Adverse Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as one of a growing group who advocate: First, a balanced budget; second, economy in the Federal Government; and third, the continued control of the constitutional powers of the House of Representatives to originate money bills.

I call to my support four adverse witnesses.

First, I call Thomas Jefferson.

He wrote to Samuel Rerchibal in 1816:

To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

And, again in 1816, he wrote to Governor Plumer of New Hampshire:

I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

Second, I call Andrew Jackson.

In his fourth annual message to Congress, in 1832, he declared:

The soundest maxims of public policy and the principles on which our republican institutions are founded recommend a proper adaptation of the revenue to the expenditure, and they also require that the expenditure shall be limited to what, by an economical administration, shall be consistent with the simplicity of the Government and necessary to an efficient public service.

Next, I call Grover Cleveland.

In his 1893 second inaugural address, he declared:

The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught that while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their government, its functions do not include support of the people.

And I call Woodrow Wilson, who, 40 years later said:

The duty of economy is not debatable. It is manifest and imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I have additional evidence to submit.

The Democratic national platform of 1932 asserted:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagances, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, running on that platform, included this in one of his campaign speeches:

Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

Also, it is appropriate at this time to recall that in 1943 Senator Harry Truman declared on the Senate floor:

It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the pursestrings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever.

It seems that—in the past—the Democratic Party openly advocated that stand which I take today. I want a balanced budget, economy in the Federal Government, and the continued constitutional control of money bills by this House.

Certain liberal gentlemen may say that times have changed.

Indeed, they have—for them.

I have used many quotations. I close with one.

Patrick Henry flung this challenge on May 29, 1765:

If this be treason, make the most of it.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1959

(Legislative day of Monday, March 9, 1959)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, Thou hast made all the highways of our hearts to lead to Thy love, which faileth never. Thou hast so fashioned our being that its deepest cravings are satisfied only in Thee.

We confess that in the conceit of our self-sufficiency, too often with our burning thirsts we have turned to the broken cisterns of worldly wisdom and of our own sophisticated cleverness. That delusive way has brought us and our anguished generation to tragedy and agony. We see now, with contrition, that darkness broods upon our path and we have missed the way to the peace which is to be found only in Thy will.

In this dangerous, yet glorious, day of challenge, when we must choose for ourselves and our civilization, life or death, the blessing or the curse, grant us the grace, in scorn of consequence, to set our wills and to base our decisions on things worth living for and, if need be, worth dying for.

We ask it in the ever blessed name of the Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 10, 1959, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee may meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are pending some other requests for committee meetings during the session of the Senate. However, I think the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee is in a different category. It has scheduled some important witnesses to be heard.

Other committees—notably the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—are considering proposed legislation.

However, in view of the fact that three amendments are pending to the bill now before the Senate and a joint meeting with the House is to be held today at noon, I felt that I was constrained to object to the holding of other committee meetings during the session of the Senate. I wish the RECORD to show the reason for the objection.

But I have no objection to having the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee meet during the session of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have received a request that the Banking and Currency Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois has objection to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have just talked to one of the members of the committee. I understand that this morning the full committee is going to mark up the area redevelopment bill. Mr. President, in view of the requests coming from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the District of Columbia Committee, I would be in a rather awkward position if I were to accede to this request, since no witnesses are scheduled to appear before the committee. I trust that it will not prove offensive to the majority leader if I do interpose objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is perfectly within his rights.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Banking and Currency Committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Public Health and Education Committee of the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to sit today during the session of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to those requests, I must object today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking and Currency Committee may meet today. I understand the members of the committee are prepared to consider in executive session a very important piece of proposed legislation. I am hopeful that they may be able to do so and report it to the Senate and have it placed on the calendar, so that the Senate may consider the area

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

redevelopment bill before the Easter recess.

I have talked with the distinguished minority leader, and I know of no individual members of the Banking and Currency Committee who have made objection to this meeting. I hope it may be possible to permit the committee to continue with its planned program today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, I have talked to the ranking minority Member on the committee. The committee is in the markup stage. It has completed hearing witnesses. I can readily understand the desire of the members of the committee to move their considerations along to a conclusion. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

UNVEILING ON MARCH 12 OF PORTRAITS OF FIVE OUTSTANDING SENATORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 1959, at 12:30 p.m., in the Senate reception room, there will be held the proceedings of the unveiling of the portraits of five outstanding Senators, as follows: Henry Clay, of Kentucky; Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts; John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina; Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin; and the late, beloved Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, who served with so many of us in this body.

The Senate will recall that, pursuant to a resolution of the Senate, a special committee was created in 1955 to choose the Senators whose portraits should be placed in the reception room. It made a very careful and thorough study, under the leadership of the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Tomorrow the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration will preside at the unveiling ceremonies. The distinguished Vice President will make some comments on the historical significance of the occasion. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], will make a statement concerning the selection of the five outstanding Senators; and the majority leader and the minority leader will participate.

I invite all Members of the Senate to be available for these proceedings.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, beginning with the nomination in the Post Office Department. I do this for the reason that shortly I must attend a committee meeting.

After considering the new reports on the Executive Calendar, we shall return to the consideration of the nomination to the Federal Aviation Agency. The distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] desires to make a statement in connection with that nomination.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

George Harold King, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

Karl Brandt, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

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

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rollin D. Barnard, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this nomination go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I inadvertently asked the Senate to consider first the nomination in the Post Office Department. We shall have to hold up our action on that nomination. I trust that we can bring up the nomination at a later time.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry J. Heinz II, of Pennsylvania, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

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

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

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

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Abbott, of Nebraska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

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

HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward Elliott Johnston, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

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

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

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

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now proceed to consider the nomination in the Federal Aviation Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it was with some misgivings that I voted, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to report to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Quesada to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

I hope General Quesada will be a good Administrator. I have not been able to find in his conduct as temporary appointee objectionable actions which would justify opposition to confirmation of his nomination.

On the other hand, I know that very often the actions taken by public officials after the confirmation of their nominations are quite different from the actions taken by them before their nominations have been confirmed. I do not say that will be the case with General Quesada.

There are, however, in my mind questions regarding his approach to the problems he will be called upon to deal with as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

First, I am concerned about the fact that General Quesada has a military background, whereas the agency over which he is to exercise authority is basically civilian in character. The new Federal Aviation Agency contemplates the participation of the military; but what we would like to know is how far General Quesada intends to go in allowing the military to dominate the thinking of the Federal Aviation Agency. I believe it is natural for a general to lean

heavily toward military thinking and the views of his former comrades-in-arms.

At the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, General Quesada stated that only a small percentage of the top officials of the Federal Aviation Agency would be military officers. However, the question is not one of numbers. Instead, it is one of influence and authority inside the organization. A handful of military persons in key spots could direct the policy of the entire agency.

Moreover, I understand that the military officers serving with FAA are on loan from their respective services. In other words, they will go back to the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy when their service with FAA is over. Their opportunities for advancement in their chosen service can be affected by the attitudes they have taken in the FAA. The idea that a military officer, beholden to his own service for the future of his career, will argue very strongly on policy matters with the top men in his career service is, to my way of thinking, naive. The Federal Aviation Act requires a report from time to time on the number and the positions held by military personnel in the FAA. This is the field which will be watched very closely not only by our committee but by those interested in general aviation.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in this subject. I wonder if the Senator will yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, so that other Senators may hear his statement.

Mr. ENGLE. I have no objection, but my statement will take only about 5 minutes. I understood the leadership wanted to proceed expeditiously to the next order of business. If my distinguished friend desires to make a point of no quorum, I have no objection, but I know the pressures which are on the leadership at this particular time to proceed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. LANGER. Most certainly, if objection is being made——

Mr. ENGLE. I am not going to oppose the confirmation of the nomination of General Quesada. I am simply pointing out some areas to which I desire to direct his attention when his nomination as Administrator is confirmed.

Mr. LANGER. I see.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my second subject is "General Aviation." General aviation represents 51 percent of the total traffic recorded by FAA towers in the 196 U.S. airports busy enough to warrant such control towers. Commercial airlines represent 28 percent, and the rest is military. There are thousands of pilots in general aviation throughout the United States who share my concern regarding General Quesada's views with respect to the importance of general aviation. In this country aviation is divided into three parts: Commercial carriers, military aviation, and what is called general aviation, which consists of private and business flying.

The Federal Aviation Agency should not be operated for the exclusive benefit of the commercial carriers and military flying. I am informed that General Quesada at one time had the idea that a private airplane had no business going into a major airport such as Washington's National, New York's LaGuardia, or Los Angeles' International, but that such airports should be reserved exclusively for commercial carriers and military use. In his testimony before the committee, General Quesada denied that he had that viewpoint. But if he has it, or even leans that way, general aviation in this country will be in trouble.

Third. I am concerned about General Quesada's attitude toward safety. A good deal of "hokum" has been generally accepted about the operation of today's airplanes. The people have been led to believe that airplanes fly so fast that a pilot cannot see out of them, that it is unsafe to fly an airplane unless it is under rigid control from the ground, and that air accidents are caused by everything except the pilots themselves. Some of us believe that the most dangerous thing about the airplane is the nut that holds the wheel, and that although positive control is absolutely necessary in congested areas, it is not necessary in visual flight operations outside of these congested areas. The way, of course, to establish complete air safety is to put everybody on the ground. Some of us are concerned that the regulations and requirements for equipment will get so heavy that most general aviation will in fact be grounded. Then, along with the rest of the taxpayers, we will pay the cost of high-priced electric "gismos" and thousands of FAA employees to chaperon the airline and military pilots through thousands of miles of bare airspace.

Fourth. There is constant pressure for further restrictions of the airspace. At the present time restricted areas encompass 22 percent of the State of California south of San Francisco, and flight-test areas encompass 73 percent of the State. We have two controversies in progress in California today where additional areas are to be reserved. The designation of restricted areas for certain types of flying is certainly necessary, but it ought to be considered in connection with the other flying requirements of the Nation, including the air carriers and general aviation. We are not very comfortable with a general making these decisions.

Fifth. General Quesada, in his testimony before the committee on the pending airport bill, supported the view of the administration that the Federal Government ought to get out of the business of building airports. Our committee and, I believe, this Congress vigorously disagree with this viewpoint. I would certainly not blame General Quesada for adopting the policy laid down by the administration. He stated before the committee that he would follow the law enacted by Congress even though he disagreed with it. However, many roadblocks can be thrown in the administration of the law. For instance, the airlines use a total of 560 of the country's 7,000 airports. In other words, there are 6,440 airports not used by the commercial carriers at all. We need many small civilian airports. The airport program should not be cut off just because the commercial carriers have gotten what they need, nor should the heavy proportion of the funds allowed by Congress be allocated at the air-carrier-used airports. We would feel a little more comfortable about General Quesada as FAA Administrator if we believed that either his background or his viewpoint was more in the direction of continuing to build this necessary link in our transportation system. Both his military background and his stated views before our committee are exactly the opposite.

These are the particular areas in which I have some misgivings regarding the confirmation of the nomination of General Quesada. I want to see both the air carriers and military flying given fair consideration. On the other hand, I know that there has been a tendency to downgrade general aviation—the importance and the future of general aviation. We have become the greatest flying nation in the world because we have permitted general aviation to grow and to prosper. The amount of business and pleasure flying has increased immensely in this country since the end of the Second World War. Today there are approximately 70,000 airplanes owned and operated by individuals and by business corporations. Commercial aircraft add up to about 1,834. Active general aviation aircraft outnumber the commercial airlines by almost 40 to 1. Even among multiengined aircraft, general aviation outnumbers the commercial airlines by 7,300 to 1,741. The commercial airlines serve only 560 of the country's 7,000 airports; general aviation serves all of them. General aviation flies three times as many hours and, I am informed, carries several times the number of passengers as do the commercial airlines.

I hope that General Quesada will bear these facts in mind as the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and that it will not be necessary for me at some later time to call attention to the misgivings I have stated here on the floor today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency?

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination on the Executive Calendar of Rollin D. Barnard,

which was passed over when the Executive Calendar was considered earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination heretofore passed over.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rollin D. Barnard, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE CLARE BOOTHE LUCE TO BE AMBASSADOR TO BRAZIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been some talk of late about the desirability of holding up the nomination of the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador to Brazil. In my opinion this would be a mistake.

Of course, no one can condone the flippant remark contained in Time magazine which had much to do with stirring up anti-American riots and demonstrations in our neighboring and friendly Republic of Bolivia, but certainly that cannot be laid at the door of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce.

I speak in this way because Mrs. Luce and I came to the Congress together in 1943 and, Mr. President, she was a good Congresswoman. Mrs. Luce performed in an extraordinarily able fashion as the Ambassador of our country to Italy, and she was a good Ambassador. Of this I speak with some personal knowledge. Despite harsh handicaps and under great difficulties she made many contributions to the welfare of the Western World and to good relationships between our country and the country to which she was sent to represent us. I express the hope, Mr. President, that the nomination of this woman of extraordinary ability, great capacity, and undoubted devotion will be given serious consideration and approval, and that her nomination to be Ambassador to Brazil will be confirmed at the earliest opportunity. I know if this is done, as was true with regard to Italy, she will represent us very well and capably as our Ambassador to the Republic of Brazil.

I make these remarks, Mr. President, in the hope that this matter will be brought to a head, that the nomination of Mrs. Luce will be reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that it will be approved by the Senate, as I am sure it will be. Thereby Mrs. Luce will be able to undertake her most difficult assignment in Brazil.

I repeat, Mrs. Luce will render excellent service on behalf of our country. She has proved her capabilities on the basis of achievements which are in her record at this time.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MORNING BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine morning business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN ZIRCON CONCENTRATES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 15,902 short dry tons of zircon concentrates now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research, or test during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND TO FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF PLYMOUTH, MASS.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass., (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE XI OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO INSURANCE OF SHIP MORTGAGES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to insurance of ship mortgages, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONCEALMENT OF ASSETS IN CONTEMPLATION OF BANKRUPTCY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the order of that court in the case of the *Trust Association of H. Kempner, etc.* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 15-56 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Zeniche Nakamura, also known as Taichi Higashi, and Bung Kun Sah, from reports relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on April 1, 1958, and April 15, 1958, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RATIFICATION OF 15TH AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION BY LEGISLATURE OF OREGON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Whereas the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States was proposed by Congress on February 26, 1869, for ratification by the several State legislatures; and

"Whereas the 15th amendment provides as follows:

" 'Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

" 'Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'; and

"Whereas the 15th amendment was rejected and not subsequently ratified by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring, That the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America hereby is ratified, and that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Enrolled Senate Joint Resolution No. 7.

"Adopted by senate February 2, 1959.

"MEDA COLE,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.

"WALTER J. PEARSON,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house February 24, 1959.

"ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
"Speaker of House."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and the New Mexico congressional delegation to review and revise the policies which permit the excessive importation of petroleum into the United States

"Whereas the entry into the United States of execessive imports of foreign oil services to inhibit the investment of funds for oil exploration in the continental and peninsular United States; and

"Whereas the prompt discovery and orderly development of adequate crude oil reserves is essential to the continued well-being and safety of the United States; and

"Whereas current importation policies have contributed to a stagnation of investment in basic exploration and development by major and independent oil companies of the United States; and

"Whereas proven reserves in the United States have failed to increase during the recent period of heavy importation of crude oils; and

"Whereas this condition is detrimental to the economy and dangerous to the national defense; and

"Whereas New Mexico is a Western publiclands State which relies heavily upon the normal development of its oil and gas resources for the maintenance of its economy and in which the industry is particularly essential to the financing of its public schools: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That responsible officials of the United States and the Congress and the New Mexico delegation to Congress be respectfully urged and encouraged to initiate and continue all measures necessary to limit the importation of crude oil to the end that the domestic industry will be fostered and developed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress; and the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ and the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. Senators from New Mexico; and the Honorable JOE M. MONTOYA and the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS, Representatives at Large from the State of New Mexico.

"ED V. MEAD,
"*President, Senate.*
"HAL THORNBERRY,
"*Chief Clerk, Senate.*
"MACK EASLEY,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*

"Approved by me this 4th day of March 1959.

"JOHN BURROUGHS,
"*Governor, State of New Mexico.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 12

"Resolution to be forwarded to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled urging that 15 percent of all Federal income taxes paid into the Federal Treasury by the public in the State of Montana and the various other States be retained in the State of Montana and the various other States to be placed in the general funds of the respective States and that a reduction of 15 percent be made in Federal grants-in-aid connected with State legislative appropriations, to the State of Montana and the various other States

"Whereas we, the House of Representatives of Montana, as assembled in its 36th session, do respectfully represent: That,

"Whereas the State of Montana and the other States of the United States of America are confronted with difficult fiscal problems in connection with their respective general funds because of the loss of revenue potential which has been precipitated by the heavy taxloads enacted by the U.S. Congress on the taxpaying public of the various States; and

"Whereas the tax sources have been thoroughly exploited to the saturation point; and

"Whereas the State governments are unable to match many of the Federal funds available to the States because of insufficient State revenue income for matching funds; and

"Whereas the States have very little or no control in the manner in which these matching funds are appropriated and expended; and

"Whereas a reduction in Federal expenditures would be accomplished, and at the same time make available urgently needed funds to the general fund of the State of Montana, and the general funds of the various other States of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that 15 percent of all Federal income taxes paid into the Federal Treasury by the public in the State of Montana and the various other States be retained in the State of Montana and the various other States to be placed in the general funds of the respective States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a reduction of 15 percent be made in Federal grants-in-aid connected with State legislative appropriations, to the State of Montana and the various other States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of Montana respectfully requests that the Governors of the various States urge their respective States to take similar action; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Governors of all of the 49 States and the Territory of Hawaii.

"In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of March 1959.

"ALLEN DONOHUE,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

The petition of Charles G. Rennar, of Jersey City, N.J., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve unemployment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Frank Marasco, of Portland, Oreg., relating to a bulletin received by him in the mail entitled "Unemployed To March on Washington, D.C.," issued by the United Auto Workers, AFL-CIO, of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION B

"Concurrent resolution urging the President, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Interior to make early transmittal to Congress of the project plan report on the Garrison diversion unit

"Whereas the regional director, region 6, Bureau of Reclamation, on January 29, 1957, submitted to the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, a project plan report on the engineering and financial feasibility of the Garrison diversion unit, Garrison diversion, North and South Dakota, Missouri River Basin project, and recommended its approval; and

"Whereas the Commissioner approved and transmitted the same to the Secretary of the Interior on April 19, 1957, which action gave hope to every interested North Dakotan that the report would go to the 85th Congress in time for hearings and action thereon; and

"Whereas after a further study and review thereof, the Secretary on June 12, 1957, approved the report which was thereafter transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget where it still remains; and

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the report be sent to Congress as soon as possible so that hearings and action thereon may be scheduled and taken at the earliest practicable time during the 1st session of the 86th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the President of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior be, and they are hereby, respectfully urged to transmit to the 1st session of the 86th Congress the project plan report on the Garrison diversion unit at the earliest practicable date; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Interior, to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, and to Representatives QUENTIN N. BURDICK and DON L. SHORT.

"C. P. DAHL,
"*President of the Senate.*
"VIC GILBREATH,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GERALD F. STARR,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY WELCOMING ALASKA AS THE 49TH STATE IN THE UNION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Assembly of the California Legislature, at its 1959 regular session, has generously adopted a resolution welcoming Alaska as the 49th State of the Union. The resolution pays a particular tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who

worked so effectively in behalf of statehood as chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 85th Congress, when the House enacted the Alaska statehood bill.

Needless to say, I join in hearty approval of this deserved recognition accorded our able colleague, the Senator from California. Alaskan statehood was a crowning achievement of his 16 years of great service and leadership in the House of Representatives.

However, I should like to go beyond this tribute and accord similar acclaim to others among the outstanding citizens of California who, for years, have warmly supported statehood for Alaska, and contributed to its ultimate realization.

Some 11 years ago, Mr. President, I organized a nationwide committee of 100 in behalf of statehood for Alaska. It contained many distinguished men. Included in it were such outstanding figures as the late H. H. "Hap" Arnold, general of the Air Force; Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army; Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz; Rear Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd; Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, whose recent passing is widely mourned; former Vice President John Nance Garner, and many other figures distinguished in public life and in the professions. Among them was Earl Warren, then Governor of California, who, in that capacity, missed no opportunity to exercise his great influence on behalf of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

In 1950, when the first Senate hearings on statehood for Alaska were being held, under the able and devoted leadership of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], then chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Gov. Earl Warren, at his own expense, flew from Sacramento to Washington to be the first witness before the committee, testifying warmly in favor of both Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood.

To that same hearing, Vice President NIXON, then a Representative in the House from the 12th California District, sent a telegram, which although written 9 years ago is today so pertinent and so valid that I desire to read it:

> Urge immediate passage of Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills. Hawaii and Alaska represent outer defenses of west coast, and all other arguments fade away when we face that uncontrovertible fact. They are the bulwark between the mainland and enemy invasion. These outer defenses will be much better manned when they become full-fledged States, and it is imperative to our security that west coast defenses are immediately and strongly built up.

In the battle for statehood in the 85th Congress, unstinting and effective support was likewise furnished by another distinguished Californian, its able senior Senator, now the minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL], who, though no less devoted to the cause of Hawaiian statehood than to that of Alaska, had the wisdom to oppose the tying together of these issues in order that each might prevail.

California and Alaska have had throughout their history, and will ever continue to have, much in common, and it gives me great pleasure, therefore, to present for publication in the RECORD at this point the resolution of the California Legislature, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 26

Resolution relative to welcoming Alaska as the 49th State in the Union

Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska, in the special referendum of August 26, 1958, declared their ardent desire for admission, as a State, to the Union of the United States of America; and

Whereas with the firmness and straightforwardness characteristic of America's pioneer people, the people of the Territory of Alaska reaffirmed their desire for statehood in the prestatehood election of November 25, 1958; and

Whereas the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, signed the proclamation admitting Alaska to statehood on January 3, 1959; and

Whereas California, as a fellow-western State, is particularly pleased to welcome and congratulate Alaska; and

Whereas Californian CLAIR ENGLE was chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at the time that committee recommended statehood for Alaska during the 1958 session of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That this House takes pleasure in welcoming and congratulating Alaska as the 49th State in the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to prepare and transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to the following distinguished officials of the State of Alaska: The Honorable William A. Egan, the first Governor of the State of Alaska; the Honorable Hugh J. Wade, first Secretary of State of Alaska; the first U.S. Senators from Alaska, the Honorable Edward L. (Bob) Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening; the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, the first Member of Congress from Alaska, and to the Alaska State Legislature; to the Honorable Clair Engle, U.S. Senator from the State of California.

RALPH M. BROWN,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alaska for introducing into the RECORD the resolution adopted by the California Legislature, which particularly refers to my activities as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in furthering the passage of the Alaskan statehood legislation. I am also delighted that the distinguished Senator has taken this opportunity to catalog for the RECORD, in general terms, at least, those Californians who were all actively participating in trying to bring Alaska into the Union as a State. It was a fitting tribute to each and all, and it demonstrated that there was a bipartisan effort by the great State of California in the interest of the Territory of Alaska at that time.

In the same spirit we are supporting statehood for Hawaii. I thank the Senator for his kindness in placing the resolution in the RECORD.

Mr. GRUENING. One of the things which heartened us most in our fight for statehood was the support of the leading men of the State of California, of whom the distinguished Vice President was certainly one.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alaska.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF HAWAII LEGISLATURE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a week ago last Tuesday the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and, so far as the proposed legislation under consideration is concerned, under the immediate management of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], voted out the Hawaiian statehood bill unanimously. Correspondingly rapid action has been taken in the House of Representatives. With a speed that reflects the highest credit on the leaderships of both Houses of Congress, the two Houses appear to be engaged in a race to see which can act on Hawaiian statehood first.

The destinies of Alaska and Hawaii, in their determination to achieve statehood, have been closely linked through the years. The people of Alaska greatly appreciate the support that was given us in the last session of Congress through the statesmanlike course of Delegate John A. Burns, of Hawaii. Now, we have before us a Senate concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, congratulating the new State of Alaska, and extending the aloha of the people of Hawaii to the people of Alaska. We are grateful to Hawaii for its aloha. We hope to reciprocate with skookum performance in regard to Hawaii's statehood bill.

The list of Hawaii senators who sponsored this resolution, which was adopted by both the territorial senate and the house, is headed by none other than Oren E. Long, distinguished former Governor of Hawaii under the Truman administration.

In view of the coincidental synchronizing of the action of the California Legislature in saluting the entry of Alaska into the Union and the action of the Hawaiian Legislature in doing likewise, and the imminence of statehood for Hawaii, I ask unanimous consent that the Hawaiian Legislature's resolution be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2

Concurrent resolution congratulating the new State of Alaska and extending the aloha of the people of Hawaii

Whereas Alaska has achieved her rightful place as the 49th State of the United States of America; and

Whereas the State of Alaska, the largest in the Union, blessed with Nature's bounties and with men and women of pioneering spirit and skills, richly deserved statehood and will henceforth enjoy an era of accelerated growth and prosperity and will contribute mightily to the welfare of our Nation; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii are especially cognizant of the great pride and elation and the feeling of great promise with which the citizens of the State of Alaska assume their full responsibilities and privileges of first-class American citizenship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the people of the Territory of Hawaii take this means to express their heartfelt congratulations and aloha to the people of the new, great State of Alaska; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Governor, the speaker of the house of representatives and the president of the senate of the State Legislature of Alaska, and to the Senators and Representatives to the U.S. Congress from the State of Alaska, so that this message of congratulations and aloha may be transmitted to the people of the State of Alaska.

JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF UTAH LEGISLATURE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Utah is now in session, and has forwarded to me and to the Vice President, for the consideration of the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 1, and House Concurrent Resolution 3.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint and concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah to the Congress of the United States proposing that the Congress of the United States amend that part of Public Law 85-868 which may adversely affect or deprive the State of Utah of the mineral rights to certain lands within the State of Utah

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah—

Whereas a large portion of the revenue for the support of the school system of the State of Utah is derived from royalties and rentals from the leasing of natural resources on public lands located within the State of Utah; and

Whereas in recent years oil and gas reserves have been discovered in the State of Utah from which the State school fund may receive in the future sufficient funds to relieve the taxpayers of the State of Utah of a great portion of the tax burden they must now bear for the support of the schools; and

Whereas Public Law 85-868, enacted September 2, 1958, is construed by the Department of the Interior and the Navajo Indian Tribe as depriving the State of Utah and its public schools of many millions of dollars in future school revenues from royalties on oil and gas already proven, and from the possibility of many millions of dollars additional revenue on yet undiscovered reserves; and

Whereas it was the announced purpose of the proponents of Public Law 85-868, prior to its enactment, that it would not affect the State of Utah or the rights of persons who otherwise would be entitled to the minerals in the lands described in the said law, and Utah Representatives in Congress were assured that the oil, gas, and mineral rights would not be affected in any way: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Representatives of the State of Utah in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested and urged to take all action necessary to protect the interests of the State of Utah and of its citizens in the rights to the oil, gas, and minerals within and upon the lands affected by Public Law 85-868; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the above be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, chairman of the U.S. Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, U.S. Senator FRANK E. MOSS, U.S. Representative HENRY A. DIXON, and U.S. Representative DAVID S. KING.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose proposed National Wilderness Preservation Acts

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein—

Whereas on January 9, 1959, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, 86th Congress, 1st session, to establish a national wilderness preservation system, and it is anticipated that an identical bill will be introduced in the Senate of the United States of America during the same session; and

Whereas said bills, each to be known as a National Wilderness Preservation Act authorize the immediate withdrawal of approximately 50 million acres of federally owned lands and the continued withdrawal of federally owned or controlled lands in the future, upon decision of Federal officials, into a national wilderness preservation system to be so protected and administered as to preserve the wilderness character of the lands withdrawn and contained therein; and

Whereas approximately 72 percent of the land in the State of Utah is owned and controlled by the Federal Government and is subject to withdrawal under the act; and

Whereas any development of lands withdrawn inconsistent with the preservation of said lands for the single purpose of wilderness areas is prohibited by the act; and

Whereas Utah stands at the threshold of a new era of prosperity through the multiple development of mineral, water, agricultural, industrial, recreational, and wilderness resources on its federally owned lands as presently permitted under law; and

Whereas there was in fact legislation enacted in 1957 by the Congress of the United States establishing an Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission to inventory our wilderness resource and report to the Congress in 1961: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That the 86th Congress of the United States of America be and is hereby memorialized to oppose and vote against any proposed National Wilderness Preservation Act as inimical to the future development of the State of Utah and the prosperity of those U.S. citizens residing therein, and as premature and unnecessary legislation; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the above be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, U.S. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, U.S. Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Representative HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, Representative DAVID S. KING, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, House Joint Memorial 2, adopted by the Montana State Legislature and approved by Gov. J. Hugo Aronson on February 20, 1959. I send to the desk the memorial, together with the official certification of the secretary of state of Montana, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

This joint memorial calls for the appropriation of $10 million to start the construction of Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River in Montana.

In 1957 the Congress authorized a settlement with the Indians for the damsite which the President vetoed. Last year we modified the settlement a little to accord with the President's views and again passed it. The President signed this authorization bill, but he has provided no funds in the current budget to start construction. Every effort will be made, of course, to add funds to the appropriation bill for beginning construction of this great project. As the legislative resolution points out, the project is needed and it will be false economy to delay in building it.

The joint memorial reflects the unanimous desires of the members of the legislature and of the Governor of Montana to end the delays and get on with the work. Every member of the Montana delegation in Congress holds the same view.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman Leroy Anderson, of Montana; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S.

House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton; the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Wilbur A. Dexheimer; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans, requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation to authorize and provide funds to start the construction on Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River in the State of Montana for 1959

"Whereas since the turn of the century men of good will and great vision have labored long and wisely to bring Yellowtail Dam into being; and

"Whereas many and high were the hurdles and obstacles that had to be overcome before construction of the Yellowtail Dam could be started; and

"Whereas one by one these many obstacles preventing the construction of Yellowtail Dam were overcome, until one alone remained, and that one was the acquiring of the damsite, upon which the proposed Yellowtail Dam would in time be built, from the Crow Indian Tribe; and

"Whereas that one remaining obstacle, the acquiring of the Yellowtail Dam site, has, due to the wise action of the last Congress, been overcome with the paying of $2,500,000 to the Crow people for this valuable piece of property; and

"Whereas the American people have a large investment in the proposed Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas no returns can be had from the moneys already invested in Yellowtail Dam until said Yellowtail Dam is constructed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be requested and urged to appropriate the sum of $10 million so that the construction of the sorely needed Yellowtail Dam project may begin at once; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the amendment include reservation of a block of power for Montana; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals, and to the chairmen of each of the committees mentioned in this memorial, as well as to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the U.S. Congress, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, Frank Murray, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "House Joint Memorial 2, a joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman Leroy Anderson, of Montana; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton; the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Wilbur A. Dexheimer; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation to authorize and provide funds to start the construction on Yellowtail Dam on the Bighorn River in the State of Montana for 1959" enacted by the 36th session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. Hugo Aronson, Governor of said State, on the 20th day of February 1959.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 24th day of February A.D. 1959.

FRANK MURRAY,
Secretary of State.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 175. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation (Rept. No. 99).

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SPACE AND ASTRONAUTICS (S. REPT. NO. 100)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, from the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics, pursuant to Senate Resolution 256 of the 85th Congress, I submit the final report of that committee, and ask that it be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1368. A bill to amend sections 503(a)(2) and 504 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to facilitate financing of new jet and turboprop aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1369. A bill for the relief of Yukie Arita Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1370. A bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

S. 1371. A bill to repeal the act approved March 3, 1897, and to amend the act approved December 20, 1944, relating to fees for transcripts of birth and death certificates in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1372. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of the Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia to cover the adjudication of the interests of husband and wife in personal and real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1373. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Massachusetts Port Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certain lands and improvements thereon comprising a portion of the "E" Street Annex, so-called, South Boston Annex, Boston Naval Shipyard, in South Boston, Mass., in exchange for certain other lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1374. A bill to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1375. A bill to set aside and reserve Memaloose Island, Columbia River, Oreg., for the use of The Dalles Dam project and transfer certain property to the Yakima Tribe of Indians in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1376. A bill to provide an additional income tax exemption for certain physically handicapped taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1377. A bill for the relief of Blagoje Popadich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 1378. A bill relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1379. A bill for the relief of Francis M. Haischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1380. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 1381. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1382. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain services provided at terminals operated jointly by a common carrier subject to part I and a railroad operating in an adjacent foreign country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Senators ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BENNETT, BRIDGES, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CARLSON, COOPER, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, ERVIN, GOLDWATER, HARTKE, HENNINGS, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, KENNEDY, KUCHEL,

LAUSCHE, MARTIN, MUNDT, MCGEE, ROBERTSON, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SMATHERS, SMITH, THURMOND, WILEY, WILLIAMS of Delaware), submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) providing for one general expenditure authorizations act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BYRD of Virginia.)

FEDERAL FISHERIES ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce a bill to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes. I request that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1374) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it has been clear for many years that the domestic groundfish industry faces a grave economic problem. And the problem is of no small consequence to New England, for over 60,000 people depend on this industry for their livelihood.

Twice in recent years President Eisenhower has been constrained for reasons of national security to reject two recommendations by the Tariff Commission for the relief of the New England groundfish industry. The industry has established economic justification before the Tariff Commission and demonstrated that it cannot maintain competition against foreign imports without tariff relief or some other measure of assistance. But security considerations have precluded relief; and the industry's condition continues to worsen.

We, therefore, ask only this: Is it equitable to assume that one industry should bear the entire brunt of our national security policies with respect to friendly nations engaged in fisheries commerce? Should this industry be forced to suffer economically for national security considerations which affect us as a nation as a whole?

Some measure of assistance is clearly in order. On this all are in agreement.

The legislation now proposed will meet the immediate needs of the distressed segments of this vital industry. It will enable shore processors to regain a measure of economic stability and to strengthen their competitive position, greatly damaged in recent years by heavy imports of groundfish. It further provides that construction differential payments will be made to fishing vessel operators who are now required under existing regulations to build new vessels in this country.

Oftentimes vessels can be built 30 to 50 percent cheaper in a foreign yard, but the operator is precluded from taking advantage of this saving.

Yet he must go out and fish sometimes just a few yards away from his foreign competitor whose vessel was built at this reduced cost. If there are tariffs to protect the domestic operator then he is unconcerned that the foreign boat was built at much less than the cost of his own.

But in view of the present tariff situation the fisherman is compelled to compete in the open market with the foreign producers. Thus the requirement that he build his boat in this country makes it virtually impossible for him to compete on fair terms with his foreign counterparts. If we cannot raise tariffs—and it is clear that we cannot under present international conditions—then we must permit fishermen who are in direct day-to-day competition with fishing fleets of foreign nations to overcome this inequity, just as the Maritime Act contemplated, and just as the Maritime Act now permits with our merchant marine. There is no distinction in the justification of the two, and it is time that Congress remedied the patent injustice.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED TAXPAYERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill granting to the physically handicapped the same $600 Federal income tax exemption now given to the blind. An estimated half a million people would be eligible for the exemption under the legislation.

By at least partially easing the present tax burden on these disabled persons, we shall help many of them to stay off public assistance rolls, thus encouraging them, as well as others benefited by the bill, to continue their efforts to become or remain self-sustaining.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that nearly 3 million persons under 64 years of age are afflicted by disabilities lasting for more than 6 months. It is further estimated that an additional 250,000 persons in this country become disabled each year.

