

1963

price in 12 States of the Southeast from Maryland and Delaware south to Florida.

USDA set a price for Commodity Credit Corporation corn stocks at 25 cents a bushel over the Chicago cash market price for 5 or more jumbo freight cars or 10 or more ordinary freight cars. In quantities of one through four jumbo cars or two through nine ordinary cars, the f.o.b. price will be 27½ cents above the Chicago cash market price.

The sales program is facilitated by use of reduced rail rates under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This means nothing less than flat pricing by areas in this Nation.

It rejects flatly any recognition of free markets wherein high regional prices would accelerate imports of a commodity. This would bring prices down to the economic value of the commodity from an interior terminal plus freight to the consuming deficit area.

This sudden price decision on the part of USDA follows the same pattern of last year when USDA used a section 22 freight rate to break the local market or perhaps to satisfy local politicians—who seem to dominate USDA price policy.

Most observers here are aghast at the arbitrary action by USDA. The pricing policy for CCC corn was quietly announced by a single posted notice on a bulletin board during market trading hours without any prior discussion of the action with the grain industry.

One may only describe this type of administrative procedure as arbitrary, capricious, and possessing political connotations. The ASCS office of USDA and the front office are now dominated by southeastern officials who have a local interest in feed grain shipments from the midwest producing areas to key States such as North Carolina and adjacent States.

In short, the slide-rule experts here in control of USDA repudiate the free market and are deciding what the price of corn should be in the 12 States.

DEFENDS ACTION

To the astonishment of this reporter, one leading USDA economic official said that his study of USDA data pertaining to this matter showed that the CCC price reflected an adequate return to the exporter of grain to the southeastern deficit area.

But the shippers of grains into that area who had already moved supplies into the States would be penalized to the extent that CCC had later capriciously fixed a price for its corn.

However, that is the situation, and the grain trade must live with it and with the uncertainty about how long this punitive situation can exist—a situation in which an individual or a group of politically minded individuals slip the slide rules and push buttons to determine what is a fair price in any area of the Nation.

TRADE FACES CATASTROPHE

The grain trade stands on the brink of catastrophe. The trade, with some significant exceptions, is revealed as an utter failure in anticipating and fighting the towering wave of administered prices as now appear inherent in the Orville Freeman-USDA philosophy.

The free, competitive markets are slowly being strangled by the Lilliputians of the USDA. The grain trader is a fallen foe.

The announcement of administered pricing by CCC is nothing less than the forerunner of catastrophe for the independent grain merchant as well as a danger signal to the processing industry, which prices its products on the basis of competitive buying of raw materials.

The U.S. Government can raise merry hell with the U.S.S.R. and its centralized control,

but it will take a long week of Sundays to explain away the distinction between Nikita's flats and those which are now being reached piecewise by USDA in commodities.

This decision for the southeastern price of corn can be merely the first step in a Government-price dominating program all over the country. Officials here are now saying that prices have been too high. Consequently, using their leverage of huge surplus stocks, they intend to break prices into line with their ideas of what they should be.

The trade is dealing with a tough, intelligent and determined group at USDA. It is about time that they took off the kid gloves and started fighting with no holds barred.

COMMITTEE STAFFING

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. BELL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the importance of good committee staffing to the work of this House is an acknowledged fact. The imbalance between staff members responsible to the minority and the majority parties has caused increasing concern and not a little comment. Because of the importance of this question I would like to insert herewith a cogent and excellent column on this subject by Roscoe Drummond appearing in the Washington Post, February 26, 1963:

COMMITTEE STAFFING

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Well, well, what should happen but that the most powerful Democrat in the House of Representatives, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, says right out that he is downright annoyed that the Republicans think the minority party should have the right to a better proportion of the professional staffs of congressional committees.

Maybe that's a little too strong. He didn't quite say the Republicans shouldn't think about correcting the egregious imbalance in professional committee staffing. Speaker MCCORMACK allows they could think about it as long as they didn't try to do anything about it.

Doing something about this injustice, he said, was just foolishly "stirring things up," making a "nuisance" of themselves—almost un-Democratic (at least with a capital D); anyway, he is against it.

