

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6603

**Representative Fino's Imagination Makes
Maine People Gambling Addicts**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER**

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino], in his extension of remarks appearing on page A6483 in the Appendix of the Record, made reference to gambling in the State of Maine.

His statement was entitled "No. 17—Maine: The Gamblers' Paradise." While we recognize that Mr. Fino, in promoting legislation for a national lottery, is seeking to focus attention on illegal gambling in all the 50 States, I believe that reference to the Pine Tree State as a "gamblers' paradise" is injudicious and untrue.

A "paradise"—yes—for those who enjoy hunting, fishing, and outdoor living at its best; for those who have sailed along the most scenic coastline in the world; for those who ski our slopes during a brisk winter day—but I have never before heard the State of Maine referred to as a "gamblers' paradise."

Mr. Fino refers to estimates of \$300 million a year in illegal gambling on horseracing in Maine and stated that according to "expert computations" the money illegally gambled in Maine of all sources totaled \$600 million last year. This is a completely unrealistic estimate.

Of course I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman in his views that illegal gambling of any size or scope is insidious and breeds crimes of every nature.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino] stated that—

After significant expenses are incurred for the corruption of governmental and law enforcement process, there is still plenty of money left in the hands of the syndicates.

I assume that this was a generalization and the gentleman from New York is not making this charge in respect to Maine's law enforcement officials.

If my assumption is not true and he has any specific information bearing on the State of Maine, I would ask that he immediately make this information available to the attorney general of the State of Maine, Hon. Frank Hancock.

To allow an inference like this to stand would be an unwarranted slur to Maine's law enforcement officials, State, county, and local.

The State of Maine is justly proud of its law enforcement. The Maine State Police under the direction of Col. Robert Marx is recognized nationally for its competence. Over 16 sheriffs' departments are increasingly efficient each succeeding year as more and more career deputies fill their ranks.

Maine's town and city police departments will measure up man for man with any departments of similar size in the country.

As a former Federal enforcement officer, I am well aware of the evil that illegal gambling brings to our society. However, I also believe that we must be eager to defend the reputations of honest law enforcement officials. If we do not, there will be even fewer conscientious men who will seek these positions.

The gentleman from New York might be interested in an editorial appearing in the Portland Press Herald, October 19, in reference to his remarks.

The editorial follows:

REPRESENTATIVE FINO'S IMAGINATION MAKES
MAINE PEOPLE GAMBLING ADDICTS

Maine people who opened their papers on Thursday to learn, according to a New York City Congressman named PAUL FINO, that \$600 million was illegally gambled in Maine last year must have been amazed to find so much loose money rattling around here.

This stupefying statistic, which is producing horse laughs all the way from Kittery to Fort Kent, is the imaginative product of Mr. FINO alone.

The gross income of Maine's million people in 1962 was roughly \$1.8 billion, which would mean that a third of it passed through the hands of bookies and other denizens of the underworld. It would mean that the average family of four gaily bade goodbye to \$2,400 in trying to get rich last year, and this is a lot of moolah—in this State especially.

Of course there is a method in the madness of the Bronx Congressman. With the perseverance of a bulldog, he has been trying to persuade his fellow Members that the cure for all our ills is a national lottery, and the way to do it is to prove illicit gambling on a big scale. Instead of taking him seriously, Governor Reed should have wired him the single word uttered by General McAuliffe at the siege of Bastogne.

Kennedy's Space Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from Aviation Week and Space Technology, September 30, 1963:

KENNEDY'S SPACE BOOMERANG

President Kennedy has dealt his own national space program its hardest blow. This extraordinary feat of political contortion was achieved with his recent United Nations speech appealing to the Soviet Union to share this Nation's effort in a joint program to land men on the moon. No matter how hard the White House apologists try to recast recent history, this speech represented a basic shift in U.S. space policy that is losing political support for the program and braking much of the technical momentum already achieved. It is also a good example of the brittle brilliance of the White House staff members who spawn scintillating ideas without much thought on their ramifications and are continually surprised by the fires they ignite.