The loss in earning power sustained by those who become disabled, the medical costs, lengthy rehabilitational training periods, and any special equipment or devices necessary, put a severe drain on family finances. Certainly these persons should be eligible for income tax consideration from the Federal Government at least to the extent called for in this bill.

The proposed legislation, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, defines a physically handicapped person as one who, because of injury, disease, congenital deformity, or defect, is substantially handicapped in obtaining or keeping employment, is unable to get to and from a job on public transportation without undue hardship or danger, or must use a prosthetic device in this employment. The bill further provides that any taxpayer seeking this exemption must submit proof in support of his claim. The exemption will not be allowed to any taxpayer already entitled to the $600 exemption for blindness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1376) to provide an additional income tax exemption for certain physically handicapped taxpayers, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ONE GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATIONS ACT FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Congress has lost control over Federal expenditures, and it acts on spending bills without providing itself with means of knowing whether it is creating a deficit or a surplus.

It authorizes vast backdoor spending and other expenditures outside of the appropriation process.

It splinters its consideration of the expenditure authorizations which do go through the appropriation process.

It does not exercise effective control over the annual rate of expenditures.

It authorizes expenditures without relating them to revenue.

Deficit financing has been the rule—not the exception—for more than a quarter of a century.

The deficit in the current year is estimated at nearly $13 billion.

We are confronted with the greatest debt in all our history, and with spending and deficit exceeded only for the World War II emergency.

The best experts concede that deficit financing in present circumstances is a heavy factor in our continuing inflation.

We have reached a point where it is difficult to sell the bonds of the U.S. Government.

Major reform in congressional procedures for enactment of spending legislation is needed. The need is obvious. It is serious. It is urgent.

I now submit a concurrent resolution designed to meet this need. In short, the resolution would enable Congress to:

Act on the spending side of the Federal budget as a whole, as well as in segments;

Control expenditures, as well as appropriations and other spending authorizations; and

Enact the spending side of the budget in full view of the latest official revenue estimates revised at each stage of the legislative process.

These reforms would provide for recapture of annual spending control by Congress, through the appropriation procedure. And in the process, spending would be related to revenue.

The concurrent resolution would enable Congress and the public to know for each fiscal year whether current spending action would result in a deficit or a surplus.

These are fundamental requirements for orderly, intelligent enactment of spending legislation. They are not met under present procedures, which have grown up in the complex of multi-billion-dollar budgets.

In present practice, the President submits the budget in January; and it is never seen again as a whole until the Budget Bureau compiles the midyear review, after Congress adjourns.

It is strange, but when people talk about the budget they are usually referring to Federal expenditures. They overlook the fact that every budget has a revenue side. And in the legislative process, we seldom consider spending legislation with revenue estimates in view.

Likewise, current appropriations and annual expenditures are frequently confused. Other sources of funds, including other types of direct spending authorizations, are overlooked.

There may be a vast difference between current regular appropriations and expenditures. Last year, appropriations totaled $61.8 billion, but expenditures totaled $71.9 billion. Revenue totaled $69.1 billion. The deficit was $2.8 billion.

It is annual expenditures—not current appropriations—against annual revenue, which determine whether there is to be a deficit or surplus, whether the debt is to be increased or not. But under present procedures, Congress does not act directly or effectively to control annual expenditures.

When Congress gets the President's budget, it splits off the spending side, and breaks up the spending authority into little pieces.

Some of it, like authorizations to spend out of debt receipts, may be enacted finally and directly in substantive legislation completely outside of the appropriation process.

Approximately $6 billion of this type of spending authority is budgeted for the current year. We can count nearly $200 billion of this type of spending authorization since inception of the technique for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Most of it has been outside of the appropriation process.

This money is drawn directly from the Federal debt. The law does not authorize expenditure from any other receipts in the Treasury. Much of it goes into revolving funds of so-called business-type agencies, and so forth; and there it is used over and over again, each time with neither appropriation control nor review.

Contract authority is another type of spending authorization established directly by basic law. In this case, subsequent appropriations are required; but they are virtually mandatory.

Permanent appropriations, also fixed by law, go through the appropriation process; but annual appropriation review is perfunctory.

The Senate this year passed $3.3 billion in direct spending authority, before the first appropriation bill was reported in the House.

Regular appropriations are broken up into a dozen or more bills. These are considered separately over a period of 6 months or more, without relating one to the other.

Large portions of the appropriations enacted in these bills are for actual expenditure in some future year.

Reduction in such appropriations does not necessarily affect expenditures in the ensuing year. All of the reduction may be applied to funds for use in future years. Such reductions may be restored in supplementals.

In all of this patchwork, Congress acts only to authorize expenditures. Authorizing expenditures under present practices is something far short of exercising annual expenditure control. Budgetary effect of action taken cannot be determined.

In fact, under current procedures Congress does not act positively, directly, or effectively to control annual Federal expenditures.

It does not act annually to control expenditures under permanent appropriations which are fixed by law in advance.

It does not control annual expenditures under contract authority which are determined by performance under contracts authorized in basic law.

It does not control annual expenditures out of debt receipts, which, with few exceptions, bypass the whole appropriation process.

It does not control annual expenditures out of regular, current appropriations, to the extent that distinction is not made between funds to be spent currently and those for use in future years.

Under existing procedures, Federal spending agencies build up unexpended balances from spending authority enacted in prior years practically equal to new spending authority requested each year.

Assuming enactment of the new spending authority requested in the budget for the fiscal year 1960, the spending agencies will have at their disposal nearly $150 billion.

The new spending authority requested in the budget for the fiscal year 1960 totals $76.8 billion. Unexpended balances under old authorizations are estimated at $73 billion.

Under present congressional practices and procedures, it is practically impossible to limit annual expenditures out of these tremendous balances.

These are fundamental deficiencies in congressional procedures and practices for enactment of spending legislation. There are more.

The need for reform is urgent and immediate.

The need to recapture expenditure control is critical.

These are the objectives of the concurrent resolution I now submit.

Under the terms of the resolution, this fundamental reform for recapture of Federal expenditure control would be accomplished by:

Bringing all spending authority, instead of appropriations alone, under jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees;

Acting on all new spending authority in one bill, to be known as the general expenditure authorization bill—with provision, of course, for necessary supplemental and deficiency bills;

Requiring annual expenditure limitation on each item in the bills;

Providing that the committee reports, including conference reports, on general expenditure authorization bills carry tabular presentations with totals of both expenditures and expenditure authorizations allowed under the bills; and

Requiring the latest revenue estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury to be inserted in the general expenditure authorization bills at each stage of the legislative procedure on them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), submitted by Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Senators ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BENNETT, BRIDGES, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CARLSON, COOPER, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, ERVIN, GOLDWATER, HARTKE, HENNINGS, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, KENNEDY, KUCHEL, LAUSCHE, MARTIN, MUNDT, MCGEE, ROBERTSON, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SMATHERS, SMITH, THURMOND, WILEY, and WILLIAMS of Delaware), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-sixth Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All new expenditure authorizations for each fiscal year shall be contained in one general expenditure authorization bill to be known as the General Expenditure Authorization Act of ——— (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The general expenditure authorization bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'expenditure authorizations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorizations, expenditure authorizations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of expenditure authorization.

"(2) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during the fiscal year against each expenditure authorization made therein; and the general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during such fiscal year against each expenditure authorization available from prior years. In each case in which an expenditure authorization for any fiscal year for any purpose is provided in any such bill and any other expenditure authorization or authorizations for the same general purpose are available during such fiscal year, the

limitation shall be against total expenditures from all expenditure authorizations available for the same general purpose during such fiscal year. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to expenditure authorizations made solely for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States or of judgments to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the inclusion in any general expenditure authorization bill or in any deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorization bill of such provisions as may be deemed appropriate with respect to transfer of expenditure authorizations or expenditure limitations.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each general expenditure authorization bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each new expenditure authorization available for expenditure in the fiscal year;

"(B) estimates of the balances of expenditure authorizations as of the beginning of the fiscal year;

"(C) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year;

"(D) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from the balances of expenditure authorizations referred to in clause (B), except expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(E) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the expenditure authorizations referred to in clauses (A) and (B).

"The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each expenditure authorization rescission bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on intragovernmental revolving and management funds and public enterprise funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) No general expenditure authorization bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(6) For the purposes of this subsection, the amount of expenditures shall be determined upon a checks issued basis.

"(7) As used in this subsection (c), the term 'expenditure authorization' shall apply to all current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States. The term 'expenditure authorization' shall not apply to appropriations of trust funds, deposit funds, transactions involving public debt retirement, or appropriations made solely for payment of refunds and drawbacks.

"(8) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general expenditure authorization bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for expenditure during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in the preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

SEC. 2. (a) The Senate, recognizing the necessity for an amendment to its Standing Rules in order to make effective the amendment to the joint rule made by the first section of this resolution, hereby adopts the provisions of subsection (b) of this section as an exercise of its rulemaking power.

(b) Effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-sixth Congress, but only if prior thereto this resolution is adopted by both Houses of Congress, subsection (b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-seven Senators, to which Committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Expenditure authorizations: As used in this paragraph the term 'expenditure authorizations' means current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States except authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States for the payment of private claims."

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16 to provide for a general expenditure authorization bill, containing separate titles corresponding to the general appropriation bills now enacted, submitted this morning by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I have asked him certain questions with respect to the bill, and he has supplied me with the answers.

I ask unanimous consent to have these questions and answers inserted in the RECORD at the end of the remarks of the Senator from Virginia.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. I am a cosponsor on this concurrent resolution. I understand that it is in the nature of an amendment to the rules. Is this correct?

Answer. Yes. It amends the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The language of this resolution would be added at the end of that joint rule.

Question. Consideration of this resolution clearly points up the fact that tremendous expenditures are authorized directly in substantive law, such as the practice of authorizing expenditures out of public debt receipts. It also points up the fact that other expenditures are authorized in a manner precluding effective appropriation review, such as contract authorizations. If I understand the terms of the resolution, it would require appropriation committee action with respect to all expenditure authorizations. Is this correct?

Answer. Yes. The resolution contemplates that procedures now followed for so-called current appropriations would be applied to all expenditures authorizations. In other words, committees with jurisdiction over substantive legislation would still determine the basic law authorization, but it would not be finally effective until it is implemented by regular appropriation action.

For instance, the basic law might provide that a program be financed out of public debt receipts, but the public debt receipts would be available only upon direct authorization through the appropriation process. The same would be true for contract authorizations, etc.

Question. The resolution first would apply the appropriation procedure to all expenditure authorizations. Then, as I understand it, all expenditure authorizations would be included in a single expenditure authorization bill.

Do I understand the terms of the resolution in this respect correctly?

Answer. Yes. At present, as you know, we consider a dozen or more bills providing for so-called current appropriations. For instance, there is the Treasury-Post Office bill, the bill appropriating for State-Justice and Commerce, the Defense Department bill, etc. All of these would be combined in one general expenditure authorization bill. And under the resolution other expenditure authorizations which now bypass the appropriation procedure would be included as well.

Question. The single general expenditure authorization bill, under the resolution, would also limit expenditures out of both the current authorizations and from any other funds available. Would you tell us how this would be done?

Answer. As I visualize the proposed single expenditure authorization bill, for each item it would first set forth the new authorization figure and then, in an added phrase, fix a limitation on expenditures out of all funds available in the account for the fiscal year in question.

For instance, take the case of an agency which was carrying over an unexpended balance of $1 and was requesting new authorizations of another $1, and planned, with congressional approval, to spend some of both dollars in the ensuing fiscal year. The expenditure authorization bill in the usual way would appropriate the new $1, and then add a phrase saying in effect that out of the new authorization and any other funds available the agency in that fiscal year could spend not more than $1.50 or such other overall amount as the committee might determine. The bill would not attempt to limit the amount of money that could be spent out of first the new authorization and second out of balances.

Question. It is obvious that by limiting annual expenditures, as provided in the resolution, Congress would literally recapture annual expenditure control. Are there any other advantages in this innovation?

Answer. Yes. For each budget account the bill would set forth two figures—one for new authorizations, and the other would establish the expenditure limitation. All of these figures would be in one bill. At the end they could be added up in two columns. The sum of one column would be the total new authorizations provided and this would be done in the committee report. The sum of the second column would be the maximum expenditures allowed for the year. There would be no doubt about either figure. The expenditure total could be compared with the estimate of revenue. The Congress and the country

would know exactly what the prospects would be for a surplus, a balanced budget, or requirement for deficit financing.

Amendments to the bill might change either or both of the figures for an item.

Question. Do I understand that the resolution would provide also for a revised estimate of revenue by the Secretary of the Treasury at each stage of the general expenditure authorization bill?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. In your opinion, would adoption of the single general expenditure authorization bill require any change in the present appropriations subcommittee organization?

Answer. I do not presume to speak for the Appropriations Committee, but I personally see no necessity for any change. As I visualize organization of the single bill, it could be divided into titles corresponding generally to the separate bills as we know them today. As I visualize consideration of the single bill, I know of no reason why each title could be considered by the subcommittee to which the corresponding bills are now assigned. And I would assume that each title could be managed on the floor by the chairmen of the respective subcommittees.

Question. The single bill idea has been criticized on the grounds that it would consume a great amount of time. Have you considered this point?

Answer. Yes. In 1950 the Congress enacted a single appropriation bill. Unfortunately, it was not given a fair trial because it was under consideration at the time the Korean war broke out. But I have checked the record and, as nearly as I can tell, in both the House and Senate more people participated in the debate on that single bill than participated in the debates on the numerous bills in the years immediately before and after the 1950 trial. And, although more people participated in the debate on the bill, the cumulated time used was less than was consumed in consideration of the numerous bills during the years immediately before and after. This measurement represents the best that can be done from analysis of the record.

Provisions in the resolution introduced today contemplate the desirability of joint sessions by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees for original hearings on the various titles, as a means of conserving time in the committee stage.

More important, I have no objections to any reasonable amount of time spent in consideration of expenditure authorizations. I do not think we spend enough time on bills authorizing huge expenditures. The Congress does nothing that is more important. In the first place, Federal programs cannot operate without Federal funds. In the second place, expenditure of taxpayers money is a prime responsibility of the Congress reserving utmost attention.

Question. The Congress enacted a single bill in 1950. Could the procedure set forth in the concurrent resolution be adopted without this proposed change in the rules?

Answer. I personally think it could. But there may be some who would disagree. For instance, possibly it could be argued that the Appropriations Committees have jurisdiction only over appropriations, to the exclusion of other types of expenditure authorizations. This would require a narrow construction of the rules establishing jurisdiction of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

I have seen it contended, for instance, that authority to spend out of the debt is not an appropriation. But I submit that article I, section 8, of the Constitution provides, "No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." No one can deny that money has been drawn from the Treasury in consequence to authorizations to spend from debt receipts.

Question. Has a resolution similar to this been introduced before?

Answer. Yes. I have introduced resolutions for the so-called single appropriation bill in every Congress since 1947. The previous resolutions have been reported favorably by the Senate Rules Committee on four occasions, and they have been passed by the Senate twice, each time without objection. But there has never been any House action on the proposal.

The resolution this year is substantially different from those introduced in the past in one respect. Previously, the resolution covered only appropriations. The resolution introduced today is expanded to cover not only appropriations but all expenditure authorizations.

Question. In the past similar resolutions have been referred to the Senate Rules Committee. Would it be more desirable to have this one considered by the Appropriations Committee?

Answer. On its face the resolution would amend the rules. In application it would affect the Appropriations Committee. I would have no objection to its consideration by either the Rules Committee or the Appropriations Committee or both. I think its importance merits fullest consideration.

Question. The Congress recently enacted legislation authorizing at least a trial of the accrued expenditure proposals. Would this resolution be in conflict with any developments under that legislation?

Answer. The accrued expenditure technique is proposed for several accounts in the President's budget for fiscal year 1960. I understand that application to several more accounts is contemplated for inclusion in the budget for fiscal year 1961. The accrued expenditures authorization expires after next year.

Answering the question specifically, I am advised that technically proposals in this resolution would not be in conflict with action taken under this prior legislation. Practically speaking, it would require additional accounting in cases where accrued expenditure limitations are being applied. The difference between the two is the difference between accrued expenditures and expenditures on a checks-issued basis.

Under this resolution there could be no question about the limitation on expenditures. This resolution clearly and definitely limits expenditures on a checks-issued basis.

If this resolution were adopted I would assume that it would supersede the previous legislation which would be allowed to expire.

Question. Would the resolution involve any additional costs?

Answer. I have raised this question with officials of the Treasury Department. It must be assumed that necessary changes in accounting procedure, certainly in some of the larger agencies such as the Department of Defense, would require some incidental expense.

I doubt if the costs would be great and I would hope that they would be more than offset by the savings which would result.

Question. Does the resolution have administration approval?

Answer. As in the past, technical advice in the drafting of the resolution has been requested and received from each of the fiscal agencies.

In the past the administration has not officially taken a position on the proposal on the ground that it was in the nature of an amendment to the rules under which the legislative branch works. Informally, high officials in the executive branch have favored the objectives of the resolution.

To answer the question more specifically, I quote from the President's budget message, page M22, Budget Document, as follows:

"The procedure used by the Congress for the review of fiscal matters is one which only the Congress itself can determine. Nevertheless, I believe that achievement of any overall fiscal objective is handicapped by the absence of arrangements under which the Congress can look at the fiscal situation as a whole. Such an arrangement was contemplated under a procedure established in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, but apparently did not prove satisfactory to the Congress. Over the years since that arrangement fell into disuse, the executive branch has made considerable progress in achieving a more comprehensive consolidated executive budget which sets forth a financial plan, including the effect of proposed legislation. I sincerely hope that the Congress will again consider ways by which it can more effectively overcome the diffused consideration which results from separate appropriation bills, the provision of new obligational authority outside of the appropriations process, and the separate deliberations on revenue bills and the debt limit."

Question. I understand also that the administration favors provision for item veto authority. Should this be coupled with this resolution?

Answer. I favor the item veto because, from my experience as Governor, I know that it can be used constructively. I have advocated it in the Federal Government since 1937 when I joined with the late Senator Vandenberg in proposing it. In the current session Senator BUSH and I are proposing it. The senior Senator of Ohio is also a cosponsor of this resolution.

But to answer the question specifically, I believe it should be considered separately from this resolution. In the first place, this is simply a concurrent resolution within the Congress to amend the rules. In contrast, the item veto may require the full procedure of a constitutional amendment.

Question. Would the resolution result in substantial savings?

Answer. I confidently hope and believe it would, but I cannot make an estimate in dollars.

The great value in this resolution would lie in the fact that it would provide both the Congress and the people with full and accessible knowledge of the amount involved in spending legislation and its effect on the Nation's fiscal situation.

With such intelligence I would rely on the judgment of the people and those who represent them in Congress.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished fellow member of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 1289) to increase and extend the special milk program for children, introduced by me on March 5, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORTS FOR OATS, RYE, BARLEY, AND GRAIN SORGHUMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 9, 1959, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1343) to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support

for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Senators CHAVEZ, CARLSON, KERR, HUMPHREY, MANSFIELD, and MURRAY) on March 9, 1959.

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, WITH RESPECT TO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS AT GREENVILLE, MISS. (S. DOC. NO. 15)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated August 5, 1958, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim review report on Mississippi River and tributaries with respect to harbor improvements at Greenville, Miss., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, and in response to an item in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

Excerpts from speech delivered by him at western space age conference, Los Angeles, Calif., March 5, 1959.

ABOLITION OF FISH TRAPS IN ALASKA COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, news which will be greeted enthusiastically by Alaskans was contained in an announcement this week by the Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, that he has included in Alaska commercial fisheries regulations this year a provision abolishing use of a device known as the fish trap. This fish trap abolition order is for Alaskans the best news to come out of Washington—I mean Washington, D.C., and not the State of Washington—the best news since the Congress passed the Alaska Statehood Act last year.

The departure of the fish trap from our waters is long overdue.

The fish trap in the almost unanimous view of Alaskans is a monopolistic device which more than any other thing has led to the tragic depletion of what once was Alaska's greatest natural resource and the greatest national fisheries resource, the Pacific salmon.

For some 50 years Alaskans have watched helplessly while the great salmon fisheries administered 100 percent by the Federal Government has gone down, down, down.

Alaska was the only Territory that by the Organic Act passed in 1912 was denied the right to manage and control its fisheries. Lacking jurisdiction over this resource, Alaskans could only urge and plead for the abolition of the traps. The same device, the fish trap, was long since abolished in the other Pacific salmon areas—British Columbia, Washington and Oregon, where the people, and not a distant Federal bureau had control over their resources. In those areas, while the same resource was originally far less bountiful, it has been conserved. In session after session our Territorial legislators have memorialized Congress to abolish fish traps. In session after session of the Congress, our voteless delegate in the House would introduce a bill to abolish fish traps. The people of Alaska, on a referendum 11 years ago, voted by a ratio of over 7 to 1 for the abolition of fish traps, but all in vain.

The result has been the tragic depletion of the fisheries, from a pack of approximately 8½ million cases a quarter of a century ago to less than 3 million cases last year. So grave was the effect of this depletion in Alaska that in 1953 President Eisenhower was obliged to declare Alaska's fishing communities to be disaster areas. Federal funds had to be spent to assist them. This is the first time in my experience that a disaster area was caused, not by so-called acts of God—hurricane, flood, tornado, earthquake, famine—but by acts of men.

Since then the situation has worsened. Alaska now has many depressed areas. Practically every fishing village in Alaska is a depressed area, and we therefore hope for the early passage of the proposed legislation which will help to relieve that situation.

This, Mr. President, is a prime example of how our natural resources can be depleted by selfish interests with their eyes only on immediate profits and entirely forgetful of the fact that our natural resources should be preserved and protected in the interests of and as a heritage for the future generations. It is also an example of how a Federal regulatory agency, whose prime responsibility is conservation, can abdicate that function and permit itself in fact to be regulated by the industry it is supposed to regulate. Despite the mounting evidence of depletion, despite the pleas of Alaskans, the agency arbitrarily accepted the industry's position on fishtraps.

Why, Mr. President, has such a great natural resource as the Alaska salmon been permitted to be depleted? The answer lies in greed and lack of foresight.

The greed was manifest in the hard fight waged by the fishing interests to continue to use fish traps in Alaska—even though the use of such wasteful fishing methods were banned in the very States—Oregon and Washington—from which many of these selfsame fishing companies hailed.

The lack of foresight, Mr. President, was manifest in the reluctance to invest in the future—a reluctance to appropriate sufficient funds to safeguard this great resource. Unfortunately, we are witnessing today a continuance of that same lack of foresight in many other areas where there is great resistance to appropriating funds with which to develop, to preserve, and to protect some of the great natural resources of our country.

In what has happened to the Alaska fishing industry we see a portent of things to come in other areas if we continue to lack the vision needed.

Mr. President, we shall shortly be debating the area redevelopment bill. It is my hope that it will be speedily passed. I am hopeful that it will prove helpful in assisting some of the Alaska fishing areas in their rehabilitation, as well as other depressed areas in the 49 States. But the need for such assistance in these areas should point up the moral. Such assistance would not have been necessary if, during the half century preceding this era, those responsible had taken the necessary steps to prevent the depletion of the salmon resources of Alaska.

The action by the Secretary of the Interior in banning the general use of fishtraps—however late—is welcome. It comes some 10 days after the first State Legislature of Alaska took similar action.

Meanwhile, Alaskans will now begin the long task of rebuilding from the bottom the once great salmon fishery resource. I am confident that now—having control of this resource, cherishing it, living close to it, understanding its importance—they will eventually succeed.

DISCONTINUANCE OF COMMUTER TRAINS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I joined this week with several other Senators in cosponsoring legislation that would prohibit the discontinuance of commuter trains until there has been a formal judgment by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a judgment based on the public interest and the needs of commuters, as well as the overall welfare of the railroad involved.

This bill would amend the Transportation Act of 1958, which now permits railroads to automatically discontinue passenger trains if they are not formally forbidden to do so by the Interstate Commerce Commission within 5 months after the application for discontinuance.

Since the passage of this act, more than 27 notices have been filed for the discontinuance of more than 100 passenger trains. Five months has proved an inadequate time for the Interstate Commerce Commission to properly investigate and make findings upon this flood of discontinuance requests.

Each of these requests poses a complex problem for the Interstate Commerce Commission, the solution of which must be based upon a delicate balance between the needs of the railroad, the needs of the public, and the overriding transportation needs of the Nation. The result of this insufficient time for proper study is that passenger trains may be discontinued by default, without public hearings and without a careful determination by proper authorities. Thus, the purpose of the Trans-

portation Act of 1958 is not being fulfilled.

I greatly sympathize with the problems of the railroad industry and I intend to do everything I can, commensurate with the public interest, to solve those problems.

The desire of railroads to discontinue unprofitable lines is understandable.

However, a railroad is different from an ordinary private enterprise. It is granted an exclusive and valuable franchise by Government and it, therefore, has a special obligation to meet the needs of the area it serves. Some of these necessary services may prove unprofitable, but railroads must be prepared to meet those public needs which involve loss as well as those which involve profit.

Under the bill I am cosponsoring, one of the criterions which the ICC must consider is the overall condition of the railroad, based on its total profit and loss situation in a given area. This is meant to protect railroads from having to continue passenger trains at a loss they cannot afford.

I recognize that the declining status of our Nation's railroads poses serious problems which deserve the immediate attention of Congress. I am prepared to join in measures to rescue the railroads from their present difficulties. But I am just as anxious that the people receive the necessary services they are entitled to, and I believe that the proposed legislation will result in a fairer consideration of the needs of the public.

NECESSITY FOR NEW TAXES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday I read from the Whaley-Eaton News Service letter and failed to give it credit for the information which appears on page 3542 of the RECORD. I apologize for that oversight.

INFLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee has been holding hearings for some time to try to discover why we have inflation.

On the one hand, some witnesses say that our inflation has been due to greater demand than supply.

Other witnesses have asserted that the inflation since the war has resulted from decisions by labor leaders and business leaders to raise prices. The testimony is further that these price-rise decisions have occurred in industries where they have so-called administered prices. Administered prices seem to be prices which can be raised or lowered by decisions of business or labor leaders and which last for a certain length of time without being affected by the market.

If this is so, it means that consumers are so anxious to buy the products of these industries and the industries are so strong, that the labor leaders and the business leaders in the industry have a wide discretion as to what price they shall establish for their product.

COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING SESSIONS

Naturally, the price of the product depends a lot on the cost of the labor that goes into the product.

In these big industries, the cost of the labor is agreed upon periodically in collective-bargaining sessions between management leaders and labor leaders.

There is representation of the management side, and of the labor side, at these meetings. The agreed wage increases—which will result in price increases—adversely affect the consuming public. But the consumer is not represented at these wage bargaining sessions.

I should like to raise the question whether there is some way in which the consumer can be represented in collective bargaining sessions.

CONSUMER REPRESENTATION?

Could the Government—without any thought of Government dictatorship—be authorized and directed by the Congress to have a consumer representative of great ability and wisdom present at collective bargaining sessions? His job could be to let the public in on what is going on during collective bargaining, and to express without power to decide what the consumer's interest appears to be.

Perhaps, in this way, the consumers could throw a little light into the collective bargaining sessions.

As things have gone, it appears that collective bargaining sessions have a big part to play in the inflationary spiral. Wages are raised and prices are raised and, though it may be argued which one comes first, that is like the argument of which comes first, the chicken or the egg. But the result is that we have both, the chicken and the egg, and that we also—over the years—have inflation.

Here is something to cause one to think twice—a list of pending bills which if enacted, would cost 190 odd billion dollars. I ask that the list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED COST OF REVENUE LOSS IF SELECTED BILLS WERE ENACTED

1. S. 722, DOUGLAS and others; Area Redevelopment Act, $400 million.
2. H.R. 2357, RAINS: Housing Act (as reported by committee), $1.6 billion through 1963, $6.1 billion in total cost, including $3.7 billion for public housing over 40 years.
3. S. 2, MURRAY: School Support Act, $15 to $16.2 billion for 5 years.
4.–5. H.R. 22, METCALF: S. 1087, HUMPHREY: Student Aid Act, $966 million for 5 years.
6. H.R. 1031, MULTER: Emergency program of grants for public works, $2.5 billion appropriation authorization.
7. H.R. 1030, MULTER: Community facilities and public works, $2.5 billion public-debt authorization.
8. H.R. 77, PATMAN: Old-age pensions for all over 65, $66 billion for 5 years.
9. S. 791, KENNEDY: Unemployment reinsurance grants, $1 to $2 billion for 5 years.
10. H.R. 102, HOGAN: Pensions for World War I veterans, $9 to $10 billion for 5 years.
11. H.R. 208, MORRISON: Federal employees' health insurance, $1.2 billion for 5 years.
12. H.R. 310, ABERNETHY: Increase individual income-tax exemption to $1,000, $50 billion revenue loss in 5 years.
13. S. 881, MORSE: Social security health insurance, $6.1 billion for 5 years.
14. S. 1, MONRONEY: Airports grants, $565 million for 5 years.
15. H.R. 1301, MCGOVERN: Farm income, $36.5 billion for 5 years.

Total, $193.3 to $196.5 billion.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 2260.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3-10-59-B" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President within sixty days after the effective date of this Act. Seven members of the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life and confirmed by the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission appointed as Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my statement in support of the amendment will be very brief. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for a moment.

It is my understanding from our colloquy last night that the Senator from South Dakota has no particular or strong feeling one way or the other regarding my amendment, or objection to it. He has modified his own original proposal which provided for four civilian and three military personnel. The Senator from South Dakota has modified his proposal so as to include six civilian and one military personnel.

As our debate last night shows, I have deep convictions about not having any persons who are on active military duty in any policymaking position involving the military. The place for them, in my judgment, is at the witness table. They should be called upon for advice, information, and testimony, but they should

not be given a vote in determining questions of policy which involve, in a very real sense, in the ultimate, at least, the legislative processes of Congress. It is one thing to have a civilian commission which can make a study and submit its advice and recommendations to Congress; but I think it is quite a different thing to put a military man on active duty in a policymaking position. That is the reason for my amendment.

I shall certainly understand whatever position the Senator from South Dakota takes on my proposal, because of my high respect for him; but it may be that the Senator from South Dakota will be wiling to accept my amendment. Then we could have one vote on the Commission as a complete civilian commission.

I ask the Senator from South Dakota if his point of view is such that he would find it impossible to accept my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, generally speaking, I respect the argument which the able Senator from Oregon has made with respect to having policy decisions made independently of the agency which would be expected to carry out any given policy. Of course, the Commission does not have the final determination in the matter. The final determination would rest in the hands of Congress. The Commission would make a report to the President.

But because I respect the argument, I did ask unanimous consent last night, which was given, to modify the amendment so as to provide for Commission personnel of six civilians and one member of the military. On the other hand, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to making the membership of the Commission exclusively civilian, and if my acceptance of the proposal of the Senator from Oregon would settle the issue, I should be glad to accept it.

I point out, in that connection, that the Commission will have the authority, under the language of the amendment, to get whatever information from the department it desires.

I call attention to paragraph (g) on page 3 of the printed amendment, which reads as follows:

> The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any department—

And, of course, that would include the Department of Defense—

> agency, or independent establishment of the Government information, statistics, data, suggestions, and other matters for the purposes of this section; and each such department, agency, or independent establishment is authorized and directed to furnish any of the foregoing matter directly to the Commission upon request of the Chairman of the Commission.

In view of that language, which is a part of the amendment, I see no necessity for having even one member of the Commission selected from the Department of Defense. It would be satisfactory to me to have the entire Commission a civilian commission, reporting to the President, who in turn would communicate to Congress whatever recommendations the Commission might make. Congress then would have the final decision in its hands.

Therefore, to the extent that my assent is necessary, I am willing to accept the amendment. I recognize that the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment, and that it can be modified only by consent. But if the Senators who are present will accept my desire in the matter, I shall be happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think all the Senator from South Dakota has to do is to ask unanimous consent that his amendment be modified.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be modified by striking paragraph (b) and substituting the paragraph designated (b) in the form of an amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, and that my amendment as modified then be substituted for paragraph (b) in the original text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I think we have greatly expedited action on the matter. I think there will be a much stronger Commission personnel arrangement now, with all of the members being civilians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as modified.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, apropos the discussion of a Commission, the Commission having been whittled down from one which would have been half military and half civilian to the point where it is now proposed that it shall be all civilian, it appears to me that one of the ways we have of avoiding issues is the creation of commissions. The President is very good at the appointment of commissions.

I wish some day there would be undertaken an investigation or survey to ascertain what has happened to all the commissions which have been appointed during the past 6 years—how many of them have made reports; how many of them have been appointed, and have died either a natural or an unnatural death; how many of them are hidden behind cobwebs in the various departments of the Government.

It is my understanding—although I may be mistaken, and I should like to ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] if my understanding is correct—that the pending amendment relates to a matter which the chairman of the committee believes should be a congressional function; and that to that end he has indicated that it is his intention to appoint a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, so that in that way a congressional committee or commission, so to speak, will look into this particular subject matter, will make a report, and in that way perhaps will be able to furnish valuable guidance, not only to the Armed Services Committee, but also to the Senate as a whole and to the Congress as a whole. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment was proposed originally in the Armed Services Committee, when we were marking up this bill. The amendment was discussed very thoroughly.

In the committee there was considerable objection to the amendment, for some of the reasons the Senator has indicated.

Many commissions have made recommendations in the military field. We have had the so-called Cordiner Committee, headed by a leader of business. It studied at some length the military manpower situation, and rendered a voluminous report.

For several years after 1951, we had the National Security Training Commission, established by the Congress to make recommendations relating to military training and such other recommendations relating to manpower as it considered desirable.

The former distinguished Senator from New York, James Wadsworth, who is recognized as an authority in this field, partly because of his service as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, when he was a member of this body—was chairman of that group. He was succeeded by General Sarnoff, who, as I recall, has been president and chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America. General Sarnoff has had a great deal of experience. They gave careful and earnest consideration to the means of providing the necessary military manpower.

In addition, there was the Rockefeller report. This was based on a study financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

This study resulted in a comprehensive report, which is available to the members of the committee, and, as a matter of fact, has been very helpful to the Congress, I am frank to state.

But, Mr. President, it has seemed to me, and it has appeared to the committee, that the subject matter of the pending amendment is within the responsibility of Congress, and that Congress cannot dodge or eliminate that responsibility by creating an outside Commission. When the bill was under committee consideration, I stated to the committee that it was my purpose at an early date to appoint a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee to conduct continuing studies into the utilization of military manpower.

After all, it is the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to provide for the strength of the Armed Forces; and although we are glad to obtain advice from every source, we have not been able to assimilate the reports of all the previous Commissions. As a matter of fact, I have not named all of them; there have been others. But I have mentioned the more outstanding ones and the more recent ones that have studied the problems which the proposed group would be created to consider.

I doubt very seriously whether the appointment of another Commission would serve any useful purpose. I believe that, instead, it would be likely to confuse the issue.

We are now considering questions about the necessary military strength of the country and the wisdom of demobilizing some of our present forces. Congress has taken one view of that matter; the executive branch of the Government has taken another.

But now it is proposed that the Congress, which has taken one position on that matter, authorize the executive branch to appoint a Commission with congressional sanction; and it would be a Commission which the executive would name. It is highly unlikely that the executive branch would name a Commission that would support the Congress and would fail to support the executive branch which would name the members of the Commission.

So I do not think anything would be gained by having such a Commission appointed now. In fact, I think the appointment of such a Commission at this time would only add confusion.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has answered my question. He has stated that it is his intention—not one arrived at lately, but one he has already brought before the members of his committee—to establish a subcommittee on manpower requirements, and so forth, and to have the subcommittee look into this particular matter.