The fact is that a number of Democrats recognize that an adequate staff for the minority party (whether Republican or Democratic) will make a more effective Congress and better legislation.

The purpose of this column is to report that progress that is being made, to clarify the real issue behind this reform and to indicate the roadblocks and prospects ahead.

The Republican reformers have not yet broken into a clear field, but, they have gained strength and momentum.

Two years ago Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, and one or two others were president voices pointing out how the 12-to-1 imbalance in committee staffing was handicapping the minority party. They weren't even getting an audience with their own party colleagues.

In less than 2 months this year—that is, since the party activists under the leadership of Representative GERALD FORD, of Michigan, took over the Republican conference—here is what has happened:

Staffing reform has become an active objective of the whole party. Last week the

Republican conference voted overwhelmingly to press until they win for the right of the minority party to have the services of up to 40 percent of the professional staff of House committees whenever the minority so votes.

The conference has put a seven-member subcommittee, headed by Representative FRED SCHWENGLER, of Iowa, to work continuously to generate action.

For nearly 2 weeks, the House Administration Subcommittee on Accounts has been reviewing the committee budgets. For the first time such able Republicans as Representatives CHARLES GOODELL, of New York, and JOHN KYL, of Iowa, have made a detailed case for proper minority staffing. They have won a handful of isolated victories.

How near did they come to a big victory—to getting 40 percent allocation of professional staff to the minority? When the issue came before the whole House Administration Committee, the Republican motion lost by only a 10-to-9 vote.

What is the issue behind this urgent reform? It has nothing to do with hiring Republican experts to work for Republicans. It has only to do with allocating to the minority membership of each House committee a fair proportion of objective, competent, professional specialists and investigators so that the minority can discharge its own responsibility.

One serious roadblock the Republicans still face is that some of their senior committee members are so unaware of what needs to be done that they are themselves blocking action.

The case for staffing reform is irrefutable. The need is great and the demand for reform is growing continuously.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

(Mr. LEGGETT (at the request of Mr. SISK) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Glenn County chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution has drafted a resolution designating February as American History Month. I think that this is a commendable interest. The people of this area are very interested in the heritage of this great country of ours. For example, most counties have historical societies which study the origins of the region. The old missions and landmarks of California are cherished by all of her citizens. And most recently, this interest in history is reflected in the launching of a new nuclear powered Polaris submarine at Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo, Calif., Solano County. This great ship was christened the *Woodrow Wilson* and the date of its launching was February 22, 1963, the birthday of our first President, George Washington.

In respect to the proud tradition of American history, we join the Daughters of the American Revolution in the observance of February as American History Month.

HEMISPHERIC FREEDOM

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. SISK) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, Russia's Minister of Defense said:

We would like to warn the aggressive circles of the United States that an attack on the Cuban Republic would mean the third world war.

Although this statement can be somewhat discounted as rocket rattling, it might some day again be made by Khrushchev. Therefore, we should take this opportunity to make it clear that this is a Communist move which must not and will not deter or neutralize U.S. efforts to protect itself in the freedom of this hemisphere.

Our answer to Russia and the Communists is:

That they are the ones who imperil the peace of the world;

That they have violated the peace and security of this hemisphere and threatened the security of the United States;

That it is the Communists who maintain a dangerous and hostile government in Cuba;

That it is the Communists who introduced a substantial offensive military threat in Cuba and although removed, continue their military operations in that country;

That it is the Communists who support and encourage acts of aggression by the Communist government in Cuba against the United States and its citizens;

That it is the Communists who are using Cuba as a base for exporting subversion and have embarked on a campaign of subversion with violence and terror to destroy all democratic institutions in this hemisphere;

That it is the Communists who, by their actions, continue to threaten the peace and security of the United States.

