

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3406. A bill for the relief of William H. Pearlmutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 3407. A bill for the relief of Francisco Joaquim Alves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3408. A bill for the relief of Basile G. Skalenakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 3409. A bill for the relief of Suzie Sevilya Aellon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 3410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leonard O. Erickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 3411. A bill for the relief of Wilmore E. Balderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 3412. A bill to authorize the appointment of Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., as permanent brigadier general of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3413. A bill to authorize the appointment of Philip Ferdinand Lindeman as permanent colonel of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 3414. A bill for the relief of Yoichi Omori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 3415. A bill for the relief of America Sanchez de Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3416. A bill for the relief of Percy C. Hasten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3417. A bill for the relief of Gyorgy Stulberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3418. A bill for the relief of Homa Gashgal and Nahid Gashgal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 3419. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward J. Steichen, U.S. Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 3420. A bill for the relief of Joseph La Piana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 3421. A bill for the relief of Rafael Walog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 3422. A bill for the relief of Electronic Medical Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUTT:

H.R. 3423. A bill for the relief of Orange Coast College, Costa Mesa, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3424. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Army, on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3425. A bill for the relief of Mondello Francesca Collearafi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3426. A bill for the relief of Hong-to Dew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 3427. A bill for the relief of Idel Volkman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 3428. A bill for the relief of John (Hanna) Karam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3429. A bill for the relief of Aristidis Veloudos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3430. A bill for the relief of Gert Forsthoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3431. A bill for the relief of Fahrudin Nushi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3432. A bill for the relief of Alice Guy Blache; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

48. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by the Newark, N.J., Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies: In opposition to the recognition of Red China by the United States and admission of Red China to the United Nations; also urging withdrawal of recognition of United Nations representatives of current Hungarian regime; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

49. Also, resolution adopted by the Vegetable Growers' Association of New Jersey opposing the use of public funds to bring new land into production; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

50. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc., New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting continuation of economic aid to Israel and the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Cecil B. de Mille

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, California and the Nation lost a great man last week.

Cecil B. de Mille, first citizen of Hollywood, came west from New York in 1913 to make the first feature-length motion picture. He stayed on to build an industry and a personal reputation that will survive him as long as men seek diversion from the cares of life in the motion picture theater; perhaps longer.

He was a pioneer in practically every phase of his industry, constantly developing, changing, adapting new ideas, many of them his own. But in his personal life he was a traditionalist, clinging to the morality, religion, and ethics taught at his mother's knee.

He once remarked that when he was a boy, there were no motion pictures, and that for entertainment his mother read each evening one chapter from the Old Testament and one from the New. His selection of religious themes for many of his productions reflects this early training. His "King of Kings," produced some 30 years ago, is still showing in far corners of the world. His latest of two

"The Ten Commandments," it has been estimated, will play for 50 years.

Although his own success was seldom if ever in doubt, De Mille was never at ease when the industry was in trouble. He gave freely of his wise counsel and often acted as financier to companies suffering the stress of a young and sometimes erratic industry.

Young De Mille ran away from school at 15 and tried to enlist in the Army to fight in the Spanish-American War. In World War I he organized a company of the California Home Guard. During World War II he personally accounted for the sales of millions of dollars' worth of war bonds, and millions more through bond-selling shows utilizing actors and actresses under contract to him.

His concept of patriotism extended beyond service in wartime. He was a leader of public affairs and political thought in peacetime as well. At the height of his career in radio, he was thrown off the air for refusing to pay a \$1 union assessment which he found incompatible with his sure sense of freedom. The assessment was to be used by the union to fight right-to-work legislation. De Mille, who favored right-to-work, contended that the involuntary assessment forced him to support a belief contrary to his own. He lost the court battle but fought for the principle for the rest of his life.

Cecil B. de Mille was honored by his contemporaries. Industrial awards, including the coveted Oscar, honorary de-

grees, and organization and Government awards came his way, justly earned. He received one of the first of nine great living American awards bestowed by the United States Chamber of Commerce in 1957.

I mourn the passing of Cecil B. de Mille. He was a great man.

Tom Kitayama—Union City Councilman

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rapidly growing areas in California is southern Alameda County. In the last 5 years three areas have been incorporated into new cities. The last came into being early this month when the people of the Alvarado-Decoto district decided to incorporate into Union City.

Under California State law this can only be done by referendum. The proposition to incorporate Union City carried better than 4 to 1.

At the same election 15 citizens of the area submitted their qualifications to the voters by seeking 5 nonpartisan city council seats. The man who topped the

ticket was Tom Kitayama, a 35-year-old prominent nurseryman.

Councilman Kitayama is probably the first northern California Nisei to seek an elective post as city councilman. His election is indicative of the respect with which Californians hold their fellow countrymen of Japanese ancestry.

Kitayama's younger brother, Kee, is the newly elected president of Eden Township Japanese-American Citizens League. Another brother, Ray, is a past president of the Freemont JACL.

The Kitayama brothers operate one of the largest carnation nurseries in the country. Tom is president and coowner of the firm and also director on both the northern California Carnation Growers Association and the American Carnation Society.

Tom is married to the former Hideko Horikawa, both Seattle-born Nisei, and they have four children.

### Washington Report

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. BRUCE ALGER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, my newsletter of January 24:

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The 1960 budget, 1,275 pages, 2 inches thick, more than 4 pounds in weight, lists \$77 billion in Federal Government expenditures for fiscal 1960 (July 1959 to July 1960). Comparatively, this is \$3.9 billion less than this year, fiscal 1959. Receipts will be an estimated \$77.1 billion, which is \$9.1 billion more than this year. (However, total expenditures to the public are listed as \$92.9 billion and total receipts \$93.5 billion as distinguished from budgetary.) The President's 78-page budget message, a condensed explanation, discussed expenditures and receipts by Government departments, by military and civilian, and by specific legislative program.

Commendable, as I see it, are these thoughts: (1) We must have a balanced budget, live within our means, pay as we go; we must foster initiative and free enterprise, a sound economy and currency; (2) we need to review existing programs; (3) Congress, not the administration, is constitutionally responsible for the appropriation of money, and the size of the budget results from earlier congressional legislation; (4) Federal programs, wherever possible, should be shifted back to the States (along with tax jurisdiction); (5) we must assure maximum defense for each dollar spent; (6) research in many fields, particularly military, is continually being increased; (7) a better agricultural program is needed with less cost to the taxpayer and less control of the farmer; (8) Government whenever possible should sell surplus property; (9) more user charges and less subsidies are needed so that users, not the general public, foot the bill; (10) private financing, not Government loans, should be stimulated, through flexible interest rates.

Criticisms include: (1) Is a budget balanced and the Federal Government con-

trolled when projects are deferred, rather than canceled; when 43,000 new employees are to be hired; when more money is to be spent in aid to education, vocational rehabilitation, public works, urban renewal, public housing, and almost every welfare program? (2) since 1955 the budget has grown two to one in welfare over defense needs, when we know military requirements are paramount; simultaneously politicians assure us budget growth results from defense requirements; (3) increased population (as reason for budget growth) puts more strain on local government (utilities, schools, etc.) than on Federal Government; (4) Congress is offered additional opportunities to lose control. Example: (a) Foreign aid development loan fund is a revolving fund outside Congress' direct control; (b) other revolving funds are proposed; (c) item veto would transfer to the President great new authority; (d) foreign aid and Public Law 480 (Food Disposal Act) each transfer jurisdiction to the President; (e) requested presidential blanket emergency funds take the purse strings from Congress. (5) The foot-in-the-door programs where great spending increases follow program inception include: (a) Defense education bill; (b) public assistance under social security; (c) urban renewal; (d) world loans through various international banks; (e) many others; (6) the Federal Government intends to foster local initiative by offering more Federal money and control; (7) built-in growth factors and fixed costs are skyrocketing costs without new programs. (Example: Public works will be at an alltime high without even adding any new projects.) (8) Tax incentives to encourage private investment abroad—Isn't this tax bribery? Will this weaken investment at home as greater gains can be had in other countries? Is this fair or constitutional? (9) Non-service-connected disabilities of veterans are soaring.

The big question really seems to be, Has the budget gotten beyond all control? After all, it is almost \$3 billion higher than the \$70 billion budget of 2 years ago that precipitated a nationwide furor. And why the increase? Perhaps Budget Director Stans said it best—"Why is it that some business leaders join taxpayers' organizations to bring pressure on the Government to cut expenses, yet support industry groups seeking more Government subsidies? Why is it that some labor leaders press hard for wage increases to keep up with the cost of living, and then urge a massive program of legislative action which, if adopted, would lead to more deficit spending, higher taxes, and inflation—all of which could only demoralize the value of wages earned?"

Now the battle of the budget begins politically. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.) Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, Appropriations Committee chairman, said, "All fiscal recommendations start with the President. Congress does not make the budget—he is at complete liberty to recommend a cut of \$5, \$10, \$15, or \$20 billion." Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, said, "The President cannot spend 1 penny which the Congress does not appropriate. We all know that." Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana, said, "The chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations referred to the increase from \$65 billion to \$79 billion over the past 4 years. During those 4 years he has been chairman of that committee, and Congress holds the purse strings over expenditures." So it goes—expenditures are voted by Congress, Democrat controlled, whose leaders now try to shift the blame to the President, who can only administer the law, which Congress passes. "The President proposes, but Congress disposes." We here know this, yet it is the people who are to be hoodwinked. True, the President could be a more forceful leader, but liberal Democrat spending critics offer only, "We must spend more." (First day of

Congress, six Democrats put in bills with a 5-year price tag of \$117 billion.)

Why not review all existing programs, as the President suggested we do in the military, to be sure we get maximum value received for each dollar spent in the Federal Government? For maximum value in the military, let's get the Defense Department out of business operations. Why not apply evaluation yardsticks to every Government program now? (1) Is this a function of Federal Government? (2) Can we afford it?

Mikoyan and Russian propaganda experts will now demonstrate over and over the reason for his visit and the gullibility of American people. Mikoyan will speak for American people as set apart and opposed to their Government. Let's review a few Russian comments. Khrushchev called Mikoyan to his face a professional traitor. Khrushchev, speaking of the United States and Russia, "We cannot coexist externally. One of us must go to his grave. We must push them to their graves." Khrushchev again, "We Bolsheviks are a ravenous people. What we achieved in the past is very little" (enslavement of half the world). "We want more and more." On Manuilsky, Russian instructor of political warfare, "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists." Need more be said?