Let me ask this question: If the President wishes to appoint a commission to look into this matter, he can do so at any time, without congressional sanction or request, can he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The proof of that is that he has already appointed commissions in this field. I believe they are called committees, when he appoints them; but they are either committees or commissions, composed of groups of men whom the President has selected to conduct studies for the benefit of other branches of the Government. There is nothing on earth to prevent the President from appointing any number of commissions that he may wish to appoint in this area. To be frank, I would not be surprised if he did appoint one to consider such problems, which have been before us for many years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me ask the Senator whether he is about to speak on the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, before the vote on the amendment is taken. Therefore, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Bennett	Butler
Allott	Bible	Byrd, Va.
Bartlett	Bridges	Byrd, W. Va.
Beall	Bush	Cannon
Capehart	Hill	Murray
Carlson	Holland	Muskie
Carroll	Hruska	Neuberger
Case, N.J.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Pastore
Chavez	Javits	Prouty
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph
Cooper	Jordan	Robertson
Cotton	Keating	Russell
Dirksen	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Dodd	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kuchel	Scott
Dworshak	Langer	Smathers
Eastland	Lausche	Smith
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
Engle	McCarthy	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Symington
Frear	McGee	Talmadge
Fulbright	McNamara	Thurmond
Goldwater	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Monroney	Williams, Del.
Hart	Morse	Yarborough
Hartke	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment proposes to create a Commission on Military Manpower, to be composed of seven members to be nominated by the President and to be confirmed by the Senate.

The bill before the Senate proposed to extend the draft, or the so-called Universal Military Training and Service Act, for 4 years without substantive amendment. The bill would only change the dates in the present law, for all intents and purposes. In fact, that is all it would do, except for the new section 5, which is not related to the substance of the operation of the act.

The testimony before the committee clearly indicated that there are inequities and discriminations in the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act today. The distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. RUSSELL] in commenting upon the testimony presented by Major General Harrison of the National Guard, said—and I quote again the statement I quoted yesterday—

> So there are a great many inequities in the program. I think it is beyond the power of mortal man to eliminate all the inequities in a program of this magnitude, but it certainly is incumbent on us to do as much as we can to see that this responsibility for the defense of the United States is distributed as widely as possible and is evenly imposed as we can on the young manhood of this Nation.

The Director of the Selective Service System, General Hershey, himself said:

> Millions of our young men have been told they have little, if anything, to contribute to their Nation's defense—because of physical or mental conditions.

He said further:

> We are not doing all we should do in preparation against possible nuclear attack. * * *
>
> Much needs to be done, but many are doing nothing. We cannot afford to waste our manpower.

One of the newspapers which I quoted yesterday said:

> Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need—

That is, the extension of the act—

> It ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Time magazine said:

> The most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable.

Yet, despite all that testimony and those conclusions, if we should pass the bill as it comes before us, without providing at least for a study by an objective civilian commission, we would be doing nothing to modify the present inequities, discrimination, waste of manpower, and whatever other evils there may be in the operation of the present System.

The amendment which I have offered was discussed in the committee. There was some sentiment for it in the committee. However, it was not brought to a vote in committee. But after considering the testimony which was given and the reports which were made by representatives of youth organizations before the committee, I felt that the Senate ought to have an opportunity to pass upon this question.

The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] raised the question about having an additional commission. I remind Senators that we have had commissions which have had fruitful results, including the Hoover Commission, which made recommendations for various reforms in Government; the Clay Commission, which made the primary report upon the basis of which the highway bill was developed, and the Cordiner Commission, which submitted a report, which led to reforms in the pay and other features of the services.

The distinguished Senator from Montana is one of the sponsors of a movement to investigate the water resources of the country.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to point out that the resolution to which the Senator refers calls for the creation of a senatorial commission, whose members would not be appointed or designated by the President of the United States. I believe that we have a responsibility in the water resource field. As the Senator from South Dakota well

knows, the water problems of this country are of great importance; and the time is not too far distant when water will become more important than oil.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that water is an important resource. But I will not debate with him or anyone else the relative merits of the water resources of the country and the young men of the country. We are taking young men between the ages of 19 and 35, in the most formative period of their lives, and subjecting them to the direction and planning of the state, the Government. They deserve an opportunity to have a civilian commission make its recommendations with respect to the regulations and the directives under which we place them.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it quite clear from the Senator's amendment that the Commission will be a civilian Commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is. Earlier in the day I agreed to the change proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which would make the Commission entirely civilian. Last night I proposed to make it a 6-to-1 civilian Commission. Today, upon the request of the Senator from Oregon, I agreed to make it a wholly civilian Commission, whose members would be nominated by the President, and whose nominations would be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it quite clear from the Senator's amendment that there is a time limitation for the filing of a report by the Commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The language of the amendment is as follows:

(h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

The bill pending before the Senate would extend the draft for 4 years. My amendment would insure a report within 2 years.

Mr. CARROLL. Within a 2-year period?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Within a 2-year period.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that I am in complete agreement with him. There is no reason why the Military Establishment should not be examined from time to time by a group of civilians, especially in view of the fact that the draft has been in effect for almost 19 years, except for a brief recess of 17 months in 1947–48. There could be no harm in taking a look at the situation. The committees of Congress, which have the primary jurisdiction, would make recommendations. We would still have all the other checks and safeguards. In my opinion no harm could come from the proposed study. At least it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is about the minimum which we ought to do if we believe that the civilian viewpoint should have full and free consideration with respect to the use of the manpower of the United States.

It is true that we also had testimony from Mr. Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, who wanted us to make better use of the scientific and technological manpower in the country. He pointed out that we still are not meeting the need for engineering and scientific talent. Many members of the committee said we ought to do something about it, but we would be doing nothing about it if we were merely to extend the draft law as it is today. The pressure would be off. Anyone with legislative experience knows that once the draft was extended the pressure would be off—the pressure for review, examination, modification, and improvement.

It is true that we had the National Security Training Commission, to which the distinguished chairman has referred. It is true that we had the Cordiner report. Both of those were presputnik. We have not had any military manpower commission studying the problem, either generally or specifically, or from the civilian standpoint, since sputnik was launched.

I believe that every Member of the Senate, if he were to consult the people of his State on this question, would vote for this amendment. But there has been no real opportunity for the people of the country to realize that this measure was coming to a vote so soon. There were 3 days of hearings last week. At that time some witnesses testified that they thought there should be longer hearings, and more notice. We marked up the bill in committee on Monday of this week. It was brought to the floor of the Senate on Tuesday. Had it not been for the debate last night, it would have been voted upon last night.

Let us give the people of the country, through civilians nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, an opportunity to express themselves, so that in the years ahead we may make the very best possible use of our most precious resource.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There are two questions which interest me. I am inclined to support the Senator's amendment, but I feel that those two questions should be determined. I notice in paragraph 3, on page 3, in that portion of the amendment dealing with the functions of the proposed commission, the following:

Alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

Those, like myself, who are deeply interested in a strong posture on the part of the United States to support its policy want to know whether that language implies any irresolution on our part in our determination to ask our young men to do the job which must be done to support our struggle for peace.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should say certainly not. This amendment would be merely an addendum to the bill. Without it we would be merely extending the draft for 4 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask the Senator whether he envisages the possibility that the commission might submit a report which might affect our foreign policy, in terms of lessening the number of men mobilized, or whether we might be asked to make some other fundamental decision which might weaken our powers in the military field, merely because the commission might not agree with what we were doing in terms of foreign policy?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would not have a weakening effect. It might result in some better use of manpower. Testimony by Under Secretary of the Army Finucane and other representatives of the Department of Defense was to the effect that if we could find some way to extend the time men remain in the service, we would have a stronger force, rather than a weaker force. Mr. Cordiner, in his report, took somewhat the same view. He stated that 25 percent of our effort is devoted to the training of manpower, and he indicated that there was waste in that field, and that we should not have to use 25 percent of our effort in that activity.

I hope recommendations will be made which will enable us to find ways and means of improving the strength of the military forces and thus make them more effective and more efficient.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator therefore say, as the sponsor of the amendment, as perfected by the Senator from Oregon, that he wishes legislative history established which will guide the commission, as reflected by the two answers which he has just made to me, as to what we had in mind, if the amendment were adopted?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Very definitely. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has asked the questions.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Last night I heard the interesting speech of the Senator from South Dakota and also the eloquent speech of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I repeat what I said last evening. First, I believe both Senators have performed a service to the Senate and to the country in insisting that there shall be a full development and discussion of the draft question in the Senate. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft for the period recommended by the Committee on Armed Services. I remember that in 1948, when this question was before the Senate, I voted to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to limit the draft to 2 years. I believe that the gravity of the situation today has brought about a different condition. For that reason I intend to support the committee in that respect.

I shall vote for the amendment offered by the able Senator from South Dakota, for many reasons. Chiefly I do so for this reason: Whether we say it is so or not, it is a practical fact that we

have a permanent draft. The draft has become almost a permanent institution in our country. Circumstances may dictate that we continue the draft period from year to year. Undoubtedly present circumstances do dictate such a decision. I still maintain my own view, however, that the draft is not an institution of American life and that it is not in harmony with the traditions of American life as a permanent institution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For peacetime.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota goes to that point, and that there will be an opportunity for a continued investigation and study and determination of the basic question of whether we actually intend to make the draft a permanent institution in our national life.

Secondly, if we are to do so, there should be made a careful and thoughtful study, by able men who have the time to go into such a study, as to the way in which it can be a most effective instrument for the security of our Nation.

I believe there is an inequality of sacrifice by the young men of this country. Some of our young men are called into service, others go into it voluntarily. There are those who do not give any kind of service. It is this kind of question which the investigation will go into and which will be covered by the report. I intend to vote for the amendment. I am happy the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Oregon have provoked this discussion and have offered an amendment which gives us an opportunity to go to the roots of these basic questions.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is there anything in the amendment which the Senator has offered to indicate that this would be a bipartisan or nonpartisan Commission? I notice that in subparagraph (b) the Commission is described, but it does not mention that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. It has not been customary in the Committee on Armed Services to raise partisan questions.

Mr. BUSH. This is to be a public Commission, as I understand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. I assume that in the tradition of the country in dealing with matters of this kind the Commission would be nonpartisan. I would say nonpartisan, rather than bipartisan. The Senate has the power of confirmation, and the Senate has a strong Democratic majority. The President is a Republican. He would name the members of the Commission, within 60 days of the effective date of the act. He would have to submit the names of the members of the Commission. They would be considered by a Senate which is 2-to-1 Democratic. That fact alone would seem to indicate that the persons named would be selected, I should hope, on the basis of their ability to analyze our manpower resources and make recommendations for the use of those resources.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator would not modify his amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would not want to do it.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have listened to the speech of the Senator from South Dakota. What is his opposition to the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, to name a subcommittee to go into the matter? It seems to me that a subcommittee composed of Senators can handle the matter very well. Why should we establish another commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The answer to that question is this. Eventually the recommendations would come to a subcommittee for consideration. However I have observed that when Senators are assigned to a committee they tend to develop a certain vested interest in the viewpoint of the department with which the committee deals. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and I cast no aspersions on that committee—naturally tends to assimilate the information of the Department of Agriculture. The Committee on Armed Services naturally inclines to the viewpoint expressed by the Department of Defense.

I prefer a commission to which the people, the rank and file of them, could feel they could go and, in an uninhibited way, express their ideas and recommendations from a civilian point of view. That is why I acceded to the suggestion that it be an entirely civilian commission. In the final analysis the answers are going to come from Congress, and Congress will make the decision. However, I should like to have the people, for whom the Senator from North Dakota has on so many occasions so eloquently spoken and whose petitions and letters he has submitted, be permitted to express themselves, and that these expressions of the public mind, which the Senator from North Dakota so frequently brings to our attention, should come into play in connection with the problems related to the effective nondiscriminatory use of our young men.

Mr. LANGER. The people go to the Senators and other Members of Congress. The people go to the Senators whom they have elected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They do, and would in this instance eventually.

Mr. LANGER. I am opposed to establishing commissions and bureaus. It seems to me that we should put an end to it at some time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. During the time when Congress is in session it is difficult for a subcommittee to devote time to this subject, as is evidenced by the fact that the bill has come to us without the benefit of any exploration into possible changes in the law.

In a review of the bill when it passed the House, one of the local newspapers reported:

> There was some support within the Pentagon before its submission to Congress for changes in the draft law because the manpower pool is steadily mounting, but administration chiefs and congressional leaders decided a simple extension of the law was preferable to opening up the complex law to legislative changes that might prove more troublesome than present defects.

That is the attitude which is reflected. That is why today 10 million young men are registered under the draft, but less than half of them will ever see military services. Does anyone believe that the burden is equitably distributed? Anyone who considers the facts must come to the conclusion that it is not.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will accept the amendment. I recognize that at this time the legislative machinery is such as to make difficult the adoption of an amendment of this sort. But I believe that if every Senator were to consult the people of his State, he would learn that they would like to have this kind of review of our manpower resources.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of some of the statements made by the Senator from South Dakota, I feel that it is incumbent upon me, representing the Committee on Armed Services, to make a brief reply.

The Senator from South Dakota has complained about the expeditious handling of the bill in the Senate. It is very difficult to please all Members of the Senate in the handling of legislation. Some Senators think the handling of a bill is too fast; others think it is not handled rapidly enough. The fact remains that this bill was introduced early in the year and has been before the committee ever since early February. The further fact is that the Committee on Armed Services afforded every witness who requested to be heard an opportunity to testify.

I do not know what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota expected the committee to do. Did he think the committee ought to have closed the hearings and advertised for people to come forth and present their views?

The Senator from South Dakota has quoted, on at least two occasions, a statement made by me. I stand firmly on that statement today. There are marked inequities and inequalities in the degree of military service rendered by young men in the defense of our country. Most of it exists in the Reserve service. There are more than 30 different ways in which a man can discharge his military obligation to his country. The chief injustices are the result of regulations which are made in the executive branch of the Government.

The principal inequity I have in mind is that those who are inducted, after they have completed their 24 months of service, are divided. About half of them are placed in Active Reserve units, where they must serve for 2 years and attend 48 drills and take 2 weeks of training a year; the other half are placed in a Reserve pool, where they have to take

only 15 days of training over a 3-year period. That is an inequity and an injustice. But Congress did not create it; it was created in the executive branch of the Government.

There is another inequity or injustice in the military which I had in mind. In 1955 the Committee on Armed Services was urged that it was necessary for the Nation to have a greatly enlarged Reserve program. The committee reported a bill. Congress passed it. The bill provided that a young man could submit himself for 6 months of active duty for training, and after he had had the 6 months of training he could serve 7½ years in the Reserve and thereby discharge his obligation. This proved to be a tremendously attractive program to the young men of the country. But as soon as the men started to appear in any considerable number the Department of Defense severely curtailed the program and said they could not operate it to its full potential. That is not the fault of Congress; it is due to the action of the executive branch of the Government.

These inequities will not be cured by our authorizing the executive branch to appoint a commission to deal with them.

When I was a young student in law school, old Dr. Morris—peace to his memory—had a saying that a jury would never convict a man for stealing a steer if the jury had eaten the beef at a barbecue. Inequities in the executive branch will not be corrected by giving the President the power to appoint a commission to deal with them.

There has been no dearth of commissions. We have had the Cordiner Commission. Mr. Cordiner, I believe, was the head of the General Electric Co. He and his associates studied methods of attracting a voluntary career force and the subject of manpower week after week and made extensive recommendations. Congress enacted legislation based on them.

We had the National Security Training Commission, as I said a few minutes ago, first presided over by former Senator Wadsworth, of New York, and more recently by General Sarnoff, of New York, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America. They submitted reports.

There have been two Rockefeller Commissions, one appointed by the President. After the first commission had reported on Defense reorganization, the Rockefeller Foundation financed a private study into defense matters. There have been many other commissions.

This problem will not be solved and Congress will not escape its responsibility by authorizing another commission to be appointed by the President. We know the basic facts in this case. We have all kinds of tables and charts. We know the number of young men who are in this age group and that age group. We know the number who have gone to college and how many have gone to high school. We know how many have availed themselves of each of the 30 methods for discharging their responsibility in the military service of the country.

It would be most unusual for us to create a commission at this particular time. Unfortunately, there have been different opinions between the majority of Congress and the executive branch of the Government on the extent of military strength necessary in this time of world crisis.

Congress has a responsibility. It will not escape it by giving to the executive department the power to appoint a commission to review the matter. Is the President likely to appoint a commission which will support the view of Congress and will be somewhat critical of his position? Or will it not be more likely to sustain the views of the President?

When the Committee on Armed Services was considering the bill, I stated that Congress could not avoid its responsibility. I said I proposed to create or appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a continuing study of the utilization of the military manpower of the Nation. Congress has a responsibility. We cannot avoid it by appointing commissions. It is about time that we got away from attempting to meet every problem by the appointment of a commission. Some day we may be overtaken by the problems.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did I understand the Senator from Georgia to say that he plans to appoint a subcommittee to study this matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. I so stated in the committee when the committee was considering the bill. It is not a new proposal. It is not in answer to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LONG. The thought occurs to me that some of the civilian experts who have been asked to study the problem have oftentimes been so busy with their own affairs that they do not have the time which is necessary to do real justice to the work, and that the persons who are hired on the staff sometimes end by being the ones who dominate the entire investigation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The persons appointed are usually those who have achieved success in the field of finance, but they do not have outstanding ability or experience in the military field. They do not have the time to make the proper study. Their names are more in the nature of symbols. Usually we end by getting practically the same recommendations from the commission that we have had from the Department of Defense on the same subject. It is merely a new way of asking for the views of the Department of Defense. It might not do any great harm, but why should we try to avoid our responsibility by appointing an outside commission?

Mr. President, I have been asked to remind the Senate—and I am prepared to do so—that at 12:15 we are expected to go to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend a joint meeting and to hear the President of one of our neighboring republics, the Republic of El Salvador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent, by leave of the Senate, on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bartlett	Frear	Morton
Capehart	Gruening	Mundt
Carroll	Hart	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Prouty
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Keating	Schoeppel
Cooper	McNamara	Wiley
Dworshak	Morse	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—68

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Allott	Green	Moss
Beall	Hartke	Murray
Bennett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Carlson	Jordan	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith
Chavez	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cotton	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Dodd	Lausche	Talmadge
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Eastland	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ervin	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGee	

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson	Gore	Kerr
Curtis	Hennings	Martin

So. Mr. CASE's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On yesterday, as I recall, the Senate ordered that a recess be declared today at 12:15 p.m., subject to the call of the Chair, because of a joint meeting which will immedi-

ately begin in the other body. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to proceed with his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up, for consideration immediately after the conclusion of the joint meeting, my amendment identified as 3-10-59-C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1961."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while so many Senators are present, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon have any idea how long he desires to discuss his amendment? Can he advise me of the approximate time so I may inform Senators?

Mr. MORSE. Not more than 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to announce for the information of all Senators that as soon as the joint meeting is concluded, the Senate will immediately reconvene, and the pending question will be the Morse amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an understanding, in order to expedite the consideration of the pending legislation, that immediately after the joint meeting I may be recognized to present my argument on the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the Senate's reconvening the Senator from Oregon be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that the Senate then proceed to vote on the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF EL SALVADOR—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that pursuant to the order entered yesterday the Senate now stand in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order of yesterday, for the purpose of proceeding to the Hall of the House to hear an address to be delivered before the two Houses by the President of El Salvador, the Chair declares the Senate in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon the Senate stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m., the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting of the two Houses to hear the address to be delivered by the Honorable Jose Maria Lemus, President of El Salvador.

(For the address delivered by the President of El Salvador, see the House proceedings of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed that under a previous agreement the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will have 15 minutes on his amendment, which is now pending, and that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will have not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Oregon prepared to proceed, or would he like to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. I am prepared to proceed.

Mr. President, in the 3 days of hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, I find testimony in opposition to continuation of the draft from many private witnesses, most of them representing churches and religious groups, educational interests, and organizations of young people.

In support of a 4-year extension, I find testimony from the Defense Department Chiefs and members of the armed services.

But where are the recommendations from the expert study groups that have been used by the President to study preparedness? What has become of the Cordiner report and the Gaither report, for example? The Gaither report has not been made public, but enough of it is known for us to say that it found America's military security in an inadequate and perhaps even precarious state.

The basic finding of the Cordiner group was that—

> The modern military manpower problem reduced to its simplest terms is one of quality rather than quantity. It is not merely a matter of the total number of people on hand but is much more a matter of the competence, skill, and experience of these people. The military services are not able to present, and under present circumstances to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people needed for the period of time necessary for those people to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force.

It was because of this report that Congress upped the pay schedules of the armed services, though many of us had misgivings at the time that we might be promoting career service in the upper grades but the tiny boost in pay for the lowest grades would do precious little to encourage the men in them to make a career of military service.

The Cordiner report continued:

> The solution is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long enough and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities.

The Cordiner report dealt primarily with compensation as a means of retaining qualified men in the armed services. But it assumed the necessity for a strong career service.

For example, on page 43, we find the following:

> The day has passed when a large portion of the military work force performed relatively unskilled tasks and a major measure of their competence was based upon discipline and physical fitness only. Today, a large portion of the defense team must possess not only the discipline and physical and mental stamina formerly required, but also a trained, experienced, and disciplined skill in the use of complex equipment.
>
> Development of this level of skill requires adequate quality input to training, an intensive program of instruction, and supervised on-the-job experience before the full effectiveness of the individual and equipment in his charge can be realized.

And on page 44:

> Such retention is not being realized today to an acceptable, economic degree. It is least realized in the skills requiring the most lengthy and costly training. Today there is a tremendous outflow of effort to train a stream of transient personnel to a journeyman level of competence without a reasonable realization of skilled service in return. This is the heart of the enlisted retention problem.

Elsewhere in the Cordiner report we find statements that modern war technology makes it almost impossible to train a specialists in 2 years, and we find a summary of Cordiner's reactions from talking to many draftees. I quote him again:

> I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They (the men) were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who do not stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teacher whose every class flunks.

This is supposed to be a report of manpower experts. Why has it not been taken into account? Does the President believe its findings and recommendations are unwarranted, except those recommendations for higher pay for the top brass which he urged Congress to adopt?

If the Cordiner report is not sound in its findings on the use and value of draftees, why has not the President and the Pentagon answered those findings and disproved them?

Figures put into the Senate committee hearing record by the Defense Department show that reenlistments on the part of all regulars in all the services ran from 43.5 percent to 50.8 percent between 1956 and 1958. Reenlistment by Army Regulars was just about the same on the average, as for the entire Defense Establishment.

But reenlistment by draftees, all of whom are in the Army, ran from 2.2 percent to a high of 4.7 percent.

I am simply at a loss to understand why a 4-year extension of the draft is being advertised as necessary to safeguard American security and to frighten the Russians. In my opinion, it will do neither. I am satisfied that the Russians know that the draft does not strengthen America's security.

What is needed is a congressional restudy of manpower needs. Of course, that job has already been done by executive commissions, but their findings and recommendations either remain locked away or are ignored by the administration that hired them done.

A 2-year extension of the draft while Congress reexamines the military manpower situation is essential for the security of the country. Voting for a 4-year extension of an inadequate system would be to vote for a label.

I want genuine security for my country, and not merely an illusion of security.

Senators know, and the record of the last 12 years amply bears me out, that I have been an advocate of universal military training. With genuine, uniform, and universal basic military training for every American man in early manhood we would have the manpower of basically trained men the Nation would need in time of war.

But I am for a universal military training program which bears a direct relation to the skills, the knowledge, and the competency of each individual. The draft as we now have it bears no such relationship.

We have never had real universal military training. We have never really put it into effect. If we did have it, and in addition had a highly trained career armed force for continuous protection, I think our country would be far more secure than it is today.

Instead, we have compromised with a continuation of selective service, a type of manpower selection that all the experts tell us is inadequate. We have neither the tremendous reservoir that universal military training would provide, nor the career, professional force that is vital over the long run when we are faced with the kind of perpetual and continuing menace of Communist pressure.

I simply do not want to delay for 4 years a reexamination of these inadequate military manpower practices. We should limit the present system to 2 years, and have a congressional study come back at the end of those 2 years with its proposals. If we did that, then I think the Kremlin would know we mean business. What the Russians will learn from a simple 4-year extension will be that the United States is satisfied with its present defense arrangement and does not plan to correct or change the inadequacies that everyone knows are in it, for at least 4 years.

In 1948, in the debate on the draft issue, when it was recommended by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate that the draft be for a 5-year period, I proposed an amendment calling for a limitation to 2 years. As will be shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that year, an excerpt from which was placed in the RECORD yesterday, my amendment was agreed to by a vote of 47 to 33.

I ask, What has happened since 1948 which would justify a longer extension than 2 years? In 1948 we voted for a 2-year extension. It was increased to 4 years at the time of the Korean war. The record which the Armed Services Committee has brought to our desks leaves no room for doubt in my mind—and I believe in the mind of anyone who will study the record—that a 4-year extension is not justified by the facts on the record. It is not justified by the expert studies on military manpower which have already been made and reports on which have been submitted. There is no doubt in my mind that this extension is being asked for by the Pentagon in order to entrench even deeper some malpractices and inefficiencies in the use of American manpower. What we must say to the Pentagon is: "We will give you 2 years more, and only 2 years more, of this inefficient draft system which you are operating, and at the end of 2 years we will bring forth a bill based upon the facts as to what the Nation needs, and we will adopt a manpower policy based upon the studies which will have been made."

The Senate will make a grievous mistake today if it extends for 4 years a draft system which is honeycombed with great weaknesses and inefficiencies, and is characterized by practices which do not strengthen the security of our country but which, in my judgment, weaken it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we all know that if we extend the Draft Act for 4 years, the danger will be that Congress will forget about the problem until the 4 years have passed. The people of the United States, the voters whom we represent, are entitled to action by the Senate today. They are entitled to action which carries out the pledge that automatically at the end of 2 years we will take another look at the draft law.

I urge the adoption of my amendment. My amendment will give to the draft system all the service from Congress to which it is entitled. My amendment will permit what I regard as an outdated, inefficient military manpower system to proceed for another 2 years, until we can adopt a perfected one 2 years hence.

Consideration of the extension of this archaic system for another 4 years in my judgment raises serious doubts as to whether we ought to extend it at all. On the basis of the same plea I made in 1948—which I believe is just as applicable today—when the Senate by a vote of 47 to 33 changed a recommendation of the Armed Services Committee for a 5-year period to a 2-year period, I ask that the Senate cut down the committee's proposal of a 4-year extension to a 2-year extension.

I rest my case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and a distinguished soldier.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the senior Senator from Georgia for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, there are a number of reasons why the Universal Military Training and Service Act should be extended for the full 4 years as recommended by the committee.

We find ourselves currently engaged in one of the most crucial stages of our struggle with the forces of communism. The entire free world looks to the United States for a large portion of their protection from the Communist forces. Any show of weakness on our part, such as a failure to extend the draft or even a failure to enact a full 4-year extension, might be interpreted as a slackening in our defense effort and thereby cause irreparable harm to the solidarity of the free world.

It is true that with our present defense structure only a relatively few persons are actually inducted by the draft process. The number of inductees alone, however, is not a true indicator of the total effect of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Unquestionably, the very existence of the draft is a major stimulus for voluntary enlistments, and it is in this capacity that the Draft Act is so effective in providing our Armed Forces with needed personnel.

We all realize that there is a degree of inconvenience attached to any noncareer military service. Such service is, however, one of the responsibilities of a citizen of a democracy which goes hand in glove with the benefits of democracy. The benefits of a democracy cannot continue to exist unless the responsibilities are also met.

Neither the individual who undergoes military training in his youth nor the country will be harmed from the experience of service. On the contrary, both the individual and the country, aside from the defense issue, will benefit. Military training builds, not only good soldiers, but strong character and bodies, which will be of ultimate advantage to the individual who acquires them and to the country to whose benefit he applies them.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have given I am convinced that H.R. 2260 should be enacted in the form recommended by the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last evening the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon placed in the RECORD the proceedings in 1948 when the Senate considered reenactment of the draft. I note that fact to indicate that at that time I voted for a 2-year reenactment.

I wish to point out that conditions in the world today are vastly different from those that existed in 1948. At that time we were just beginning the period that has been so aptly described as the cold war. We had about 1.4 million men

in the armed services, and this number was not regarded as adequate. We found it necessary to reinstate the selective service law in an attempt to bring the total up to about 2 million, as I recall. At that time we were still imbued with the hope that we could come to an understanding with the Soviet Government with regard to world conditions. There was still some hope by those who had not had any great experience with the Soviets that the Soviets might on occasion keep their pledged word and carry out their commitments.

Since that time we have found that it is characteristic of them not to discharge their commitments unless it is to their advantage to do so when the time of performance has come.

Therefore, Mr. President, today we must deal with a very dangerous and delicate situation in international relations. This situation revolves around Berlin. The Soviet Union has moved all over the space of the world. It has not been long since the danger point was in the Formosa Straits, on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Then they jumped with startling speed to the Middle East. There was trouble in Lebanon. We were compelled to send forces there in order to maintain our commitment. Then the trouble spot was moved from the Middle East to Berlin. Today Berlin is the focal point of conflict between international communism and the free world where there is respect for individual dignity. This conflict is centered in the capital of the old German nation.

There is a great deal more involved in the bill than the mere extension of the draft. It contains authority to extend for 4 years the ceilings on the Armed Forces. If the bill is not enacted it will be necessary on the 1st of July to reduce our military strength by about 500,000. Some 325,000 of that reduction will come in the Department of the Air Force, upon which we pin such vital hopes for our survival as a free people.

There are other provisions in the bill. To take care of the dependents of those who are in the Armed Services, and those provisions also would expire if the act were not extended. So much more, therefore, is involved in the bill than the extension of the draft.

We have had a great debate in the country—and it is manifest on the floor of the Senate every few days—about the size of military forces this Nation should maintain in order to make sure that we will be able to meet any threat anywhere on the globe.

Some of our most distinguished and learned military strategists have advised us that more ground forces are needed to maintain our position in Berlin. That demand has been voiced again and again by Senators in this Chamber. Indeed, the Senate has voted to maintain the manpower at 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps for this fiscal year, and will undoubtedly vote to maintain that strength in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, in what position would we be if we haggled, quibbled, and squabbled here today about extending the draft for the 4 years requested by the administration? Congress would be saying, in effect, "We must have manpower to defend the country. The administration must acquire greater military strength." While we would be saying that in one voice, in another voice we would be saying, "We will extend the draft for only 2 years." We would be haggling and quibbling about the means to maintain the military strength we say is essential.

I am not a slave to consistency, but, in my opinion, it would be the height of inconsistency—almost puerile—for us to say that the military strength must be increased, while at the same time we placed drastic limitations on the only machinery which we know will provide the manpower necessary to maintain that strength.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. It should be defeated. It should be voted down. Let the word go out from this Chamber that the U.S. Senate means what it says when it asserts that the military strength of the United States must be maintained; and that, distasteful though it may be to extend any form of compulsory military service in this Republic, we realize that the draft is the only means by which our military strength can be maintained; therefore, we are extending the draft for 4 years and are saying to our associates in the free world, and, more than that, are saying to the men who are exercising the vast power of a tyrannical dictatorship in the Kremlin, that the United States of America means what it says.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has all time under the agreement been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two more minutes remain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Who controls that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the Senator from Georgia willing to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield back the time, if that is the only time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand that the vote will be on the Morse amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote will be on the Morse amendment to extend the draft for 2 years instead of 4 years. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent, by leave of the Senate, on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—24

Capehart	Humphrey	Mundt
Carroll	Langer	Murray
Case, S. Dak.	Magnuson	Neuberger
Church	Mansfield	Proxmire
Clark	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Dworshak	McGee	Wiley
Gruening	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—67

Aiken	Frear	Morton
Allott	Fulbright	Moss
Bartlett	Goldwater	Muskie
Beall	Green	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Hartke	Pastore
Bible	Hayden	Prouty
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Bush	Hill	Robertson
Butler	Holland	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Scott
Cannon	Javits	Smathers
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smith
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Chavez	Jordan	Stennis
Cooper	Keating	Symington
Cotton	Kefauver	Talmadge
Dirksen	Kennedy	Thurmond
Dodd	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Long	Yarborough
Engle	McClellan	
Ervin	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Gore	Martin
Curtis	Hennings	
Ellender	Kerr	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks I have prepared with respect to the Draft Act extension be printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The remarks prepared by Mr. YARBOROUGH are as follows:

In a few minutes, I, like the great majority of the Members of the Senate, will vote for extension of the draft. It is a vote which I shall cast with some reluctance. But, with the obligation of economic and military leadership of the free world upon us, it appears to me that we have no alternative.

Khrushchev, with his ultimatum to us to abandon Berlin by May 27, has dealt a deadly hand of nuclear Russian roulette to all mankind. In this grave crisis, we could more seriously consider legislation to vastly increase our Armed Forces than we could to allow the draft to end.

Since the obligations and duties of leadership give us no choice but to extend this law compelling a period of military service for our qualified young men, I think we should consider carefully the result of our action.

The draft is a liability which has rested on our young men since 1940, excepting one minor gap, and if extended, will mean that a whole generation of American boys will be following their fathers into the draft lottery system. Who knows what changes this will mean in our national outlook and character, our traditional love of freedom and aversion to the unrestrained power of the military over the person?

Even as we pass this draft extension, I think we should be resolving to pass a new GI bill of rights for veterans of the seemingly endless cold war. The bill, S. 1138, which I have already had the privilige of introducing in cosponsorship with 25 members of the Senate, would not only restore to the boys we are going to draft, and their families, the lost opportunities resulting from their performance of this duty to our country, but also it would be to the very substantial benefit of the Nation in providing millions of more highly educated and trained citizens who would produce millions of additional revenues.

I believe that as we prepare to extend the draft law, we should also be thinking in terms of passing the cold war veterans GI bill, which I hope and expect will be before the Senate for consideration within a few weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The question now is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—90

Aiken	Fulbright	Morse
Allott	Goldwater	Morton
Bartlett	Green	Moss
Beall	Gruening	Mundt
Bennett	Hart	Murray
Bible	Hartke	Muskie
Bridges	Hayden	Neuberger
Bush	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Cannon	Humphrey	Randolph
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Javits	Russell
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Scott
Chavez	Keating	Smathers
Church	Kefauver	Smith
Clark	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Symington
Dirksen	Long	Talmadge
Dodd	McCarthy	Thurmond
Douglas	McClellan	Wiley
Dworshak	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Engle	Magnuson	Yarborough
Ervin	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Langer

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Gore	Martin
Curtis	Hennings	
Ellender	Kerr	

So the bill (H.R. 2260) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Washington to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 75, S. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 3, line 10, after the word "amended", to strike out "is" and insert "shall be"; in the same line, after the word "a", to strike out "law" and insert "provision of the Constitution"; in line 11, after the word "State", to insert "as provided in section 7, subsection (b) of this Act"; in line 20, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; in line 23, after the word "amendment", to strike out "or law,"; in line 24, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "It is further agreed that neither the State of Hawaii nor any subdivision thereof shall take any action or enact or enforce any law or regulation which imposes a tax, requirement or restriction which unreasonably discriminates directly or indirectly against nonresident persons, firms or corporations, their business, property, or occupational activities or opportunities."; in line 19, after "(a)", to insert "Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section"; in line 21, after the word "shall", to insert "succeed to the title of the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions in those lands and other properties in which the Territory and its subdivisions now hold title"; in line 24, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "have and retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall be and become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be."; on page 5, line 15, after "(b)", to insert "Except as provided in subsection (c) and (d) of this section"; in line 16, after the words "United States", to strike out "hereby"; in line 17, after the word "upon", to strike out "the date of"; in line 18, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "absolute" and insert "United States'"; in line 20, after the word "Hawaii", to strike out "as described herein,"; at the begininng of line 21, to strike out "in" and insert "held by"; in the same line, after the word "to", to strike out "the" and insert "its"; in line 22, after the word "admission", to strike out "of such State"; in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "Union," and insert "Union."; in the

same line, after the amendment just above mentioned, to strike out "except as otherwise provided in this Act: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall retain absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be. As used in this subsection, the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded."; on page 6, line 13, after the word "The", to strike out "lands" and insert "grant"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "granted" and insert "made"; in line 17, after "(c)", to strike out "The lands granted to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom," and insert "Any lands and other properties that, on the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, are set aside pursuant to law for the use of the United States under any (1) Act of Congress, (2) Executive order, (3) proclamation of the President, or (4) proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii shall remain the property of the United States subject only to the limitations, if any, imposed under (1), (2), (3), or (4), as the case may be."; on page 7, after line 2, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(d) Any public lands or other public property that is conveyed to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section but that, immediately prior to the admission of said State into the Union, is controlled by the United States pursuant to permit, license, or permission, written or verbal, from the Territory of Hawaii or any department thereof may, at any time during the 5 years following the admission of Hawaii into the Union, be set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order of the President, made pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, and the lands or property so set aside shall, subject only to valid rights then existing, be the property of the United States.