Therefore, the United States has made it clear, and must continue to do so, that—

The existence of a Communist government in Cuba is incompatible with our inter-American system and a threat to the security of the United States and all our policies will be and are directed toward the eradication of this threat; Force will be met with force;

The United States will take all military action determined necessary to protect itself against acts of aggression, including pursuit into the territory of Communist Cuba;

We will take all action, military or otherwise, together with Latin American governments to meet and prevent the Communists' hemispheric plan of violent subversion.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S SPEECH BEFORE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. SISK) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest the text of President John F. Kennedy's speech and responses to questions before the Ameri-

can Bankers Association's symposium on economic growth yesterday. This is a remarkable record, and it tells us much about our President, in addition to being most informative on the economic matters discussed. In my opinion, there have been few such occasions when the fiber and caliber of the President have been so clearly shown as they were on this occasion yesterday. When one considers the substance of the President's answers to questions that were penetrating and difficult, it is clear that he has a profound grasp of the intricacies of these problems, even in his off-the-cuff statements.

I confess I am impressed by the President's abilities in this regard. They reflect much study and very mature reasoning on some of the most perplexing questions before this Congress. They are our problems, and it is my hope that we can match the wit and ability of the President in dealing with them. This is a challenge and an opportunity. We have been given the proposals of a strong leadership, and now our task is to demonstrate the same maturity and wisdom in responding to those proposals.

I ask that the RECORD include herewith the complete transcript of the President's speech to the American Bankers Association, as it appeared in the Washington Post today, and I respectfully call the attention of the Members to this and his answers to questions from the bankers:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1963]

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH TO BANKERS AND QUESTION PERIOD

(NOTE.—The following is the text of President Kennedy's speech yesterday as delivered to the American Bankers Association symposium on economic growth at the Mayflower Hotel here, with the question and answer period after the President's speech.)

The President. Mr. (David) Rockefeller (symposium chairman), Mr. Secretary (Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon), Mr. (Walter) Heller (chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers), Dr. (Per) Jacobson (managing director, International Monetary Fund), gentlemen, a 100 years ago today, in the darkest domestic crisis this Nation has ever known, the national banking system was founded. It was a farsighted act and provided for a sound basis for the extraordinary economic expansion which has brought the United States to its present unrivaled position.

Today, many Americans tend to think of developing underdeveloped countries in terms only of faraway nations, but in 1863, even measured by 1963 dollars, our own per capita income—and this should be a source of encouragement to many who are laboring with the problem of underdevelopment in far-off countries—our own per capita income was less than \$1 a day, approximately the same as Chile's.

Nearly 80 percent of our labor force was engaged in agriculture, the same percentage as is today engaged in the Philippines. An estimated 20 percent of our population was illiterate, the same percentage of the population of Ceylon.

Only one-fifth of our 34 million people lived in towns or cities of over 5,000 in population, as is roughly true now of Turkey. In 1863, this Nation had fewer railroad tracks laid than India has today, and its children had a shorter life expectancy than a child born this year in Thailand or Zanzibar.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

What can be summed up in the past 100 years, I think, the history of it, can be summed up in two words, and that is "economic growth." No nation in the history of the world has ever experienced a century of economic growth comparable to that of the United States in the last 100 years.

In 100 years, the growth of our free-enterprise economy under a free political system, and under the development effectively of our national and local and State educational systems, has brought our citizens to an unprecedented standard of living.

It has brought to our Nation an unparalleled position in the world, as the world's foremost banker, merchant, manufacturer, and consumer. It has demonstrated the power of freedom for all to see, and sustained the cause of freedom through hot wars and cold, at home and abroad.

All this and more has been made possible by economic growth, and yet we have heard in recent times that economic growth is too abstract a concept; that it is too academic for politicians and voters; that it is too theoretical a basis for proposals to the Congress.

I do not see anything abstract or academic about economic growth. It means finding 1.2 million additional jobs every year for the men and women pouring into our labor market, half of them below the age of 25. It means preventing the periodic recessions which have hit our Nation, three times in the last 10 years.

It means ending the persisting slack which has kept our unemployment rate at 5 percent or above for 62 out of the last 63 months. It has kept output \$30 billion to \$40 billion below our productive capacity and kept corporate investments in 1962 actually below the levels of gross retained earnings. There is nothing theoretical about that.