### Legislative Proposals

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. BASIL L. WHITENER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have today offered seven bills for consideration by the House of Representatives. These bills, in my judgment, should be promptly considered by the appropriate committees and reported out for final approval at the earliest possible date.

The legislative proposals which I am making may be briefly summarized as follows:

#### I. EXCISE TAX REPEAL

One of the bills provides for the repeal of the excise tax on communication services and facilities, and another provides for the repeal of such taxes upon the transportation of persons.

Further collection of these excise taxes seems to me to be unwarranted in view of the fact that they were originally imposed as wartime tax-raising devices. These taxes constitute an undue burden upon individuals of small businesses. Repeal would result in very little loss of revenue to the Government and would serve as a stimulus to small business and individual savings.

In the 85th Congress we repealed the excise tax upon the transportation of property, and it now seems highly proper that we should do the same with reference to transportation tax upon persons.

## II. ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

One of the bills which I have offered will increase the amount which a taxpayer may deduct on account of expenses paid for the care of his or her dependents who are under the age of 16 years. The other measure would increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer, including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness.

The working mothers in our country are being heavily penalized under the present Internal Revenue Code by reason of their inability to deduct the costs of care for dependents while the mother is necessarily working to earn a livelihood for her family. To fail to give the consideration which this bill offers for taxpayers who must pay for the care of their dependents while gaining their livelihood will constitute the compounding of a wrong which has long been experienced by the working mothers of our country. I believe that this legislation is long overdue and entertain the hope that others in the House will concur with that thought.

An increase in the personal tax exemption for taxpayers from \$600 to \$1,000 will give tax relief to the lower income citizens and, thereby, should have a great stimulus upon business as well as personal savings by those in the lower income brackets. The increase in personal exemption which is envisioned will result in very little overall loss of revenue to the Federal Government and could, in the long pull, result in an increase in the revenue by reason of the stimulation which it will give to business.

## III. SOCIAL SECURITY

Another bill which I am offering will amend title II of the Social Security Act by removing the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.

This legislation is made essential by reason of the inflationary spiral in which those who are receiving benefits find themselves. Those recipients who are physically able to carry on gainful employment should not be penalized for their diligence and energy, but rather should be encouraged to continue to make their contribution to the business, economic, and industrial life of their country.

Those who have attained all eligibility requirements except the reduction of their own income should not be penalized but should be given the encouragement which this legislation proposes.

## IV. WORLD WAR II AND KOREAN WIDOWS AND ORPHANS

Another bill that I am offering today provides that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans. This legislation, if enacted, will meet one of the real needs in the field of veterans' affairs in this country. Since 1934 the provision has been made

for widows and children of deceased World War I veterans in the manner now sought to be extended to widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean veterans. Certainly it can be said that these individuals should receive the same consideration as now extended to those similarly situated by reason of casualties of World War I.

This legislation will mean a great deal to many needy and worthwhile widows and children in this land of ours.

## V. SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

I am also offering a bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board.

It has alarmed most Members of Congress that young boys are being brought from their homes throughout the country to Washington to serve as pages in the two bodies of Congress without having any provision made for their supervision and housing upon their arrival in the Nation's Capital.

This is a situation which should not be permitted to exist beyond the current session of the United States Congress.

To establish a pages' residence would not require any tremendous appropriation, particularly in view of the fact that it is contemplated that the pages will pay such rates and fees, as far as practicable, as are sufficient to make the operation and maintenance of the residence self-sustaining.

This residence idea is not a new one. It has been discussed with and by many of my colleagues, and it seems to be uniformly agreed that something should be done immediately to eliminate the failure of supervision which we now observe in the handling of housing arrangements for our splendid young boys.

Mr. Speaker, I again reiterate that I entertain the hope that the legislative proposals which I am today making will be seriously and promptly considered by the House of Representatives through the appropriate committees and that action may be taken upon them with the greatest possible dispatch.

## Tribute to Representative Herman P. Eberharter

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, may I also join my colleagues from Pennsylvania, and other Members, in paying a brief tribute to the memory of the Honorable Herman P. Eberharter. He was a great Democrat and a most able representative of the people of his district and his State. He possessed a wonderful personality and served with great distinction as a member of the Ways and Means Committee. We miss him and will continue to miss him.

May I extend an expression of my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

## A Problem Confronting the Indian People of South Dakota

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to bring before the Congress one of the most vexing problems confronting the Indian people of South Dakota, confronting the counties and the State of South Dakota.

The problem results from a policy of the Indian Department established at the Washington level, that when an Indian has been away from a reservation for 1 year, the Department is no longer responsible for him or his family, either for medical care, for relief, or any other benefits intended by Congress for the Indian people, including such benefits as trades training, on-the-job training, educational loans, and so forth.

These latter programs, however, do not cause too great disruption between Federal and local governments, they have only a detrimental effect upon the welfare of the individual Indian.

One of the serious problems, however, arises from the fact that most States, including the State of South Dakota, have a statute providing that an indigent person or an indigent family moving from one county to another may not become a resident of the new county, and, therefore, become a county ward or a financial burden upon that new county, if the new county into which the individual or the family moves, does, within a certain time, serve upon him a notice to prevent acquiring a legal settlement.

Such notice in South Dakota provides that the individual coming into such county from another county or another State who is likely to become a public charge, is thereby warned to depart therefrom, and that service of such notice shall apply to all members of such family.

Through the years, the law has been upheld and interpreted many times by the Supreme Court. Families have been returned to their original county several years after leaving that county, if they should attempt to become a public charge upon the new county.

The Indian Department, however, refuses to recognize the laws of the State of South Dakota. When an Indian has been off of the reservation for a year, the Department washes its hands of him, regardless of whether the county into which he has moved serves a notice to prevent acquiring legal settlement or not. Public Health follows the policy of the Indian Department. The result is that counties in South Dakota located near Indian reservations, where Indian people congregate for employment, find themselves in an unbearable position, with the

Indian Department refusing assistance and the country unable to provide the assistance. The Indian finds himself caught in the bind.

One serious example is the hospitals in Rapid City, S. Dak., where many thousands of dollars of hospital bills each year go unpaid by either the county or the Federal Government. Indian people are brought to the hospital in serious condition, an emergency exists and they must be given treatment. Because the Indian is indigent and unable to pay, the hospital is required to carry the cost of treatment and hospitalization.

I would quote from a letter under date of January 19, 1959, from the St. John's McNamara Hospital of Rapid City, S. Dak., with regard to the hospital bill of one Bert Guy Eagle Horse, age 41, an indigent taken to that hospital for emergency treatment and hospitalization. Part of the letter follows:

He was found lying in the street, a tire iron lying nearby and with severe lacerations about the head. A severe blow across the base of the man's head caused a state of unconsciousness requiring immediate attention. I called Dr. Sicher, the Indian public health physician, at the clinic in the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., for authorization. This was refused. I explained that he had authorized treatment for the man for rattlesnake bite at a previous admittance, August 1, 1958, and that they had recognized him as being eligible for authorization. He advised me that this was true, but that he had discovered that this was a mistake and that he should not have given it.

When the hospital called Pennington County Welfare Office they were advised that Bert Guy Eagle Horse was not a resident of Pennington County and apparently was prevented from becoming a resident, because of the South Dakota law. The county in which the home reservation of Bert Guy Eagle Horse is located will, of course, not pay the bill.

This, Mr. Speaker, creates a no man's land with the individual Indian and the hospital caught in the bind. The Congress appropriates millions of dollars annually in the belief that the Indian people are being cared for. The fact is, the policy of the Indian Department makes of these people, who are encouraged by the Department to leave the reservation, a man without a country and ineligible for any assistance. This, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, is a field in which the Congress must act. It is unfair to the Indian people that a vacuum should exist in which these people now find themselves at the mercy of non-Indian hospitals located adjacent to an Indian reservation.

We are advised that the Public Health hospitals on the reservation will give service to Indian people regardless of the fact that they have left the reservation for a time, but there is no provision for their return and no provision for emergency treatment. Worse than that, there is no provision for any public assistance to these families who having been encouraged to leave the reservation in search of work and to integrate into the white society, then find themselves destitute in a county which has served legal notice upon them to prevent their acquiring a legal settlement.

### In the Quality and Integrity of Our Young People Lies the Strength and Future of America

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Kentucky Junior Chamber of Commerce names its three outstanding young men and an outstanding young farmer of the year. On January 20 the selections for 1958 were made and it was with a great deal of gratification and pride that I learned that two of the four young men chosen for this distinguished honor are from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky which I have the honor to represent.

Thomas B. Hagerman, selected by the Kentucky Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of its three outstanding young men, is a native of Bowling Green, my hometown in Warren County. And William T. Roark, chosen as the outstanding young farmer, is from Franklin, Simpson County. These two men exemplify, in the truest sense, the tradition of selfless service to community and fellow citizens which has played such an important part in the growth of Kentucky and this great country of ours.

The choice of Thomas B. Hagerman is quite appropriate as the variety of activities in which he participates with excellence makes him indeed worthy of the appellation "outstanding." As an agent for Aetna Oil Co., in Bowling Green, Mr. Hagerman gives freely of his time, energy, and leadership to the various groups whose common denominator is the betterment of the community and the instilling of worthy ideals of service and integrity in the youth of that community. In these troubled times when the newspaper headlines scream of juvenile crimes, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for young men such as Thomas B. Hagerman. I can think of no better way to inspire the youth of our Nation with the ideal of service to their fellow man than by example. The emulation of men such as Thomas Hagerman cannot help but produce finer citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. Hagerman, who graduated from Western Kentucky State College, is a Jaycee, is active in church work, is a coach of the Small Fry Football Conference, a member of the Two Gallon Blood Donor Club, is a Warren County jury commissioner, a veteran participating in the Army Reserve program, and a high-school football official. The scope of his interests ranging from church work, youth direction, service to community as a jury commissioner, to Army Reserve activities indicates the fullness and maturity of character possessed by Mr. Hagerman.

As service to community enhances the facilities of our urban centers, so excellence in farming contributes to the

productivity of our rural areas upon which this Nation was built. It is to men such as William T. Roark that we can look with pride and confidence to the further development of agriculture. During the past 11 years in which Mr. Roark has engaged in farming, he has increased the productivity of his 985-acre farm by 166 percent. He raises beef cattle and seed. In addition to his truly outstanding farmwork, young Roark is active in his church, the Rotary Club, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, Ma-sons, soil-conservation work, county extension council, Simpson County Farm Bureau, and Simpson County Tobacco Association. When so many of our young men are leaving the land with the idea of quick success in the city, the example set by William T. Roark should serve as an inspiration to the youth who elect to remain on the farm and achieve a full and satisfying life in agricultural pursuits.