After line 14, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(e) Within 5 years from the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, each Federal agency having control over any land or property that is retained by the United States pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall report to the President the facts regarding its continued need for such land or property, and if the President determines that the land or property is no longer needed by the United States it shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii.

After line 22, to insert:

"(f) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section and public lands retained by the United States under subsections (c) and (d) and later conveyed to the State under subsection (e), together with the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of any such lands";

On page 8, line 20, after the word "under", to strike out "the preceding subsection" and insert "this Act"; after line 22, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(g) As used in this Act, the term "lands and other properties" includes public lands and other public property, and the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or properties so ceded.

On page 9, after line 5, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(h) All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property which vests in or is conveyed to the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (e) of this section or reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto shall cease to be effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

After line 12, to strike out:

(d) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

At the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(i)"; at the beginning of line 21, to insert "and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 212, Eighty-third Congress, first session, 67 Stat. 462)"; on page 10, line 1, after "Sec. 6.", to strike out "Upon" and insert "As soon as possible after the"; in line 3, after the word "of", to insert "the Territory of"; in line 7, after the word "all", to insert "State"; in line 9, after the word "Hawaii", to insert "and for two Senators and one Representative in Congress. In the first election of Senators from said State the two senatorial offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. No identification or designation of either of the two senatorial offices, however, shall refer to or be taken to refer to the term of that office, nor shall any such identification or designation in any way impair the privilege of the Senate to determine the class to which each of the Senators elected shall be assigned."; in line 18, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "but the officers so elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by the constitution or laws of said proposed State, said Representatives shall be elected at large."; in line 25, after the word "election", to strike out "not less than sixty nor more than ninety days after said proclamation, and a general election shall take place within forty days after said primary election," and insert "and a general election"; on page 11, line 4, after the word "be", where it appears the second time, to insert "chosen by the people"; in line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and officers for other elective offices provided for in the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii may be, chosen by the people."; in line 17, after the word "be", to insert "either the primary or"; after line 22, to insert:

"(1) Shall Hawaii immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?

At the beginning of line 25, to strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)"; on page 12, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; in line 19, after the word "language" to insert "article XI shall be deemed to include the provisions of section 4 of this Act;"; in line 22, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "second" and insert "third"; in line 23, after the word "other", to strike out "language." and insert "language, and section 10 of article XVI shall be deemed amended by inserting the words 'at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution and two Senators and one Representative in Congress shall be nominated and elected' in lieu of the words 'at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution shall be nominated and elected; but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives to the Congress, and unless and until otherwise required by law, said Representatives shall be elected at large'."; on page 13, line 11, after the word "shall", to strike out "thereupon"; on page 14, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "State" and insert "Territory"; in line 6, after the word "said", to strike out "State" and insert "Territory"; in line 7, after the word "Union", to insert "the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial office in, under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and"; in line 10, after the word "Congress", to strike out "from said Territory," and insert "thereof,"; in line 17, after the word "in", to strike out "or"; in line 22, after the word "and", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; in line 23, after the word "and", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; on page 15, line 4, after the word "to", to strike out "two Representatives" and insert "one Representative"; in line 6, after the word "such", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; on page 16, line 9, after the word "amended", to strike out "to read as follows: '(a) The district judges, except in Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judge in Puerto Rico shall hold office for the term of eight years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.'" and insert "by striking out the words 'Hawaii and'. The second sentence of the same section is amended by striking out the words 'Hawaii and', 'six and', and 'respectively'."; on page 17, line 23, after the word "no", to insert "writ, action,"; in the same line, after the word "indictment,", to strike out "action," and insert "cause"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "proceedings" and insert "proceeding"; on page 18, at the beginning of line 8, to

strike out "cases" and insert "writ, action, indictment, cause or proceeding"; in line 13, after the word "no", to strike out "suit" and insert "writ"; in the same line, after the word "action", to insert "indictment"; in line 14, after the word "or", to strike out "prosecution" and insert "proceeding"; on page 20, line 15, after "section 1294", to insert "as amended"; in line 16, after the word "is", to insert "further"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; in the same line, after the word "paragraphs", to strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)"; in line 18, after the word "and', to strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "as paragraphs (4) and (5) respectively" and insert "accordingly"; in line 21, after the word "Code", to insert "as amended"; in the same line, after the word "is", to insert "further"; on page 21, line 14, after the word "in", to strike out "commission" and insert "office"; on page 22, line 23, after the word "as" to strike out "hereinbefore"; in line 24, after the word "provided", to insert "in section 4 of this Act"; on page 23, line 3, after the words "United States", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That, except as herein otherwise provided, a Territorial law enacted by the Congress shall be terminated two years after the date of admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union or upon the effective date of any law enacted by the State of Hawaii which amends or repeals it, whichever may occur first"; in line 14, after the word "to", to strike out "the" and insert "its"; in the same line, after the word "admission", to strike out "of the State of Hawaii"; in line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "the" and insert "its"; in line 18, after the word "admission", to strike out "of the State of Hawaii"; on page 25, at the beginning of line 22, to insert "controlled or"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "military, naval, Air Force," and insert "Defense"; in line 24, after the word "purposes", to strike out the period, insert a colon and "*Provided, however,* That the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as have been heretofore or hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense."; on page 26, line 14, after "SEC. 17.", to insert "The next to last sentence of"; in line 5, after "(38 Stat. 251)", to insert "as amended by section 19 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 350),"; in line 7, after the word "amended", to strike out "by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: 'When the State of Hawaii or any State is hereafter admitted to the Union the Federal Reserve districts shall be readjusted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such manner as to include such State. Every national bank in any State shall, upon commencing business or within ninety days after admission into the Union of the State in which it is located, become a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by subscribing and paying for stock in the Federal Reserve bank of its district in accordance with the provisions of this Act and shall thereupon be an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and failure to do so shall subject such bank to the penalty provided by the sixth paragraph of this section.' " and insert "by inserting after the word 'Alaska' the words 'or Hawaii.' "; in line 23, after the word "this", to strike out "or any other"; on page 27, line 3, after the words "United States", to strike out "its Territories"; in line 10, after the word "words", to strike out "and" and insert "an"; in line 15, after the word "words", to strike out "an"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "an"; in line 25, after the word "acquired", to strike out "nor" and insert "or"; on page 28, line 2, after the words "United States", to strike out "may have been" and insert "is or was"; in line 4, after "SEC. 20.", to insert "(a)"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "SEC. 21." and insert "(b)"; in line 9, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "third line of the"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "contained in the" and insert "to said"; in the same line, after the word "sentence", to strike out "thereof"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "SEC. 22" and insert "(c)"; in the same line, after the word "of", to insert "Section"; in line 13, after the word "Act", to insert "as amended"; in line 14, after "8 U.S.C. 1421(a)", to insert "72 Stat. 351"; in the same line, after the word "is", to insert "further"; in line 15, after the word "words", to strike out " 'District Courts of the United States for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska' and substituting therefor the words 'District Court of the United States for the Territory of Alaska'." and insert " 'for the Territory of Hawaii, and'."; at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "SEC. 23." and insert "(d)"; after line 23, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 21. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, section 3, subsection (b), of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629), is amended by substituting the words "State of Hawaii" for the words "Territory of Hawaii".

On page 29, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "24" to "22"; in line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "to any person"; in line 9, after the word "word", to strike out "to other persons and" and insert "in other"; and, at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "25" to "23"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of this Act, and upon issuance of the proclamation required by section 7 (c) of this Act, the State of Hawaii is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, is declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever, and the constitution formed pursuant to the provisions of the Act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "An Act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor", approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949), and adopted by a vote of the people of Hawaii in the election held on November 7, 1950, is hereby found to be republican in form and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and is hereby accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 2. The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the islands, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, included in the Territory of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act, except the atoll known as Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, but said State shall not be deemed to include the Midway Islands, Johnston Island, Sand Island (offshore from Johnston Island), or Kingman Reef, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters.

SEC. 3. The constitution of the State of Hawaii shall always be republican in form and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

SEC. 4. As a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, shall be adopted as a provision of the constitution of said State, as provided in section 7, subsection (b) of this Act, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided,* That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, may be amended in the constitution, or in the manner required for State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired by any such amendment whether made in the constitution or in the manner required for State legislation, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian home lands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian home lands may be made in the constitution or in the manner required for State legislation, but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from the "available lands", as defined by said Act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said Act.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall succeed to the title of the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions in those lands and other properties in which the Territory and its subdivisions now hold title.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) and (d) of this section, the United States grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon its admission into the Union, the United States' title to all the public lands and other public property within the boundaries of the State of Hawaii, title to which is held by the United States immediately prior to its admission into the Union. The grant hereby made shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this Act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(c) Any lands and other properties that, on the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, are set aside pursuant to law for the use of the United States under any (1) Act of Congress, (2) Executive order, (3) proclamation of the President, or (4) proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii shall remain the property of the United States subject

only to the limitations, if any, imposed under (1), (2), (3), or (4), as the case may be.

(d) Any public lands or other public property that is conveyed to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section but that, immediately prior to the admission of said State into the Union, is controlled by the United States pursuant to permit, license, or permission, written or verbal, from the Territory of Hawaii or any department thereof may, at any time during the five years following the admission of Hawaii into the Union, be set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order of the President, made pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, and the lands or property so set aside shall, subject only to valid rights then existing, be the property of the United States.

(e) Within five years from the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, each Federal agency having control over any land or property that is retained by the United States pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall report to the President the facts regarding its continued need for such land or property, and if the President determines that the land or property is no longer needed by the United States it shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii.

(f) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section and public lands retained by the United States under subsections (c) and (d) and later conveyed to the State under subsection (e), together with the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of any such lands and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible for the making of public improvements, and for the provision of lands for public use. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall constitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands granted under this Act shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

(g) As used in this Act, the term "lands and other properties" includes public lands and other public property, and the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or properties so ceded.

(h) All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property which vests in or is conveyed to the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (e) of this section or reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto shall cease to be effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

(i) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, Eighty-third Congress, first session; 67 Stat. 29) and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 212, Eighty-third Congress, first session, 67 Stat. 462) shall be applicable to the State of Hawaii, and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

SEC. 6. As soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to certify such fact to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii. Thereupon the Governor of the Territory shall, within thirty days after receipt of the official notification of such approval, issue his proclamation for the elections, as hereinafter provided, for officers of all State elective offices provided for by the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, and for two Senators and one Representative in Congress. In the first election of Senators from said State the two senatorial offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. No identification or designation of either of the two senatorial offices, however, shall refer to or be taken to refer to the term of that office, nor shall any such identification or designation in any way impair the privilege of the Senate to determine the class to which each of the Senators elected shall be assigned.

SEC. 7. (a) The proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii required by section 6 shall provide for the holding of a primary election and a general election and at such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 shall be chosen by the people. Such elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii for the election of members of the proposed State legislature. The returns thereof shall be made and certified in such manner as the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii may prescribe. The Governor of Hawaii shall certify the results of said elections, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(b) At an election designated by proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii, which may be either the primary or the general election held pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, or a Territorial general election, or a special election, there shall be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following propositions:

"(1) Shall Hawaii immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?

"(2) The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the Act of Congress approved _____, and
(Date of approval of this Act)
all claims of this State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States.

"(3) All provisions of the Act of Congress approved _____ reserving
(Date of approval of this Act)
rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property therein made to the State of Hawaii are consented to fully by said State and its people."

In the event the foregoing propositions are adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, shall be deemed amended as follows: Section 1 of article XIII of said proposed constitution shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of section 2 of this Act in lieu of any other language; article XI shall be deemed to include the provisions of section 4 of this Act; and section 8 of article XIV shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the third proposition above stated in lieu of any other language, and section 10 of article XVI shall be deemed amended by inserting the words "at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution and two Senators and one Representative in Congress shall be nominated and elected" in lieu of the words "at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution shall be nominated and elected; but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives to the Congress, and unless and until otherwise required by law, said Representatives shall be elected at large".

In the event the foregoing propositions are not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the provisions of this Act shall cease to be effective.

The Governor of Hawaii is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said propositions to the people. The return of the votes cast on said propositions shall be made by the election officers directly to the secretary of Hawaii, who shall certify the results of the submission to the Governor. The Governor shall certify the results of said submission, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(c) If the President shall find that the propositions set forth in the preceding subsection have been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii, the President, upon certification of the returns of the election of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 of this Act, shall thereupon issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President, the Territory of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted into the Union as provided in section 1 of this Act.

Until the said Territory is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial office in, under, or by authority of the government of said Territory, and all of the officers of said Territory, including the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in, under, or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representative in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representative shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 8. The State of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to one Representative until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representative shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That such temporary increase in the membership shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the Act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13), nor shall such temporary increase affect the basis of apportionment established by the Act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U.S.C., sec. 2a), for the Eighty-third Congress and each Congress thereafter.

SEC. 9. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived

from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the terms of office of the district judges for the district of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and". The second sentence of the same section is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and", "six and", and "respectively".

SEC. 10. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 11. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be six years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be six years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 12. No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution of said State, or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no writ, action, indictment, or proceeding shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses. The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 13. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out "Hawaii and" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit", and by striking out the words, "supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "supreme court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, as amended, is further amended by striking out paragraph (4) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (5) and (6) accordingly;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "United States District Courts for the districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided,* That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *And provided further,* That service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in office as a district judge for the District of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act;

(e) section 92 of the Act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the Act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), as amended, are repealed;

(f) section 86 of the Act approved April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(i) section 91 of title 28, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,"; and

(j) the Act of June 15, 1950 (64 Stat 217; 48 U.S.C., sec. 644a), is amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,".

SEC. 15. All territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this Act or by the constitution of the State, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as provided in section 4 of this Act with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States: *Provided,* That, except as herein otherwise provided, a Territorial law enacted by the Congress shall be terminated two years after the date of admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union or upon the effective date of any law enacted by the State of Hawaii which amends or repeals it, whichever may occur first. As used in this section, the term "Territorial laws" includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to its admission into the Union, and the term "laws of the United States" includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provision of this Act.

SEC. 16. (a) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the ex-

ercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for Defense or Coast Guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, (i) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority, and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and used for Defense or Coast Guard purposes: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as have been heretofore or hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 17. The next to last sentence of the first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251) as amended by section 19 of the Act of July 7, 1958, (72 Stat. 339, 350) is amended by inserting after the word "Alaska" the words "or Hawaii."

SEC. 18. (a) Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, or possessions, or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports.

(b) Effective on the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(1) the first sentence of section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1156), is amended by inserting before the words "an island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or";

(2) section 605(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1175), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or"; and

(3) the second paragraph of section 714 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1204), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory" the words "the State of Hawaii, or".

SEC. 19. Nothing contained in this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, nor to terminate nationality heretofore lawfully acquired, or restore nationality heretofore lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.

SEC. 20. (a) Section 101(a)(36) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 170, 8 U.S.C., sec. 1101(a)(36)) is amended by deleting the word "Hawaii,".

(b) Section 212(d)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188, 8 U.S.C., 1182(d)(7)) is amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the word "Hawaii," and by deleting the proviso to said first sentence.

(c) The first sentence of section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 239, 8 U.S.C. 1421(a), 72 Stat. 351) is further amended by deleting the words "for the Territory of Hawaii, and".

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be held to repeal, amend, or modify the provisions of section 305 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 237, 8 U.S.C. 1405).

SEC. 21. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, section 3, subsection (b), of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629), is amended by substituting the words "State of Hawaii" for the words "Territory of Hawaii."

SEC. 22. If any provision of this Act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word, or the application thereof or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word in other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 23. All Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on passage of the bill, so that all Senators will know such a vote is expected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that action on the bill to provide statehood for Hawaii will be completed today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas can give no such assurance. Some Senators have indicated they may desire to discuss the subject. I do not know how long Senators will talk.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. I suggest that each Senator be on notice that if it is at all possible to complete action today we shall attempt to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me rephrase my inquiry. Is it the expectation that action on the bill will be completed today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is a matter entirely within the control of individual Senators. The Senator from Texas is prepared to vote on the bill today, but I do not know that it is the desire of other Members of the Senate to do so. I think we will have to let the other Members decide that question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me further rephrase my inquiry. Is it the hope that action will be concluded on the bill today? [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope that we can conclude action on the bill today, but I can give no such assurance and I do not want to give any such intimation.

NEW ERA OF AGING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have emphasized to my colleagues the fact that the Nation has a very definite responsibility toward brightening the future of its senior citizens. This important growing class of individuals in the United States now represents 8.4 percent of the total population and these citizens have spent the greater portion of their lives helping to build this great country. We certainly have a moral responsibility, as well as a practical need, to take constructive steps to meet the special problems of our golden agers.

What do elderly folks need? I have attempted to answer this challenging question on many occasions. I have introduced legislation on old-age problems and, in this past session of the 85th Congress, I actively supported the amendment to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system so as to raise the level of retirement benefits from 7 to 10 percent.

I have been happy to correspond extensively with old-age groups; the Senior Citizens of America, Golden Age Clubs, and numerous Federal, State, and local experts in order that these folks can be helped to increasingly realize that they owe a responsibility to themselves—a responsibility to be active, creative, and constructive so as to acquire new interests and build a bright, new chapter in their lives.

I have pointed up the forthcoming White House Conference of the Aging to be held in 1960 and stressed the importance of sound planning, including planning for the various preceding State conferences, in order to focus national interest on problems of older people and to stimulate action in State and communities to meet those needs.

On many occasions I have emphasized that age is not a matter of chronology; it is not a matter of passing a certain arbitrary milestone, but rather it is the composite of one's interest, one's skills, and one's outlook. Our elderly folks need a purpose toward which they can strive; a motivation for a long and healthy life; and, with that purpose, a faith in an all-knowing, all-powerful Creator, a God of love and truth. They also need respect, esteem, and appreciation; coupled with fruitful activity toward helping to earn their own way. Toward this latter end, our American employers need to be reeducated to the value of utilizing the skills and experiences of the middle and later years.

I have been particularly pleased to note the many constructive activities at the grassroots level dedicated to meeting the challenges of our senior citizens. Recently I received a report from the State Medical Society of Wisconsin in which was given an account of a communitywide program on the new era of aging recently held by the Fond du

Lac County Medical Society. This account pointed out that Wisconsin's 370,000 citizens who are 65 years or older represent 9.1 percent of the State's population, which is slightly higher than the National average; and that this indication of an addition to the average life span has also pointed out that there are additional problems of the aged to be met.

In this roundtable discussion were representatives of 38 organizations and groups in the city and county who discussed basic needs of older individuals; disabilities which arise from bone and joint diseases, changes in vision and hearing, high blood pressure, arteriosclerosis, and diabetes; and the role of nutrition and religion in healthy living for older citizens.

In this same issue of the Wisconsin Medical Journal was a short article which tells of a national conference to be held this spring in Chicago under the sponsorship of the Joint Council for the Health Care of the Aged. A director of the council is one of Wisconsin's native sons who has distinguished himself in the field of medicine, Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, of La Crosse, who is also president of the American Medical Association.

I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERA OF AGING

In Wisconsin, some 370,000 people are in a growing class of senior citizens, who are 65 years old or older. They represent 9.1 percent of the State's population, a figure which is a shade higher than the national average of 8.4 percent.

Such statistics are heartening. Yet each addition to the average life span has also brought a multiplication of the problems of the aged. Medical science, well aware that it is primarily responsible for the advance of longevity, has long been in the forefront of several national and State conferences on the growth of the elderly population.

Recently, the Fond du Lac County Medical Society brought the matter down to the local level by initiating a communitywide program on the new era of aging.

Representatives of 38 organizations and groups in the city and county joined physicians in mid-December for a roundtable discussion of the problems involved in the aging process and suggestions which can be carried out to meet the needs of the elderly.

SPARKPLUG

The sparkplug of the event was Dr. A. M. Hutter, chairman of the County Medical Society's Division on Geriatrics.

Ten basic needs for older individuals were cited by Dr. Hutter:

1. A balanced diet.
2. Elimination of waste products.
3. Rest, with adequate rest of the mind and body every 24 hours.
4. Recreation.
5. A sense of humor.
6. Emotional control.
7. Companionship.
8. Maintenance of a sense of pride in one's job.
9. Participation in community affairs.
10. Preservation of an open mind.

Dr. Hutter said that "arbitrary assignments of older persons to inactivity cannot be tolerated in a society which places a premium on individual work and dignity. We cannot isolate the aged. Labor and industry should evaluate their support of arbitrary retirement based on chronological age. All groups must reorient their attitude toward the aging process and opportunities which the new status of age provide."

Dr. D. W. McCormick discussed disabilities arising among the older residents from bone and joint diseases. Dr. Harvey K. Guth discussed the genital urinary diseases and disturbances of calcium metabolism.

RURAL RELATION

Dr. W. C. Wojta described changes in vision and hearing and discussed high blood pressure, arteriosclerosis and diabetes. Dr. James Haberman of Mt. Calvary talked on the problems of rural communities in relation to the aging. He emphasized the need to prevent and arrest the causes of degenerative diseases.

Others discussed the role of nutrition and religion in healthy living for older citizens.

Dr. Hutter stressed the necessity for aging programs that are "health-oriented and not disease impelled." He said that exercise, intellectual activity and mental equanimity is a blueprint for continued good health.

CONFERENCE

Plans are currently under way for a national conference on the health problems of the aged to be held in the spring of 1959 under the sponsorship of the Joint Council for the Health Care of the Aged.

The council, based in Chicago, is supported by the American Medical Association and the national associations of dentistry, hospitals and nursing homes.

This conference will provide the basis for more effective joint planning on the part of those who are the principal surveyors of health care for the aged, according to officials of the council.

Dr. Gunnar Gundersen of La Crosse, president of AMA, is a director of the council. The council's objectives are to identify and analyze the health needs of the aged, appraise available health resources for the aged, develop programs to foster the best possible health care for the aged, foster effective methods of payment for the health care for the aged, and foster health education programs of the aged.

RED BAN SHIFTS SEEN VINDICATING PRESIDENT'S FIRM BERLIN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, the nations of the world, free and Communist, are watching carefully the rising crisis in Berlin.

Since Khrushchev—without justification—last November 27th, declared that the Soviet Government considered its agreements relating to the occupation of Germany and Berlin null and void, the tensions have been mounting.

At this time, it is difficult, of course, to offer any panacea.

We recall that prior to the end of World War II, agreements were reached by the wartime Allies, including Russia, on common policies and plans for enforcing the surrender terms on Nazi Germany.

Under the agreed plan, the forces of the Allied Powers would each occupy separate zones of Germany. The agreements entered into in good faith by the Allies were to be considered binding upon the agreeing parties, pending a final peace settlement with Germany.

The attempts by the Soviet Union to abrogate its obligations under the agreements, as well as to undermine the rights of the United States to be in Berlin are, in effect, a violation of international law.

We remember, of course, that as early as 1948 the Soviets had begun violating the occupation agreements, particularly by infringing on the rights of free access to Berlin.

One thing, however, should be made abundantly clear: the right of the three Western Powers to free access to Berlin is not a privilege bestowed by the Soviet Union upon the Western Powers; rather, it is an essential part of their right of occupation. The Soviet Union accepted its zone of occupation subject to these rights of access.

Inasmuch as the rights of occupation and of access do not stem from the Soviet Union, the Soviets are without any authority to repeal those rights by denunciation of agreements, or by purported transfer of control over them to third parties. Furthermore the Soviet Union cannot affect the rights by declaring agreements null and void because the rights exist independently of the Soviet Union. Nor can the Soviet Union affect the rights by declaring them subject to the sovereignty it claims to have bestowed upon its puppet regime in East Germany, because, again, the rights remain in being irrespective of any act of the Soviets. Whatever relationship the East German regime may have vis-a-vis the Soviets, it cannot acquire a power in the Soviet Zone which the Soviets are powerless to give. There is no legal or moral doubt of the right of the United States to maintain its occupational functions and its rights of access to Berlin.

These precepts have been, and should continue to be, the foundation of our policy relating to the Berlin situation.

I am aware, of course, that there have been criticisms of our Berlin policy. Some say that it is too hard and fast, too inflexible, and that we need a more creative, imaginative policy. I should be most happy if we could ingeniously find a way to resolve the Berlin situation. However, if by imaginative policy it is meant that we should attempt to find a way to placate the Soviet lust for power and aggrandizement through relinquishing our own obligations, or that we should keep up a facade of living up to our agreements, but bow down before Soviet threats—then I, for one, would oppose this type of modification of our Berlin policy.

Until now, the U.S. proposals for a foreign ministers conference to attempt to lay the groundwork for resolution of the problems of Berlin, and of Germany, appear to be the best road to a solution.

A major question involved in this whole situation is, of course, how long can the Soviet Union continue to flout world opinion, to break agreements, to tear up treaties, to abrogate responsibilities and obligations, whenever and wherever it serves Soviet policy to do so, regardless of the rights of other nations?

Yesterday's Washington Evening Star carried an article by Earl H. Voss entitled "Red Boss' Shifts Seen Vindicating President." In addition, today's New York Times carried a thought-provoking editorial on "The Soviet Program."

I request unanimous consent to have these articles printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 10, 1959]

RED BOSS' SHIFTS SEEN VINDICATING PRESIDENT

(By Earl H. Voss)

President Eisenhower's stand on Berlin apparently is being vindicated, some administration officials believe, by Soviet Premier Khrushchev's day-to-day modifications of position.

Mr. Khrushchev began last November demanding that West Berlin be made a demilitarized free city.

Yesterday in East Berlin he said he would settle for a militarized, free city.

"We would not mind even if United States, British, French, and Soviet troops or some neutral countries maintained minimum forces in West Berlin," the Soviet Premier said.

Some Western diplomats believe the allied forces in West Berlin could be reduced, and Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain may have mentioned this prospect in his talks with Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow last month.

PROPOSALS UNACCEPTABLE

The Soviet leader's inclusion of Soviet troops would bring Red forces into West Berlin for the first time. American officials indicated this would not be acceptable. But the offer is open to a counterproposal for extending the jurisdiction of the Russian-proposed minimum forces to all of Berlin, including the Communist East sector.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev has softened his original November proposal in other ways. It was first presented as an ultimatum.

But Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan made it clear in Washington last January his government would be willing to negotiate.

When British Prime Minister Macmillan went to Moscow, Mr. Khrushchev was insisting that only a summit meeting should consider the German question. By the end of the Macmillan visit, the Soviet Union accepted the Western idea of a foreign ministers' conference.

Last November, Mr. Khrushchev had set a 6-month deadline, expiring may 27, for turning over Soviet occupation responsibilities to East Germany. In Leipzig last week the Soviet Premier set the deadline back at least a month or two if negotiations were in progress.

All these modest retreats have come while the West has been affirming its intention of standing firm on its rights in Berlin, but making no move to back its words with deeds.

Congressional agitation for deeds has been mounting in the last few weeks. Democrats increased the pressure yesterday. They demanded postponement of cuts in American military forces projected before the Berlin crisis arose.

OPPOSES MOBILIZATION

President Eisenhower strongly opposed general mobilization at his press conference last week—as proposed by some Democrats—indicating the economic consequences would be disastrous.

Administration officials, while defending the Eisenhower position, add that Mr. Khrushchev has not yet softened his position sufficiently.

State Department Press Officer Lincoln White said yesterday that Soviet Premier Khrushchev has made so many conflicting statements the past few days "it is difficult to differentiate between one and the other."

The trend, however, is found encouraging.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1950]

THE SOVIET PROGRAM

While Western statesmen confer on the Soviet challenge over Berlin, there is one vital requirement which the whole Western World must meet before an effective and constructive program can be devised to counter that challenge. It is essential for both the statesmen who will formulate the program, and for the public and its representatives who will be called upon to support it, to understand clearly the Soviet program—that is, to recognize the meaning and substance behind Soviet words.

The Soviets agree that a German peace settlement is the key to both European and world peace and on this ground press for a new summit meeting to write a German peace treaty. But they blandly repudiate the essential prior condition for such a treaty—namely, the creation of a reunified Germany by means of free elections, to which Mr. Khrushchev himself agreed at the Geneva summit meeting. Instead, they demand a peace treaty with two German states, which means permanent German partition and permanent European insecurity.

Furthermore, under the Soviet peace treaty draft, this divided Germany would be neutralized and disarmed of modern weapons, which means that, in return for a theoretical release of Communist-ruled East Germany from the so-called Warsaw Pact, West Germany would have to leave the North Atlantic alliance and the alliance itself would have to withdraw from Germany all its troops, nuclear arms and bases. This would mean the end of the alliance as an effective military instrument, the collapse of European unification moves and the early withdrawal of American troops from Europe.

The Soviet program also calls, in the name of noninterference in German internal affairs, for a confederation between the two German states, which really means between West Germany and Soviet Russia as the real ruler of East Germany. In the name of the same noninterference Premier Khrushchev proclaims that he will never permit the liquidation of the East German Communist regime. At the same time he denounces the West German regime as militaristic, reactionary, and bent upon war—a regime which under his peace treaty draft and in the words of his East German Commissar, Walter Ulbricht, must be liquidated in favor of a comprehensive democratization of social and political life in West Germany, meaning its sovietization.

Finally, the Soviet program demands either the withdrawal of all Western troops from West Berlin and its conversion into a defenseless free city or, as a compromise, the admission of Soviet troops to West Berlin, or the stationing there of neutral troops. To the Soviets, Poland and Czechoslovakia, counted as neutrals in the Korean armistice commission, would presumably be neutral in Berlin, too. Either they or the Soviet troops could be counted upon to enforce the limitations on the freedoms of free West Berlin on which the Soviets likewise insist.

MISS CHRISTA WUERTZ, QUEEN OF MISS MINNESOTA PAGEANT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which describes a peculiarly warm and pleasant little incident recently in one of the suburbs of Minneapolis, Minn.—Bloomington—in the choice of their candidate for the Miss Minnesota pageant.

The community's choice was a young German girl, Miss Christa Wuertz. I think that the choice of this young lady is rather symbolic of the natural warmth and good will of the American people which is reflected so many times each week in acts of generosity and openheartedness, and which our Government's frequently bombastic pronouncements tend to obscure.

Mr. President, I wish that our friends from around the world could see more of the real America which the little pageant at Bloomington, Minn., more truly reflects than the rather stiff and formalistic pronouncements of the administration. I believe that the letter which Mr. William J. Endersbe, of Bloomington, has written to me describing this incident should be brought to the attention of a wider audience and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the letter from Mr. Endersbe.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOOMINGTON JUNIOR
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Bloomington, Minn., March 1, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Tonight, out of a field of 21 lovely girls who live in Bloomington, we selected a young lady named Christa Wuertz as queen who will reign as Miss Bloomington for the coming year and will be our representative to the Miss Minnesota pageant this year.

The only thing unusual about this young lady is that she is a German national. She has resided in this country for 3 years and intends to become a U.S. citizen. Her parents after a sojourn in this country have returned to Germany where they presently live in a town near the Swiss border.

This young lady is 21 years of age and resided as a child in Berlin during the last year or two of the war. As you can well imagine she suffered many hardships and actually had to spend some time in a sanitorium following the war to regain her health.

In these times of stress and anxiety, particularly involving Berlin at this time, I only wish there was some way that we could convey to not only the Germans (East and West) but to all Europe and the world that the people of this country embrace all humanity in the spirit of brotherhood. Perhaps our little local pageant does not amount to much in itself but it is symbolic of the general feeling and attitude of the American people, especially as directed to individuals vis-a-vis governments.

Perhaps it is ironic but my own wife (a former British national) suffered the same hardships of bombing and other privations as Christa did although they were, as much as children can be, on opposite sides of the political and military fence.

This young lady is very proud of her title which she won fair and square. We are likewise proud of her and love her. We only wish that such sentiments could be enlarged to the world scene.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM J. ENDERSBE,
President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The young lady to whom I have referred, Miss Christa Wuertz, has resided in this country for only 3 years. She intends to become a U.S. citizen. Her parents, after a sojourn in this country, have returned to Germany, where they live at present in a town near the Swiss border. This young lady lived as a child in Berlin during the last war, and suffered many hardships.

This little incident goes to prove the value of immigration. A charming attractive young lady who is an immigrant becomes one of the queens of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been a good deal of discussion of the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1960. To me one of the most distressing features of this budget is the huge amount of money to be spent in interest payments on the public debt. Such payments are expected to increase by $500 million in 1960 over 1959 to a new record high of more than $8 billion.

The basic reason for the tremendous increase in interest payments in recent years has been higher interest rates. In the period from 1953 to 1960 the public debt will have risen an estimated 7 percent, but in this same period interest payments on the public debt will have gone up 23 percent.

I repeat that there is no single item in the entire index of the cost of living or the entire index of our economy which has been subjected to a greater increase in that 7-year period than the rate of interest.

Interest payments in 1953 totaled $6,583 million as compared to an estimated $8,096 million in 1960. Measured percentagewise, interest payments accounted for 8.8 percent of Federal expenditures in 1953 as compared to an estimated 10.5 percent in 1960.

In recent months interest rates have risen sharply to the highest levels in a quarter of a century as a result of the Federal Reserve's tight money policy. The Federal Reserve has applied credit restrictions on the grounds of preventing inflation. It is worthy of note, however, that during the Federal Reserve's tight money policy in the period of 1955 to 1957 we experienced one of the sharpest rises in prices in the history of the country.

There is considerable doubt among a growing number of students of monetary policy as to the effectiveness in combating inflation through the conventional means of credit restrictions, as employed by the Federal Reserve. Many contend that modern-day inflation is not due to excessive availability of credit. It is not a case of too many dollars chasing too few goods—the conventional explanation of mounting prices.

If the Federal Reserve's tight money policy is in fact ineffective in halting inflation, this error is costing the people untold billions each year in added interest payments on both the public and private debt, not to mention the loss suffered as a result of heavy unemployment and economic lag.