CONCRETE FIGURES

There is nothing academic about pushing our economy to 4 percent instead of 3 percent, which might total over the next 10 years in today's prices \$400 billion more in output of goods and services, with all that this would mean to family incomes, wages, profits, and governmental revenues.

These are the concrete, not abstract, figures that growth represents. That is why I am pleased that the American Bankers Association has devoted this conference to that subject. And that is why I believe the most urgent piece of business before the Congress this year is Federal tax revision.

Last year, a year of recovery and prosperity for most Americans, unemployment averaged the same high 5.6 percent of the labor force as it did in the recession year of 1954. Business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level last year than it was in 1957, although total output and profits were much higher. These are deeply disturbing statistics, and yet there is nothing deeply wrong with our economy.

We have the most productive skilled workers in the world, and the most ample national resources, and a respected currency. We have no lack of savings or technicians or mass markets or price stabilities, such as hampers economic progress in so much of the world today. We have, in short, no basic obstacle to growth, and we have opportunities for greater growth.

I do not believe that any thoughtful American could look at the statistics and impartial facts about this Nation's economy over that period and not conclude that we need to step up our growth. But it will not be stepped up by political slogans or homely analogies. It will not be stepped up by canceling defense contracts or lowering the debt ceiling.

In my opinion, it will be stepped up only by lightening the repressive rate of wartime



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

No. 29

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Nahum 1: 7: *The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and He knoweth them that trust in Him.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that daily we may be lifted by the mighty tides of Thy gracious spirit into the glad assurance that Thou art able and willing to help us meet faithfully all our tasks and responsibilities.

Grant that we may be inspired to put the various problems of life in the right perspective for we are frequently far more conscious of our perplexities than we are of Thy divine power which we may appropriate by faith.

May it be our highest wisdom to trust in Thee and go forth with a firm and calm reliance that we shall be guided by Thee in the high adventure of building a nobler civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

UNITED STATES MUST FIND WAY TO LIBERATE CUBANS

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Russian occupation of Cuba, a nation of the Western Hemisphere, has sounded an alarm in every city, village, and hamlet of the New World. The voices of concern raised in the United States are many. One voice raised Sunday merits the careful study and, in my judgment, the support of every straight-thinking American. I refer to that great man from In-

dependence, Mo., the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

Former Presidents of our country by tradition are properly regarded as the elder statesmen and their counsel in times of crisis has much significance. The man from Independence is known throughout the world as the man of decision. In the stormy days of his administration when our Nation carried almost singlehanded the great burden of freedom's cause against the imperial tyranny of the Russians, it was he who stemmed the tide of Communist aggression and launched programs to buttress the frontiers of freedom throughout the world. When the chips were down he acted with a resolute will and determination which rallied our Nation and the friends of freedom on farflung fronts. Harry S. Truman has won a special place in the hearts of his countrymen by the boldness of his vision and the determination of his purposes.

Now, when the frontiers of freedom are many, when the United States has strong and able allies in common cause, when the Russian empire shows strong signs of internal conflict which the masters in the Kremlin cannot control, when the security of the entire Western Hemisphere is directly challenged by the new imperialism of Moscow—the man from Independence, Mo., has spoken out in the Washington Post in a thoughtful article entitled "United States Must Find Way To Liberate Cubans."

By leave obtained, I insert this article in the RECORD and commend this guidepost to action to all who share the responsibility for the future of freedom's cause:

UNITED STATES MUST FIND WAY TO LIBERATE CUBANS

INDEPENDENCE, Mo., February 23.—Along with everyone else, I have been concerned about the situation in Cuba. The Cuban people have been beset with internal prob-

lems almost from the time Cuba was discovered by Columbus. One set of tyrants seems to be succeeded by another in guise of liberators.

In an open society such as ours it is natural for people freely to express their opinions, or in other words to sound off. This tendency is particularly apparent in times of crisis. There is now much talk about Cuba. There are those who read and talk about it—and there are those who tell those in charge what to do and how to do it.

That is all right, as far as it goes, but it does no good and could do much harm if we get into a political hassle about it. Foreign policy should never be an issue between the great political parties. The United States should agree on and have but one approach to dealings with other nations.