I am justifiably proud in being able to place in the RECORD a brief tribute to the accomplishments of these two fine young men from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky. In the quality and integrity of our young people lies the strength and future of America and certainly Thomas B. Hagerman and William T. Roark are worthy of the trust placed in them.

### Justice for Hawaii

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a statement made by me before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union.

The statement follows:

#### JUSTICE FOR HAWAII

Mr. Chairman: In the last Congress, Alaska came of age; it is now long past the hour to end Hawaii's apprenticeship. It is an indisputable fact, that Hawaii met the traditional threefold test of eligibility for statehood.

Before analyzing Hawaii's eligibility, permit me to remind my colleagues of the three basic requirements demanded by tradition and precedent for admission. First, the people of the Territory must evince love for the ideals of American democratic government. Second, a majority of the electorate must express a clear desire for statehood. And third, the Territory must possess sufficient resources and population to support the cost of State government. I shall demonstrate that Hawaii has passed these tests with high honors.

The Hawaiian people have been drawn to America almost from the very dawn of their modern history. In 1820, 17 New England missionaries arrived in the archipelago; and before the passage of many years the natives in large measure were converted to Christianity and made familiar with the ways of the West. White whalers, traders, speculators, and sugar planters migrated to the islands in progressively greater numbers.

By 1842, five out of six ships calling at Hawaii were American; and Yankee cultural influence, despite strong British competition, rapidly assumed predominance. In 1842 a constitution modeled in part after that of the United States was adopted. Fourteen years later the people of this constitutional monarchy urged their King to negotiate for annexation to the United States. He complied, but the project was abandoned with his untimely death.

In 1898 Hawaii became a Republic, and negotiations for annexation were immediately undertaken. A treaty linking the two Republics was soon fashioned, but it was withdrawn from the American Senate by President Cleveland, who had not been in office when the Hawaiian revolution erupted and who disapproved of what he considered the unseemly haste by which the annexation convention had been drafted.

Four years later a new treaty of annexation was signed, but it, too, failed of ratification. Finally, sponsors of the treaty abandoned it in favor of submitting to Congress a joint resolution of annexation, the passage of which required only a simple majority vote. The resolution was approved, and President McKinley signed it on July 7, 1898. Two years later, on April 30, 1900, the Organic Act for Hawaii was approved (to take effect June 14, 1900), and Hawaii thereby became an incorporated Territory.

Since 1903 the Hawaiian Legislature has petitioned Congress for statehood nearly a score of times; and from 1920 to the present time, approximately 50 bills providing for statehood have been introduced in successive Congresses. In 1947 substantive, if incomplete, action was finally taken. On June 30 of that year the House passed the statehood bill, but it died in the Senate. The same melancholy story was repeated on March 7, 1950, and March 10, 1953.

In 1954 the Senate saw fit to combine the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, and on April 1 of that year approved the dual measure. There are some who still maintain that passage was obtained only because assurance had been given the antistatehood bloc that the House would reject the joint bill, despite the fact that House support for Hawaiian admission alone was overwhelming. Whatever the reason, the prophets of disaster were vindicated.

In 1955, during the succeeding Congress, another dual bill was introduced, this time in the House. On May 10 of that year it was recommitted. This year there is before us only the single Hawaiian bill; let us pray that it will meet with a deservedly kinder fate.

Let us turn now from the representatives of the people in both Hawaii and the United States to the respective peoples themselves. In a 1940 plebiscite, the Hawaiian people voted 2 to 1 for statehood. A decade later they approved the proposed State constitution by more than a 3-to-1 majority. As for the views of mainland Americans (incidentally, the Hawaiians, of course, are just as much American as you and I), Dr. George Gallup has found that a decisive majority has supported statehood ever since pre-World War II days. More recently, the ratio of approval has jumped from 3 to 1 in 1946 to 8 to 1 in August of 1958.

We know that Hawaiians and their compatriots in the States want statehood. But are we sure that the islanders are loyal enough and Americanized enough to deserve such status? I say that the question was answered affirmatively long ago, and particularly so during World War II and its aftermath.

Immediately after the infamous assault on Pearl Harbor, rumors were rife, especially in the States, that Americans of Japanese ancestry engaged in the most heinous sabotage, even designating targets for the attacking planes. Mr. Robert L. Shivers, former spe-

cial agent in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Honolulu from 1939 to 1943, gave the lie to such calumnies. He testified that all those rumors were false \* \* \* and that sabotage and fifth-column activity was never engaged in at any time prior, during, or subsequent to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Perhaps even more eloquently expressive of Japanese loyalty was the story of the 452d Combat Team and the 100th Battalion. The combined record of these units is probably the most remarkable one in all American military annals. Approximately 10,000 men, most of whom were Japanese from Hawaii, saw action in Europe with the famed outfits. Of these, 4,500 received Purple Hearts. The quantity, as well as quality, of other awards is equally impressive, particularly the 353 Silver Stars and 112 Army and division commendations. Crowning their glory was the fact that not a single one of these boys displayed the slightest cowardice. It's true that three of them went a.w.o.l.—from their hospital beds back to their foxholes.

The unmatched record of the Hawaiian soldier remained untarnished throughout the Korean conflict. Not a single case of cowardice or defection to the enemy was recorded. The battle-casualty rate for Hawaiians was three times as great as the rate per capita for stateside contingents.

One might well ask, in connection with statehood: So what? No one questions that the Hawaiians were brave, but does courage alone entitle a people to statehood? No, it doesn't; but it does prove that those "go for broke" Americans loved their country with an awesome passion. And certainly patriotism must constitute an integral part of any legitimate concept of Americanism.

Other manifestations of similarity with things American are widely prevalent. Despite the oriental heritage of large segments of its population, Hawaii's culture, for the most part, is American. And Hawaiians, regardless of ancestry, look to the West for guidance and emulation. Whether it be business, education, sports, politics, or mores, the pattern is always, and unmistakably, American.

Further evidence of the deep-seated Americanism of all Hawaiians—not merely the Japanese—lies in their chilly reception of the Commonwealth idea. They refuse to trade what they consider their birthright for tax exemption. In other words, they insist on being recognized as first-class Americans, and demand the right to assume all the obligations that such a cherished condition would entail.

The Hawaiian people, I'm sure, are also aware that the imposition of Commonwealth status would, in all probability, be unconstitutional. In *Downes v. Bidwell* the Supreme Court of the United States declared that "where the Constitution has been once formally extended [in all its parts, both fundamental and formal] by Congress to Territories neither Congress nor the Territorial legislature can enact laws inconsistent therewith." Mr. Justice Brown, in *Rasmussen v. United States*, another of the famous insular cases, asserted that "the extension of [the provisions of the Constitution \* \* \* once done, is irrevocable." It follows, then, that those who would remake Hawaii in the image of Puerto Rico are at least disingenuous when they extol the benefits Puerto Ricans derive from Federal tax exemptions. As an incorporated Territory, Hawaii is subject to section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, which provides, in part, that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It is doubtful, to say the least, that Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to exempt the citizens of Hawaii from the applicability of this uniformity clause.

It might well be, too, that the Hawaiian people are cognizant that the promise of

statehood—at least by implication—was tendered them long ago. Of the 31 incorporated Territories in our history, all but Hawaii have graduated to statehood. From a legal, or constitutional, standpoint, Hawaii is no different from its more successful predecessors. The Federal courts repeatedly have said that incorporation leads to statehood. In 1883 an incorporated Territory was defined in *Ex parte Morgan* as an inchoate state. About 40 years later, in *Balsee v. People of Porto Rico*, among many similar cases, the Supreme Court asserted that "incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood." Admittedly, the Organic Act establishing the Territory of Hawaii did not explicitly promise statehood; yet it must at the same time be conceded that precedent and judicial opinion, whether dicta or not, alike have considered Territories as destined for statehood after a reasonable period of tutelage. It would seem that 59 years is long enough.

It behooves us to heed the Hawaiian argument that statehood for the other 30 incorporated Territories has never resulted in failure. Almost without exception, those Territories experienced an immediate and marked expansion in population and in agricultural or industrial development following their admission into the Union. Above all, the people of those new States demonstrated that when they were their own masters, progress recognized no shackles.

The third requirement for statehood—the ability to pay for statehood—poses no problem for Hawaii. The islands constitute, in terms of financial solvency, the richest Territory ever to knock on the statehood door. The gross Territorial product of Hawaii for 1957 was about \$1¼ billion, a figure twice as large as that of any other State at the time of its admission. In 1956 the per capita income exceeded that of 26 States, while the per capita tax burden was higher than that of 33 States.

Hawaii's population, estimated in 1958 to total 569,504, is larger than that of any 1 of 5 States, and is more than twice that of Alaska. It is also larger than that of any State at the time of admission except Oklahoma.

Now that it has been established that Hawaii merits statehood, it is in order to examine the principal benefits that would accrue to the people of Hawaii under statehood. They may be listed as follows—and no rights were ever more precious: (1) The right to full voting representation in both Houses of the U.S. Congress; (2) the right to vote for the President and Vice President; (3) the right to choose their own Governor and to carry on functions of government by their own elected officials instead of by Federal administrators; (4) the right to determine the extent of the powers of their own legislature; (5) the right to have their judges locally selected rather than federally appointed; (6) the right to have Federal and local jurisdictions clearly defined and separate; (7) the right to a voice in any proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution; and (8) the right to help write the Federal taxes. Can any reasonable person deny that these rights are basic to the American way of life; or that so long as they are withheld, no citizenship can be first class?

Benefits to the Nation as a whole would also be substantial. Among these would be (1) enhancement of national security; (2) favorable psychological effect on the peoples of the Pacific Basin, and (3) inspiration to racial harmony on the mainland.

The strategic importance of Hawaii is obvious, especially so now that our Pacific military commands have been enlarged and moved to Oahu. Headquarters for the commanding general, U.S. Army Forces Pacific, are at Fort Shafter, in Honolulu.