It is time, Mr. President, for us to take a hard look at the monetary theories of the administration and the Federal Reserve. I am confident that the Joint Economic Committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in the study it is undertaking on the subject of inflation and related matters, will throw new light on the role of monetary policy in controlling prices. It is time that we fully explore new means of dealing with this vexing question.

It seems to me that the people who are writing letters to Members of Congress about the rising cost of Government ought to be directing their letters to the President of the United States and asking him why this administration insists on saddling on the back of the American consumer and taxpayer an ever-increasing cost of interest payments on public and private indebtedness, which is exactly what the administration has been doing during the past 7 years.

There appeared in the February 28 issue of Business Week magazine an excellent editorial dealing with the subject of my remarks today. Commenting on the need to consider new ways of dealing with inflation, the editorial states:

> More and more, it is being recognized that we are not confronted with the orthodox type of inflation which can be controlled by orthodox monetary policy. What we need is some new thinking and bold new action to put the Treasury's house in order.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial titled "Why the Treasury Is in Trouble," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

WHY THE TREASURY IS IN TROUBLE

The grave situation facing the U.S. Treasury was brought to the public's attention last week when President Eisenhower announced that the administration might have to ask Congress to lift the 4¼ percent ceiling now prevailing on the interest rate on new Government marketable bonds. For the Treasury has been experiencing increasing difficulty in its borrowing despite its willingness to pay attractive rates.

The present crisis has been building since last summer, when the Federal Reserve revealed that it was shifting to a restrictive credit policy to combat inflation.

In times of tight money, the very existence of a ceiling on rates becomes a positive handicap to the Treasury, because rates promptly gravitate toward the limit. The ceiling is an arbitrary restriction that hampers the Treasury's financing task.

But the lifting of the ceiling is no panacea, and under present circumstances, is almost superfluous. With the Federal and Treasury voicing their fears of inflation, few investors are interested in long-term bonds. The amount of funds that the Treasury can raise in the long-term market is always limited, and if rates are raised, it runs the risk of drawing funds that would otherwise be used for housing and capital spending.

There is no simple solution to the Treasury's problem. On one hand, it has no choice but to raise the funds to pay for the programs voted by Congress. On the other, it must raise the money under the handicap of the debt limit and the interest-rate ceiling set by Congress. Thus, when the Fed is pursuing a restrictive policy, it cannot go to market on terms or times of its own choosing.

The result is that the Treasury has had to resort to short-term financings. So far, at least, this route has not been inflationary, because corporations, flush with cash, have bought its obligations. But as business activity increases it is probable that companies will cash in their securities; this means the Treasury will have to sell increasing amounts of short-term issues to the banks, which is inflationary.

It is the position of the Fed and the Treasury that higher interest rates are essential to fight the threat of inflation and safeguard the dollar. They are particularly concerned about foreign fears of a deterioration in the dollar and feel that we must demonstrate our resistance to inflation by wholehearted reliance on orthodox credit controls.

Unfortunately, the record of the last few years gives little assurance that this will work. During the 1955–57 boom, the Fed's general controls over credit did restrict the money supply, but they failed to halt the wage and price spiral. At the same time, rates on long-term bonds practically doubled, but this did not result in a stronger market; on the contrary, the long-term bond market hardly exists.

To repeat this process seems likely to destroy the Government market completely and further weaken confidence in the dollar. Equally important, it threatens to curtail our growth at a time when growth is essential.

Instead of relying on methods that have already been used and found wanting, it would be wise to explore what other means are available. The use of specific controls over credit should be considered; and we must decide what amount of money is required to insure growth without inflation.

This does not entail any diminution in the Fed's power. In fact, it would give new responsibility to monetary management. More and more it is being recognized that we are not confronted with the orthodox type of inflation which can be controlled by orthodox monetary policy. What we need is some clear new thinking and bold new action to put the Treasury's house in order.

THE RISING TIDE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the same type of monetary control to which I have referred has been totally ineffective in doing anything to check the rising tide of unemployment. In recent months I have viewed with increasing concern the continuing high level of unemployment. In January, the number of unemployed rose to 4.7 million—the highest jobless figure for that month since 1941. Six percent of our work force can find no jobs.

Particularly disturbing is the fact that the increased production of recent months has not, as was expected, alleviated the unemployment situation. Continued heavy unemployment appears to have two major explanations.

First, the total labor force has been rapidly increasing in recent years, whereas our economic growth has been lagging.

Secondly, our modern-day plants and equipment are capable of turning out more and more goods with fewer and fewer workers.

An excellent article by Sylvia Porter on the unemployment problem appeared in the March 10 edition of the Washington Star.

I invite attention, in particular, to Miss Porter's cure for unemployment:

> More growth to absorb the unemployed and new job seekers.
>
> Which means new industries and more production and consumption of such things as autos, houses, appliances, soft goods, public works, services—in short, more of enough things and nonthings to create jobs for all able, willing and seeking work.

Unfortunately, our economy in the past 3 years has remained virtually stagnant. We have failed to maintain the economic growth which is absolutely necessary if we are to avoid increasingly heavy unemployment.

I am shocked every day when I contemplate a recent expression by a Cabinet officer, who said that the No. 1 danger facing the United States was inflation, indicating, apparently, that in the mind of this administration inflation is an even greater danger than the potential conflagration of war. Apparently, according to this spokesman, it is a danger greater than the Communist military and economic threat. I submit that the thinking of an administration which sees the inflation which it has itself created, as a greater danger than economic stagnation and Communist penetration stamps it as an administration which is hopelessly sterile of ideas, and incapable of giving this country the leadership which is needed. The refusal of the administration to face this fact is, in my opinion, one of its most serious shortcomings. The lag in our economy at this critical time in world history cannot be tolerated.

When I hear the President and others say we must be strong and we must stand firm, as in the Berlin crisis, for example, and when I hear spokesmen of the administration speak of our strength, I ask them to compare the relatively limited growth of our economy with that of our opposition in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Miss Porter be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Sylvia Porter)

It was a private luncheon and the executive in charge of hiring for one of the Nation's giant corporations was speaking freely:

"Sure, we expect better business and our sales are going up. But while we're producing more than at this time in 1958, we're doing it with—thousands less on the payroll. It's really amazing how much we were able to tighten up on costs in 1957–58 and how handsomely our more efficient plants and machinery are paying off now.

"And I'll tell you this. I'd rather have our employees work a longer week and pay overtime than add one more man than necessary to the payroll. We got such brickbats thrown at us when we had to lay off men last year that I'm going to do everything I can to avoid taking on new ones whom I might have to lay off later and invite the brickbats all over again. It's cheaper to pay the extra expense of overtime than to pay the extra expense of a public relations drive to explain a layoff."

I gulped. "Granted that it makes sense on the balance sheet. But what about the unemployed and the new workers seeking jobs in your area? Don't you feel any responsibility to them? Don't you see yourself benefiting if they have jobs and can buy your products and those of others?"

He didn't gulp. "It is not the responsibility of individual corporations to employ more than we need nor to guarantee full employment at all times. It is my responsibility to my corporation to try for maximum production and for a maximum—although reasonable—profit."

There you have it—a key, straightforward, ungimmicked explanation why unemployment is remaining millions above normal.

And don't kid yourself. The unemployment statistics will continue mighty disheartening at least until well into spring.

Translating the unemployment explanation into simple terms.

1. Corporations have greatly improved their efficiency of operations and they're aggressively pursuing ways to turn out more goods with fewer workers.

2. Many feel that while overtime is expensive, it's cheaper in the short run than training workers who might be only temporary and who, if laid off later, would give the corporation a sour reputation the Nation over.

3. New workers are constantly entering the work force, threatening to swell the jobless ranks.

Today's jobless problem is not a superficial thing. It is a byproduct of the new age of automation. It is a result of the huge investment corporations have made in plant improvements and expansion. It is a reflection of the sharp, although short, 1957–58 recession.

The superficial cures lie in extension of jobless benefits, aid for depressed areas, major relocation efforts. But the basic cure lies in only one thing:

More growth to absorb the unemployed and new jobseekers.

Which means new industries and more production and consumption of such things as autos, houses, appliances, soft goods, public works, services—in short, more of enough things and nonthings to create jobs for all able, willing and seeking work.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I read with great interest the speeches made yesterday by the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD], dealing with the terrific problem of unemployment in West Virginia. I do not believe it is right for the Senate to adjourn from Monday to Thursday and from Thursday to Monday without something being done for the 289,000 unemployed people of West Virginia. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota will remember that when Floyd Olson was Governor of Minnesota and saw the situation in his State during the early 1930's—and all of us saw similar conditions throughout the Middle West—he took care of the situation. Likewise we took care of the people in our sections, although in the Middle West we did not have the situation which was described by the Senators from West Virginia yesterday, with people actually suffering want and hunger and starvation.

I agree that the administration should take prompt and effective steps. I do not care how they do it. There is, as the Senator from Minnesota knows, a large fund which the President can use in any foreign country in which he wishes to use it. I believe it was originally $100 million, and then it was raised to $200 million. We know about that in the Committee on Foreign Relations. Certainly somewhere in the administration there must be a fund which is available to take care of the unemployed people in West Virginia. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that the example set by Floyd Olson, when he was Governor, is one which the Senate might well emulate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am gratified by the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] which forcefully brought to the attention of his colleagues in the Senate the serious economic situation which exists today in the State of West Virginia. I would say to the Senator from North Dakota, and to all Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, that West Virginians are concerned about these problems. Our people do not desire handouts from the Federal Government. They believe that the Federal Government should give to them the means by which they can help themselves. That is all they want. They feel that, in the provisions of S. 722, there are afforded methods by which they can move forward.

As an indication of this plight in West Virginia, figures for July 1957 to June 1958, taken from the 21st annual report of the Department of Employment Security of West Virginia, reveal that all major manufacturing industries in the State registered losses in employment during this 12-month period, ranging from 2,400 in chemicals to 3,500 in primary metals.

Included among those reporting losses were food, minus 200; products of petroleum and coal, minus 200; textiles, minus 400; fabricated metals, minus 500; apparel, minus 800; lumber, wood products, furniture, and fixtures, minus 900; machinery, minus 1,900; and stone, clay, and glass, minus 3,300. Printing and publishing ended the fiscal year with employment at the same level as in June 1957. All other manufacturing industries reported combined losses of minus 1,800.

Nonmanufacturing industries in the State reduced employment 30,200 during the June 1957 to June 1958 period. In descending order, losses reported were: Mining, minus 16,200; transportation, communications, and public utilities, minus 8,000; trade, minus 4,000; contract construction, minus 3,100; and finance, insurance, and real estate, minus 100. Gains were limited to services, plus 900, and government, plus 400.

These are some of the figures told in their stark reality: The economic story of some of the finest areas of West Virginia in the richest nation on earth in the era of its so-called greatest and most unprecedented prosperity. But in West Virginia they mean poverty, distress, and humiliation.

If we cannot defeat conditions of such character now—while we stand at the pinnacle of our power as the world's strongest industrial nation—when can we overcome it?

If we cannot cure this economic ailment—this degrading recession within our own borders and cut it out of our economic body—then we fail in precisely those fields of endeavor in which we make our loudest boasts.

In the principles of S. 722—the Area Redevelopment Act—we have answers set down clearly and simply—the specific in economic remedy to a specific economic ailment.

There are few measures that will come before the 1st session of the 86th Congress for which I shall feel so strong a sense of personal support as S. 722. This bill is the fruit of the genius and the dedication largely of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It bears in its cosponsorship the imprint of my most diligent colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and that of other distinguished Senators.

For me this measure has profound meaning because it goes deep to the heart of the American philosophy of government. It has deep meaning because it is sound and businesslike. It has none of the elements of that maudlin do-goodism that characterizes certain Government spending.

If I had to define the bill, of which I, too, am a cosponsor, in some of its major aspects I would call it a program in support of private enterprise and community growth and rehabilitation. It is a way to create wealth—not just to spend it. I would say it is a measure to cut down the inflationary process and promote productivity. It is legislation that does not hand out Government largess but, instead acts in most part in the role of a banker. The Government Treasury is the banker—and the Government Treasury in this case not only expects to have its money repaid under its loan provisions, but insists upon repayment with interest. This is sound.

A section of the bill, to be sure, makes provision for outright grants, as distinguished from interest-bearing loans. And it is this that helps us to recognize that, after all, ours is indeed a government and not a purely financial institution. Thus, the element of human welfare enters into the picture.

In addition to the $300 million the bill provides for interest-bearing loans, $75 million is to be used where needed in terms of grants.

The proposed Area Redevelopment Act has a very special impact on me as a Senator from the State of West Virginia, because our State is particularly hard hit—as the statistics cited bear out—and especially in labor surplus cities and areas.

What does this mean?

It means an area in which there is a labor surplus of 6 percent or more of the work force covered by unemployment insurance. Of course my first concern is for those areas in West Virginia where the blow of economic distress is hard, persistent, and unyielding. But the problem is plainly a national one that has struck 80 major labor market areas in some 25 States. All these 80 major labor market areas had 6 percent or more unemployment, according to the reports of the U.S. Department of Labor. The Department discloses also that there are no less than 188 smaller labor market areas throughout 35 States that also suffered from at least 6 percent unemployment—or more.

The proposed Area Redevelopment Act strikes at the root of the depressed conditions in West Virginia and the other 34 States. It establishes the means for achieving a sound economic cure. It does so by a system of advice, carefully meted-out loans, the reimbursement of Government expenditures, and the levying of a reasonable interest rate in accordance with the Government standards that apply in other forms of Government loans.

S. 722 mobilizes the best brains in Government—long and highly trained experts in their respective fields—and uses their skills and their experience to assure the Government and the people of the United States that the loans are wisely made and will yield the returns to the areas—and to the Government Treasury—that are intended by the terms of the measure itself.

This bill, Mr. President, embodying the ideas of some of the best economic minds of our time, bears in its very method of operation the elements of success. It is a modern piece of legislation—one that is designed to meet modern conditions of recession—and is tailored to handle the problem through skillful and long-term planning. It is not merely Government that is doing the job, but State and local authorities as well, in cooperation with private interests and private enterprise. And the aim is not to help a business as such, but to help an entire community—an area—bounce back and stand tall on its own feet, not the Government's.

I have discussed—through the statistics previously cited, and without embellishment—exactly the conditions in West Virginia which make this must legislation.

It is my belief that this area redevelopment program encompasses Government aid, but in terms that draw into the orbit of the project the distressed community itself—its resources, human and physical; its private enterprise, banking, and manufacturing—and it makes all of these a coordinated and cooperative endeavor. The measure would accomplish these results in terms of modern banking and modern industry, with repayment of Government help. It does what needs to be done within the normal operations of our kind of economy.

It is these qualities of fiduciary and economic soundness and carefully drawn provisions that take into account all the realities of the situation that make the Area Redevelopment Act a compelling and appealing one. It is for this reason that S. 22 is a sensible draft of economic legislation, and it is compelling because it answers a chronic problem of unemployment.

And, Mr. President, unless we are—as a Nation and a Government—calloused beyond all human understanding, we will stop gloating over our economic prosperity until we shall have wiped out these areas of economic decay and bankruptcy inside our own borders. S. 722 would provide the mechanism for the achievement of these objectives.

Let us bring forth and pass this Area Redevelopment Act, and place it to work with a minimum of delay. Let us proceed with the busines of reconstruction and rehabilitation. The senior Senator from Illinois, to whom we owe so much for the economic knowledge and wisdom set forth in this bill, has explained its provisions before the Senate.

It is a measure that is not aimed at a passing situation in the changing picture of the American economy. It is directed toward and as an answer to a chronic, ingrown, imbedded, and impacted economic disease that has taken hold in the areas under question—a disease that is dragging the pall of economic death in its path.

Again I thank the Senator from North Dakota for calling to the attention of our colleagues the impact of unemployment in the State of West Virginia, where we find not only distress and poverty, but a real degree of humiliation as well. This should not exist in a democratic country like the Republic in which we are privileged to share our cooperative responsibilities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his comments relating to my remarks on the administration's fiscal policies and the unemployment situation. It gives me an opportunity to associate myself with the very fine sentiments expressed by the Senator from North Dakota relating to the acute and exceedingly difficult problem in West Virginia which, by the way, is a problem being experienced in other States, including Minnesota, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. It is being experienced also by the miners in Butte, Mont.

What I tried to say before is that it seems rather odd to me now to hear spokesmen of the administration say that the No. 1 threat is inflation, at a time when there are literally thousands of people in State after State who do not have jobs. Unemployment compensation payments are being exhausted. In some States there is even surplus foods in the commodity bins——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Nine billion dollars worth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Which the Government of the United States apparently cannot get to the people because of administrative difficulties.

We have asked for a food-stamp plan, but the Department of Agriculture says it cannot be provided. We have asked for area redevelopment, about which the Senator from West Virginia has commented. The President vetoed the bill. We will pass a similar bill again, and this time over the veto.

There are ways and means of helping; but we cannot help those who are in need if there are spokesmen for the Government who feel that the primary problem is the problem which they themselves, by their fiscal policies, have created, namely, inflation, and they are unwilling to do anything effective against the real human problem, the serious difficult human problem, of unemployment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I may say that I remember, in the late 1920's and the early 1930's, the terrifying period of the great depression, when legislation was proposed to lend tens of millions of dollars to the homeowners of our country, so that they might keep intact the roofs over their families, that there were those who were opposed to such proposals. They declared the

money would not be repaid. They had little faith in the American people.

But I say to the Senator from Montana who has been generous in yielding time, to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who I hope will have the opportunity to speak in a moment, that home loans were repaid.

Senate bill 722 is an area redevelopment bill. It provides for revolving funds to be channeled to the communities and the people within them. I say to the Senator from North Dakota, especially, that the people of West Virginia are of hardy stock. They want only the opportunity to help themselves. If they are given this aid, they will make certain that the money is repaid to the Government of the United States.

The distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who was in this Chamber earlier today, found it necessary to attend a session of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is at present considering the bill for area redevelopment, so that it may be reported to the Senate for early consideration. I trust that Senators who were not privileged to hear his speech on yesterday, will refer to the RECORD for an evaluation of the compelling remarks he set forth on this problem.

I was greatly heartened by the evident feeling with which the Senator from North Dakota spoke on this matter. Even though he is not so vigorous as he once was physically, he spoke today with a ringing determination. He sought to make certain that this type of proposed legislation shall receive the attention of the Senate, and receive it promptly.

Mr. LANGER. I will give every possible assistance, not only to the Senators from West Virginia and the people of their State, but also to the people of the entire country. I am delighted by the vigorous fight which the two Senators from West Virginia are making to bring this matter to the attention of the entire Nation. I wish them godspeed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I think an editorial, entitled "What We Need," published in the Detroit Times of March 9, 1959, is quite in order while we are discussing this subject. The Detroit Times is a newspaper which normally is critical of approaches such as this. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE NEED

Three events which occurred in Government-industry relationship last week deserve review.

On Monday, Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, staged hearings here on his proposed $383 million Area Redevelopment Act, a proposal to pump Federal loans into areas distressed by continued unemployment.

On Tuesday, the board of assessors of the city of Detroit announced the total assessed valuation of the city dropped $71 million under 1958 levels. It was the second successive year of reduction and was caused primarily by loss of industry.

On Wednesday, the Ford Motor Co. and the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. simultaneously announced separate expansion programs that will mean a total investment in their Detroit area installations of $69 million.

The hearings staged, and we use the word advisedly, by Senator DOUGLAS, revived last year's State election campaign issue of whether high wages and high taxes in Michigan have created an unhealthy climate for industry here.

The bulk of the testimony came from witnesses Senator Hart, Democrat of Michigan, Governor Williams, Mayor Miriani, and Walter P. Reuther. All heartily endorsed the Douglas measure, as DOUGLAS had expected.

But Senator WALLACE BENNETT, a Republican from Utah and DOUGLAS' colleague on the committee, raised a question whether Michigan did not need first to get its house in order before Federal assistance would be of benefit. Some wee small Republican voices from outstate echoed his sentiments.

Reuther replied that unemployment is a national problem, showed that most of the distressed areas are in the East.

Miriani placed the blame on industrial blight—old factories which must be torn down and replaced with new, efficient ones, if Detroit is to regain high employment and maintain sufficient tax revenues.

The announcement of the decreased assessed valuation was like an exclamation mark after the mayor's testimony.

Announcement of the expansion plans of Ford and Michigan Consolidated seemed further to show that Michigan is a good place to do business.

The series of events aptly, and in rapid-fire succession, dramatize how Detroit and Michigan are being swept by crosscurrents of transition. The winds of politics help fan these crosscurrents.

Primary cause for the dispersion of industry in this area has been decentralization and automation in the automotive industry.

This is the basic reason Michigan has not recovered as quickly as some other States from the effects of the recent recession.

There is an element of truth in the charges that high wages and high taxes may discourage new industry from locating here.

There is an element of truth also in the contention that industry had had to disband some of the old Detroit factories because they are obsolete.

But no single source ever seems to tell the whole story. And no one seems to have enough wisdom to get the entire matter into perspective.

From the testimony submitted to the Douglas committee, however, it should be clear that Detroit and many upstate cities could utilize to advantage the provisions of the Douglas bill.

It would provide loans to private industrial firms for building new plants and loans to local units of government for building such facilities as water lines, and roads to service these plants. The money would be repaid to the Federal Government.

As Mayor Miriani pointed out, the bill would help rejuvenate industry here.

It should be made clear that the Douglas bill does not provide outright grants to cities or anyone else either for slum clearance or for building new plants.

The slum clearance grants are included in other legislation labeled urban renewal, also currently under consideration in the Senate.

Money from the Douglas bill could be utilized by the new industries expected to locate here once old factories have been torn down and the land made available by the city.

Detroit badly needs both the urban renewal legislation and the Douglas bill if it is to stave off industrial decay.

FARM SUBSIDIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on February 23, on February 26, and again on March 2, I placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statistics obtained from the Department of Agriculture showing that under our present agricultural laws major benefits of the price-support program are going to the large corporate-type farmer and that our present agricultural program is definitely not in the best interest of, and of very little benefit to, the bona fide American family-type farm.

I placed into the RECORD a long list of names of corporations and individuals who in 1957 had received in excess of $100,000 in price-support loans as support of the production of cotton, rice, wheat, and corn.

Also, on February 26, I pointed out that 10 companies had in 1957 received nearly $3½ million in Government loans in support of the cotton, rice, and wheat which they produced while during the same year this same group of companies received from another Government agency over one-half million dollars as payments for crops they agreed not to produce.

There are those who have tried to claim that the Government does not lose money but in effect makes money on the price-support loans because they are always paid off. Certainly they are paid off, because in granting the loan the Government agrees to take as collateral for full payment of the loan that agricultural crop against which the loan is made. If the market is low the farmer merely lets the Government take the commodity as full payment, and the loan is marked "paid in full."

That is where we have gotten our $9 billion inventory which is now in Government-rented warehouses. On some of these loans the Government, through other agencies, has inaugurated extensive buying programs of the commodities for the intended purpose of exporting these commodities out of the country at sacrifice prices in order to peg the domestic market at a high level. That is what has happened in cotton.

The Government supports the production of cotton in the United States through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and this is done by granting loans to the farmers with the cotton as collateral. In each instance the loan is granted for the full value of the cotton at the support price. Then, under Public Law 480, another Government agency, operated within the Department of Agriculture, buys this cotton and exports it at sacrifice prices.

For instance, in the case of cotton in the past 3 years the Government has under this program purchased 16,100,000 bales and then exported this cotton at a direct loss to the American taxpayers of $835 million; that is an average of $22.30 loss to the American taxpayers for every bale of cotton which has been produced in America during the past 3 years, and still in face of this $835 million loss on cotton alone, some of the Congressmen representing these large corporation farmers have the audacity to

issue statements claiming the Government is making money on this cockeyed operation.

Only yesterday two California New Dealers in the House issued a statement making this ridiculous claim and headlined their remarks with the charge that WILLIAMS is wrong on the cotton loan statements. I quote their remarks as carried by the wire service:

WILLIAMS named four central California corporations as having received price supports amounting to $1,857,677 in 1957–58.

On February 23 as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date I did name four California corporations receiving exactly that amount—plus 14 cents—and not even they contradict the accuracy of my figures.

Those loans were as follows:

Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif., 5,611 bales cotton	$854,450.67
W. J. Dean, Mendota, Calif., 2,419 bales cotton	370,040.84
Frank and Jim Garona, Bakersfield, Calif., 2,387 bales cotton	350,290.43
Waldo W. Weeth, Coalinga, Calif., 1,898 bales cotton	282,895.20
Total	1,857,677.14

Taking into consideration the taxpayers' average loss of $22.30 per bale on all cotton produced during the last 3 years, it means that the actual loss sustained on the operation of these four California companies alone in 1957 was $274,624.50. The taxpayers' loss on the five California companies listed in my earlier report would on the same basis be $321,967.40 plus the $180,470.58 which two of them received in soil bank payments.

Those are official figures, and they stand unchallenged. The Secretary of Agriculture in a press release has also confirmed the accuracy of this report. Furthermore, the Representatives themselves have accepted the same figures although in an effort to muddy the water they try to pretend they are making a defense by claiming that they are pointing out some errors.

I also call the attention of these Representatives to the fact that one of their particular pets, the Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif., not only received price support loans of $854,450.67 on 5,611 bales of cotton produced by them in 1957 but also collected from the U.S. Government $125,942.50 in a direct subsidy check during the same year for agreeing not to grow cotton on another 1,223.9 acres which they owned or controlled. This is one of the "little farmers" these California Representatives are trying to defend and about whom they are shedding their crocodile tears.

As a comparison with what this "little California farmer" gets, I call their attention to the fact that in the year 1957, when the Westlake Farm, Inc., received $854,450.67 in price-support loans on cotton produced, that amount represented more money than was received in crop-support loans by all of the farmers in the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware, combined, on all of the crops which they produced during the same year.

In 1957, Delaware farmers received a total in price-support loans of $69,618.00, while Pennsylvania farmers received a total of $783,353.00.

Furthermore, the $800 million which the American taxpayers have lost in supporting the price of cotton alone during the past 3 years means that the taxpayers in my own State of Delaware, which pays 1 percent of all of the taxes collected in the United States, paid a total of $8 million as their part in supporting these cotton farmers.

The $5 billion loss which the Federal Government is estimated to be taking in the current fiscal year on all of its price-support operations means that the taxpayers in my State will be required to pay into the Federal Treasury $50 million as their proportionate part in sustaining this high-support program. Why should the taxpayers of my State spend $50 million in 1 year to support these large corporation farmers throughout the United States, when the small farmers in my own State—dairy farmers, poultry growers, as well as farmers producing other crops—are all having a desperate time to make a living?

Mr. President, Congress should long ago have repealed the high, rigid price-supports program, and should have adopted a more flexible program, as has been advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an additional list of large California farmers who in 1957 received subsidy checks in excess of $50,000 as payment for crops they agreed not to produce. Five other California companies, who had received in excess of $100,000 in soil-bank payments, were listed in the RECORD on February 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name and address	Acres	Commodity	Dollar amount
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles, Calif.	3,086.0	Wheat	$97,209.00
Hammonds Ranch, Inc., Firebaugh, Calif.	928.4	Wheat and cotton	95,535.64
Newhall Land & Farming Co., Firebaugh, Calif.	870.5	Cotton and rice	83,903.50
Raymond Thomas, Inc., Five Points, Calif.	395.5	Cotton	66,839.50
The Garin Co., Firebaugh, Calif.	625.4	Wheat and cotton	66,460.92
Peres, Nickel & Pfitzer, Los Banos, Calif.	792.8	Rice and cotton	62,998.80
Broadview Farms, Firebaugh, Calif.	537.0	Cotton	60,681.00
William E. Glotz, Tranquillity, Calif.	480.9	Cotton and rice	55,073.20
Heidrick Bros., Woodland, Calif.	972.5	Wheat and rice	54,528.08
Layton Knaggs, Woodland, Calif.	788.2	Rice	54,388.47
Redfern Ranches, Dos Palos, Calif.	829.0	Rice and wheat	51,480.50
R. J. Roesling Co., San Francisco, Calif.	389.5	Cotton	51,024.50

PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Fellows of the American Bar Foundation in Chicago on February 21, 1959, Mr. Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time, Life, and Fortune, gave a most interesting, challenging address, directed to the attainment of peace through law.

I should like to read a few excerpts from Mr. Luce's address, which I believe should be given wider circulation:

Can the West produce a political idea * * * ? That was, and is, the question. Can we answer it by saying "Yes * * * our idea is liberty under law"? That is the political idea of the West. In fact, there is no other. And we need no other. We need only to enter fully into the idea and, with reverent attention, let the idea enter fully into us. "Liberty under law" is the idea which for 2000 years has been elaborated in theory. In a few times and places, notably in America, liberty under law has been significantly realized in practice, thanks to the deeds of Founding Fathers and of other heroes and to the devotion of honest men in all walks of life. * * *

Our unanimous purpose has been to establish a just and durable peace. To that end, we have fought wars. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on horrifying weapons. We have given away billions of dollars. We have contracted innumerable military alliances. We have agitated ourselves with debate and doubt. We have propagandized and we have even prayed—but in all this massive material and moral effort we have hardly ever used the word "law"—except in pious parentheses.

* * * * *

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message this year, made the advancement of the rule of law the significant new emphasis of his world policy. Secretary Dulles devoted himself exclusively to this subject in the last speech he made before going to the hospital. We pray for his return to full activity and to this decisive theme. Under his guidance, proposals for making more sense out of the U.N. Court will presently go to Congress. Such are the results on the visible stage of high policy.

* * * * *

The way for this crusade has been prepared by many dedicated groups, notably for example by the International Commission of Jurists.

Everywhere in the welter of world politics, there grows the belief that civilization depends on the strength and the power of the law. * * *

May I just stress the importance of the intellectual leadership which is being displayed by various types of law institutes recently established at Cornell, at Harvard, at Duke, at Stanford and at other centers of light and leading.

* * * * *

We are on the march, but we must keep up the momentum. We need more volunteers, stronger leaders—in public life, in intellectual labors, throughout the Nation generally and especially in the legal profession itself. If we lose momentum now, we may never regain it until the world entire is engulfed in such a moral catastrophe that those who survive physically may scarcely deem themselves fortunate.

Mr. President, rather than take up the time of the Senate to read further sections of the address—I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAY OF THE LAW

(Address by Henry R. Luce)

Last year at Atlanta it was your good pleasure to have as your speaker Lord Hail-

sham. I think he won't mind if I call him the managing director of the Conservative Party of Great Britain. In words of authentic eloquence, he addressed himself to the question of the future organization of the world. To this question, he said, the East, the Communist East, has an answer "but that answer is a conspiracy against human freedom." Has the West got an answer? In Lord Hailsham's words: "Can the West produce a political idea less offensive than imperialism, less anarchic than the petty nationalism which has brought war and ruin wherever it has been tried—an idea not negative, but positive, an idea dynamic for peace which neither sacrifices justice nor provokes aggression."

Then, turning to the mountains of vision, Lord Hailsham prophesied:

"I see a world where freedom under law is the rule and not the exception for mankind. In that world the sums now spent on arms are devoted to education and research, to the elimination of disease, to the rescue of deserts from the sand * * * and to the enjoyment of the good things of life by the suffering millions of mankind."

Thus prophesied our brilliant friend from Westminster. And I am sure you were impressed by the ardent faith of this practical politician. Would that we had more such politicians here—and everywhere.

Lord Hailsham's eloquence was devoted, in the main, to putting the signature of his conviction to his vision. He did not have much to say about how it is to be achieved. That is the task to which I set myself tonight. If my task is pedestrian, I enter into it nevertheless with enthusiasm. For this reason: The project of bringing about the rule of law on earth, this tremendous project is on the road. Men are at work. Step by step we approach the foothills of those mountains of vision.

"Can the West produce a political idea?" That was, and is, the question. Can we answer it by saying "Yes * * * our idea is liberty under law"? That is the political idea of the West. In fact, there is no other. And we need no other. We need only to enter fully into the idea and, with reverent attention, let the idea enter fully into us. Liberty under law is the idea which for 2,000 years has been elaborated in theory. In a few times and places, notably in America, liberty under law has been significantly realized in practice, thanks to the deeds of Founding Fathers and of other heroes and to the devotion of honest men in all walks of life. Why is it, then, that we have heard so little of it in these past 30 years?

Our unanimous purpose has been to establish a just and durable peace. To that end, we have fought wars. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on horrifying weapons. We have given away billions of dollars. We have contracted innumerable military alliances. We have agitated ourselves with debate and doubt. We have propagandized and we have even prayed—but in all this massive material and moral effort we have hardly ever used the word "law"—except in pious parentheses. Why? I ask the question not to answer it for to do so would require a monumental review of modern history. I raise the question just to remind you of the conspicuous absence of the word "law" in all our busyness. Somewhere in the answer would be the moral breakdown of the West, the descent of the West into philosophical confusion. On the one hand, spectacular achievement in science and economics; on the other hand more and more intellectual confusion leading to political impotence—there is the good and the bad of a brilliant era.

Can we say that now at last we of the West have begun to work our passage back out of tragic confusion to reasonable and reasoned hope? I think we can. Can we say that the West is producing an idea? I think we can.

And I should like to sketch, in a few simple human terms as I see it, the story of how it happens that in 1959 the advancement of the rule of law is becoming once again the sign under which the West survives and conquers. The story, as I see it, began in the summer of 1957 at the meeting of the American Bar Association—in London, largely planned by your president, David Maxwell. London. What more symbolic and providential place for the story to begin. There, a few miles from the Runnymede of Magna Carta, there in Westminster, hometown of the mother of Parliaments, there where all about you have grown the oaks from the acorns of the common law—where else could the idea of liberty under law more fittingly have rebirth? There was the place. And the activating force had to be the power of the United States of America. But this time, in the summer of 1957, that power was represented not by atomic warheads, not by dollars; this time the power of America was represented by American lawyers and by American judges who, in turn, represent and are the technicians and the trustees of America's ultimate dedication to liberty under law.

It happened that at that time a man, then little known, became the president of the American Bar Association. Taking up the spirit of your London meeting, Mr. Charles Rhyne returned to this country to make the advancement of the rule of law the chief business of his term. In a year and a half the consequences have been—let us not exaggerate—they have been considerable. President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message this year, made the advancement of the rule of law the significant new emphasis of his world policy. Secretary Dulles devoted himself exclusively to this subject in the last speech he made before going to the hospital. We pray for his return to full activity and to this decisive theme. Under his guidance, proposals for making more sense out of the U.N. Court will presently go to Congress. Such are the results on the visible stage of high policy. But behind these results one sees the gathering of the clan of the warriors for the law. Volunteers and recruits are to be found at every level, among the best legal thinkers and in the smallest bar association.

The way for this crusade has been prepared by many dedicated groups, notably for example by the International Commission of Jurists. In 1955 their Act of Athens gave perfect utterance to our immortal theme. And only last month their conference of lawyers of 53 nations in New Delhi, India, testified to what may be the most hopeful single fact of our time—namely that leaders in 50 Asian and African countries realize no less than we do—or more—that whereas the peace of the world depends upon the establishment of law between nations, that in turn depends upon the deepening and strengthening of the sense of law within nations. Everywhere in the welter of world politics, there grows the belief that civilization depends on the strength and the power of the law.

To enumerate all that is going on concurrently in this country would take me far into the night. May I just stress the importance of the intellectual leadership which is being displayed by various types of law institutes recently established at Cornell, at Harvard, at Duke, at Stanford and at other centers of light and leading. At Cornell, Professor Schlesinger heads up a 10-year project in comparative law. Seeing him the other day, I was immensely encouraged by his assurance that there are basic principles of law which can command assent in all the countries of the free world—and even beyond.