Is there no hope for Cuba? Is Cuba now doomed to become the Balkan satellite of the American continent? Are the Cuban people without hope of becoming a genuinely free and independent people? These and many other questions are being raised.

The one thing that history teaches us over and over again is that no system of government that defies the will of its people can long endure and, while modern weapons in the hands of a new crop of quislings make the task of liberation more formidable, it is as true today as it ever was that the will of a people to be free is irresistible.

Any government that imposes its will from the top will be overthrown in time. This happens when the people reach that certain point of loss of patience and the congelment of their will to resist.

Cuba, historically, has suffered a long series of misfortunes, from its rulers and their depredations, greed, and corruption. From the time in 1898 when the United States intervened in Cuba to set her free and to help her establish and maintain a free government for the benefit of all of her people, she has experienced one failure after another.

We have always been sympathetic toward the Cuban people, but for one reason or another things never seemed to work out so that the affairs of Cuba could be administered by honest and devoted patriots rather than the greedy, selfish, grafting dictators that kept succeeding one another.

The present situation in Cuba defies all reasoning. Castro, as a revolutionary leader fighting to unseat dictator Batista, attracted sympathetic support from many quarters in this hemisphere, and from the United States in particular. There was some reason to hope that here at long last there may have arisen a true patriot and able leader, who would devote his energies to the establishment of representative government and put through necessary reforms for the benefit of all the Cuban people.

But again our hopes were doomed to disappointment. The man, Castro, became inflated and power mad—and incapable of the kind of leadership Cuba needed in her period of reconstruction.

Instead of applying his energies to the solution of the needs of Cuba, Castro betrayed his revolution by delivering the Cuban people to the political imprisonment of a Russian-made Communist dictatorship. He thus committed Cuba to a life of crisis, aggression, oppression and intrigue.

PUT OFF RESPONSIBILITY

We admit that our policies toward Cuba, and I would include my own administration as well, have left something to be desired. For some reason we have put off for too long our responsibility to put pressure on the Cuban leaders to institute badly needed reforms.

The situation in Cuba today is not unlike that of the plight from which many satellite nations are suffering, except that the tragedy of Cuba could have been prevented by us.

Somehow we must seek a way of helping the Cuban people to liberate themselves once and for all. The world situation today is vastly different from what it was at the time we liberated Cuba from Spain. We now have the United Nations, which could have been helpful and perhaps could be in the future. We have the Organization of American States and other cooperative agencies that also could have been enlisted in dealing with that situation. But all of that is water over the dam.

MODERN WEAPONS

There is one thing we cannot do and must not do and that is to abandon Cuba to her self-imposed tyrants and new conquerors. For as long as these people enforce their will by the use of modern weapons the Cuban people will be compelled to undergo prolonged suffering, before they can hope to restore themselves by the process of spontaneous popular uprising.

The Cuban people are now pretty much in the same fix as the Hungarians who found that they could not liberate themselves by attempting to meet mechanized Russian divisions with rifles and home made explosives.

But Cuba is in our own frontyard where we have a direct responsibility to make her people free again. The first time we "remembered the Maine"—now we should never forget to "remember the missiles." Now we must seriously consider the Communists and their Asian and Eastern European ideas.

IN DIFFERENT CATEGORY

It is my opinion that until the sources of all the world's tensions and dangers are overcome within those nations that constitute the centers of the Communist conspiracy, namely, the police states of Russia and China, there is little chance for the occupied satellites to settle matters for themselves.

But I repeat that the Cuban situation is in a different category and should not be confused with the other satellite victims within the Russian-Chinese orbit. Cuba was delivered to Communist control and domination by a betrayal of a modern-day Quisling, Castro. He perpetrated this act of treason against Cuban people and even his revolutionary followers in the name of liberation from "colonialism." But instead of winning her freedom from her own dictatorship, Cuba

has become a colony again—a colony of Communist Russia.