Statehood opponents concede that Hawaii is strategically vital, but they profess to see

no relevancy between military considerations and the statehood issue: Statehood, they argue, would have no effect one way or the other on our defense posture in the Pacific. Apparently they are all materialists; things of the spirit escape them. I say to them that the greater stability afforded local government and the greater popular pride in full citizenship under statehood would enable the Armed Forces to be supported materially in time of war more effectively from the twin standpoints of local economic assistance and local civilian cooperation. And the will of the people themselves to fight, should total war ever become our lot, would be immeasurably strengthened were they called upon to defend their own State—and not a colony.

I reply to the isolationists and the racists who sneer at world opinion and deny any need to impress the East with such a meaningful demonstration of the dynamism of democracy as the elevation of Hawaii to statehood would present, with the observation that the American people have indicated that in these parlous days it's a pretty good idea to miss no bets in the pursuit of friends.

Hawaii justifiably has been called the melting pot that melts. Although its people comprise diverse blood strains, the Territory has a unique record for interracial harmony and cooperation. With the closer association between the islands and the mainland which would accrue from statehood, continental Americans would become more acutely aware of the degree to which democracy is practiced in Hawaii. The example assuredly would have a salutary effect on race relations throughout the States.

The reasons for statehood as outlined above surely dwarf the importance of the opposition's arguments. Chief among these are the alleged dominance of communism in Hawaii, and the disproportionately large representation that Hawaii would enjoy in the Senate of the United States.

The communism scare is strictly a phony. The constitution of Hawaii, which the people themselves drafted a decade ago, disqualifies Communists from holding any public office. And dock strikes, which formerly were both embarrassing and damaging, have been rendered impotent by the enactment of a law enabling the Territory to seize and work the docks.

As for disproportionate representation, that question was resolved, legally and constitutionally, in the Connecticut Compromise of the Federal Convention of 1787.

Hawaii has met all the arguments, and they are hers.

I strongly urge the committee to act favorably on legislation to admit Hawaii as a State of the Union. I shall program the bill after it is reported for as early consideration by the House as is possible.

### Tribute to Representative J. Harry McGregor

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues from Ohio, and others, in paying a brief tribute to the memory of our late friend, Representative J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio, whose sudden and untimely passing during the recess of the Congress came as a great shock to his many friends in this Cham-

ber and throughout the country. He was a friendly and most personable Member who represented the people of his district and State most ably.

May I extend my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

### Seventy-sixth Anniversary of the Civil Service Act

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. GEORGE P. MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and a tireless champion of Federal employees, the senior Senator from South Carolina, made the principal address at a banquet on January 17, 1959, celebrating the 76th anniversary of the Civil Service Act.

The American Federation of Government Employees sponsored the banquet under the sage and mature leadership of Mr. James Campbell, its national president. Toastmaster for the occasion was the genial and witty Thomas Walters, operations director of the Government Employees Council.

There were many dignitaries present including the Honorable Arthur Fleming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Honorable Barbara Gundersen, member of the Civil Service Commission. General Melvin Maas, a former member of this body and a distinguished member of the Marine Corps whose work among the handicapped is well known, was present as Chairman of the President's Committee To Employ the Physically Handicapped.

Senator JOHNSTON delivered a stirring address in which he pointed that the vitality of the Nation depends in great measure on the strength of our Federal civil service.

I am honored and privileged to make his remarks a part of this RECORD:

SPEECH BY SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AT THE 76TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

President Campbell, Secretary-Treasurer Johnson, Secretary Flemming, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to join with you in observance of the 76th birthday of the Civil Service Act. I always look forward to and enjoy these meetings with you my fellow workers in the Federal service. Meetings of this kind are richly rewarding. They give us a chance to exchange ideas and to develop new ones.

New ideas and fresh thinking are needed today. We cannot afford to become sterile or stale in our thinking or in the way in which we act.

Our way of life depends on our national strength and vitality.

The vitality of the Federal civil service will remain strong in the future on a balanced diet of improved public opinion, purpose and progress.

I long have held to the belief that our civil service has been the victim of undeserved

bad publicity. It has been the victim of an unfortunate lack of understanding by the public of what it is and of what it does. If the man in the street knew it as we do, there would be no need to concern ourselves with the problem of public opinion.

Unfortunately, that is not the case today. Neither will it be tomorrow unless positive steps are taken to bring it about. As for my part, I propose to do all in my power to help mold a better and more realistic public opinion of the Federal service.

You, here tonight—the organization to which you belong—others like you—should consolidate your efforts on ways and means of acquainting the public with the virtues and accomplishments of our Federal service and our civil service system.

I doubt that the public gives proper credit to our civil service. It contributes so much to making this Nation strong and great.

How many know that much of our once fertile land is tillable today only because of farsighted and well-executed programs of conservation conducted on a national basis.

Is the public aware that our rivers have been harnessed bringing floodwaters under control; that our forests have been created, extended, and improved; that game and fish have not been allowed to become extinct as the result of national planning and programs.

Does the public know that the foods we eat are clean and pure; that the medicines we take are safe and up to standard; that the cosmetics we use are free of harmful ingredients because of federally administered programs.

Does the public realize that our progress in providing a network of better roads; faster and safer transportation by land, air, and water; more effective prevention and cure of disease; maximum safety of bank savings; old age and disability benefits; greater protection to the honest and innocent against crime and fraud; and, improved communications result from Government interest in and attention to our national social problems.

Even if the public had such an awareness—and I think we can agree that it doesn't—there would still be the problem of getting across effectively that each of these varied and complex programs are only as good as the people who carry them out.

The mere recognition and identification of a national problem of itself does not provide a solution. That is only the first step.

Enactment of legislation—no matter how well concerned and designed—does not assure solution. That is merely a second step.

The most important ingredient is the human element. Let me make that point clear. Generally, the results are better with a bad piece of legislation in the hands of good people than a good piece of legislation in the hands of bad people.

Our Nation is and has been fortunate in many ways. We are blessed with abundant natural resources, rainfall, and sunshine, an industrious and honest citizenry and a government run for and by the people. This concept of government gave birth 76 years ago to the enactment of the legislation from which our civil service merit system is derived.

The Nation is fortunate that the legislators of that day had the wisdom and vision to look so well into the future. Without the benefit of that act, I fear we would not have attracted and could not have retained the high type of personnel needed to effectively carry out our many and varied Federal programs.

A good public opinion will not come our way easily or quickly nor will it remain with us long unless it is deserved. Unless we serve well and faithfully we do not deserve nor should we expect a good public opinion. To the end that we continue to warrant a

good public opinion, we should reexamine our purpose in being where we are and in doing what we are doing.

We should each dedicate ourself to the task of giving the public better service by doing our job as efficiently, effectively and economically as humanly possible.

Whatever our field—whatever our assignment—the world of today is a challenge to each of us to do our best that tomorrow may be better.

I think every position in the Federal service should have a purpose. If it doesn't, its existence can't be justified. Every employee should know fully the purpose of his position and periodically renew his dedication to the fulfillment of that purpose.

You, Congress, and the leaders in the executive branch must be alert to the needs for maintaining the kind of civil service system in which you can be proud to serve.

I am sorry to say, this administration has not been alert to those needs during the past 6 years. Some of the appointments it has asked Congress to approve as leaders of this civil service system have left much to be desired.

I am happy to say, it looks as if Rip Van Winkle has finally awakened to needs of the service. The recent appointment sent to the Senate for Chairman of the Civil Service Commission leads me to believe they are at long last taking a proper look at this important post.

I sincerely hope they follow up this appointment with a good legislative program to make the service more attractive and to reward you for a job well done.

Maybe this is too much to hope for; maybe this new found respect for the civil service system is still in such infancy that they do not have a bold new program to submit.

As for me I took the Democratic majority leader's recent words very seriously—when he said to the administration—"Lead or be led." He was endorsing my actions for the past 6 years. I think you all are aware of the accomplishments I refer to.

As for the future, I will offer a bold new program. I hope the administration will join with me. If they do, the task will be made easier. If they don't, I will do it anyway.

I have already introduced legislation to—  
1. Create a Federal employees health insurance program: As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am going to recommend to the committee that this be the first order of business. If we receive any kind of cooperation from the administration, this bill should become law before this session adjourns.

I am grateful to the subcommittee of the Government Employees Council for preparing this legislation. I know it represents many days of hard work.

2. Modify the Group Life Insurance Act to permit employees to purchase two times the amount of their salary; many employees have expressed the desire to be able to increase the amount of insurance they are allowed to purchase under present law.

3. Increase the per diem and travel allowance: I believe the present allowance is completely unrealistic. It was set in 1955. Recent surveys show the cost of travel has increased greatly since that time.

4. Allow persons convicted of an offense not involving the national security to draw the annuity they have earned, paid for, and are entitled to.

5. Preserve the rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; and

6. Give employee organizations the right to represent their members and participate more fully in the formulation of personnel policies and practices.

During a recent trip to several European countries, I was impressed with the fact that the governments of most of these coun-

tries maintain a splendid working relationship with leaders of employee organizations.

These, then, are some of the things I hope to accomplish, to help insure for you a brighter and better tomorrow.

I say, thank you, for a job well done.

Good luck and God bless you all.

### Importation of Firearms

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill which would prohibit the importation into the United States of certain firearms.

I had introduced similar legislation in the 83d and 84th Congresses, but these measures prohibited members of the armed services and their dependents from bringing into this country pistols, revolvers, and other types of small firearms. The Department of the Army had submitted an adverse report on this legislation, primarily due to the fact that they felt that the bill would discriminate against military personnel and their dependents.

Last year I eliminated the provision restricting the ban to members of the Armed Forces only, and have asked that the prohibition be extended to everyone—civilian and military alike—who would bring such weapons into the country.

I have been in touch with many law-enforcement officers throughout the United States, and the vast majority of them have endorsed this legislation and have agreed that any attempt to keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of criminals, potential criminals, children, and irresponsible individuals should receive the full support of all those interested in combating crime, and minimizing tragedy which results when some of these guns are accidentally fired. Our own district attorney, in Queens County, N.Y., one of the most heavily populated counties in the country, the Honorable Frank D. O'Connor, has agreed with me that the supply of illicit weapons should be stopped at its source, and fully supports the proposed measure.

Statistics have shown that as many as 50,000 of these contraband weapons have been brought into the United States on just one troopship returning from the European theater. Multiply that by the number of troopships and the number of civilians bringing such weapons into the country and we have an astounding figure.