IMMEDIATE EFFECTS

The immediate effects of the President's ill-conceived invitation to the Soviets to join the U.S. Apollo program are twofold:

First, it will provide congressional opponents of his space program with the well-sharpened ax they need to cut its fiscal 1964 budget drastically and retard U.S. space progress even more than the restrictions of technical development. It has changed the fiscal 1964 NASA budget bill from an essential instrument to achieve a top-priority national goal essential to this Nation's security and international leadership into what can easily be construed by its opponents as a Russian foreign aid bill. It also leaves the congressional supporters of the President's space program with neither inclination nor ability to defend it successfully.

Second, it will induce a psychological drag into the vast program that has just begun to build promising technical momentum. It may change the motivation of several million Americans who are involved in all phases of the manned space flight effort from a patriotic sense of extreme urgency to a routine 9-5 job in which the fruits of their labors may be retailed to the Soviet Union.

The long-term effects are difficult to perceive in detail, but there is little doubt that the manned space flight program faces the prospect of dwindling from one of the most exciting challenges ever accepted by a nation to an unimportant pawn in the cold war to be sacrificed in the first gambit of appeasement.

There are certainly many indications that the Soviets are finding the current U.S. pace in space technology a serious challenge to their present claim of international leadership in this vital area. During the period of their unquestioned leadership they were not interested in exchanging any technical data on their manned space flight programs with anybody. Now that they are feeling the pinch, they are making overtures to tap U.S. technology.

To understand just how the Soviets view technical exchanges, it is worth recalling the few experiences in the aerospace field of recent years.

Andrei Tupolev was shown the modern Convair plant at San Diego, then producing F-106 supersonic interceptors, and the Douglas plant, where Thor ballistic missiles were being built. When USAF brass visited Moscow they were shown the two oldest aircraft factories in Russia—one producing jet engines of British design, and the other, Serge Ilyushin's versions of a Convair 240 transport. Who benefited most from that exchange?

AEROFLOT VISIT

When an Aeroflot delegation visited the United States as a preliminary to negotiations for a bilateral air transport agreement, they were given a thorough look at U.S. airline operations, including inspection of a modern jet overhaul operation. When the U.S. jet arrived in the U.S.S.R. for reciprocity, they were denied access to any jet engine overhaul facilities and shown more opera houses and ballets than Aeroflot operations. Who benefited most from that exchange?

The Soviet contributions to international space technology gatherings in recent years have been vapid and inconsequential compared with the data that they have obviously garnered from their pioneering efforts.

The shock of the President's lunar landing policy reversal has not yet been fully felt, either technically or politically. This casual act that could divert the purpose of a vast technological effort and billions of taxpayers' dollars in attempting to create a fleeting political impression must certainly cast grave doubts on the sincerity of many other phases of the Kennedy administration's program.

ROBERT HOTZ.

A6604

Test Ban

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 23

Copy of Second Letter to President Requesting Intentions as to Establishing Promised Test Ban Safeguards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, below is reproduced my second letter to President Kennedy relative to the vital matter of establishing the safeguards promised by him to diminish the admitted risks and disadvantages of the test ban treaty. For reference, my first letter to him on this subject was reproduced in the RECORD for September 30 at page A6115:

OCTOBER 18, 1963.

Re reductions of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My letter to you dated September 24, 1963, concerning the above-captioned matter has just been answered by Atomic Energy Commission Chairman, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, under date of October 17, 1963.

Dr. Seaborg's letter states your administration is seeking authorization to make the

following treaty safeguards expenditures during the balance of fiscal year 1964:

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico:	
Occupational health laboratory	\$1,650,000
High temperature chemistry facility	1,435,000
Plutonium research support building	655,000
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.:	
Radiochemistry building	5,900,000
Hazards control addition	1,000,000
Plant engineering and services building	1,400,000
West cafeteria addition	255,000
Craft shop addition	200,000
Sandia Base, N. Mex.:	
Development laboratory	3,780,000
Explosive facilities	540,000
Classified technical reports building (addition)	500,000
Nevada Test Site: Control point additions	630,000
Total	17,945,000

Dr. Seaborg's letter also indicates that a request for appropriation of \$5,945,000 will be made and that the remaining \$12 million of the total sum of \$17,945,000 will be obtained by reallocating money already appropriated for other purposes.

