this point in the hope that it may induce a different "state of mind" in the New Haven's trustees and that they will reconsider their ill-advised move to deprive the public of railroad passenger service which clearly is so much in demand.

There being no objection, the editorial referred to follows:

THE OLD 508 IS MORE THAN A TRAIN

The New Haven Railroad will make a big mistake if it abandons train 508, not because of inconvenience to its passengers—and, goodness knows, it will cause inconvenience—but because it will deprive the road of its best publicity gimmick in Rhode Island.

In the trying years before trusteeship, the most accurate barometer of public feeling about the New Haven was "Old 508." When its morning arrival in Providence was delayed 66 minutes by a hot box north of East Greenwich, the road got more condemnation than if the Merchants Limited hadn't run at all. But when 508 ran on time, God was in His heaven and all was well with the world.

Train 508 is a state of mind as well as the last commuter train in Rhode Island, and all because of the special breed of passenger it carries. They are mostly residents of South County, which also is a state of mind. Their fraternity in adversity from riding the 508 has been a wondrous development to watch. In late summer and fall, they stepped off 508 onto Union Station with marigolds in their lapel, the flowers having been dispensed by a fellow passenger as they got on the train a station or two down the line.

They have suffered great adversity together. They have shivered at Kingston Station on winter mornings waiting for the train that could drop behind schedule by 30 minutes between New London and Westerly without half trying. They have seen it overshoot the station at East Greenwich, then back up to pick up the passengers its engineer nearly forgot. They have complained, griped, and cursed its service—but now they are up in arms because New Haven says it

loses money on the 508 and wants to take it off. They protest probably because nothing could be just a little bit worse than the 508.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. LINDSAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. ROUSH.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1220. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 3, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim report on Grand River, Grandville, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 16, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 157); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1221. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the semiannual report for the Department of the Navy relating to military construction contracts awarded on other than a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder for the period January 1 through June 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 87-554; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1222. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs resulting from the noncompetitive procurement of aeronautical replacement spare parts by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1223. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report of all claims paid by the Department of Commerce during fiscal year 1963 pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2675); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1224. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a certified copy of amendments to the regulations governing the numbering of undocumented vessels, promulgated by the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and submitted for publication in the Federal Register, pursuant to the Federal Boating Act of 1958 (46 U.S.C. 527d); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly; with an amendment (Rept. No. 754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: House Resolution 527. Committee on Rules. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8363, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 755). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 510. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 756). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 514. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 757). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 515. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; without amendment (Rept. No. 758). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 8499. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 8500. A bill to prohibit departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government from participating in activities which are in competition with private news services engaged in dissemination of news or other information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8501. A bill to provide for a parkway connection between Mount Vernon and Woodlawn Plantations, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 8502. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8503. A bill to provide for the tariff classification of certain particleboard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 8504. A bill to amend the Government Employees' Training Act in order to eliminate the requirement contained in regulations pursuant thereto which prohibits the selection for training purposes of certain non-Government facilities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 8505. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Re-

serve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 8506. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 8507. A bill for the relief of certain medical and dental officers of the Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 8508. A bill to amend section 336 of the Communications Act of 1934, to permit cargo ships on voyages between Hawaiian ports to carry radiotelephone in lieu of radiotelegraph installations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8509. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 8510. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KYL:

H.J. Res. 745. Joint resolution to provide that the District of Columbia shall pay court costs and reasonable attorney's fees in any proceeding to acquire land for highways and urban redevelopment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.J. Res. 746. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 747. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim November 19, 1963, as Gettysburg Address Centennial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H. Res. 524. Resolution providing an additional stationery allowance for the 1st session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 525. Resolution providing an additional allowance for telephone and telegraph service for the 1st session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 526. Resolution to provide additional postage for the 1st session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for a 200-mile offshore limit for taking fish off the New England coast by fishing vessels of foreign countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8511. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Altobello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 8512. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 8513. A bill for the relief of Jechiel Shulkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8514. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Shavitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 8515. A bill for the relief of Dr. Adil Sokmensuer and his wife, Ulku Sokmensuer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8516. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in real property situated in Florida to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

305. By Mr. O'NEILL: Petition of the City Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., requesting the Congress to amend the Constitution of the United States to allow reading of sacred Scripture in the public schools, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

306. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Gibson Gayle, Jr., secretary, American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., relative to approving in principle the provisions of S. 1061 and H.R. 4700, now pending in the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

My Skyscraper City: A Child's View of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, most people who do not come from Manhattan think that no one lives there. Just the reverse is true—all kinds of people live in Manhattan, and surprisingly enough many children are brought up there and are very happy about it.

In fact, in my opinion, boys and girls brought up in Manhattan are usually better adjusted than those who have the blessings of green grass and trees.

I was thrilled when one of my constituents, Katrina Thomas, aided by Penny Hamond, published a book—via Doubleday & Co.—entitled "My Skyscraper City: A Child's View of New York."

It is a wonderful book, and it is full of excitement and fun. It is a picture story of Apwick, a little boy who lives in Manhattan and who loves the city. From Apwick's point of view we see the skyscrapers, the glass wall buildings, the museums, the snow on the trees in Central Park, the tugboats on the river, the

pigeons, the animals in the zoo, the streetcleaners, and the mounted policemen.

He is a very busy little boy in a very busy city, and he is doing fine.

Katrina Thomas, who also loves New York City, has given all city folk a lift by her beautiful book.

New Jersey: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the New Jersey congressional delegation, about gambling in that State. New Jersey is one of those 24 States that has had the sense to legalize, control, and profit from parimutuel betting. But, as in most other States so acting, only a half step has been taken. Illegal gambling—the logical result of bluenosed governmental attitudes—is keeping the crime syndicates fat and happy in New Jersey. A covert coalition of hypocrites and mob-

sters is keeping gambling illegal—and bleeding the State in the process.

In 1962, New Jersey ranked fourth in the Nation in parimutuel betting. Almost \$325 million was wagered on the State's racetracks. The public treasury of New Jersey made about a \$30-million profit from this turnover.

However, most of the money gambled in New Jersey is doing nothing to swell governmental coffers. Instead, the revenues of illicit gambling are financing the underworld crime syndicates.

New Jersey's share of the estimated figure for national off-track betting presented to the McClellan Committee came to almost \$1.7 billion last year. When it is realized that off-track betting constitutes less than one-half of the total illegal gambling, the full and stunning extent of illegal gambling becomes apparent.

In New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, the total amount wagered illegally each year may approach \$3½ billion. This figure represents the turnover. The gambling syndicates retain only 10 percent of the turnover as profit. But this is enough to make New Jersey a gangland graveyard.

The gambling rings contribute much of their take to the financing of syndicated crime. The gross profit which may reach \$350 million a year in that State is diminished by expenses such as