I have been informed that in one county of New York City 75 percent of the crimes of violence have been and are being committed with these so-called souvenirs. Every day we read in the papers or hear over the radio and television of tragic accidents which occur, and of crimes which have been committed with these weapons. Just the other day Police Commissioner Kennedy

issued a report indicating a substantial increase in crimes of violence in the city of New York.

The time has come to put an end to this potentially explosive situation. We simply cannot afford to wait any longer and must make a determined effort to prevent these crimes and mishaps at their source. I can think of no better way than by banning the importation of these weapons and by preventing them from getting into the hands of those who might be tempted to use them illegally or carelessly.

I urge my colleagues to give this legislation every possible consideration.

### Rumanian Freedom

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a speech made by me Thursday evening, January 22, 1959, on the occasion of the dinner given by the League of Free Romanians in Washington, D.C., commemorating a century since the re-establishment of Rumanian independence:

Mr. Farcasanu, ladies and gentlemen, the event we commemorate this evening is indeed a historical one. It commemorates the 100th anniversary of the firm intervention of the Western Powers in order to re-establish the independence of Rumania's lands and thus stem the Russian invasion in Europe, suggests a definite similarity as to the basic facts of today's situation.

A century ago, Moscow imperialism was making aggressive inroads toward the heart of Europe. It was at that moment, after a long and bitter experience, that the Western Powers realized that acquiescing in Russian encroachment in Eastern Europe was not the proper method to insure the balance of power in Europe. The security of nations in Europe depended on checking the Russian advance, or peace in Europe would be in permanent jeopardy.

At the Treaty of Paris in 1856 a successful attempt was made to substitute collective action on the part of the concert of Europe for aggression by Russia. Today a greater alliance of free people is confronted by the recurring and intensified danger from Moscow under communism. This danger has spread from the relatively small area of Eastern Europe to the greater part of Asia. The problem which now faces all those who stand for freedom is to stop the expansion of a ruthless Soviet tyranny aiming at world domination. The dimensions and implications of this issue are far greater today. The new feature of this Soviet drive for world dominion is its implacable and universal subversive organization.

As chairman of the House committee investigating the Katyn Forest massacres, I had the sad opportunity to go deeply into the ruthlessness of Soviet Communist schemes. The coldblooded killing of thousands of proallied Polish officers and civilians was done with the same cynicism and purpose as the wholesale murder of the Hungarian freedom fighters; the purpose being, by physically liquidating the fighting elite

of these nations, as they did also in Rumania and elsewhere, to destroy the backbone of independence in the respective countries.

But in spite of it all hate for Soviet-Communist domination is deeper than ever. That is one of the reasons why, in Rumania for instance, the Soviets have organized the largest concentration camp in Europe, the Danube-Black Sea Canal and recently, after the Hungarian uprising, the Danube Delta slave-labor camp. It is reported that this Danube Delta camp is an international pool of slaves, where besides Rumanians there are Hungarians, Poles, Koreans, Germans, and others.

These are a few features of a situation on which the Soviets would like us to make new agreements implying fresh concessions either in the West or in the East. Such concessions would consolidate and augment the menacing strength of the aggressive Red bloc.

I am sure the American people now sense the inherent danger latent in any new concessions. Our own security requires, on the contrary, that we uncompromisingly follow a policy of restoring freedom to Rumania and other Soviet satellite nations.

The following is a statement by Rev. Father Eugene Lazar, of 1133 Madison Street, Gary, Ind., made at a dinner given Sunday, January 25, observing the 100th anniversary in East Chicago, Ind.:

**THE CENTENNIAL OF THE UNION OF THE PRINCIPALITIES OF MOLDAVIA AND MUN- TENIA UNDER ALEXANDER ION CUZA**

Saturday, January 24, marks the observance of the 100th anniversary of the Union of the Principalities of Moldavia and Muntenia under Alexander Ion Cuza. The event is one of the most important in the history of the Rumanian people.

The 19th century was a time of flourishing idealisms and of realizations for the national state. Some of the most recent writings claim that the beginnings of such attitudes are to be found in the 16th century writing of Machiavelli. It took much time before it came to the attention of the political and spiritual leaders of Europe, that the people aspired for a free and independent national life. The completion of this movement commenced with the unification of Germany and of Italy in 1870-71. The principles of self-determination of President Woodrow Wilson and of the peace treaty of Versailles, which had adopted this principle, further solidified this world change.

A hundred years ago when Rumania was not to be found on the maps of Europe as it was known in later years, brothers of the same nationality and blood of the two principalities of Moldavia and Muntenia were forced to fight each other for the ambitions of foreign sovereignty. Rumanians decided to end this situation with the election of the same sovereign in both Moldavia and Muntenia in the person of Col. Alexander Ion Cuza.

During that period of time the peasants were exploited without any compassion by the lords, who in the majority were foreigners.

Alexander Ion Cuza, who himself was the son of a lord, understood the peasants' situation better than anyone else, and gave heed to the cry and aspiration of the peasants, and began to give justice to the people, and gave to the people some of the land that they had worked for their masters.

This certainly could not have been of any liking to the lords and therefore began to maneuver through the liberal and conservative party to force Cuza to resign. The first try at dethroning Cuza, the "lord of the peasants" was in 1865, during the absence of Cuza from the country.

To a great extent the parallel can be made between Lincoln and Cuza, each in his manner—unifying a torn country and freeing

those that had been oppressed. Another Cuza will arise, not only in Rumania, but in other Iron Curtain nations, and destroy the Communist tyrant and restore liberty and self-government. Freedom-loving people throughout the world hope that day is not far distant.

## Social Security Benefits

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1221, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year the amount of outside income permitted without deductions from benefits, and to provide that all types of income shall be taken into account in determining whether an individual's benefits are subject to such deductions. I have now requested the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to ignore this bill and am today introducing another bill which would embody the first part only of H.R. 1221, that is, the increase of outside earnings or wages permitted without deducting from benefits.

As might be expected, Mr. Speaker, I have received a substantial volume of mail in protest against the second part of H.R. 1221 which would have included all forms of income, earned and unearned, for the purpose of determining outside income. Many of those who wrote me stated that I was in effect penalizing persons who by virtue of thrift have been able to invest in stocks, bonds, or various forms of rental income to supplement their social security benefits following retirement. I have replied to such persons that this was not at all my intent and that I did not actually seek to make this particular provision a part of title II of the Social Security Act. I rather intended to focus attention upon the entire question of limitations on outside income which, to me, completely destroy the insurance concept of the social security program. To my way of thinking, it is manifestly unfair to have the present low limitation of \$1,200 per annum on earned income and no limit at all on unearned income and my introduction of H.R. 1221 was merely intended to point up this inequity. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that an individual who has contributed to the social security program the required number of quarters should be permitted to draw his benefits without any regard to his earnings from other sources as is the case after he has passed age 72. What the present law does, however, is to force people to retire from gainful employment upon reaching their 65th birthday if they desire to avail themselves of social security benefits.

As a matter of fact, the entire concept of an arbitrary and fixed retirement age does not appear to me to be sound. I am sure every Member of the House

knows many people who, both physically and mentally, are well qualified to continue gainful employment past the age of 65. I am equally certain that every Member of the House knows others who should be retired substantially in advance of that age. I must confess that at the moment I see no practical possibility of making the social security retirement age more flexible, but I do wish to voice my objection to it in principle.

What is the position of the administration on the question of raising the limit on outside income? I think this is best set forth by the following texts of two reports, one from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dated October 2, 1957, and one from the deputy to the Secretary of Treasury dated February 28, 1958, and both addressed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It will be noted that both Departments are opposed to the enactment of such legislation at this time:

DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, October 2, 1957.

HON. JERE COOPER,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your requests of May 8 and March 25, 1957, for a report on H.R. 4636 and H.R. 4828, bills which would amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder.

H.R. 4636 would increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 and H.R. 4828 would increase from \$1,200 to \$2,400 the amount a beneficiary under age 72 may earn in a year without losing any old-age and survivors insurance benefits for the year. H.R. 4828 would leave unchanged the unit (\$80) by which the total yearly earnings in excess of the exempt amount are divided to determine the maximum number of monthly benefits which may be withheld by reason of earnings. H.R. 4636 would increase the unit to \$120.

The limitation on the amount of earnings a beneficiary may have and still receive benefits is necessary if the benefits are to be restricted to persons who have substantially retired from gainful work and to dependents of retired or deceased workers who do not themselves have substantial earned income. (For practical reasons, the same earnings test is used to determine whether the worker has retired and whether a dependent has substantial earned income.) Under present law a person can work enough to earn \$2,088 a year and still receive at least 1 month's benefit. If he does not earn more than \$1,200 in a year, he can receive all of his benefits for the year.

While it is difficult to determine the exact amount of earnings that most satisfactorily discriminates between retirement and non-retirement, the Department believes that the present exemption of \$1,200 is preferable to the higher exemptions proposed by H.R. 4636 and H.R. 4828.

Even with the present test, some people can continue to work full time at their usual level of earnings and still receive benefits. For example, workers who have been earning at the rate of \$2,000 a year can, after reaching retirement age, receive 2 months' benefits in the year without in any way changing their work activity. In 1955, 21 percent of the workers under old-age and survivors insurance with earnings credits in all calendar quarters had earnings of \$2,000 or less; many of these no doubt were full-time workers. Any increase in the amount of earnings

exempt under the earnings test would increase the number of persons who could continue in their regular jobs and still receive benefits. If the exempt amount were increased to \$1,800 and the unit used to divide earnings in excess of the exempt amount were increased to \$120 as proposed in H.R. 4636, persons earning as much as \$3,120 a year could continue in their jobs and receive 1 month's benefit.

If H.R. 4636 or H.R. 4828 were enacted, the cost of the old-age and survivors insurance program would be increased. The estimated level-premium cost of H.R. 4636, on an intermediate-cost basis, would be 0.53 percent of payroll. The cost of H.R. 4828 would be 0.90 percent. The additional cost resulting from an increase in the amount of earnings exempt from the earnings test would be incurred for the benefit of only a small percentage of the old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries and these would be persons who already had substantial income from work. The great majority of beneficiaries do not have substantial earnings.

We therefore recommend that H.R. 4636 and H.R. 4828 not be enacted by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, February 28, 1958.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the Department's views on H.R. 4636 to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and to liberalize the provisions under which such earnings are charged for purposes of such deductions.