For the purposes of comparison, I have prepared the following table setting out the sums I have estimated are necessary to establish the treaty safeguards you have promised and sums you requested on October 16:

Action required by promised safeguards	Cost estimated in Sept. 24, 1963, letter to you	Your Oct. 16, 1963, request	Percent
Underground test site improvement and additions	\$100,000,000	\$630,000	0.63
Weapons Laboratory improvements and retention of topflight scientists	160,000,000	17,315,000	10.82
Readiness for atmospheric tests resumption capability	610,000,000		.00
Detection system improvements and miscellaneous	130,000,000		.00
Total	1,000,000,000	17,945,000	1.79

This table indicates a serious discrepancy between your views and mine as to the actions required to implement the safeguards, their costs and as to the permissible delay in implementing them. This discrepancy is further enlarged by my estimate that, in addition to the original investment, at least one-quarter billion dollars must be spent annually to maintain the safeguards in operational efficiency.

Inasmuch as statements by yourself and members of your administration raise no question as to the necessity for establishing the safeguards, the difference between my views and yours seem to lie in the following areas:

1. What actions are necessary to establish the safeguards?
2. How urgent is it to establish them without delay?
3. How much will they cost?

These are very grave questions concerning which I believe the American people are entitled to know your views in detail. I feel they also are entitled to reassurance that the \$12 million reallocation above mentioned is not from items essential to the national security.

Dr. Seaborg's letter, I presume, indicated only a part of what you may have in mind relative to investments at the laboratories and for underground test site facilities. It was wholly silent as to what you may have in

mind respecting the creation and maintenance of readiness for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing under emergency conditions. It also was wholly silent as to what you may have in mind respecting the improvement of our capability to detect possible violations of the treaty and to monitor Soviet nuclear weapons improvements.

I sincerely hope you will avail yourself of an opportunity to reveal to the Nation your thinking on these important matters, either in a comprehensive reply to this letter or otherwise.

I make this request because the amount you are presently seeking for implementation of the safeguards is such a small fraction of what many believe is needed that it raises doubts that the entire matter of the safeguards are being taken seriously by those who may be advising you in these matters.

I make this request also because there is no assurance that Soviet scientists have not already embarked on a clandestine program of secret developments aimed at overpowering U.S. capability in every category of nuclear weapons; there can be no assurance on this point until the promised safeguards are fully in being; and, until they are, an open invitation to the Kremlin is outstanding to get away with anything and everything we cannot detect or discover.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Is Medical Experimentation Cruel to Animals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues in the House, like me, have received much mail on the subject of inhumane treatment of animals during experimentation for medical research purposes. I received a very thoughtful article that was written by one of my constituents on this subject and submit it for the possible interest of my colleagues.

AMORY IS NEEDLESSLY CRUEL TO SCIENCE

(By Bonnie Brian Seliger)

After reading Cleveland Amory's article "Science Is Needlessly Cruel to Animals" I would like the opportunity to discuss this situation from a different point of view.

In the beginning, I would like to say that I feel sure that the type of inhumane treatment of animals reported by Mr. Amory does happen. However, I would like to ask, to what percentage of the animals involved and by what percentage of the men and women involved? To say "science is needlessly cruel to animals" is a sweeping statement and to suggest Federal control seems a drastic solution. The picture must be viewed in its entirety to give it proper perspective. The incidence of sadistic activity in the science labs involves such a small percentage of the men and animals in the overall picture of the science research program that it does not warrant this move for congressional action.

By accumulating the facts of a few obscure and unhappy incidents and printing them in the front of the Post, Mr. Amory and the editors of the Post have blotted from the view of the public, the thousands of dedicated men and women who give their lives to the search for new knowledge.

The same day Mr. Amory's article appeared in the Post, our local newspaper carried the story of parents who had beaten their 6-year-old child to death for wetting the bed. Stories of such happenings are printed almost daily. Does this mean parents are needlessly cruel to children and that the Government should be brought in to control the discipline of children? Everyone assumes, and rightly so, that the vast majority of parents have enough humanity and judgement, to discipline their own children without outside interference. When a case of gross mistreatment or unkindness is found it is corrected and the guilty persons punished according to the local laws. So it should be with scientists.

My husband is doing research under a Government grant at this time. I am not at all inclined toward this type of work and much prefer to use animals just for the enjoyment a pet gives me personally, but I have seen for myself many times and in several schools, the way all kinds of research animals are treated. Their fate does not bother me, a pet lover, in the least. I have answered many strange questions people have asked me about animal research so I would like to answer some of them here.

I can't begin to count the number of times someone has asked me if they put the ani-