All this is what I mean by saying that once again the West is getting hold of its one great idea.

We are on the march, but we must keep up the momentum. We need more volunteers, stronger leaders—in public life, in intellectual labors, throughout the Nation generally and especially in the legal profession itself. If we lose momentum now, we may never regain it until the world entire is engulfed in such a moral catastrophe that those who survive physically may scarcely deem themselves fortunate.

Our purpose is nothing less than at last to make the world the lawful habitation of mankind. Tonight, let me speak of this formidable task under three heads. First, there is the philosophical. Second, there is the political—the development of political leadership in this country together with the winning of public consent through understanding. Third, there is the technical or operational—the immense amount of highly expert work that has to be done—mainly of course by lawyers. Under each of these heads I shall attempt to make only one or two points.

First, then, as to philosophy. The question to be answered by philosophy is whether, on the one hand, law is only what anybody wants to make it, only an accidental product of irrational forces. Or whether, on the other hand, law reflects and must seek to reflect a structure of justice established by the Creator of all things for the right relation of man to man and nation to nation. Only if the second answer is correct, only then does it make any sense to speak of general principles, and only if there are some general principles to which all men everywhere may give their consent, only then is there any hope of peace through law.

For many decades, American law schools, American legal thinking and American lawyers have refused to be interested in this basic question. Thus when a few years ago I began to study the possibilities of peace through law, I came across an article in the Columbia Law Review by Prof. Thomas A. Cowan. Its opening sentence read as follows:

"The most striking observation which occurs to one reporting on the philosophy of law in the United States is that the subject matter of the report seems not to exist."

Surely a sorrowful indictment! Was this the final and most ugly American know-nothingism? America at the height of her military and economic power—and intellectually aimless, having neither chart nor compass nor rudder nor star to steer by.

Professor Cowan's report continued:

"To the foreigner, American philosophers, apparently spurning all philosophical traditions, seem to be characterizable under only one all-inclusive 'ism,' namely, anarchism."

Obviously this country cannot contribute to the peaceful ordering of the world if its own mind—and soul—is in a state of anarchy.

There was much to support this darkly pessimistic view—both what is called American anti-intellectualism and the fashion of American intellectuals themselves to distrust and/or disavow all or any general principles whatsoever.

Fortunately for us the tide has turned. It was predictable that we would come out of the hog wallow of know-nothingism or positivism. In the field of law or jurisprudence, the reason for faith was stated by Prof. Harold Berman some years ago. From him I learned that in times of crisis, Anglo-American law can be expected to rise to the challenge of ultimate greatness. He said:

"In times of relative stability it is customary to forget that the attempt to grasp and comprehend the totality, and to see particulars in relation to that totality, is in fact part of the Anglo-American legal tradition. It is that part which is reserved for crisis."

Well, thought I, we sure are in a crisis. So, if Berman is right, we can expect Anglo-American law to rise to the challenge.

And sure enough it has—or is beginning to. In my recent consultation of the authorities, I came across, for example, Prof. Jerome Hall in the Virginia Law Review. He is saying:

"The most striking fact about current developments is the rise of natural law philosophies almost everywhere."

Almost everywhere. There is the shining sun of hope upon our future. Almost everywhere. In America, throughout the West, including Latin America and notably also in Japan.

Now I would like to say just a word—a very amateurish word—about natural law. The classic phrase "natural law" is a stumbling block for many thoughtful people. For others it has most satisfying meanings, reflecting that structure of justice of which I have spoken.

But note that Professor Hall speaks of natural law philosophies—plural. I suggest that there is, indeed, one universal natural law to which human beings are and ought to be conformable. But I further suggest that the one and the same natural law is made equally evident by starting from two different emphases. The one emphasis is justice or order. That was the emphasis of classical Rome and of the Middle Ages. The other emphasis is freedom. That has been the American emphasis. Starting with order, you arrive, under Christian inspiration, at the human necessity of freedom. Starting with freedom, you arrive at the social need for order—or in our tradition what we call liberty under law.

I would hope that in the next few years our thinkers would achieve a powerful synthesis of these two approaches to a knowledge of the natural law.

The object, for ourselves and for the world, is to achieve "that liberty which without order is a delusion and that order which without liberty is a snare."

The American word is "liberty." In American thought and feeling the rights of man are not derivable from physical nature nor from any absurd Rousseau-ian theory of noble savage or social compact. The rights of man are derived from his Creator—

"Our fathers' God, to Thee
Author of liberty,
To Thee, we sing.
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light."

But the American word is also liberty under law. In American tradition, we have more naturally spoken of the moral law than of the natural law—not the same things, but closely related. It is typical Emerson to say: "The moral law is at the center of the universe and radiates to its circumference." And so also our greatest men from George Washington and Chief Justice Marshall to President Eisenhower have spoken of the moral law, or the higher law, by the light of which the Constitution is to be interpreted.

Finally, there is one more thing to say about the manmade law that serves the moral or natural law. The law is not to be conceived of as something static. The law is to provide for change—change in the direction of greater justice as the vision of justice is continually being revealed to men in ever-larger terms. A Matthew Arnold defined God as "a power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," so we ought to conceive of justice not as something which we have invented. We must conceive of justice as something established prior to us, in the beginning, and also as something which stands out beyond us, in whose work we are privileged to participate.

With this kind of concept of justice and of law, we can find confidence in our own minds. We will overcome the intellectual anarchy which has weakened us. And we can go forth, both humbly and confidently, to speak to other men everywhere, inviting them, praying them to reason together, to discern the general principles which all men may hold in common and thus to proceed to make the world the lawful habitation of mankind.

I have been speaking of "we." But who do we mean by "we"? It is my thesis that the advancement of the rule of law should be the major objective of the American Nation. This leads me, then, from the philosophical to the political. How shall the resources of this Nation be centered on the advancement of the rule of law? Obviously that requires political leadership, which is to say actual politicians, flesh-and-blood politicians, who will make this cause their own.

Ideas have consequences. The role of the politician is to be the executor of an idea. But he cannot execute an idea until the idea has been born, or in this case, reborn and made clear. That is why I have spoken first of the intellectual task. Ideas have consequences—and we also say: Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come. Can we say that the time has indeed come to make the rule of law the dominant force in the world? I think we can for two reasons: First, because the philosophy of law is gaining in health and strength; and second, because it finds acceptance among leaders of many nations. Thus serious thought has prepared the way for the politician. But the politician has a right to ask something else—he has the right to ask that there be a degree of readiness in the voting public to follow his leadership. Here is our difficulty now: how to get any great part of the public to get interested in, to get urgent about the rule of law. This is a tough one.

I speak now not only as a concerned citizen, but as a practicing editor. The doubts that rush to one's mind are sharp—striking deep to the roots of our life as a people. Is it idle fantasy to imagine summoning serious popular interest in so seemingly abstract an ideal as the rule of law? Is it just too much, and too naive, in a democracy—with all its intellectually leveling processes—to expect a stirring of concern (let alone a surge of zeal) for such an ideal by the hypothetical Mr. Average Citizen?

Well, perhaps brashly, I say "no" and "false" to these pessimistic propositions. And I say in retort: "It is not the law or rule of law that is the abstract concept. It is the concept of the average citizen that is the deceptive abstraction."

Let me explain—first about this citizen, then about the law.

It is widely asserted that this American citizen lives in a society that lacks high purpose and spiritual vigor. We all have been hearing—a lot of late—the adjectives of lament or scorn applied to our society. Our society is vacuous. It is anti-intellectual. It is mediocre. It is indulgent and egocentric. It is, in short, a society, fat with affluence, but pitifully thin in spirit and will and wisdom. And so, what could one expect of the average citizen—its typical human product?

I concede some fragments of truth in this grim picture. In many areas of our national life—from the schoolroom to the TV screen—we have a surfeit of the shallow and the banal. But these, in my reckoning, are the frivolities of a characteristically serious and reflective people—serious in purpose, reflective upon their responsibilities to themselves, to other nations, and even to future generations. We love our country. We know as well as love the ideals of liberty that stirred at our birth as a Nation, that have strived even after through our life as a united people. We know that only sustained struggle can carry its ideals into the future—investing that future with promise and meaning. And this is crucial; for the American wants, indeed longs for, nothing so much as to know that his life as an American has meaning and purpose.

If this be true, as I believe, then we can believe one thing more: the American people need the vision of a just cause to summon them to action. Not just any cause, not even just any just cause, but a cause that is right and proper and true for America.

What is the name of this cause—and what is its substance? Peace? Maybe; but peace on what terms, based on what principles, sustained by what purposes? Freedom? Sure—but freedom fortified by what strength, guarded by what rule and authority?

The answer—I submit—is not obscure. The answer is: Peace through law—and freedom under law. For surely without law, there can be neither peace nor freedom. And what is a more meaningful, a more authentic, definition of a just cause than—law?

This, then, is no mere academic abstraction. It can be the heart and nerve of our national purpose. It is practical. And it is pertinent.

Let me suggest some proof of these assertions. I submit a piece or two of evidence—what properly can be called highly material testimony—drawn from the plainest facts of mid-20th century life.

First. As a Nation, we confront no more crucial task than that of relating our spiritual and our material values. Put it differently: our task is to translate our highest values into the lower language of action and policy. This act of translation is performed by law. For law functions on that middle ground between the spiritual and the material. For law is principle applied to fact. And thus it can be the true catalyst of our national purpose throughout the world as well as at home.

Second. The people of the world feel—and feel deeply—that today's sinister balance of power, this peace-by-mutual-terror in which we live, is a dead end. Literally, a dead end. And what question is more urgently asked—from New York to New Delhi, from Akron to Accra—than: Is there no way out?

The rudely realistic answer, of course, is: No there is no way out. The invention of the most horrible weapons of destruction is that fateful aspect of human ingenuity which is irreversible. The secrets unlocked can never be sealed again.

But if there is no way out, there must be something else: A way forward. This must be a way that leads toward mastery and control, in the name of justice and liberty, over the new forces unleashed by science.

This is the way of the law.

And therefore I believe that political leaders—of all ranks, of perhaps all nations—have a rare opportunity. To these leaders, we can rightly and reasonably say: Study our proposition. Scan the promise that lies in these simple words: the rule of law. Place this promise on your political banners. Let the people see that you believe. And they will believe—in it, and in you. They will follow. For you will have given them hope—and reason to hope.

Mr. Arthur Larson, who has recently left the White House to set up the World Rule of Law Center, with President Eisenhower's blessing, at Duke University, says that people come to him saying, "I think what you are going to do is one of the most exciting things I ever heard of—but exactly what is it?"

People seem to understand an atomic warhead better than they do the rule of law. But they would like to understand the rule of law because there, they intuit, they may

find some tidings of comfort and of joy, which they certainly do not find in atomic warheads.

What then is it, this rule of law? It is, as we have noted, a fundamental concept of political philosophy. It is also a multitude of concrete acts and instances—concrete laws and legal arrangements made and to be made, tested and to be tested, sustained and to be sustained.

So we come to the third aspect of the subject which I venture to touch on tonight, namely the fact that there is an immense amount of actual legal work to be done, right now, and mainly, of course, by lawyers. And let me add, emphatically, in most cases for a proper fee. We are not talking about part-time do-goodism; we are talking about doing the world's work, full time, with the highest professional competence.

The work needs to be done for its own sake, for the weaving of the fabric of law. But it is equally important for the sake of public understanding: Every step taken to put some part of international affairs under law is a demonstration to the public of the uses of the law.

Examples of legal work to be done could be drawn from literally every field of human activity—from outer space to internal medicine. I will choose two large examples—one, in the field of world business, the other in international politics.

As to the economic organization of the world, we have long been involved in foreign aid and will continue to be. But for years some of us have been saying that far, far more important than any amount of handouts would be a stern, no-fooling effort to establish adequate rules for international investment and trade. Have our words been lost in the wind? They seemed to be—but now, here too, the power of a right idea makes its way. Our recent eminent visitor from South America, President Frondizi of the Argentine, tells us with enthusiasm that the future of the Argentine's economy is based on respect for law. And now, most importantly of all, there lies on the agenda of international affairs a really fundamental proposal worked out by the No. 1 banker of Germany, Mr. Hermann Abs. Mr. Abs calls his proposal a Magna Carta for trade and investment throughout the world. Every enlightened American corporation should back that Magna Carta—whether or not it is engaged in foreign trade. Corporations need the advice and the prodding of their lawyers to see the profound importance of the Abs proposal. For at stake there is the prosperity of the world—and our prosperity. At stake there is the future of free enterprise—at home no less than abroad. At stake there may even be the peace of the world, since nothing could so vitalize the rule of law as to have it extended to all business transactions everywhere on earth. This would give to millions of people the habit of abiding by the law, of trusting in the law, and of prospering in the trust and confidence which only the law can give. The law seen both as the tremendous first principle, and the law seen also as the moderator of daily life.

In the field of international politics, the example I would take is arbitration agreements. All during the 19th century there was a steady advance in the use of arbitration. In fact, American use of this technique began with the founding of this country. You will remember that in 1794 the Jay Treaty between Great Britain and the United States provided for the arbitration of certain issues arising at the end of the Revolutionary War, including the boundary between Maine and Nova Scotia. The negotiations were successful and the results were accepted. In the 100 years that followed, a total of 177 disputes between nations were resolved by arbitration and the United States was involved in 79 of them. And remember, all this was done without any supranational policeman with a big club.

The high tide of faith in arbitration as a means of having peace with justice was probably marked by the Hague Conference of 1907—about the time Andrew Carnegie set up his Peace Foundation with every expectation that war would be abolished, long before now. But then came the breakdown of the West in 1914—and since then one has heard less and less of arbitration. The reason was, in part, a basic loss of faith that nations and governments would keep their word. Pacta sunt servanda—agreements must be kept. The way to restore faith in good faith is to make more agreements, to make them carefully, and to keep them.

But arbitration agreements are only a part of the fabric of lawfulness throughout the world. The fabric can be even more strongly woven by developing regional courts. Why not, for example, a court with a developing body of law to settle all disputes, without exception, in the Western Hemisphere? A marvelous thing for the New World and a splendid example to the Old.

Meanwhile, there is the World Court of the United Nations—the most unused court in history. As President Eisenhower indicated in his message, we cannot proceed to advance the rule of law until we do our part to make that Court a little more useful than it is. That means that the Connally amendment must be repealed. Since that amendment bears the name of a beloved Texas Senator, I think we should call upon the members of the Texas bar to make it their special job, with all respect to Old Tom, to amend that amendment.

The agenda, of which I have merely suggested a very few examples, is vast. If it is to be mainly your work, how will it relate to mine? As an editor, I have reason to know that the American people's appetite for facts is ravenous. But I also know—and the people know—that facts by themselves, facts in their "innumerable swarmings," are meaningless. Facts about the world, facts about the contemporary United States, facts about our Nation's activities in the world, become significant only as they are attached to a theme, a line of effort, a vision of the truth. As an editor presenting the news of America and the world, I need a clear theme. And so does the reader. So do we all—all the people.

But the theme cannot be contrived. It must be deeper far than propaganda. It must be found actually running through the operations of our society and its government. I think the theme now lies half-hidden, half-visible in the actual American experience. We may agree with those who point out that the American destiny has been largely shaped by the particulars of place and time; that much of our experience as a nation and many details of our way of life are peculiar to us—and will remain so. But the essentials of the American experience can be communicated. First of all, we must understand them more clearly ourselves in order to communicate them to the world.

More than ever, and on the broadest scale, the appropriate theme for America is "Liberty under Law"—and this is our opportunity to work in the world. It is this theme, developed from its highest moral principles down to its most practical aspects, that can define the role that the United States must play in the world. And it can restore to us all an ample sense of the meaning and purpose of life in America, in the world, from day to day—and into the farthest reaches of vision and prophecy.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have the honor of making the opening remarks in this Chamber on Senate bill 50, a bill to admit the populous and prosperous Territory of Hawaii into our Union as a full and equal sovereign State. My remarks on this historic occasion will be brief and general; the details of the bill will be presented by the distinguished and able junior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories, which conducted the hearings and reported the measure to this body.

Mr. President, the admission of a new State into our Union of States is always a historic occasion. It is an epoch-making event both for the people of the area admitted to full partnership in the Union and also for the country itself. The growth of our Republic has been accompanied by a corresponding growth in our prosperity and economic strength and in many ways the successive admission of new States has symbolized our rise to power and riches as a nation.

AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS UNDER CONSTITUTION

On March 4, 1791—almost 168 years ago to the day—the United States of America was a little band of 13 States hugging the eastern seaboard of the Atlantic. On that historic date the State of Vermont was "received and admitted into the Union as a new and entire member thereof," in the words of the statute admitting Vermont to the Union. Authority for this action of the First Congress is found in article IV, section 3, of the Constitution, which provides in simple, straightforward language:

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

The most recent occasion on which this constitutional authority was exercised was last year, when on June 30, 1958, H.R. 7999, the bill to admit Alaska as a State, was approved by this body by a vote of 64 to 20. What a splendid record of achievement and national strength and vigor has marked that span of 167 years between the admission of Vermont in 1791 and Alaska in 1958.

During those 167 years the authority conferred by the quoted section of the Constitution has been exercised by this body on 31 different occasions by providing for the admission of the 36 States which have become a part of the Union on a "free and equal footing" with the Original Thirteen.

PATTERN FOR ADMISSION OF NEW STATES

The pattern for the admission of new States, generally speaking, was established in the famed Northwest Ordinance by the Continental Congress in 1787. The Northwest Ordinance was the statute for the government of the vast area west of the Allegheny Mountains and north of the Ohio River. From this Territory the five States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan were created.

Under this pattern, the Territory was first of all incorporated into the Union. That is, the Constitution of the United States was extended to it, and the area thereby legally and politically became a

part of the Union. As soon as a part of the area had sufficient population to support statehood—the original requirement was but 60,000—and the inhabitants gave evidence of their desire for statehood, an enabling act was passed by Congress, which prescribed a procedure for the organization of a State government and certain standards for and conditions of statehood. When these steps had been taken and the requirements met, States were admitted into the Union on a free and equal basis with the Thirteen Original States.

A slight variation in the above pattern has occurred in certain instances when the people of a Territory have gone ahead on their own initiative and held a constitutional convention, drafted a constitution, and submitted it to the people without waiting for the Federal Congress to authorize them to do so. The constitution would then be submitted to the Congress, and if approved, the State would be admitted by the enactment of an Admission Act by Congress. Seven States have entered the Union through this procedure by taking the initiative themselves, namely, Arkansas, California, Florida, Idaho, Maine, Oregon, and Wyoming.

ACTION BY PEOPLE OF HAWAII

I mention this variation of the pattern because Hawaii has followed the precedent of those States and has held its constitutional convention and drafted its own proposed State constitution. The proposed State constitution of Hawaii is before us at this time, it is printed in the committee's report on S. 50, and I wish to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to it. It gives us a preview, so to speak, of the kind of State we would be admitting.

However, regardless of whether the people of a Territory waited for the passage of an enabling act by Congress or acted on their own initiative, the end result, namely, statehood, has been the same for each of the incorporated Territories. Hawaii is the only incorporated Territory which has not yet achieved statehood. The greatness of our Union and the strength of each of the 36 subsequently admitted States today is manifest proof of the success of the policy with respect to incorporated Territories which the Continental Congress established 172 years ago.

In no instance has statehood failed. With the admission of each of the 36 States, the people in the established States have benefited as well as have the people of the new State.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII IN HISTORIC TRADITION

Mr. President, today we begin debate on a bill that is within this historic tradition and pattern under which we have grown great. For Hawaii qualifies under each and every one of the historic concepts that we have evolved in the 37 previous actions this body has taken in admitting new States. Hawaii is the only area that does meet those tests and conditions.

I want to emphasize this point to put at rest the professed fears of those opponents of statehood for Hawaii who assert that by admitting Hawaii we are opening the door to the admission of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam. There is no merit to this contention. No area now under the American flag other than Hawaii meets the historic tests of readiness for statehood. No other area conceivably could qualify for statehood under our precedents in the foreseeable future, in my judgment. This idea of "opening the door" is not and cannot be a valid argument, and I hope very much that it will not be made here to this body.

I am certain that many speakers on this bill will discuss those historic precedents and qualifications for statehood. They have been set forth and discussed in each of the five favorable reports the Senate Interior Committee has submitted on the issue of statehood for Hawaii. I wish to direct particular attention to the explanation of these requirements for statehood set forth in the excellent and comprehensive report on S. 50, 86th Congress, filed last week by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. This report, Senate Report No. 80, is one of the most outstanding documents in the long history of statehood for Hawaii in the wealth of information it contains and its clarity of expression.

READINESS FOR STATEHOOD

I shall quote from page 7 of the report for the benefit of the Members of the Senate. Under the heading "Readiness for Statehood," the report states:

> The Constitution of the United States provides that new States may be admitted into the Union by the Congress, but it sets forth no specific requirements. However, a study of American history, with particular attention to the facts and circumstances surrounding the admission of each of the 37 States that have come into the Union since its founding, shows that the requirements have been (1) that the inhabitants of the proposed new State are imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government; (2) that a majority of the electorate desire statehood; and (3) that the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was unanimous in finding that Hawaii met each and every one of those qualifications beyond any reasonable doubt. In few, if any, instances has the case for the grant of statehood been as well documented and is as clearly shown as in the present instance.

Mr. President, since 1935, the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees have held 23 hearings on the subject of statehood for Hawaii. The record on the question comprises more than 6,600 printed pages of testimony and exhibits. More than 850 witnesses have been heard in the Territory and in Washington. Seven of the hearings have been held in Hawaii. In addition, at least 12 reports have been made.

ISSUE MOST THOROUGHLY STUDIED

The question of admitting Hawaii to statehood has been longer considered and more thoroughly studied than any other statehood proposal which has ever come before Congress. Thirty-six States have previously been admitted to the Union by the action of Congress; yet in no single case has there been such a thoroughly careful study of the qualifications of the applicant as in the case of Hawaii.

The numerous, exhaustive studies on Hawaii have built up a great body of irrefuted and irrefutable evidence that Hawaii is in every way qualified to stand on a basis of equality with the present States of the United States. Her more than 600,000 people are American in word, thought, and deed. The vast majority of them—more than 85 percent—were born under the American flag, were educated in Hawaii's excellent school system, and are thoroughly imbued with American principles and ideals. They know no loyalty other than that to America—our country and their country.

Hawaii is possessed of great riches of soil and climate. Her more than 300,000 acres of arable land are among the most intensively, and scientifically, cultivated in the world. More than a million tons of sugar, valued in excess of $150 million, are produced annually. Hawaii also produces 85 percent of the total U.S. supply of canned pineapple products. This is 65 percent of the world's production.

IMPORTANT MINERAL DISCOVERY

Hawaii's pleasant climate, scenic beauty, and recreation facilities are also a major asset. The tourist industry has expanded annually—from a $6 million-a-year industry in 1946 to $65 million in 1956.

Within the last several years still another source of wealth for the Territory and for the Nation has become known. I refer to the discovery on the "Big Island" of Hawaii of tremendous deposits of bauxite, the raw material from which aluminum is produced. Hawaii's reserves of bauxite are placed at 60 million tons. This is 10 times the mainland reserve and enough to make our Nation independent of foreign sources of this so vital metal.

In short, Mr. President, there can be no doubt that Hawaii's great resources will enable her to support statehood and to carry her full share of the burdens of the Federal Government. Admission of Hawaii as a State will enrich our Nation materially as well as spiritually, morally, and politically.

Mr. President, in bringing my remarks to a conclusion, I realize I have dwelt much on the past—on our great forward progress as a Nation. As a lawyer, I have profound respect for precedent and tradition, but as a Member of the Senate I realize that Congress is not bound by precedent. I realize the question of admitting, in 1959, the richly endowed and strategically situated American Territory of Hawaii to full equality in our Union of States is within the sound discretion of the 86th Congress.

FAILURE TO ADMIT HAWAII WOULD BE BREAK WITH PAST

However, I believe the past can be used as a useful guide for the present and future. Therefore, I feel justified in calling the attention of the Senate to the historic precedents, and in pointing out that refusal to pass the measure would be breaking the historic pattern—

would be a marked departure from the tradition—under which our Nation has expanded and grown great.

After thorough hearings and careful study, I have found that our 600,000 fellow Americans in Hawaii merit statehood, that they desire it, and that they are ready, willing, and able to support it. I believe that statehood for Hawaii will be in the best interests of the United States as a whole and of the people of Hawaii. I therefore earnestly recommend that the Senate take prompt, affirmative action on this measure, which for 15 years or more has been a major plank in the platforms of both of our political parties.

Admission of Hawaii as a State of the United States is clearly in the best interests of our Nation, and of the free world, as well as fulfillment of the longing of a splendidly patriotic vigorous group of American citizens—600,000 strong—who by every historic test merit full equality with their fellow Americans in the present 49 States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, no one can fairly accuse the Congress of undue haste in admitting Hawaii to the Union. Indeed, the proposal that Hawaii be admitted to the Union was made so long ago that no man who sat in the Senate at that time is here today.

Our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], will recall that historic Congress. He was then serving in the House of Representatives as the first Representative from the new State of Arizona.

The first Hawaiian statehood bill was introduced so long ago that some of the present Members of this body had not then been born, and some were still being paddled by their teachers in grade school.

The first Hawaiian statehood proposal was made in 1919, in the second administration of President Woodrow Wilson. The bitter debate over America's entry into the League of Nations was then taking place.

In January of that now seemingly remote year of 1919, a director general of European war relief was appointed to distribute $100 million worth of supplies provided for by Congress in a European famine relief bill. The director was an engineer named Herbert Hoover.

In May of the same year, Congress passed a resolution submitting to the States a constitutional amendment providing for women's suffrage. Now the ladies have been voting for so long that many who then voted for the first time as young women are now voting as grandmothers or great-grandmothers.

Indeed, to look back to the day when Hawaiian statehood was first proposed is to look back to a day that seems ancient, in the light of later events, for in October 1919 the Volstead Act became law over the President's veto. That act was designed to enforce prohibition under the 18th amendment to the Constitution.

In October 1919, Frederick Hoenemann, a Missouri farmer, appealed to the courts against the newfangled flying machines; he said that as they flew over his farm, they were scaring his chickens and were making his cows go dry. The judge agreed with the plaintiff, and issued a temporary injunction against the operation of planes above Mr. Hoenemann's farm.

Finally, in the same year, 1919, the population of the United States was approximately 105 million, or some 70 million less than it is today.

Congress may be charged—sometimes justly, and sometimes unjustly—with many things. But certainly no one can say Congress has behaved with mad haste in admitting Hawaii to the Union.

Every possible argument either for or against Hawaiian statehood has been raised and debated. There is no need to review again all the facts and arguments. The issue is not a partisan one. Both political parties have repeatedly pledged support to Hawaiian statehood.

The Territories Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously recommend enactment of the Hawaiian statehood bill—S. 50. The full Interior Committee, under the distinguished guidance of its chairman, the senior Senator from the State of Montana [Mr. MURRAY], has voted to report the bill, and, for the first time in the long history of the consideration of similar bills, the vote was unanimous. Members on both sides of the aisle have made important contributions to the issue, and it is appropriate that the presentation of the bill today should be a bipartisan effort.

Certainly, one of the most tireless workers on the Territories Subcommittee is its ranking minority member, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I want to thank him and all the other members of my subcommittee for their generous help and support.

Mr. President, I should like especially to thank the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for the early scheduling of the bill for debate. I believe we have set a record for prompt action between the reporting of the bill by the full committee and its consideration on the floor of the Senate.

I called the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas, at the time when the bill was reported by the subcommittee; and I advised him that we would be ready in a certain number of days. At that time he told me, "As soon as the bill is ready, we will schedule it for immediate consideration by the Senate."

I should like to add, that the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], has been most helpful and cooperative in connection with bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate in record time.

Mr. President, let us now refer to the provisions of the Hawaii statehood bill.

We should remember that we are considering an act of admission. No further congressional action will be required.

The last 11 statehood bills passed by Congress since 1889 have uniformly provided for the following: A republican form of State government, definition of boundaries, transfer of court jurisdiction, and a popular referendum on the question of statehood itself. Comparable provisions may be found in Senate bill 50.

Specifically, the bill provides as follows:

Section 1 recognizes the constitution adopted by the people of Hawaii to be republican in form, and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States.

Section 2 sets forth the boundaries of the new State, which will consist of the islands included in the Hawaiian Archipelago.

Section 3 requires that the constitution of the State of Hawaii shall always be republican in form and consistent with the Constitution of the United States.

The next section deals with a problem arising out of the original acquisition by the United States of the Hawaiian Islands. As a condition, our Government promised to retain certain lands for the benefit of the native-born Hawaiians. The Hawaiian Homes Act of 1920 expresses the intent of Congress to adhere to that promise. Section 4 requires that the State of Hawaii adopt the Hawaiian Homes Act of 1920 as a provision of its constitution, and provides that it shall not be changed in its basic provisions except with the consent of the United States.

Section 5 provides that the State of Hawaii shall succeed to the title now held by the Territory. This section further provides that during a 5-year period any public lands which are controlled by the United States may, by act of Congress or Presidential order, be set aside for the permanent use of the United States.

Election procedures for the new State are covered by sections 6, 7, and 8. Upon the President's signature of the statehood bill, the Governor of Hawaii will issue his proclamation for the holding of elections. The proclamation shall provide for the holding of a primary election no less than 60 nor more than 90 days later. A general election is to be held within 40 days of the primary election. At this general election the citizens of Hawaii will elect a Governor, a Lieutenant Governor, and a State legislature; and, in addition thereto, two U.S. Senators and one Representative will be elected.

Sections 9 through 14 are concerned with the judiciary, the maintaining of the Federal court, and the transition from a Territorial to a State court. Technical amendments to the United States Code to indicate the changes necessary upon Hawaii's becoming a State are enumerated in these sections.

It was the considered opinion of the committee that provision for a cutoff date at some fixed point in time relative to Territorial laws of Congress now in effect should be incorporated into the bill. For this reason, section 15 states that all Territorial laws in force at the time of Hawaii's admission into the Union shall continue in force for a period of 2 years, unless the State legislature sees fit to act prior to that time.

Section 16 provides that Hawaii National Park shall continue under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S.

Government. The section further provides that the United States will have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over any military installations that are determined by the President or Secretary of Defense to be critical areas.

By means of section 17, the Federal Reserve Act is modified to cover Hawaii.

Section 18 covers maritime matters, and continues in effect the present jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board over water transportation to and from the State of Hawaii.

Section 19 provides that the act shall not affect the nationality of any person.

Section 20 makes technical corrections in the Immigration and Nationality Act, to conform it to the new State of Hawaii.

Section 21 applies to the State of Hawaii, section 3(b) of the act of September 7, 1957, which is concerned with the guaranteeing of loans for air feeder lines.

Senate bill 50 differs only in minor respects from the previous Senate bill 50, reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 85th Congress. For the benefit of my colleagues, I may observe at this time that the bill the Senate is now considering is practically identical with House bill 4221, which was reported yesterday by the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported, for the consideration of this body, a bill which completely and concisely makes statehood for Hawaii a reality.

Mr. President, what will the admission of Hawaii mean to the United States?

On their islands, the Hawaiians have in their own way created the same miracle that we have brought about on the mainland. It is the miracle that we take for granted, although it unfailingly arouses the wonder and approval of foreign observers of our national life. It is the miracle of unity in diversity; of peoples of varying racial stocks, religions, and points of view who retain their individuality, while at the same time they live in harmony with, and actively cooperate with, their neighbors for the good of the whole community, local, State, and National.

Nor is this all. The Hawaiians are also in the process of doing on their islands what we have done on the mainland. Nearly 200 years ago, when our Nation was being born in the minds of our founders, a farmer of French descent among us—Hector de Crevecoeur—wrote about something new under the sun. He described what he called "that new man—the American." And indeed he was new. He might have been of English, Dutch, Irish, German, or Swedish descent, or of some mixture of these or other strains. But on this soil he became something never seen before, something we describe as "American"—a person easier to sense or to spot anywhere in the world than to describe.

This is also becoming true of Hawaii. There, one finds men of numerous racial strains or admixtures of them: Polynesians, Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, Yankees, Filipinos, Europeans, Micronesians. They are of varying colors of skin, various religions, and various points of view regarding many things. But they are already visibly stamped as something new under the illimitable horizons of the Pacific: they are Hawaiians, and yet they are Americans. They are essentially a new group of people, like their forebears, but, unlike them; they combine, we believe, the best qualities of their ancient and honorable ancestry with the best qualities of the American new world.

In admitting Hawaii to the Union, we shall get more perhaps than we give. It has always been our desire, however skeptically others may have regarded us in the past, to live upon terms of peace, amity, and active cooperation with the great Asian peoples. The achievement of this desire is still a dear objective of all of us; and I think we may come the closer to it as Hawaii becomes a part of the Union, as Asians see that we do mean what we say and do say what we mean.

Recently, in addressing the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, I said this:

> When Hawaii is admitted, it will come into the Union, not just as the 50th State, but as our "diplomatic State"—our "diplomatic representative"—if you please, next door to over one-half of the world's population. * * * Here the Occident and the Orient have met in a climate of mutual trust, understanding, and respect. By precept and example, you have given us in the Pacific the kind of environment which will have a great meaning throughout the Far East.

I think, then, Mr. President, that we may well rejoice in the prospect that Hawaiian statehood, first proposed 40 years ago, is about to become a reality.

In the interval, those of us on the islands and on the mainland have come to know one another better. More than that, we have become one in the fires of a tremendous conflict when the loyalty, the resolution, and the courage of the Hawaiian people were tried and were not found wanting.

We hope that the people of Hawaii will benefit spiritually and materially from their closer association with us in our union of States. But I have no doubt that mainland Americans will benefit greatly through their closer association with the islander Americans.

Soon, throughout the vast reaches of the Pacific, whose waves wash lands that shelter a large part of the human race, the State of Hawaii will stand as a living embodiment of liberty.

Hawaii will represent in the Pacific what West Berlin stands for in Europe—freedom.

Wherever men endure as slaves, as puppets, as the dispossessed and the disinherited, Hawaii will be a star of hope. It will be the exemplification of one of man's most noble political doctrines: Government by consent of the governed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that, as amended, the bill be considered as original text and open to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments, which have been placed in the RECORD earlier today are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to call up some technical amendments which I have sent to the desk, and ask that they be considered en bloc. These amendments are intended to correct grammatical and typographical errors which have been discovered in Senate bill 50 as reported with the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and they will be received.

Mr. JACKSON. The amendments are at the desk.

I ask that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that they be considered en bloc immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered, and they are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, do I understand that the amendments were agreed to en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

The amendments which were agreed to en bloc are as follows:

> Section 5(a), page 4 at line 24, insert a period after the word "title."
>
> Section 7(c), page 14, line 4, strike out the word "Territory" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "State."
>
> Section 7(c), page 14, line 6, strike out the word "Territory" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "State."
>
> Section 7(c), page 14, line 9, strike out the following words: "all of the officers of said territory including."
>
> Section 18(b)(2), page 27, line 15, insert the word "an" before the word "island."
>
> Section 18(b)(3), page 27, line 21, insert the word "an" before the word "island."
>
> Section 22, page 29, line 6, strike out the word "or" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "in any."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. A long dramatic struggle in our political history is now about to conclude. The 60-year-old dream of American statehood for Hawaii, from that day in 1898 when she relinquished her independence to become a part of the United States, is finally about to become a reality.

High on the list of accomplishments of this 86th Congress will be, I feel sure, the admission of the populous and prosperous American Territory of Hawaii into this dynamic Nation of ours.