H.R. 4636 would increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year the amount of income a beneficiary under age 72 may earn without losing any old-age and survivors insurance benefits for the year. In addition, it would increase from \$80 to \$120 the unit by which the total yearly earnings in excess of the exempt amount are divided to determine the maximum number of monthly benefits which may be withheld by reason of earnings.

Two aspects of this bill are of particular concern to this Department.

If enacted, H.R. 4636 would increase present and prospective benefit payments substantially without at the same time increasing social security contributions. Responsibility for the payment of social security benefits is vested in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and that Department has estimated that on an intermediate-cost basis the increase in the cost of the program would approximate a level-premium cost of one-half percent of payrolls. This would result in a corresponding weakening of the financial soundness of the insurance program. We concur in the opposition of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to such increases in benefits and costs of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

Moreover, a liberalization of the earnings test for social security benefit purposes would have important implications for the retirement income credit allowed under the individual income tax. As your committee is aware, discrepancies between the tax treatment of social security benefits and other forms of retirement income have been a concern for a number of years. In the Revenue Act of 1954, the tax credit for retirement income was adopted to equalize the treat-

ment of individuals receiving taxable retirement incomes with those receiving exempt social security benefits. In that connection, a deliberate effort was made to parallel the provisions governing the tax credit, including the earnings test, in the income tax with provisions in the Social Security Act. The amount of income which retired individuals could earn without reducing their retired income credit was fixed at \$900 to parallel the annual earnings test of \$900 which insured workers could earn without reducing social security benefits. In 1956, the amount of income which could be earned without reducing the credit was raised from \$900 to \$1,200 to parallel a corresponding increase in the earnings test provided under the 1954 amendments to the Social Security Act.

Enactment of H.R. 4636 would again unbalance the social security and retirement income credit provisions and stimulate pressures for a corresponding adjustment in the provisions of the retirement income credit. Such adjustment would not only reduce income tax revenues but raise additional questions concerning the relative income tax treatment of retired workers and other groups in the population.

In view of these considerations, this Department recommends against enactment of H.R. 4636.

The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DAN THROOP SMITH,  
Deputy to the Secretary.

The thing that both departments appear to overlook is the fact that over a period of time the steadily increasing cost of living has made many social security benefits completely inadequate to maintain a respectable standard of living. There are obviously two ways to solve this problem. One is to further increase the benefits and thereby incur the necessity of either higher payroll taxes or an additional increase in the income base for social security purposes. Having carefully studied the recent report of the advisory council on social security financing and the contemplated schedule increases in payroll taxes between now and 1969, I would hesitate to upset this balance. The other way seems to me to give a little more ability to those past 65 but not yet 72 to supplement their social security benefits with outside earnings of their own. This is what I am interested in accomplishing.

I can appreciate the objections on the part of both the Treasury and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nevertheless, I regard this problem as an extremely serious one and it is my belief that the Ways and Means Committee should give it careful consideration. If hearings are held by that committee on amendments to the Social Security Act, I trust I will be given an opportunity to testify and further expound my views in this connection. But this time, however, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor for the purpose of reassuring those people who protested to me against H.R. 1221 that my sole purpose in originally introducing this bill was to call attention to this present inequity regarding the whole question of outside income under the social security program and not with any idea of penalizing those people who, through

thrift, have been able to supplement their retirement income from unearned sources.

There follows the text of my letter to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee requesting that H.R. 1221 not be acted upon by that committee:

JANUARY 26, 1959.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,  
Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to request that my bill, H.R. 1221, which was introduced on January 7, 1959, be ignored and that no action be taken by your committee in connection therewith.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,  
Member of Congress.

## Fidel Castro and the New Cuba

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, whether Cuba's new climate of freedom lasts depends largely on Fidel Castro. Castro defends the necessity and fairness of the military trials of accused war criminals. Many important voices have been raised in the United States to protest the trials as drumhead courts-martial and the executions as a blood bath. These procedures are far from ideal, but how significant are these shortcomings?

Many who loathed Batista are sickened by the thought that Fidel Castro, perhaps in spite of himself, may end up just another Latin American strong man ruling for an interval by terror and tribute. This is by no means impossible.

Because I had long admired Castro as a brave fighter against Batista and because I want to do whatever I can, however little, to help the new Cuba to be democratic, I accepted an invitation from Fidel Castro and the Cuban News Reporters Association last week to visit Havana. My distinguished colleague, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, was also visiting Cuba at this time and will make his own report to the House of Representatives. His deep interest in the Caribbean area is well known.

I was there Wednesday and Thursday. I attended the mammoth rally. I spoke with Fidel Castro, with President Urrutia, whom I had previously known and respected as a determined and democratic anti-Batista man, with cabinet ministers whose merits I had read about in a State Department dossier I read on my way down to Havana; with our top Embassy officials; with 26th of July leaders, with seasoned Latin American newspaper reporters, and with ordinary Cubans both rich and poor.

Of course it is conceded that some people feel they can fly through the stratosphere over any country and immediately become qualified as experts in all

aspects of the country's political, economic, and social affairs. I confess that my 2 days on Cuban soil, though very busy days, may not have qualified me fully to advise Castro, our State Department, and United States citizens generally on this delicate, crucial period in Cuban history.

Whatever my credentials, here is my report:

It has been my good fortune to visit Colombia, Venezuela, Honduras, and now Cuba within the past 2 years in each instance after the ousting of a dictator. My interest in hemispheric affairs no doubt exceeds my information. I am still learning and there still are several countries in this hemisphere for me to visit.

#### WARM ABRAZO OR FORMAL HANDSHAKE?

If Castro's Cuba is in fact an emerging democracy, then the newly adopted policy of our Government requires our rendering a warm abrazo. If this is not true, then a cool, formal handshake only should be proffered in our relationships. This follows Dr. Milton Eisenhower's recent proposals which the President has endorsed.

My good friend and respected mentor, the senior Senator from my State, is deeply respected in Cuba as elsewhere in the world for his unflinching and aggressive liberalism. Senator WAYNE MORSE has referred to the executions in Cuba as a "blood bath" and has stated that "the Castro regime shot many Batista people without a semblance of a fair trial," although he adds, "I haven't any doubt that a fair trial would have found them guilty."

Senator MORSE is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. He has always been an outspoken foe of dictators.

Another friend whose qualifications and motives are above question is John O'Rourke, distinguished editor of the Washington Daily News and immediate past president of the Inter-American Press Association. On January 23, 1959, he editorialized in his paper as follows:

Few will deny that Batista was an evil man—and good riddance. But Fidel Castro's determination to proceed with "rebel justice"—drumhead trials, mob juries, and arbitrary executions—cannot avoid stirring second thoughts among those who hoped the revolution signaled the end of tyranny.

Here also is a friendly voice which cannot be ignored.

Another hardworking and sincere friend of Latin America, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, has urged his colleagues and the public to reserve judgment on the Cuban revolution until events more clearly show what has happened there. He believes it is too early to tell whether the revolution was a victory for freedom or simply a change in dictatorships.

#### WIDE EDITORIAL CRITICISM

Editorial comment in Oregon and throughout the Nation has been adversely critical for the most part. An article by S. L. A. Marshall, January 21, 1959, on the editorial page of the New York Herald-Tribune refers to "Cuba's new strong man harvesting vengeance in

the name of the revolution" and to "swift, farcical trials and firing squads working as callously as if they were slaughtering bees."

The Louisville Courier-Journal recently made an editorial comment that "the demand for vengeance is still short-circuiting the orderly processes of democratic justice."

My own hometown newspaper, the Eugene Register-Guard, approved Senator MORSE's words "blood bath" as accurate and states that the world wishes Castro well but that "he cannot keep the favor of decent people around the globe if he sanctions the same terrorist tactics that the world deplored in the deposed dictator, Batista."

What about these charges?

Are they true?

Are Fidel Castro and the new Cuba fast returning to the same old "strong man" situation?

No, I do not believe that there has been any blood bath in Cuba nor do I believe that Castro and his 26th of July movement are denying fair trial to accused war criminals, although I believe their procedures should be much improved.

My opinion is based on 2 years of observing the Cuban situation.

What is a blood bath?

I would say it was irresponsible, indiscriminate killing of persons. As for drumhead trials or lack of elementary due process, I suppose that means the accused not knowing exactly the charges against him, not being confronted with the witnesses against him, and not having a proper opportunity to defend himself.

Persons critical of the trials and executions are not, in my judgment, fully informed, often through no fault of their own. They do not realize the magnitude and high morality of the revolution.

Before Batista's frantic flight to Trujillo's haven for defeated dictators, I had met many Cuban revolutionaries in the United States and elsewhere in the hemisphere. Manuel Urrutia, the provisional President, Ernesto Betancourt, the Washington representative of the movement, Tony Varona, former president of the Cuban Senate, Dr. and Mrs. Santos Buch, and many others were well known to me.

#### NOT A RABBLE IN ARMS

These revolutionaries were devout, not fanatic; humble, not arrogant; angry, but not bloodthirsty. Last week I met many who served in the ranks. My impressions square with those of impartial observers who lived with them in the mountains. The Castro men are restrained, disciplined, and dedicated to their task. They are not a rabble in arms.

The rebels tortured no one. They shot no prisoners. Even after victory there is no report of looting or violence by them. There is a crusade for an honest and terror-free Cuba, not a conquest-driven drive for wealth and power. Priests and Protestant ministers were attached to the rebel forces. Batista's army had no chaplains at all.

In short, and I invite you to ask anyone who knows Castro and his men, the 26th of July movement is not made up

of men who would indulge in or allow irresponsible, indiscriminate killing or, if you will, a blood bath.

Since Castro took over in Cuba there has been respect for civil liberties. The press has been entirely free. Many journalists have roamed all over the island with notebook, tape recorder, and movie camera. Whatever else the revolution may or may not be, it is newsworthy.

I have followed these reports closely and I have yet to see a specific allegation that even one accused war criminal was denied elementary due process or that a particular one of them was unjustifiably executed. I asked veteran newspapermen in Havana if they knew of any such instance. They did not. They were convinced that the men executed deserved conviction and that they had had a fair opportunity to defend themselves at their trials.

During Batista's years of terror there was censorship. "Official" acts of cruelty and murder were kept out of print. Huge sums of money were spent by the Government to bribe both publishers and reporters. It is no wonder that many persons in the United States thought Castro's insistence on the continuance of these trials harsh and ominous.