I think that it is well that we take a look at the record of our past relations with Cuba. From early 1899 to mid-1902, while Cuba was under temporary U.S. military rule following her liberation from Spain, most of the offices were placed under Cuban nationals. During that period much was done to build public works, strict measures of sanitation were put into effect, the civil service was reformed and public education significantly improved. Yellow fever, which had been plaguing Cuba for centuries, was eradicated.

At the same time a constitutional convention was called to establish a system for self-government. The first Cuban Continental Congress met on May 5, 1902, and we turned over control of the government to the people of Cuba.

In restoring Cuba to self-government the so-called Platt amendment was accepted by Cuba on June 12, 1901, as a part of its constitution.

AMENDMENT PROVISIONS

Among the several provisions of the Platt amendment were these:

1. The sanitation measures set up by the military were to be maintained.
2. Naval stations were authorized to be leased to the United States.
3. The United States reserved the right to interfere in the affairs of the island if it became necessary.

It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development. These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

FAIR FROM EXHAUSTED

The situation is clear, the problem is obvious, the solution not so apparent. But, like the bubonic plague of cholera, quarantining is one remedy that every public health authority knows must be imposed until a virulent epidemic abates.

As a nation devoted to peace, we have had to suffer much abuse and provocation at the hands of the Communists, but we have been patient. And our patience, though often sorely tried, is far from exhausted. We, of course, continue to hope that somehow, somehow, the Cuban people will see to it that these latter-day quislings are overthrown and that freedom and the needed reforms are established for the benefit of all the Cuban people.

A former President, much as he might try, cannot detach himself from events, even long after he is out of office. On one of my walks a thought kept going through my mind on how I might have dealt with Castro if it had been mine to do. This is how I saw it: Immediately after the conclusion of the revolution in Cuba, I would have invited Castro to the White House. This is the way I might have put it to him:

"Mr. Castro, your revolution is over and now you have the responsibility and the big job of reconstruction. You have made a great many promises to your people in enlisting their support. How are you going to make good in those promises? You don't have the resources of your own in Cuba, and there are no means in sight to enable you to perform the things you promised the Cuban people.

"Now, there are only two places where you might get the necessary economic support to put over your program of reforms. We

are close to Cuba and we have historic ties with your country. All we would expect in return for our support would be that you keep the Cuban institutions free, and the Cuban people free, and that you get rid of corruption. This is all we would ask, this is all we would expect, and Cuba would enjoy complete sovereignty and independence as a nation. But if you should elect to go the other way—the Communist way—you will become a puppet and that can only lead you to more trouble and bloodshed."

WE STAND FIRM

I would have hoped that after some such exchange we should have come to an understanding and I think we might have reached a friendly agreement. All this, of course, needed to have been quietly negotiated within the privacy of the White House. With that out of the way I might have closed our meeting with a friendly suggestion, perhaps something like this:

"Now that we understand each other, Fidel, let us get to work and do all we can for the cause of your people."

The Cuban crisis has served one useful purpose—it again smoked out the Russian capacity for bluff and their hit-and-run type of international piracy. And it provided the United States with an opportunity to make it clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

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

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, if anyone had any doubts about the gambling spirit of the American people such doubts should have been removed as the result of the activities last night at Yonkers Raceway in New York.

Not only did we witness 28,732 legal bettors going through the turnstiles to wager over \$2 million but we saw how this instinctive universal human trait was unruffled by inclement weather. This tremendous crowd of decent citizens braved the snow and 30° temperature to enjoy an evening of relaxation, pleasure, and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, last night was the earliest opening of horse racing in New York State not because of the State's interest in the improvement of breeding horses but because of the State treasury's need for additional tax revenue.

Last night's activities, profitable to the State and the National Government as well, clearly indicated that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings and that neither snow nor cold weather will stop people from gambling—legally or illegally.

Mr. Speaker, if we had the courage to recognize and accept the obvious, we could easily, painlessly, and voluntarily pump into our Federal treasury over \$10 billion a year in additional income through a national lottery. A national lottery would provide the answer to our Government's great need for more revenue and the American taxpayers' demand for tax relief.

MANAGED NEWS

(Mr. STINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this