Hawaii is far more than an historic Pacific island paradise with 600,000 people. This beautiful chain of islands, with its vigorous, patriotic people, its unquestionably sound public finances, its thriving economy, its highly scientific, intensive agriculture, has met each and every one of our historic tests of qualification for statehood.

But the issue is even greater than that. In this melancholy world, with the evils—against which we and our friends are arrayed, Hawaii and its people, who are our fellow Americans, represent a symbol of freedom and of democracy in modern day action. And her belated admission to the American Union as an equal member will be one more alluring showcase example that America practices the self-government which she preaches.

AMERICAN PEOPLE OF DIVERSE ANCESTRY

Mr. President, we are a heterogeneous people. The people of every race and from every clime on this globe have come, in part, to this North American Continent to enrich our heritage, to create a great American culture, and, beyond that, to add immeasurably to American strength.

The population of the Territory of Hawaii likewise, Mr. President, is heterogeneous in character, and its admission as an equal in our American Union of States will, without question, bring additional strength to the cause of freedom for which our country and our people stand.

Mr. President, this is no partisan or political question. I salute my friend from the Pacific coast, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], under whose chairmanship our Subcommittee on Territories once again this year has fashioned an admirable bill by which Hawaii may be admitted into the Union.

COMMITTEE ACTION UNANIMOUS

The action of the Interior Committee in amending this bill and reporting it to the Senate was unanimous. It is to the great credit of my able colleague, the chairman of the full committee, the senior Senator from the State of Montana, my friend during my six years in the Senate, that action in the full committee, under JIM MURRAY's chairmanship, was so expeditious and harmonious. As a result, once again the Senate has before it a well-considered, effective bill to establish a new State. I wish also to salute my revered chairman [Mr. MURRAY] on the very eloquent and informative, remarks he has made in this body today on the measure for which he has fought the good fight.

Both political parties again and again have promised the people of the country that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of some of these past platform commitments be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to say that I think the distinguished Senator from California will agree with me that one of the men who fought for Hawaiian statehood for years, and years was the late Delegate Farrington, who passed away some years ago. The fight later was taken up by Mrs. Betty Farrington, one of the most gracious and most lovable women in the entire United States. She has fought hard to bring this day about.

Then, men like Judge Felix in Hawaii, and a score of others, continually bombarded the Senate with letters and resolutions urging statehood for Hawaii.

I particularly desire to refer again to the work done by the late Delegate, Mr. Farrington, because he labored long, long hours, and performed arduous tasks to bring the desire of Hawaii for statehood to the attention of the United States Senate. I know my distinguished friend from California will agree with me.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do, most wholeheartedly, and I thank my able friend the Senator from North Dakota for making this contribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTY PLATFORM PLANKS

To: Senator THOMAS F. KUCHEL.
From: Stewart French, chief counsel, Interior Committee.
Subject: Hawaiian statehood planks in party platforms.

Indicative of the bipartisan nature of the cause of statehood for Hawaii is the fact that for at least the last 15 years major planks in both party platforms have urged Hawaii statehood. Thus, in 1944, the Republican Party platform stated—

"Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of homerule looking toward statehood, and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and in the application of all our national laws."

This platform was of course accepted by the Republican nominee for President, Thomas E. Dewey, of New York.

Again in 1948 the Republican platform had in it a plank favoring Hawaii statehood.

By 1952, all suggestion of Hawaii statehood at some time in the future had given way to the realization that Hawaii was ready and more than ready for statehood. The Republican Party platform stated simply, "We favor immediate statehood for Hawaii."

This sense of urgency was reiterated in the 1956 party platform. The Republican plank stated, "We pledge immediate statehood for Hawaii."

So, too, with the platforms of the Democratic Party. Their platform of 1944 likewise called for "eventual" statehood for Hawaii.

At the 1948 party convention, it was "immediate statehood."

In the 1952 platform, Hawaii was described as a "vital bastion in the Pacific" that had contributed greatly to the welfare and economic development of our country, and again immediate statehood was urged.

The 1956 Democratic platform provided, in its constructive, affirmative part with respect to Hawaii, that the Territory had contributed greatly to our national, economic and cultural life and was vital to our defense. Immediate statehood was called for.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank my distinguished friend from California for yielding to me. I merely wish to say I wholeheartedly and very gladly support S. 50. I am in favor of statehood for Hawaii. I believe I voted seven times for Hawaiian statehood in the other body of Congress.

I served in Hawaii while I was in the Navy during the war. I have been there on many occasions since, and as recently as last December. I have visited all the major islands of Hawaii. I have met the people of Hawaii with their great many different ethnical backgrounds. I have found them to be loyal American citizens. I have enjoyed my association with them.

The Territory has long been ready for statehood. I am glad we have arrived at this happy day in the Senate when we seem to be on the verge of recognizing the merits of the long and ardently held desire on the part of the Territory and people of Hawaii. I look forward to the time when this body will number an even 100 Members. I suppose at that time we shall be known in the press as the "Century Club" and among our Members as "Centurians."

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my able friend from Pennsylvania for what he has said on the question of statehood for Hawaii. The people of the Territory of Hawaii do not have a better friend in the Congress of the United States than the able Senator from Pennsylvania. I can recall that when the Senator graced the chairmanship of the political party to which he and I belong, he spoke out on the subject unequivocally. I congratulate him on the courage with which he stated his convictions at a time when it took substantially more courage than it does to assert that position today.

Mr. SCOTT. That was a period when some of us were pioneers, I will say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the witnesses before the subcommittee was a good American citizen by the name of Mike M. Masaoka. I wish to read into the RECORD a few sentences from his testimony, as shown on page 69 of the subcommittee hearings.

Prior to World War II, racist myths were current, ascribing to all persons of Japanese ancestry, citizens and aliens alike, an unswerving loyalty to the Emperor of Japan. Immediately after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, wild and distorted rumors asserting that the Japanese in Hawaii engaged in sabotage and espionage were circulated.

The fact of the matter is that according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Army and Navy Intelligence not a single case of espionage and sabotage was committed by a resident alien or citizen of Japanese origin before, during, and after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Indeed, the first Japanese enemy captured was by a Japanese-American.

Although purchased at a high cost of lives and personal resources, the magnificent wartime record of the Nisei and Issei in Hawaii and the United States conclusively demonstrated that—

Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart;

Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry.

More recently, on the battlefields of Korea, the men of Hawaii were again fighting and dying with their fellow Americans from the continental United States. As in World War II, Americans of Japanese ancestry carried their share of the load, for the records reveal that based upon population more than three times as many Japanese-Americans were wounded and killed in Korea than the national average.

In this record of devotion and sacrifice lies the answer to those who question the loyalty of the so-called Japanese population in Hawaii. They have purchased with their blood the right to be accepted as Americans individually and to have statehood extended to the Territory that gave them birth and imbued in them that spirit of liberty and freedom that inspired their wartime gallantry.

If to assimilate American ideals and traditions is to understand the meaning of democracy and to have such faith as to be willing to go out and die for our country in spite of prejudice, discrimination, mistreatment, and persecution such as Japanese-Americans were subject to after the attack on Pearl Harbor, then Americans of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii have been completely assimilated into our way of life.

SUPPORT OF BOTH REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIONS

Mr. President, to the credit of the present administration, President Eisenhower and his Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, our former colleague in this body, have been in the vanguard of those who have fought for Hawaiian statehood. So that there may be no misunderstanding of the fairness in which I try to make this discussion today, let equal credit be given to President Harry Truman and his able Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, who with equal vigor again and again urged the Congress of the United States, no matter which party was in control of the Congress, to admit Hawaii into the Union as a State.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the testimony of Secretary Seaton before the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There can be no possible question concerning the position of the administration on Hawaii statehood. Since this Congress convened, the President has on several occasions urged the Congress to admit Hawaii into the Union as a State. You are dealing this year not with an enabling act but with an admission act. We of the executive branch wholeheartedly concur in this approach and recommend that the bill before you be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

* * * * *

The record is clear. For over 100 years people of Hawaii have been dedicated to the goal of complete union with our mainland. The accomplishment of their goal became inevitable with the annexation of Hawaii in 1898 as an "integral part of the United States." To me, there can be no question properly raised as to whether Hawaii should become a State. The question is simply "when shall Hawaii become a State?"

As a personal observation, I believe that the language we all use in referring to the admission of Hawaii "into the Union" is not technically correct. Hawaii is as much a part of this Union today as any State. As an incorporated Territory, and the only one we have left, Hawaiians are subject to all of the obligations imposed upon any citizen in any State by the Federal Government. The problem arises because they are denied some of the most precious prerogatives of freemen, among them equal representation and the right to vote in national elections.

The record is also clear on another aspect of the subject before you. Since the incorporation of Hawaii into the Union, Hawaiians have developed their islands at a rapid pace. Any part of the Hawaiian economy, culture, philosophy, or political institutions that is examined today will be found to be a duplicate of or modeled after the way of life in vogue in the continental United States. Hawaii is the picture window of the Pacific through which the peoples of the East look into our American front room.

This will be particularly important in our future dealings with the peoples of Asia, because a large percentage of the population of Hawaii is of oriental or Polynesian racial extraction. The participation of the people of Hawaii in the full measure of the benefits of American citizenship will bring a fresh, new, informed outlook to our councils. More significantly, the peoples of those eastern lands washed by the waters of the Pacific will look through that front window of ours and take renewed notice that we do, indeed, practice what we preach. There can be no finer way to demonstrate the dynamic nature of our Union and the everlasting validity of the principles upon which our Republic was founded than by the admission of Hawaii as a State in this session of Congress.

While I have mentioned the racial background of some Hawaiians, let me hasten to point out that it would be both unfair and inaccurate to conclude that the objectives of Hawaiian people are in any way "foreign" to those of any other American group. No conclusion could be further from the truth. The overwhelming majority of Hawaiians are native-born Americans—they know no other loyalty and acclaim their American citizenship as proudly as you and I.

* * * * *

One argument against Hawaiian statehood, that of Communist infiltration, seems to demand explanation here today. Historically, even this is not a completely new subject in debate and consideration of statehood, because the question of loyalty to the United States has, indeed, been raised in regard to other States prior to their admission. Debate in Congress as to the extent of French influence in Louisiana and that of the Spanish-speaking people of New Mexico are significant examples. The Communist question, of course, presents a new ramification of the subject of loyalty not presented in the past, and that is whether any substantial segment of Hawaii actually is committed to a doctrine which advocates the violent overthrow of the very Government in which the overwhelming majority of Hawiians seek to permanently become a full partner.

For myself, I believe that this committee and all advocates of Hawaiian statehood will squarely face the Communist issue.

The people of Hawaii have time and time again rejected completely the Communist philosophy and have thwarted every attempt of the Communists to influence their government.

The proposed constitution of the State of Hawaii contains a far-reaching prohibition against any Communist holding public office or public employment of any kind.

A perennial target of alleged Communists in Hawaii has been the law enacted by the 1949 Territorial Legislature following a prolonged dock strike, which empowered the Territorial government to seize Hawaiian docks in the event of a strike. Notwithstanding four general territorialwide elections for the legislature, those laws are still on the books in Hawaii today. In each election the laws were an issue, and in each legislative session attempts have been made to repeal them. This is a prime example of the dogged determination of Hawaiians to stand firm on what they consider to be a matter of principle.

COMMUNISM NO GREATER THREAT IN HAWAII THAN ELSEWHERE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few continue to say, "The problem of communism ought to prevent Congress from now admitting Hawaii into the Union." I deny that. There may well be a problem of communism in the Territory of Hawaii, precisely as there is a problem of communism in the State of California or in the United States as a whole. Indeed, there is a problem of communism today which faces every free nation around the globe.

In that connection I wish to point out that 8 years ago, in 1950, the people of the Territory of Hawaii on their own initiative adopted a constitution which would govern them on their admission as a State. Section 3, article 14, reads as follows:

No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

That is a quotation from the proposed constitution for the new State of Hawaii which the people of Hawaii drafted and adopted for themselves.

Mr. President, the problem of communism, whatever it may be, will not change when statehood status is given to Hawaii; or, if there is to be any change at all, it will be a change to give the people of that great part of our country a better opportunity to cope with the problem at first hand.

EYES OF FORMER COLONIAL PEOPLES ON AMERICA

For an entire generation, an American Territory, whose citizens are thoroughly American in every respect—has been ready for statehood. Its people have long been asking for admission to equality in our Union. The whole world—especially the former colonials of the Pacific—await America's decision.

Hawaii has been at the threshold of statehood for nearly 60 years, patiently and graciously, in the face of a dreary succession of delays and setbacks. Since 1903, the Territory, through its legislature, has petitioned Congress for statehood on 17 different occasions. Since 1920, no fewer than 66 bills have been introduced in successive Congresses, calling for statehood for Hawaii. The House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees have held 22 hearings on Hawaii statehood since 1935. The record on the subject comprises more than 6,600 printed pages of testimony and exhibits. More than 850 witnesses have been heard in Hawaii and in Washington.

Seven of the hearings have been held in Hawaii, in 1935, 1937, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1954, and 1959. The Hawaii statehood question has been considered longer and more thoroughly studied than any other statehood proposal ever to come before Congress.

EARLY HISTORY OF STATEHOOD MOVEMENT

The granting of statehood to Hawaii now, some 61 years after its annexation, is in the national interest. It is a logical step in our growth to political maturity. It amounts to nothing more than the granting of a diploma in self-government to a segment of our people who long since have achieved political and social maturity. It should be accomplished without further delay.

History shows how truly American is Hawaii's case for statehood. Early in 1893, when the Kingdom of Hawaii was overthrown, a provisional government was established. There were charges that the American Minister to Hawaii had had too large a hand in the uprising. This gained credence when the provisional Government sent a mission to the United States with instructions to

arrange for the transfer of the sovereignty of the islands to the United States.

Opposition to annexation came from many quarters, both at home and abroad. Distance was cited as an obstacle. Noncontiguity was advanced as a bar. Race was put forth as an argument. Economic and political assimilation of Hawaii was declared to be an impossibility.

LEGALISTIC OPPOSITION

The strongest arguments against annexation, however, were purely legalistic. Annexation was declared to be repugnant to the Constitution and our form of Government.

In the forefront of the antiannexationists was the great author-jurist Thomas M. Cooley. "Apparently it is expected," wrote Cooley in the Forum for June 1893, "that the islands will be taken in as an outlying colony of the United States, not as a Territory of the sort we now possess and govern, and not, so far as we are notified, with any expectation that they are to be by-and-by accepted as one of the States of the American Union. Government as a colony is what it is said those proposing the annexation would prefer."

The proponents of the argument that annexation was in violation of the Constitution were confronted, however, by a number of historical precedents which defied rebuttal. The purchase and annexation of Spanish Florida—the acquisition of French Louisiana—the annexation of the Republic of Texas—the acquisition of Alaska, then commonly referred to as Russian America.

PRECEDENT OF LOUISIANA PURCHASE

The legal arguments of the antiannexationists were on infirm ground. Actually the matter had been settled many years before by none other than Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson, though frankly admitting that the Constitution contained "no provision for our holding foreign territory and still less for incorporating foreign nations into our Union," nevertheless went ahead and purchased the Louisiana Territory from Napoleon. His record for legal nicety was overcome by consideration of the national interest. When members of his own party had risen in opposition to the Louisiana purchase, Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris, Jefferson's principal political opponents, had come to his support. Soon after Louisiana was purchased and annexed, its inhabitants, in spite of national origins differing from those of the predominant portion of our population, were welcomed into the Union.

The annexation of the Republic of Texas was largely the handiwork of that great statesman and patriot, John C. Calhoun. Texas had been a part of Mexico and Mexico still asserted claims of dominion. It was inhabited by a population not homogeneous with our own and had been settled by pro-slavery Americans.

The purchase and annexation of Alaska, in 1867, brought in a territory not contiguous to the rest of the Union. At the time of its annexation Alaska was largely inhabited by Eskimos and Indians.

Thus, the Constitution had been interpreted prior to the Hawaiian annexation movement to allow for the expansion of the territorial borders of the United States. Although concepts of the Constitution of the United States ran back through the Magna Carta and English Common Law, it has already been found adequate for the preservation and protection of the human and property rights of such peoples as Frenchmen, Spaniards, Indians, and Mexicans.

OLD WORLD POWERS DISAPPROVE

The antiannexationists, nevertheless, won the argument in 1893. President Harrison ordered the lowering of the American flag from the government building in Honolulu. A constitutional convention was called and, on July 4, 1894, the Republic of Hawaii was proclaimed.

The victory of the antiannexationists in the early 1890's was attributable in no little part to diplomatic pressures from Great Britain, France, and Germany. Old World colonial powers did not relish the idea of the Hawaiian Islands coming into the possession of the United States. The United States, on the other hand, was determined that Hawaii should not fall into other hands.

Thus, toward the close of the 19th century, the people of Hawaii found themselves facing an unhappy situation. As an independent nation, they were too weak to survive long, but their wealth and strategic location made them desirable to several other nations. Yet, they wanted to cast their lot with the United States, their largest customer and the homeland of a substantial part of the island population. The United States seemed reluctant to receive them.

ANNEXATION A NATIONAL ISSUE

Hawaiian annexation became a national issue. One of the leaders of the Hawaiian annexation movement was Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama. He made many speeches and wrote many articles urging annexation of the islands.

One of the most forceful of Senator Morgan's article was published in the Forum for March 1898. It was entitled "The Duty of Annexing Hawaii." It was written in reply to a previous article by Great Britain's Right Honorable James Bryce, M.P., which had obligingly pointed out to Americans the dangers of the annexation of Hawaii by the United States.

The arguments advanced by Senator Morgan for annexation of Hawaii in his reply to Bryce have a ring of familiarity to us today as we consider statehood for Hawaii. The following are some excerpts from Senator Morgan's article:

> From the beginning we have uniformly declared that the Hawaiian Islands and people hold to the United States a relation that does not exist between them and any other nation and that we will not permit to exist with any other country.
>
> It is quite safe to assert that, for military and strategic reasons, the authorities are overwhelmingly in support of the annexation of Hawaii and agree as to the serious danger to our country of allowing these islands to become a base of operations for any European or Asiatic power against our western coasts.
>
> Annex Hawaii, and we will rapidly build up at Honolulu, in sight of Pearl Harbor, a commercial mart, like Hong Kong, protected by a fortress, easy of construction, far stronger than Gibraltar, that will stand sentinel over the surrounding ocean for thousands of miles.

Senator Morgan had great vision for Hawaii.

The Republic of Hawaii was annexed at the turn of the century and incorporated into the Union as an organized Territory. Hawaii is now ready for statehood—for a status of equality in our political system. It is generally agreed throughout the United States that this step should be taken. This is established by public opinion polls and newspaper comment which is overwhelmingly in favor of statehood now.

HAWAII BILL PASSED BY HOUSE THREE TIMES

In June 1947 the House of Representatives enacted legislation approving statehood for Hawaii. The vote was 196 to 133.

On March 7, 1950, for the second time in our history, elected representatives of the people of the United States acted to bring statehood to Hawaii. On this date the second bill to enable Hawaii to come into the Union as a State was passed by the House of Representatives. The vote was overwhelming—262 in favor to 110 against.

On March 10, 1953, the House for a third time passed, by a vote of 274 to 138, the bill to enable Hawaii to become a State. The Senate on April 1, 1954, by a vote of 57 to 28, passed the combined Hawaii-Alaska Enabling Act.

In the 84th Congress statehood for Hawaii and Alaska was considered jointly in comprehensive hearings. On May 10, 1955, H.R. 2535 was recommitted by the House to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by a vote of 218 to 170. On August 23, 1958, in the closing days of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, by a vote of 22 to 4, reported H.R. 49, introduced by Delegate JOHN A. BURNS, to the House, but the bill was not scheduled for floor debate.

Today, with Alaska in the Union as the 49th State, it is Hawaii's rightful turn.

DESIRE OF PEOPLE OF HAWAII

The people of Hawaii have long aspired to statehood. In a 1954 debate in the House of Representatives, Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, the late Hon. Joseph R. Farrington, stated that if a vote were taken today, Hawaii's people would vote 4 or 5 to 1 for statehood now.

S. 50 calls for a plebiscite in Hawaii on statehood so there can be no question but that statehood will be in accord with the wishes of the people of Hawaii.

Today, at the close of the first half of the 20th century we are again confronted with a situation in the Pacific which forebodes little good for our security and national well-being. It is a situation which also threatens the future of our friends and neighbors in the Pacific. It is my conviction that statehood for Hawaii at this juncture of history will serve notice to the world that we are in the Pacific to stay and that we are there in the interests of man's freedom and of

self-government. Statehood for Hawaii will bind us closer together as a nation.

STATEHOOD URGED IN 1898

Over a period of five decades Congress has heard many eloquent appeals for the admission of Hawaii into our Union. None more so, however, in my opinion than that uttered by Representative Charles Lewis Henry, of Indiana. Speaking to the House of Representatives on June 13, 1898, urging, even as I am doing now, support for this longstanding measure, Mr. Henry said:

We want these islands because of their value from a naval and military point of view; we want them on account of the commercial advantages which they will bring to our country; we want them in order that no foreign power may use them as a base of operations against us in time of war; we want them because they are more contiguous to our territory than to that of any other nation; we want them because they are geographically a part of the United States; but Mr. Speaker, we want them more than all on account of the true Americans who have made their homes upon these islands and now seek to present these islands as a free offering to their mother country. Let us pass these resolutions, and bring back again into the family fold the people who have been away from home establishing us a home in these delightful islands.

Let us proceed to pass this proposed legislation and to prepare to welcome the State of Hawaii.

Mr. President, I have the honor in part to represent 14 million people in California. I think over the years the people of California have been most friendly and most intimate with the people in the Territory of Hawaii. Long ago the people of my State looked forward to the day when their friends in Hawaii would be citizens of another State in the American Union. Time and again representatives of the government of California have appeared before the committees of the Congress to urge statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

ADVOCACY BY HON. EARL WARREN

Perhaps the most distinguished of California's Governors, who is now the distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, spoke unequivocally in favor of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii in 1950, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his comments as set forth in the hearings by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H.R. 49, 81st Congress, in 1950, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. EARL WARREN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE INTERIOR COMMITTEE IN 81ST CONGRESS

(NOTE.—The testimony of Governor Warren, when he appeared before the committee on April 24, 1950, with reference to Alaska statehood, is inserted herein in its entirety at his request.)

Senator ANDERSON. Now, Governor Warren, if time permits, I would like to give personal testimony to the nice way in which you treat members of the Government when they come to California, and particularly to your courtesy to me when I was out there as Secretary of Agriculture. We are very happy to have you with us this morning and will be glad to hear anything you have to say on this question of statehood for Alaska. If you find it inconvenient to be back here the following week to tell us anything you desire about Hawaii, if you wish at this time to add anything you have to say about Hawaii, the door is open for you to add that additional material this morning, if you desire to do so.

Governor WARREN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee. That is very generous of you, and I appreciate it, because I am under commitment to be in Sacramento tomorrow morning at the opening of business.

I apologize for not having a written statement, but I do not propose to offer any statistics, because I am not here as an expert on the economy of Alaska, I am not here as an expert on the defense of Alaska, nor am I familiar with the details of H.R. 331. I am appearing here as a neighbor, from a neighboring State, a State that is friendly to Alaska and that is hopeful for the opportunities that it may have in the future. I am also appearing as a westerner who happens at the moment to be chairman of a Governors' conference of the 11 Western States, which organization has gone on record several times during the past few years in favor of statehood for Alaska.

We in the West believe that the development of any part of the West is of great benefit to the entire West, and we consider Alaska as an integral part of the West. We have had the association of its Governor in the council of the Governors' Conference Committee 5 or 6 years, and we have come to believe that this is the time for Alaska to be given statehood.

We believe that we have a particular interest in the defense of Alaska, and we believe that if Alaska is given statehood, is given an opportunity to develop its resources and its civilization, that it will be a greater factor in the defense of our Nation than it could otherwise be. We believe, in the last analysis, the defense of Alaska will come from the civilization that we develop there rather than just from the airplanes that we send there, or the fortifications that we develop. We are of the opinion that Alaska will not develop to the fullest extent of its potentialities unless it does achieve statehood.

We believe that no Territory of this country that is owned, more than 98 percent, by the Government and managed by it, by bureaus as far away as Washington is from Alaska, can give the people the opportunity to develop in accordance with American principles and ideals.

We believe that this is a particularly significant time, so far as the development of Alaska is concerned, because it is the outpost of our civilization, it is the outpost of our democracy, and we fervently believe that if people are encouraged to go to Alaska and develop its resources that we can make that portion of our country more secure than could otherwise possibly be done.

We believe that statehood will increase the population of Alaska much faster than it has developed in the past. While we are interested in the welfare of Alaska, we are also interested in our own welfare, and we believe that the development of Alaska will help our economy. We believe that the more people there are there, the more trade they have, the more we will share in it and the better it will be for our people.

We believe that it is only justice for the people of Alaska that they be admitted into the Union of the States. For 83 years Americans have lived in Alaska, and for the last 38 years they have lived under a Territorial government. The people have served in two wars, they have served faithfully and loyally, they have paid the taxes that our Government has imposed upon them, and we believe that they have earned statehood in every sense of the word.

On the question of the population, I want to say that Alaska has more people now than my own State had when it was admitted to the Union 100 years ago.

Senator CORDON. May I also suggest, Mr. Governor, that at the time your State was admitted it also was noncontiguous with another State?

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir. Senator, I was about to say that, and also to point out that I left San Francisco yesterday afternoon at half past four by the fastest mode of transportation that we have, arriving here at 9:30 this morning, and I could have gotten to southern Alaska quicker than I could have gotten to Washington by the same mode of transportation. So we do not feel that the distance out there on the Pacific coast is material to this issue. We are used to distances, and we believe that the great distances in the West represent a great part of its strength.

So we feel that the people of Alaska have earned the right to statehood, and we believe they have earned the right to full development under statehood.

Now, there are always those who view with alarm the distance that the West has been from the Atlantic coast whenever a new State sought admission to the Union, and even some very famous men, men of this Senate, have expressed that alarm in times gone by. I happened to run across a statement of Daniel Webster in the U.S. Senate just a little over 100 years ago, in which statement he said this:

"What can we do with the western coast? A coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it. I will never vote 1 cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer Boston than it is now." [Laughter.]

Senator ANDERSON. Governor, I will say to you I used that quotation some time ago, and the Library of Congress told me Daniel Webster never said that. I think both of us ought to check it.

Governor WARREN. I quoted it from what I considered was good authority.

Senator ANDERSON. I took it on the best authority that I thought there was in the world. I hope it is true, but I just was not able to find it as yet. You do recognize it is typical of the thinking of a great many people 100 years ago.

Governor WARREN. Yes, and perhaps, some people today, and I say that without intending to give any offense.

I am sure Alaska seems a great deal farther away to many people in our country than any of the European countries, and perhaps some of the Asiatic countries, but really it is not far away. I believe it can be integrated with the other States in the Union, and I am also of the opinion that it will never develop to its full potentialities and possibilities until it does have the same opportunities for self-government that the other people in the United States have.

I believe this is the time for us to integrate our policy on the self-determination of people, and inasmuch as these people have lived there for a period of 83 years under our sovereignty and for 38 years as a Territory and fulfilled every obligation that has been put upon them, it seems to me a matter of common justice that they should be admitted to statehood and should stand in the way of totalitarianism spreading its influence from the Eastern Hemisphere into the Western Hemisphere. I think, if given statehood, the people of Alaska would measure up to that responsibility.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

If I might just say a word now on the question of Hawaii, because I must return to California.

Senator ANDERSON. May I ask you just this question?

Governor WARREN. Yes, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. Has the Council of Western State Governors to which you referred adopted officially resolutions on the question of statehood for either Alaska or Hawaii?

Governor WARREN. They have adopted officially resolutions favoring both.

Senator ANDERSON. Both?

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDERSON. Would you supply for the record copies of these resolutions?

Governor WARREN. Yes sir.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you.

The resolutions adopted by the Governors' Conference are as follows:

"JULY 13–16, 1947.

"XIV. STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

"The people of Hawaii have at the ballot box expressed their desire to achieve statehood. Hawaii is one of the two incorporated Territories of the United States for which statehood, following American tradition and precedent, is clearly indicated as their destiny. Hawaii has been under the American flag for 49 years and has, therefore, undergone a period of preparation and tutelage far longer than that of most Territories, before they achieved statehood. The expressed wish of our own fellow citizens of Hawaii is merely for the fulfillment of the moderate, understandable, traditional, and legitimate aspiration to achieve full equality and responsibility in the family of States and for self-government according to the established American pattern.

"Therefore, the Governors' conference hereby expresses its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood of the people of Hawaii, and endorsed the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

"JUNE 13–16, 1948.

"IX. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

"The Governors' Conference hereby reiterates its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood of the people of Alaska and Hawaii, and endorses the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

"JUNE 19–22, 1949.

"X. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

"The Governors' conference urges the Congress promptly to enact enabling legislation to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

"IV. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

"(Resolution adopted by the western Governors' conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 7–8, 1949)

"The last three national Governors' conferences have adopted resolutions urging the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

"Since in two successive Congresses, the 80th and the 81st, the committees to which were referred the bills providing statehood for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii have reported favorably thereon, the conference of western Governors now urges the Congress to act on this legislation at the coming session and speed the admission of the 49th and 50th States."

Governor WARREN. While I am not chairman of the national conference, it also has adopted resolutions recommending statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator ANDERSON. If there is no objection, we will hear the Governor at this time on Hawaii also.

Senator BUTLER. While their resolution was on the question of statehood for Hawaii, it was not on H.R. 331

Governor WARREN. That is true.

Senator BUTLER. There is a vast difference between the two, you understand that.

Governor WARREN. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. I am strong for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, under proper conditions, but I do not think they are getting anything like a fair deal under H.R. 331. Of course, I am open to conviction. Maybe the Governor over there can convert me before we are through taking his statement.

Governor WARREN. No, Senator; our resolutions were directed to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii now, not at some distant date in the future. We are for statehood now. As to the terms and conditions of the admission, we have little knowledge and have nothing to urge at this particular time.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Governor, may I ask you if your conference made any recommendations as to the provisions under which Alaska should be admitted as a State?

Governor WARREN. No; we did not. I can say to you, from a discussion with all of the members of the conference, that it was hoped that it would be under conditions that were most favorable to a State, a new State that would have a very hard job to do, and certainly on terms equal to those that have heretofore been granted to other States as they were admitted to the Union.

Senator ECTON. Thank you.

Senator LEHMAN. Governor, may I ask you this question: I want to emphasize that resolution of the national conference of Governors, of which I was a member for a great many years, is pretty significant, because it is not just one of these hurried resolutions that are acted upon after 5 minutes' consideration. Those resolutions are first submitted and discussed by the executive committee, and then a statement is made to the entire conference, so they did receive very careful consideration.

Governor WARREN. Yes. It so happens, Senator, that I was both on the executive committee and on the resolutions committee, and I know that is true, and that it was considered very seriously by the executive committee and at the conference itself. The resolutions committee gave a great deal of time to the consideration of these resolutions.

Senator LEHMAN. That was my question. Thank you.

Senator ANDERSON. How unanimous was their action? Was it close or overwhelming?

Governor WARREN. It was unanimous, Senator, because we have the rule in the Governors' conference, both in our national conference and in our western conference, that we do not adopt resolutions unless they are unanimous.

Senator ANDERSON. That would be a very good rule to have here.

Governor WARREN. The reason for that is because there is so much diversity of opinion, the country is so complex, and unless we can arrive at a unanimous conclusion we do not think it would serve any great purpose.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you for your statement.

Now, if you will proceed with the question of Hawaii.

Governor WARREN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me everything that I have said concerning Alaska could well be said concerning Hawaii, and I can add to that also the fact that California has been particularly close to Hawaii for a great many years, and we feel our economic relations and our social relations with the islands at this time, and for many years in the past, have been just as close as with any of the States of the Union, and much closer than with many of the States of the Union.

We believe that Hawaii, having been a Territory for 52 years and having been an outpost for this country during two wars, and having served faithfully in both of those wars, has earned statehood, if it is possible for any people to earn statehood.

We believe that the islands have the resources and the ability to take care of themselves, and having paid into the United States Treasury, as I am informed, much more than they have ever received from it, they are well able to govern themselves, to finance themselves in every respect.

We believe that a half million people in those islands to be deprived of full citizenship for any greater length of time would be an injustice to them and would be a reflection upon the integration of the principles that we have expressed in the United Nations, and otherwise. In California we feel very earnestly that Hawaii should be admitted to the Union at the earliest possible day.

Senator ANDERSON. Are there any questions of Governor Warren by any members of the committee?

Senator BUTLER. Governor, I just have one question.

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator BUTLER. I have the impression that there would be very little opposition, if any, to the admission of Hawaii to statehood as a part of California.

Governor WARREN. Well, Senator Butler, we are pretty aggressive out there in California in a lot of ways, but I never have heard California express the desire to take Hawaii into the territorial limits of California.

Senator BUTLER. Well, they are fine people.

Governor WARREN. I have never heard a public discussion of that in my State, where any Californians have ever advocated that. I feel certain that if it were advocated it would be overwhelmingly repudiated, not because we do not like the people of Hawaii, but because we do not want to force ourselves upon them. We believe it would be unfair to them, we believe they would resent it, and there isn't any reason that we can see why those islands at that distance should become a part of the jurisdiction of any State on the mainland.

Senator BUTLER. The distance you said a while ago was no factor in this matter, and I think so, myself—I agree with you in that—but I do think the economy being built largely around sugar in Hawaii, almost entirely on sugar, and the economy and social relations having been so close over the years, that it would not be a bit different than adding another county down below the southern California line, if that was possible.

Governor WARREN. Senator, a difference for one purpose might be one thing, and for another purpose it might be something entirely different. So far as becoming an integral part of the Union and as one of the States of the Union, it seems to me that the distance between the mainland and Hawaii is insignificant, but when it comes to a question of local government in each of these islands in the Hawaiian group, making them counties of California, it seems to me it would present problems that might be insurmountable.

Senator BUTLER. I do not think it would present any problems that would be insurmountable for the State of California any more than for the United States Government.

Governor WARREN. That is, of course, Senator, local government and on a different footing and representation in a State legislature, which, it seems to me, is on a far more intimate basis and on a far more local basis than representation in the Congress of the United States and in the other agencies of the Government.

Senator ANDERSON. Are there any additional questions? If not, thank you very much, Governor, and if you, or the associations to which you referred, desire to make any supplementary statement, we would be glad to have it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Lastly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter dated March 10, 1957, addressed to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia

[Mr. BYRD] by the Secretary of the Interior, together with the enclosures. This letter contains highly important and significant information with respect to the Territory of Hawaii that bears directly on the issue of statehood.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1959.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: We have your letter of February 20 and are pleased to provide you the following information concerning Hawaii.

Hawaii was annexed to the United States on July 7, 1898, by request of the Hawaiian Legislature and pursuant to a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress. Formal transfer took place on August 12, 1898. Upon the enactment by the Congress of its Organic Act on April 30, 1900, Hawaii became an incorporated, organized Territory of the United States. United States citizenship was at the same time conferred upon the citizens of the former Republic.

According to the 1950 Census, Hawaii's civilian population was 476,913. The present civilian population is estimated to be approximately 578,000. The enclosed table lists by racial ancestry Hawaii's population in 1950, and in January 1958. We do not know the number of aliens by race group. Of the present civilian population, however, about 85 percent are American-born or naturalized U.S. citizens.

The economy of Hawaii is well developed and prosperous.