"There is hardly a family which has not felt the brutality of the Batista police," a Life correspondent reported—Life, January 26, 1959. Time magazine for the same date reports:

Many of the Batista cops who faced the firing squads last week were proved killers whose twisted minds drew pleasure from pain. To extract secrets from captured rebels, they yanked out fingernails, carbonized hands and feet in red-hot vices. Castration was a major police weapon.

Bodies were left in sun-speckled streets as police warnings. One Santiago cop of the Batista regime, trying to break down a rebel woman, brought one of her brother's eyeballs on a platter to her cell. Other rebels were forced to watch their wives raped by cops. A U.S. resident of Santiago, who chanced upon Police Chief Rafael Salas Canzarez shooting 4 young rebels dead in the street, reported:

"He was in a state of maniacal ecstasy—face flushed, eyes bright, breathing hard."

#### CASES CAREFULLY PREPARED

The cases against the accused war criminals were not hastily concocted on the say-so of some hysterical woman who might or might not be telling the truth. The movement had many spies. Almost every Cuban was against Batista.

Vehicle movements of Batista men were carefully checked. Pictures were taken. Batista's policy was to allow pictures of torture victims to become available widely. He wanted to terrorize the rebels and their friends.

Dossiers were prepared by the rebels. Many of Batista's murderers and torturers escaped when the Government fell. Those who did not are being tried by military courts under war criminal laws similar to those the Allies employed in Germany after World War II.

"If I allow just one man to be killed unjustly, I destroy my whole movement," Castro told me very seriously when I first talked with him. We were jammed together with his chiefs and with journalists from all over the hemisphere on the

speakers' platform at the rally last Wednesday.

This was the rally where he asked those who supported the continuance of the trials to raise their hands. Of course I deplore such tactics and others he has used. Let me make it clear, however, that I believe in the good faith of Fidel Castro and the new Cuban Government. These men are not vengefully killing people, nor are they harvesting vengeance or giving swift, farcial trials, or allowing firing squads to work callously as if they were slaughtering bees.

If wanton murder and inhuman torture are capital crimes, and they are in the rebel war criminal code, those executed deserved to die and were permitted to do so far less painfully than their victims.

We fought a war to make the world safe for democracy but the fact is that a Democrat in Latin America in the past several decades has lived a precarious life and often died a painful death. The recent overthrow of a number of dictators gives reason to hope that the hemisphere may become unsafe for tyrants and their menials.

#### CASTRO, NOT THE MOB, RULES

At his gigantic press conference last Wednesday, which included almost 400 newsmen and lasted 5 hours, Castro said that a public opinion poll showed that 93 percent of the Cubans wanted all the imprisoned accused war criminals executed. "But they will receive fair trials," he said. "I am not so radical as the people."

Senator MORSE's suggestion to Castro that he invite a United Nations observation team to Cuba to investigate the war crimes procedures is of course a good one. I strongly recommended its careful consideration when I spoke with the highest officials in the new government and with Castro. A committee from the Organization of American States or from the Inter-American Bar Association could serve the same purpose.

I personally do not need convincing as to the motives of Castro and the new government, but an outside group of ability and prestige could do much to reassure many Cubans and their apprehensive friends elsewhere. A minister of the new government assured me that these suggestions were being explored and considered.

When I sat next to Fidel Castro at dinner last Thursday evening I told him that I thought it was wrong to hold war crimes trials in the Sports Palace and to allow unrestrained press, radio, and TV coverage. A man's trial for his life, I said, should not be made a spectacle. The first—and I hope last—such trial was barely 2 hours old when I said this.

#### TOO LITTLE AND TOO MUCH

As I spoke I felt the irony of my words because a few days earlier I had been urging the new Cuban Government to invite newsmen and various opinion leaders to observe for themselves the war-crimes procedures. I cabled President Urrutia that the new Cuba had nothing to hide. Castro had a right to feel baffled about an outside world that apparently did not know its own mind.

I pointed out the middle way: A small courtroom, spectators and journalists limited in numbers; dignity yet no hint of star-chamber proceedings.

I predicted the outcry that did in fact ensue. The following day he radioed from Caracas to stop the trials in the Sports Palace and take away the TV and radio coverage.

I shall refrain from claiming credit for this move. Many others no doubt were saying the same thing to him. It does demonstrate, however, his ability to learn and his wish to do what is right.

Castro is not infallible. He is 32 years old and without broad experience. He makes mistakes. I think he is entitled to a few mistakes considering his accomplishments and his great responsibilities.

Operation Truth brought almost 400 newsmen from every country in the hemisphere except the Dominican Republic. They came at the expense of the new Cuban Government and were in addition to the journalists already there. They rightly criticized the circus quality of the trial in the Sports Palace but they also agreed that the legal procedures used were fair.

"Better understanding abroad of the provisional government's aims was foreseen as a result of the public trials," said an Associated Press story, January 24, 1959, in the Washington Evening Star. Better understanding can come without boisterous public spectators, TV and radio coverage. Press coverage, on a pool basis if need be, is of course essential.

If Castro had been after power and money he could have much of both firmly in his grasp by now. Instead he set up the provisional government under President Manuel Urrutia. Neither Urrutia nor his Ministers are men who would act as puppets for Castro or anyone else. The State Department prepared a notebook with their biographies for me to read on my way down to Havana. I was impressed by the fine qualifications of these men.

#### AMATEURS IN POLITICS

Of course, like Castro himself, many of them are amateurs in politics. They will need help and forbearance until they learn how Cuba can be governed effectively in conditions of honesty and human freedom.

Castro now governs Cuba but the signs are that he will soon turn over his great powers to the new government. He drives himself relentlessly but manages to keep his sense of humor and humility. His remark about 200,000 gringos dying was a flippant sally in answer to a newsman's flippant query as to what would happen if the United States sent the Marines to Cuba. The U.S. press solemnly printed this as a bragging threat and called him a demagog. He is wryly rueful about the incident, but I think certain reporters have more to answer for than Castro. I am certain that he is not anti-United States at all.

Fidel Castro can mean democracy at long last for Cuba or he can mean disillusionment and another strong man government. His present reign is characterized by confused disorganization but much good will and dedication in pre-

paring for a democratic Cuba. One of his young bodyguards, a U.S. citizen from Brooklyn, told me, "Fidel uses C.S.T., Castro Standard Time—6 hours late."

He needs counsel from experienced Latin American democrats like Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, Costa Rican ex-President Jose (Pepe) Figueres, Colombian President Alberto Lleras Camargo and Venezuelan President-elect Romulo Betancourt.

These men can tell him much he needs to know about relationships with Cuba's immediate neighbors, the United States, and Soviet Russia. Fidel Castro has it within his power to win a place in the history books as a great builder of Latin American democracy as well as a guerrilla leader of a highly popular revolution.

#### TIME TO SHAVE THE BEARDS

If this is to come about, he will have to seek solitude and to allow the provisional government to rule Cuba and to set the stage for free elections in 18 months. This will be hard to do, but it must be done.

I told him, with my usual tact and omniscience, that he and his followers should now shave or trim their beards and that they should discard their characteristic fatigue uniforms for the regular Cuban military uniforms. Nothing would mark more dramatically the passing of the combat phase to the civilian phase of the fight for a democratic Cuba.

Castro made a mistake in naming his brother Raul as his successor in case of death. Successor to what? This is the move of a strong man, not a man who wants an orderly lawful government to rule in Cuba. Upon reflection I think he will want to remove the mantle of succession from Raul's shoulders—and then destroy the mantle.

His demand that the United States return Cuban war criminals and the money they stole is another indication of his incomplete education in public affairs. It is up to Cuba to indict these men and to invoke reciprocal treaties providing for extradition.

The trials should be slowed down. Cuba is at peace, and civil judges, not military judges, should sit on the bench. More time should be allowed for the preparation of defense cases, although I have yet to hear or read of any protest on these grounds made by an accused war criminal or on his account. I urged these changes in policy in writing before I went to Cuba and personally when I was there to President Urrutia, Castro, and Secretary of Justice Angel Fernandez.

#### SENATOR MORSE'S FRIENDLY ATTITUDE

I agree entirely with Senator MORSE's statement:

It is not too late. We want to be friends of the new leadership of Cuba. I believe the leaders are democratically motivated. When a wrong develops, steps should be taken to correct the wrong.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, speaking in the other body January 20, 1959, and commending Senator MORSE's stand for better judicial processes in the war criminal trials, said that Senator MORSE "has been principled in his comment and

stand and, at the same time, considerate and tolerant."

SENATOR HUMPHREY CONTINUED:

I hope the people of Cuba realize that the remarks which have been made by Members of the Senate, and in particular by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs [Mr. Morse], were made not in a spirit of hostility, bitterness, or antagonism, but rather in a spirit of understanding, friendship, advice, and kindly admonition. They were made in a sincere effort to maintain wholesome, respectful, and cordial relationships between the people of Cuba and the people of the United States.

Castro needs rest. He needs time to ruminate, time for contemplation and study, then consultation with others and travels in Cuba and elsewhere. If he does not withdraw, he will inevitably diminish, then destroy, the authority of the new government. This will make the transition period difficult and perhaps impossible.

Many Cubans will protest his withdrawal into the wings at this time. They will cry, with understandable concern, that Cuba needs him. More than Castro, Cuba needs a functioning government, honest and mindful of human freedoms. Castro has no desk, no organization for government, and no time or ability to decide the many and often complex issues brought to him. Most important of all, he has no business trying to do what the provisional government was established to do.

#### "NOT UNDER MAN"

As a thoughtful lawyer Castro can recall Coke's famous proposition, inscribed in Latin on the pediments of Langdell Hall at Harvard Law School, "Not under man, but under God and the law." This proposition, in addition to being right and just, is the only feasible way to run a government today and to maintain human freedoms.

As I said goodbye to him Wednesday evening he said I had given him things to think about. My bet is that he will find time to think. Cuba's emerging democracy will be realized without still another bloody detour.

What about our Government's policies now?

In my opinion they are excellent, both in theory and practice. Last Wednesday morning in Havana I conferred with the Chargé d'Affaires, First Secretary Dan Braddock, and the top Embassy staff people for about an hour. Our various programs are all set to resume operations, awaiting only necessary organizational moves of the new Cuban Government. Our men there have the right attitude about extending the warm abrazo to this Government of honorable and democracy-minded men.

After two sorry experiences with amateurs, we are now sending a first-rate career Ambassador to Cuba, Philip Wilson Bonsal, a man who, according to the New York Times, January 22, 1959, "does not strive to conceal his strong preference for democratic governments."

In my opinion much credit must be accorded to William Wieland, the State Department's director for Cuba, Mexico, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. He

is highly competent and conscientious. Mr. Wieland was a United Press reporter at the time of the dictator Machado in Cuba. He was jailed for his activities against that tyrant. His sympathies are unchanged. However, he dealt honorably and correctly with all Cuban factions, winning the respect of all those who themselves were respectable.

#### ADDITIONAL AID IS AVAILABLE

We have further aid available for Cuba. All the new government has to do is ask. The request will receive careful and favorable consideration. This is also a bit ironic, for our official governmental policy is far more friendly to the new Cuba than are many vocal opinion leaders and many editorial writers.

Often the reverse has been true.

My explanation is that in this case the Government is better informed as to the character of the men who threw Batista out and as to the nature and extent of the crimes of the accused war criminals and as to the procedures by which these men are being tried.

Fidel Castro and his friends who seek to bring democracy to Cuba need and deserve our sympathy, our forbearance, and support. Our condonation for acts of cruelty is not solicited because, so far as I have read the record made by the free and active press, they are not guilty of any such acts.

Democracy is not won by vanquishing a tyrant. It is won by fostering human freedoms and basing the government on the results of free elections. Democracy is an equilibrium. Once attained, it has to be retained.

Expediency and indifference can destroy democracy. This is why the United States must concern itself with the development of democracies in other lands, and particularly with respect to a close neighbor like Cuba. To the extent we encourage democracy elsewhere we help maintain and strengthen our own standards of human freedom.

Faith without works will fade. The more faith in democracy we export, the more we have.

I hope that many of my colleagues and other fellow citizens will have occasion soon to visit Cuba and to see for themselves what a tremendously significant revolution has taken place.

This, then, is the report of a recent tourist about his 2-day trip to Cuba, a freed and freedom-loving Cuba, a pro-American Cuba, a peaceful and law-abiding Cuba, a Cuba that needs and deserves our help in its historic opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following items: A letter to the editor of the New York Times of January 25, 1959, from my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES]; an editorial from the Times for January 23; and a column by Drew Pearson as it appeared in the Miami Herald for January 23:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1959]  
OUR CUBAN POLICY QUERIED—PRESENT ANTI-AMERICANISM DECLARED RESULT OF OUR SUPPORT OF BATISTA

(The writer of the following letter, formerly Governor of Connecticut, was U.S. Ambassador to India from 1951 to 1953. He is now a Member of Congress.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Millions of Americans have been shocked at the brutal manner in which the new Cuban Government has been disposing of many of its adversaries and the bitterness of its attacks on the United States.

Although our disappointment and resentment are understandable, it is important that we appreciate the extent to which our own policies have helped create the antagonism with which we must now contend.

According to the narrow view of many of our policymakers, any dictator who tells us he is against communism, regardless of how hated or corrupt he may be, deserves American support. This has led us time and again to place American dollars and American prestige behind reactionary, rightwing governments which ruthlessly exploit their people and which sooner or later are doomed to fail.

#### SOURCE OF ARMS

For nearly 3 years the now victorious Cuban revolutionaries were hunted like animals through the mountains and jungles by Batista's armed forces. Many of the Government tanks, planes and small arms which brought death to their families were manufactured in American factories, paid for by American taxpayers and shipped to Cuba by the American Government.

Our Government cannot be held responsible for the brutal behavior of the fallen Cuban dictator. But it can and should be held responsible for the damaging effect which some of our policies and personnel have had in producing the anti-American resentments unleashed by the Cuban revolution.

Our last arms shipment was landed in Cuba scarcely 9 months ago. If the victorious leaders of the new government did not now resent the official support and comfort we gave the vanquished Batista, they would be less than human.

Although this experience has cost us heavily, not only in the respect of Cubans but in that of other non-Communist peoples in all parts of the world, there is scant evidence that we have taken it to heart. On the very day that Castro's revolutionary forces were entering Havana through cheering crowds we announced that a Marine Corps training mission would be sent to Haiti to bolster a government that since last summer has been forced by public opposition to rule by decree.

#### REVOLUTIONARY PRACTICES

All thoughtful observers regret General Castro's drumhead courts, mass shootings, and his demagogic raving about a "gringo" invasion. But our disappointment should not blind us to the implications of our own failure to live up to what the world expects of us.

The truths which our Declaration of Independence held to be self-evident are still providing the inspiration for non-Communist revolutionary leaders who are challenging dictators in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Whether the Cuban revolution succeeds or fails in its effort to provide freedom and dignity for the Cuban people will depend largely on what Castro does with his victory in these first few weeks. But this and much more will also depend on our capacity to remember our own revolutionary origins and to bring our policies into focus in a world of revolutionary change.

CHESTER BOWLES.

WASHINGTON, January 21, 1959.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1959]

#### HAVANA AND WASHINGTON

A new and what must be a happier chapter in Cuban-American relations is about to begin. Our Ambassador, Philip W. Bonsal, is a splendid choice and Cuba's new Ambassador to Washington, Prof. Ernesto Dihigo,

an educator and diplomat of the highest caliber, is certain to represent the revolutionary regime with distinction.

It is time to put aside arguments and recriminations on both sides. There is much constructive work to be done. Cuba has to get her sugar crop going, her roads and railways repaired, and her governmental structure reorganized all the way up from municipalities to the capital of Havana.

Cuba is being reborn. She has the greatest opportunity ever offered in her history to construct a new, free, honest, democratic government. The men now in control have fought, and many of their fellow Cubans suffered torture and death, just for that.

There is a major work of repair to be done in Cuban-American relations. The harsh fact has to be faced that the resentment and bitterness of Cubans against the State Department and American policies rose to a crescendo under the ambassadorships of Arthur Gardner and Earl E. T. Smith. Now a distinguished career diplomat with a splendid record is to take over. Philip Bonsal has every qualification that could be asked for the difficult and gratifying task he is taking on.

Dr. Dihigo, the Cuban Ambassador, is professor of Roman law at the University of Havana, the author of a number of books on international law, a jurist, a former Ambassador to the United Nations, and a former Minister of State. In addition he knows the United States and likes Americans. It is to be hoped that both Ambassadors will get to their posts as soon as possible.

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 23, 1959]

#### EXECUTION OF TERRORISTS NECESSARY ACT BY CASTRO

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Though not condoning kangaroo courts and quickie firing squads, Latin American diplomats returning from Cuba report that if Fidel Castro had not proceeded at once with the trial and execution of Batista's chief terrorists, he would not have been able to maintain order in the country.

Continuous censorship during the last year of Batista's reign kept newsmen living there from giving even an approximate picture of the slaughter that was taking place.

As a result, U.S. readers got no real idea how Batista's agents—military and police—

operated against suspected civilian sympathizers of Castro's July 26 movement.

On one occasion, for instance, the bodies of 17 university students were thrown on the capital's streets from speeding police cars.

One of the first common graves located in Oriente Province on January 6 contained 183 half-burned corpses.

Impartial medical inspection showed that the majority had been pushed into the hole alive, gasoline poured over all, and the torch applied. There have been half a dozen other similar graves discovered.

As one observer put it: "Castro landed from Mexico on December 2, 1956, with 81 followers. Four months later, after the first skirmishes with Batista's forces, only 12 of that original group were still alive.

"If he hadn't had volunteers flocking to him from the farms and small towns all over Oriente, he would have been finished.

"Relatives of those volunteers—especially brothers and sisters—paid for that support by the thousands, with their lives, their sight, their fingers, or toes, or genital organs, their virginity.

"By the time Castro was ready to start his final big push, early in December, he had 8,000 men and women fighting for him, and one family in three all over Cuba was giving active aid to the rebels.

"There are only a little over 6 million people in Cuba. In every town and city, all the people—whether they were helping Castro or just keeping out of it—knew the names and faces of the Batista men in their areas who were carrying out the torture, rape, and murder.

"In order to hold his army together and maintain its morale, Castro had to promise that every such agent who was positively identified would be tried by the revolutionary forces, as soon as they won, and shot if convicted.

"If he had reneged on that—failed to seize the terrorists, or held them indefinitely for civilian courts to be reorganized—there would have been a wave of mob lynchings all over Cuba, with at least 2,000 or 3,000 dead by now, instead of 200 or 300, without trial of any kind.

"It's a grim, bloody business, of course, but this was a real civil war, with practically every Cuban involved on one side or the other—not just another one of the palace guard coups that so often pass for revolutions in Latin America."

### National YMCA Week, 1959

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the fact that the week just past was National YMCA Week.

During last week, millions of Americans affiliated with nearly 2,000 Young Men's Christian Associations across the country celebrated one more year of fine service to our youngsters, teen-agers, young men, and to our family groups also.

Since 1844, the YMCA has been a pioneer in the cause of brotherhood and development of our youth—the spirit and mind of youth as well as physical well-being. The Y has become also a unique and vital part of virtually every American community.

The YMCA has served our fighting men during every war since the Civil War. It has contributed mightily to health and physical fitness programs and has contributed much to American sports and athletics, creating such games as basketball and volleyball.

The Y has also sponsored organized camping, water-safety instruction, youth and government programs, and boys' work.

The YMCA has also pioneered in night-school education, short-term community finance campaigns, and many other advances.

I am certain that all of us will join in a sincere "well done" to this excellent and growing organization and, we might also add, "Please keep up the good work."

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1959

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

Eternal Father, Thou who art the light behind life's shadows, and the love behind life's sorrows,

Coming into this temple of our democracy to pray, we would not catalog the sins of others; we would not exult that we are not as other men. But, rather, confessing our own sins, we would pray for Thy forgiveness and Thy cleansing.

We beseech Thee to make us such public servants, so captured and possessed by Thy vast designs for human brotherhood, that Thou canst trust Thy ageless purposes to our willing and eager hands.

We ask only for light enough for the next step, courage enough to face the present duty, truth enough for today's

decisions, as into Thy hands we commit our ways.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 23, 1959, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION OF WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I submit a resolution which I feel will make a substantial contribution to the Senate's legislative work in the field of water-resource conservation and development.

During this first session of the 86th Congress, the U.S. Senate is faced with many significant and important issues of nationwide importance. Federal aid to education, airport construction, housing, a new farm program, community facilities, foreign aid, and defense are but a few major issues. However, I feel that the congressional program would not be complete if we did not devote consider-