Among civilian industries agriculture is still the major source of income, although manufacturing and tourism are growing rapidly.

Significant economic data are as follows (all figures 1957):

Sugar production: Tonnage, 1,084,646; value, $146 million.

Pineapple: Exports, cases canned, 30,787,208; value, $110,200,000.

Other agriculture: Value, $45,823,000.

Tourism: Number of visitors spending 2 days or more in the islands, 168,829; tourist expenditures, $77,600,000.

Manufacturing: $101,955,824.

Retailing: $666,467,660.

Wholesaling: $277,650,632.

All services: $128,548,264.

Armed Forces expenditures, appropriated funds: Civilian payroll, $97,828,000; military payroll, $141,182,000; goods and services, $68,930,000.

In terms of average incomes and standards of living, Hawaii compares well with stateside averages. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, total personal income in Hawaii in 1957 was $1,098 million, a figure greater than that of eight of the present States. Average personal income per capita in Hawaii in 1957 was $1,821, a figure which places Hawaii ahead of 24 of the present States in this respect. From 1956 to 1957, Hawaii showed a gain in total personal income of 7 percent, slightly larger than the 5 percent gain of the continental United States. From 1950 to 1957 Hawaii gained 59 percent in total personal income, again somewhat larger than the 53 percent gain for the continental United States for this period.

The present trend of income and economic development continues to be upward, particularly in such fields as tourism and light manufacturing. For example, the number of visitors staying 2 days or more increased from 46,593 in 1950 to 168,829 in 1957, and private investment in tourist facilities such as resort hotels is growing at a rapid rate. Recent discoveries of tremendous deposits of bauxite offer hopes of adding a new mineral industry to the Territory's economy. Certain branches of agriculture likewise are capable of expansion; however, the land resources of the islands are generally well developed and further increase in agricultural production may well be limited by the limited acreage of land yet available.

Shipments to Hawaii from the continental United States and imports from foreign countries in 1957 amounted to $488 million, of which all except $24 million represented purchases from the mainland. We assume that this figure of $488 million may be taken as representing Hawaii's requirement during a prosperous year for goods to be brought in from outside the islands. To pay for this level of imports and sustain her economy, Hawaii provides the United States with about one-eighth of our sugar needs, 85 percent of our canned pineapple, and miscellaneous other products, and bolsters her income with tourism and with the provision of goods and services to military and Federal civilian personnel stationed there.

Hawaii is also a taxpaying partner of the present States on a large scale. Residents of Hawaii all pay the same taxes to the Federal Treasury as do residents of the present 49 States. In 1957 payments to the Federal Government by Hawaiian residents amounted to $183 million, compared with total Federal expenditures in Hawaii (other than military expenditures) of $77 million.

At present, the Territorial government of Hawaii is solvent and well-financed from adequate local revenue sources. From its local revenues it provides the whole range of services (education, health, highway construction and maintenance, Territorial institutions, etc.) commonly provided by any State for its own people, and on a comparable scale. The grant of statehood would make little difference to the fiscal position of the government of Hawaii or to the Territorial taxpayer of Hawaii, since virtually all the costs of government services at the Territorial-local level are already defrayed from local revenues.

With respect to Federal assistance, Hawaii receives generally the same treatment as do the States on most Federal grant programs, such as public assistance under the Social Security Act, wildlife and fish restoration, aids for agricultural extension work, and the like. In these cases Hawaii's apportionment is generally computed on the same basis as any State's, and Hawaii's matching requirement is generally the same.

The only items of Federal expenditure peculiarly attributable to Hawaii's territorial status are the salaries of the Governor, government secretary, one other person in the Governor's office, and the members of the territorial legislature (for one session per biennium only), and a portion of the salaries of 14 territorial judges. The total of these items amounts to an average of $231,775, per year. This figure represents the additional cost of statehood to Hawaiian taxpayers. It represents about one-quarter of one percent of the territorial budget.

With respect to revenue sources and territorial expenditures, we enclose a copy of the Governor's 1957 annual report, which gives some data on pages 11 through 15. The 1958 report, now being printed, will give somewhat more detail. Although the latter report is not yet available for distribution, we enclose copies of pages 15 through 17 of the page proof, which include all the financial tables.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Copy to Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

Latest population figures show proportionate increases in the Territory's Caucasian and part-Hawaiian groups. All other groups show relative declines except the Negro which remained the same. All groups showed numerical increases except the Hawaiian. Breakdown by race is as follows:

	1950		1958	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Hawaiian	2.5	11,786	2.0	11,390
Part-Hawaiian	14.8	69,774	16.0	91,120
Caucasian	23.0	108,433	25.0	142,376
Chinese	6.5	30,644	6.0	34,170
Filipino	12.2	57,517	12.0	68,341
Japanese	36.9	173,564	35.0	199,326
Korean	1.4	6,600	1.3	7,404
Negro	.5	2,357	.5	2,848
Puerto Rican	1.9	8,958	1.8	10,251
Other	.3	1,414	.4	2,278
Total	100.0	471,447	100.0	569,504

Source: Department of sociology, University of Hawaii; Department of Health, Bureau of Health Statistics; EIA Market Data Department, January 3, 1958.

Comparative statement of tax collections for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1957 and 1958

Source of revenue	Fiscal year 1956-57	Fiscal year 1957-58	Increase or decrease [1]	Percentage
Bank—Financial corporations	$217,761	$281,610	$63,849	29.32
Compensation and dividends	13,217,451	9,283,208	[1] 3,984,243	[1] 30.14
Declarations of estimated taxes—corporation		143	(3)	
Declarations of estimated taxes—individual		1,701,608	(3)	
Employment security contributions	2,835,967	3,104,358	268,301	9.46
Fuel	11,873,574	12,317,869	444,295	3.74
Fuel retail permits		5,030	(3)	
General excise, consumption and compensating	38,138,517	48,621,304	10,482,787	27.49
Inheritance and estate	426,605	338,604	[1] 88,001	[1] 20.63
Insurance premiums	1,229,012	1,382,782	153,770	12.51
Liquor and permits	2,173,822	2,750,252	576,430	26.52
Net income—corporations	$4,163,393	$4,616,256	$453,863	$10.90
Net income—individual	2,113,435	2,459,712	346,277	16.38
Public utilities	3,003,093	3,382,493	379,400	12.63
Public welfare [2]	891	321	[1] 570	(3)
Real property appeal deposits		87	(3)	
Tobacco and licenses	1,249,024	1,698,496	449,472	35.99
Withholding on wages		6,090,047	(3)	
Total	80,641,545	97,984,180	17,342,635	21.51
Personal property [4]	13	67	54	(3)
Real property [5]	6,604,069	22,505,739	15,901,670	(4)
Grand total	87,245,627	120,489,986	33,244,359	(4)

[1] Decreases.
[2] Repealed July 1, 1943.
[3] Not applicable.
[4] Repealed Jan. 1, 1948.
[5] Data not comparable as fiscal year 1957-58 includes double real property tax, while fiscal year 1956-57 has no current collections due in both instances to delays in setting tax rates in legislative years.

Comparative statement showing allocation of fiscal year tax collections

	Fiscal year 1956–57	Fiscal year 1957–58	Increase or decrease	Percentage
Territorial funds:				
Territorial general	$52,934,218	$68,693,179	$15,758,961	29.77
Territorial highway	6,583,622	6,589,851	6,229	.09
Territorial airport	1,286,373	1,376,451	90,078	7.00
Small boat harbor maintenance	63,873	61,452	[1] 2,421	[1] 3.79
Employment security contributions	2,835,967	3,104,358	268,391	9.46
Subtotal—Territory	63,704,053	79,825,291	16,121,238	25.31
County revenues:				
General excise	$12,997,786	$13,868,774	$870,988	6.70
Property	6,604,082	22,505,806	15,901,724	(2)
Fuel	3,939,706	4,290,115	350,409	8.89
Subtotal—County	23,541,574	40,664,695	17,123,121	(2)
Grand total	87,245,627	120,489,986	33,244,359	(2)

[1] Decreases.
[2] Data not comparable as fiscal year 1957–58 includes double real property tax, while fiscal year 1956–57 has no current collections due in both instances to delays in setting tax rates in legislative years.

Trend in economic conditions as reflected by business volume, wages, dividends, gasoline consumption, etc., on a comparative basis for the 2 fiscal years are summarized from information obtained from current year's tax returns

Taxable base	Fiscal year 1956–57	Fiscal year 1957–58	Increase or decrease [1 2]	Percentage
Gross business volume	$1,656,980,356	$1,751,964,045	$94,983,689	5.73
Retail sales	623,205,275	651,045,853	27,840,578	4.47
Wholesale sales	271,065,785	279,561,345	8,495,560	3.13
Sugar sales	113,394,923	96,680,488	[1] 16,714,435	[1] 14.74
Canning (pineapple sales, etc.)	96,546,681	99,121,036	2,574,355	2.67
Manufacturing	103,577,508	106,324,191	2,746,683	2.65
Producing	42,404,841	48,971,289	6,566,448	15.49
Contracting	113,373,993	139,094,833	25,720,840	22.69
New business licenses issued	8,265	7,736	[1] 529	[1] 6.40
Licenses canceled	7,472	5,822	[1] 1,650	[1] 22.08
Total number of licenses issued	45,517	44,613	[1] 904	[1] 1.99
Wholesale value of tobacco sales	$8,326,891	$8,769,896	$443,005	5.32
Wholesale value of liquor sales	18,054,716	17,858,027	196,689	1.09
Salaries and wages [3]	600,741,218	412,080,077	[1] 88,661,141	31.40
Dividends [3]	42,581,887	34,722,523	7,859,364	18.46
Withholding on wages		230,223,539	(3)	
Gasoline consumption ... gallons	116,926,239	117,662,736	736,497	.63
Diesel oil consumption ... do	23,575,538	21,477,795	[1] 2,097,743	[1] 8.90
Aviation gasoline consumption gallons	36,753,517	39,327,176	2,573,659	7.00
Butane consumption ... do	161,130	206,795	45,665	28.34
Small boat harbor maintenance gallons	3,843,160	3,684,210	[1] 158,950	[1] 4.14

[1] Decreases.
[2] Repealed Jan. 1, 1958.
[3] Not applicable.

Comparative real property tax values and other related data covering the entire Territory

Items	As of Jan. 1, 1957	Percent to total	As of Jan. 1, 1958	Percent to total
Assessor's gross valuation:				
Land	$966,657,339	50.00	$1,021,591,382	49.75
Buildings	966,667,881	50.00	1,031,818,707	50.25
Total	1,933,325,220	100.00	2,053,410,089	100.00
Exemptions:				
United States	421,810,647	21.82	453,879,623	22.10
Territory of Hawaii	147,239,155	7.62	166,142,921	8.09
Counties	68,495,407	3.54	75,331,271	3.67
Homes (fee and leaseholds):				
(1957) 50,774	150,598,578	7.79		
(1958) 52,714			156,380,468	7.62
Public utilities	30,322,089	1.57	31,199,893	1.52
Exemptions—Continued				
All others	$80,445,345	4.16	$84,520,451	4.12
Total exemptions	898,911,221	46.50	967,454,627	47.12
Assessor's net taxable values	1,034,413,999	53.50	1,085,955,462	52.88
Valuations on appeal	10,109,014		9,380,720	
Taxpayers net valuation	1,024,304,985		1,076,574,742	
50 percent of valuation on appeal	5,054,508		4,690,360	
Net valuation for tax rate purposes	1,029,359,493	53.24	1,081,265,102	52.66
Amount raised by taxation	15,649,187		16,637,902	
Average rate per $1,000 value	15.20		15.39	

Summary analysis of the finances of the Territory of Hawaii for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958

	General fund	Special funds	Bond funds	Total
The Territory received from:				
Taxes	$68,692,073.77	$11,271,419.06		$79,963,492.83
Nontaxes	14,065,273.69	28,471,911.28	$27,800,000.00	70,337,184.97
Total receipts	82,757,347.46	39,743,330.34	27,800,000.00	150,300,677.80
Available cash at beginning of year	(3,923,368.93)	30,488,715.32	7,296,311.99	33,861,658.38
Total resources	78,833,978.53	70,232,045.66	35,096,311.99	184,162,336.18
The Territory paid out	77,626,678.20	38,497,314.20	26,964,952.84	143,088,945.24
Available cash at close of year	1,207,300.33	31,734,731.46	8,131,359.15	41,073,390.94
The cost of operating the Territorial Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, is detailed below by major functions and activities:				
Schools	29,537,176.96	7,460,226.32	437,536.32	37,434,939.60
Highways	17,523.41	9,930,613.26	9,931,911.08	19,880,047.75
Public safety	3,440,082.88	5,231,630.97	128,609.08	8,800,322.93
Hospitals	8,073,087.42	663,577.02	224,842.84	8,961,507.28
Public welfare	9,047,968.93	96,152.44	62,465.53	9,206,586.90
Utilities or other enterprises	88.54	4,057,837.14	3,936,680.22	7,994,605.90
General government	5,686,257.09	188,137.97	134,809.11	6,009,204.17
Health	2,570,531.12	625,517.64	41,397.50	3,237,446.26
Development and conservation of natural resources	2,769,172.08	1,078,951.51	775,482.42	4,623,606.01
Libraries	884,551.44	72,516.61	771.76	957,839.81
Miscellaneous	7,901,320.13	2,925,206.37	5,654,559.54	16,481,086.04
Loans to counties from bond funds			5,635,887.44	5,635,887.44
Purchase of investments	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00		4,000,000.00
Bond redemptions and interest expense	5,698,918.20			5,698,918.20
Unemployment compensation and benefits payments		4,166,946.95		4,166,946.95
Total	77,626,678.20	38,497,314.20	26,964,952.84	143,088,945.24

EDUCATION—DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

The increasing school population with its concomitant factors has continued to be one of the most important issues with which the public school system of Hawaii has had to contend. It has been made more acute by the fact that practically the entire increase has been on the island of Oahu, and more especially in rural Oahu. Most of the military installations are in rural Oahu, but many civilian housing projects are also rapidly being constructed in that area.

The geographical location of the increases are shown in the following table representing the five administrative districts of the Department of Public Instruction for Hawaii's territory:

	Honolulu	Rural Oahu	Hawaii	Maui	Kauai
Enrollment Jan. 1, 1957	50,240	38,723	17,491	11,511	6,892
Enrollment Jan. 1, 1958	52,153	42,471	17,341	11,294	6,899
Percentage increase	3.8	9.7	−0.9	−1.9	0.1

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this concludes my remarks, at least for the time being.

I hope that before this legislative day is concluded the Senate once again will have approved the admission of Hawaii, with its more than 600,000 patriotic, vigorous, resourceful American citizens, to the Union. This year, I hope and believe, the House of Representatives will do likewise. At this precise moment the House bill for statehood for Hawaii is being debated over on the other side of the Hill.

Welcome to Hawaii.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, during my service in the U.S. Senate I have spoken to many people in my own State and throughout the country concerning statehood for Hawaii. As a member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I made a trip to the Hawaiian Islands in 1953 for the purpose of ascertaining the feelings of the Hawaiians on the question of statehood and to gather information on many questions that had troubled me and others to whom I had spoken.

As a result of my study of this situation, I became convinced that to deny to the people of Hawaii the right to be a sovereign State in these United States of America was a grave injustice.

In previous Congresses, as in this Congress, I have sponsored legislation to bring Hawaii into full partnership in our Union of States. I am convinced that we should take this action for many reasons.

Over 100 years ago, the people of Hawaii asked to become a part of the United States. President Franklin Pierce supported negotiations to that end. In 1894, Hawaii became a Republic and 3 years later the new Republic offered to surrender its sovereignty for eventual statehood. The following year the United States annexed Hawaii by joint resolution of Congress under the same procedure by which Texas became part of the Union.

To deny Hawaii the right to become a State now would be to oppose the very purpose for which she gave up her sovereignty.

Since 1898, the people of Hawaii have repeatedly petitioned for the right to become a State. They are subject to Federal laws and pay Federal taxes. They do not want Commonwealth status, which is a step leading toward sovereignty. The people of Hawaii expressly gave up their sovereignty to become a part of the Union.

The right of the people of Hawaii to a State government and to representation in Congress should not be governed by geographical limits, and particularly so in this age of rapid communication. I have no fears for the United States on this account.

I am in favor of Hawaiian statehood, and I do not agree with those who do not trust the democratic processes to operate successfully in Hawaii.

The people of Hawaii have much higher educational standards than the average within the United States. They have a very low rate of illiteracy. Their per capita tax payments to the Federal Government are far greater than the national average.

I believe a serious error would be made to conclude that the problem of maintaining peace and good will between members of the Caucasian and Negro races applies to the situation in Hawaii. There the citizens of Japanese ancestry slightly outnumber the Caucasians. Those of Hawaiian, Philippine, and Chinese ancestry are also present in large numbers. Less than 1 percent of the population of Hawaii are of Negro ancestry.

With regard to the matter of Communist influence, according to my information, the actual number of Communists there is small. The latest figures from the Subversive Activities Commission for the Territory of Hawaii estimate that there are only fifteen hard shelled Communists left in the Isands. Hawaii is to be commended for establishing its own Subversive Activities Commission—something which very few States have done. In every State in the Union, it is probable that there is a handful of Communists. However, this does not mean that the vast majority of people in every State are not loyal Americans.

At this time, I would like to pay special tribute to the present Delegate from Hawaii, JACK BURNS. During World War II, JACK BURNS was responsible for the investigation of subversives and those whose interests were inimical to the United States. Many will recall that he was publicly cited for his work in persuading defection from the Communist Party.

It is gratifying to know that the present Delegate from Hawaii is a man who did much to defeat and destroy the influence of those who were unsympathetic to American ideals.

In the Second World War the Hawaiians proved their loyalty and dedication to the principles on which our country is founded. The degree of patriotism evidenced by Japanese of American ancestry during World War II is revealed by the gallant record of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, which was not excelled by any fighting unit serving under the Stars and Stripes. This unit sustained more casualties and received more decorations than any unit its size fighting for America in the Second World War. Not a single man surrendered to the enemy and only one was captured after he had been totally disabled. On one occasion this unit volunteered to rescue a Texas battalion that had been cut off by the Germans. Although they succeeded in their mission, they suffered more casualties in the operation than there were Texans left to be rescued.

The history of the expansion of our Union through granting statehood to new Territories is very enlightening in connection with the arguments being used to oppose statehood for Hawaii. 1953 was the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. In studying my history at the time of this anniversary, I was impressed with the fact that today's opponents of statehood advance substantially the same arguments used by their predecessors in opposing all additions to the Original Thirteen States.

The Louisiana Purchase doubled the size of our new Nation. It was the biggest real estate bargain of all time since the Federal Government paid an average of only 3 cents per acre.

However, Representative Griswold, of Connecticut, on October 25, 1803, in opposing the acquisition of this new Territory, argued as follows:

> It is not consistent with the spirit of a republican government that its territory should be exceedingly large; for as you extend your limits, you increase the difficulties arising from a want of that similarity of customs, habits, and manners so essential for its support.

Senator Plumer of New Hampshire, on this same day, predicted:

> Admit this western world into the Union and you destroy at once the weight and importance of the Eastern States and compel them to establish a separate independent empire.

Senator James White, of Delaware, spoke out against Senate ratification of the Treaty of Acquisition in the following words:

> It may be productive of innumerable evils and especially of one that I fear to ever look upon. Thus our citizens will be removed to the immense distances of two or three thousand miles from the Capital of the Union, where they will scarcely ever feel the rays of the Central Government—their affections will become alienated; they will gradually begin to view us as strangers; they will form other commercial connections and our interests will become distinct. Even supposing that this extent of territory was a desirable acquisition, $15 million was a most enormous sum to give.
>
> We have already territory enough, and when I contemplate the evils that may arise to these States from this intended incorporation of Louisiana into the Union, I would rather see it given to France, to Spain, or to any other nation of the earth upon the mere condition that no citizen of the United States should ever settle within its limits. (The Louisiana Purchase, GPO, 1900, pp. 37–38.)

The passage of time has shown how ridiculous these arguments are that "affections will become alienated" and that "they will gradually begin to view us as strangers." It is hard for us to believe in this day and time that our Congressmen and Senators in the early 19th century could have been so shortsighted.

In 1811, when the area which I have the great honor to represent in this body, asked that interim territorial government be exchanged for statehood, Representative Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, felt that it would be better to destroy the Union rather than admit "these westerners." I quote his remarks:

> The bonds of the Union must be dissolved rather than admit these westerners. As it will be the right of all, so will it be the duty of some to prepare definitely for a separation, amicably if they can, violently if they must." (Yankee From Olympus, Bowen: Little, Brown & Co., p. 27.)

Eight years later, when Alabama petitioned for statehood, he became even

more abusive in his opposition to taking in new States:

> You have no authority to throw the rights and property of the people into the hodgepodge with the wildmen of the Missouri, nor with the mixed, though more responsible race of Anglo-Hispano-Gallo-Americans who bask on the sands in the mouth of the Mississippi. Do you suppose the people of the Northern and Atlantic States will, or ought to look with patience and see Representatives and Senators * * * pouring themselves upon this and the other floor, managing the concern of a seaboard 1,500 miles, at least, from their residence? (Ibid., p. 35.)

Every past effort to peacably bring in new States has met with similar disapproval. A few illustrations of this point will show that objections have not been restricted to any specific area. Western, eastern, northern, and southern Territories have had to contend with the same arguments when they strove to claim their full birthright as citizens of this great country.

The admission of California to the Union was filibustered in the Senate. An Ohio Senator predicted:

> With all its extent, California will never sustain one-half the population of Ohio, not one-half. The population of California will be very small indeed. (H. Rept. No. 109, 83d Cong., p. 70.)

Incidentally, it is estimated that California's population is now almost 14 million while Ohio's is slightly more than 9 million.

Oregon also faced opposition in the Senate in January 1843, when it petitioned for statehood. Senator McDuffie said:

> What is the nature of this country? Why, as I understand it, 700 miles this side of the Rocky Mountains is uninhabitable; a region where rain seldom falls; a barren, sandy soil; mountains totally impassable. Have you made anything like an estimate of the cost of a railroad from here to the Columbia (River)? Why, the wealth of the Indies would be insufficient. Of what use will this be for agricultural purposes? Why, I would not, for that purpose, give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory. I thank God for His mercy in placing the Rocky Mountains there.

When Mississippi asked to be admitted, the House Committee Report submitted December 23, 1816, stated:

> Your committee beg leave to remark that they cannot believe a State of such unprecedented magnitude as the one contemplated by the memorialists can be desirable to any section of the United States. Between the Tennessee and the Mississippi settlement there is not, and probably never will be, any commercial interest whatever.

In 1845, Florida's admission was attacked in Congress because a large part of the population consisted of Indians and Negroes, and because of the Spanish ancestry of many of her white citizens. When Arizona sought admission early in this century, Senator Henry E. Burnham of New Hampshire, a member of the Senate Committee on Territories, spoke for 3 days against statehood, criticizing the wide usage of the Spanish language in these States and holding that New Mexico and Arizona did not have sufficient population and natural resources to become prosperous members of the Union.

It is well known that the purchase of Alaska brought ridicule and abuse upon the head of Secretary Seward. The United States paid only $7,200,000 for the territory which has become our newest State and whose two distinguished Senators we were so happy to welcome to this body at the opening of the session. And yet, Representative W. F. Butler, of Massachusetts, on July 7, 1868, spoke out against ratification of the treaty of cession as follows:

> If we are to pay for Russia's friendship I desire to give her the $7,200,000 and let her keep Alaska. I have no doubt that any time within the last 20 years we could have had Alaska for the asking. No man, except one insane enough to buy the earthquakes in St. Thomas and the ice fields in Greenland, could be found to agree to any other terms for its acquisition by the country.

We would do well to pause and be thankful for the wisdom of our leaders who secured Alaska for our great country. If Alaska at present were a part of the U.S.S.R., our situation today in world politics would be far less tenable than it is.

It would be well for those who oppose the admission of Hawaii to recall that, without a single exception in our history, the addition of each new State has done more than merely enlarge our Nation; in each instance our country has been morally enriched and physically strengthened in the process.

Our country has become the great Nation that it is today largely because of statesmen in past Congresses whose sound judgment, foresight, and moral courage prevailed in the face of opposition to new States. Theirs was the vision to perceive that each new State brought into our Union resources and qualities which all of us today recognize to be indispensable ingredients of our national character. No one would care to dispute the fact that the United States would be much the poorer had Alabama, California, Louisiana, Oregon, or Texas been denied statehood. If these early critics of bringing new States into the Union had prevailed, the United States would now be composed of 13 States and a vast territory administered by even more Washington bureaucrats. And let us not forget that in every case each one of the 36 new States of our Union has faced the same kind of vigorous opposition that faces Hawaii today.

It is indeed fortunate that at these critical times in our history, our Congresses were peopled with men like Senator Breckenridge of Kentucky, whose reply to Louisiana's detractors in 1803 is as applicable today as it was 150 years ago:

> Is the goddess of liberty restrained by water courses? Is she governed by geographical limits? Is her dominion on this continent confined to the east side of the Mississippi? So far from believing in the doctrine that a republic ought to be confined within narrow limits, I believe, on the contrary, that the more extensive its dominion, the more safe and more durable it will be. In proportion to the number of hands you entrust the precious blessings of a free government to, in the same proportion do you multiply the chances for their preservation. I entertain, therefore, no fears for the Union on account of its extent.

Americans will always venerate the Jeffersons, the Livingstons, the Monroes. On the other hand, as the historian, Tallant, says:

> As to those who opposed, most of them faded into obscurity.

Is there reason for us to feel that future historians would be kinder to us if we failed to bring Hawaii into our Union?

A recent Gallup poll has shown that our citizens are in favor of Hawaiian statehood by more than 8 to 1. There is certainly no doubt that the vast majority of the citizens of the Hawaiian Islands wish to be full partners in our Union of States. It is my feeling that it would be a grave injustice to delay any longer in granting statehood to these loyal Americans.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we are fast approaching the hour of decision on whether Hawaii is to become our 50th State.

If our answer is "yes," then we will have welcomed into the Union, as an integral part of our country, the last of our incorporated Territories. Statehood will confer upon the people of the islands, long since citizens of the United States, fundamental rights of self-government equal to our own. They will then elect their Governor, as we do ours; they will then be entitled to two U.S. Senators and a voting Representative in the Congress; and they will participate with us, every fourth year, in the election of the President.

But if our answer should be "no," let no one be deceived into believing that Hawaii will remain indefinitely an American Territory. To be neither in nor out, but to stay a colony, is no more acceptable to our fellow Americans in Hawaii, than it was to our own forefathers. They were subjects of the English King; they bore arms in his defense, and paid the taxes he levied upon them. Again and again, they petitioned him, through his appointed Governors, for redress of their grievances, but he refused to grant them more than limited rights of self-government. So, their call to reason, "No taxation without representation," became, at last, a call to arms.

Yet, despite this national birthright, we are today denying our fellow citizens in Hawaii many of the same prerogatives refused our forefathers by George III. In 1957, the Hawaiians paid over $150 million in Federal taxes, a larger total than several of the existing States, but Hawaii had no representation in Congress to vote either on how much tax should be collected, or upon how the money should be spent. In time of war, Hawaiians shoulder arms with the rest of us, yet they cannot vote for the President who shapes their foreign policy, or for Representatives in Congress who together hold the purse strings over their defense.

To remedy these inequities, the people of Hawaii want statehood. They are tired of standing, hat in hand, at the door of our Union. But what we must understand is this: If we refuse to let them further in, they will, in due course, demand to be let further out.

That we actually face a choice between these alternatives, my recent visit in Hawaii has convinced me. There, I was privileged, as one of five Members of Congress from the Interior Committees of both Houses, to conduct a joint investigation of the statehood question. The House committee was represented by B. F. SISK, Democrat of California; E. Y. BERRY, Republican of South Dakota; LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democrat of New York; while my colleague, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. JOHN CARROLL, and I, represented this committee of the Senate. We talked with hundreds of Hawaiians from all walks of life. We listened to every argument, pro and con. The consensus of this opinion, together with the most current information we could gather about social, economic, and political conditions in Hawaii, left me strongly persuaded the islands are ready for statehood, and we had best admit them now.

There is no doubt but what the vast majority of Hawaiians favor statehood. Even before Pearl Harbor, a plebiscite showed the population endorsing statehood by a margin of 2 to 1. Since then, support for statehood has steadily grown stronger. In 1950, a proposed Hawaii State constitution was approved by the people of the Territory by a vote of more than 3 to 1. Today, I would judge that the Hawaiians want statehood fully as much as did the Alaskans, who, a short 6 months ago, proved their sentiments when five out of six voted to ratify the bill admitting Alaska as the 49th State.

The proponents of Hawaiian statehood believe their case just as deserving as was that of Alaska. Indeed, the islands' economy is far more developed. Sugar and pineapple are produced in abundance by the best paid field workers in the world. The export of Kona coffee is increasing. On the large island of Hawaii itself, the 300,000 acre Parker Ranch, next to the world's largest ranch for Herefords, is a sight for a westerner who believes that the cattle country is limited to the highlands of the mountainous West; while to every island tourists come in burgeoning numbers, beckoned by the gentle tradewinds, in quest of the dazzling beaches and inviting waters. Hawaii, for all its tropical beauty, is bustling and prosperous. No one can charge it with being a "poor relation."

In other ways, too, Hawaii meets all the traditional tests for statehood. Its population of more than 550,000 exceeds that of 5 present States, and closely approaches that of my own State of Idaho. Its islands comprise an area of 6,423 square miles, making it larger than Delaware, Rhode Island, or Connecticut. Those who remonstrate that Hawaii is too remote, fail to reckon with the age we live in. From Boise city, the capital of my State, Honolulu can be as quickly reached by air as Washington, D.C.

Finally, the loyalty of the people of Hawaii has been proven in the hardest of tests. Americans of Japanese ancestry constitute more than a third of the population of Hawaii. Yet, when the Japanese torpedo bomber devastated our Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor, and the threat of imminent invasion haunted the islands for months following, not a single act of sabotage was ever traced to a resident Japanese American. Rather, the young Japanese volunteered by the thousands for army service. In the Italian campaign, their casualties were so heavy that their famous outfit was dubbed "the Purple Heart Battalion," winning seven separate Presidential Citations for valor.

It is true that Hawaii is the melting pot of the Pacific. The people are a polyglot mixture of native Hawaiian, Caucasian, Japanese, Filipinos, and Chinese, and the crosses between. But it is also true that Hawaiian life and culture, though it clings naturally to many happy phrases, songs, and customs of its colorful past, is nevertheless essentially American. The cities, the stores, the homes, streets, and schools, all bear the unmistakable stamp of the United States.

We met with public officials and private citizens alike, with teachers and students, with judges and housewives. We talked with businessmen and labor leaders. I had a morning's conference with the presidents of the Big Five, the dominant commercial interests that were once opposed to statehood, but now favor it.

When we left the islands, I came away convinced that the interests of our country urgently require that statehood be no longer denied Hawaii. Already a Commonwealth Party has been activated there. I talked with several of its leaders, who would like to see Hawaii set loose from the United States, absolved of all Federal taxes, and granted full rights of self-government, while the people retained for themselves American citizenship and the continued protection of the American flag. Patterned after the British system, the commonwealth idea is alien to our American tradition of building one Nation, rather than a loose-knit empire.

Today, the Commonwealth Party in Hawaii is small. The people of the islands are not seeking such a free ride. But if statehood is refused Hawaii, the commonwealth idea will grow rapidly. I shall not forget the parting word of one prominent commonwealth proponent. "Senator," he said to me, "right now, the people of these islands want statehood. If you refuse it, they will turn to our solution, and the time will come when you will have to recognize the independent Commonwealth of Hawaii."

To us on the mainland, facing westward toward an Asia awakening from its ancient slumbers, Hawaii is much too vital not to be made an inseparable part of the United States.

Mr. President, we are acting today to fulfill a pledge we made less than a year ago—the pledge to take up a statehood bill for the Territory of Hawaii at an early date in the 86th Congress. I am very pleased that before the Ides of March are quite upon us, we have honored this pledge.

The bill before the Senate, Mr. President, is not pedestrian legislation. It has historic and unique significance. In these days of continuing world crisis, it cuts cross-grain to the negative course that seems to have befallen us. This bill embraces no design to counteract or to contain. Its whole object is to expand and to fulfill in our best tradition as a free nation.

If this bill is enacted, the year of our Lord 1959 will be remembered by our children, and our grandchildren after them, as the year the great American Union was completed. The admission of Hawaii, the last of our incorporated Territories, as our 50th State, will lay in place the finishing stone of the mighty edifice of our Republic, the building of which began 170 years ago.

And in the history of the Western World, Mr. President, the year of our Lord 1959 will be remembered and remarked upon as the year the United States put an end to the last major vestige of its adventure in colonialism. As Hawaii achieves statehood, becoming a full and equal partner in our Union, we signal to the world that the principles of freedom and self-government still burn brightly in our land. If, in the days of our infancy, we could ignite a flame of freedom so bright as to shine like a beacon around the world, then now, in the days of our greatness, we must not do less.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I believe it should be said that Hawaiian statehood would bolster American democracy in the Pacific, an area where American influence has suffered serious setbacks in recent years. The Communists have traded in propaganda concerning our differences and our conflicts. Not only would Hawaiian statehood bolster our military defenses and serve notice of our intention to remain in the Pacific, it would provide a State where the peoples of the Pacific and of Asia could study American traditions, where they could have visual proof that the east and west can meet, can live, and work together in peace and war, under the flag of freedom.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada has recalled, Senator Newlands of Nevada, worked hard for Hawaiian annexation when he was a Member of this body 61 years ago. Nevada, because of its service in the Civil War, became known as the Battle Born State. What better, modern example can we have today of Hawaii's loyalty than the courage and sacrifice of its citizens during the critical days of World War II?

Today, Hawaii, with its rich tradition in the service of democracy, holds perhaps an even more strategic role in the defense of America. The islands are rendering an invaluable aid to our preparedness, in furnishing strategic tracking stations for our space satellite program. Taking part in our satellite program are such vital Hawaiian installations as the Air Force Tracking Station at South Point on the southerly tip of the big island, the Smithsonian Institution Observatory Station on Maui, the Missile Tracking Station on Oahu and at our Naval Air Station in the islands, in addition to our permanent Naval, Air Force, and Army bases.

Mr. President, Hawaii is now U.S. soil, it will, regardless of what we do here today, remain U.S. soil, and surely must

one day—now, I hope—become a State. I believe this particular time, when expressions of our faith and hope for the future are so desperately needed, would be the most appropriate time for statehood. The Hawaiian people have demonstrated their citizenship and their Americanism. Let us, then, face up to our responsibility.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am proud to associate myself with legislation that will add the 50th star to the U.S. flag with the admission of Hawaii as a sovereign State.

Last year we fulfilled our obligation to Alaska and we can do no less this year for Hawaii. In fact, Mr. President, the arguments raised for and against the admission of Alaska as a State are equally relevant to the case for Hawaii.

The interest of my native State in Hawaii's destiny goes back many years. One of my illustrious predecessors, the late Senator Francis G. Newlands, introduced a resolution in Congress in 1898 which provided for the annexation to the United States of the Hawaiian Islands. At that time Mr. Newlands was a representative in Congress, and he was largely instrumental in gaining Territorial independence for the Republic of Hawaii.

To bolster the validity of the old saying that there is nothing new under the sun, I should like to point out that the argument of noncontiguity was raised by those who opposed the annexation of Hawaii more than 60 years ago. Senator Newlands' answer to this argument was contained in the following words:

> I shall assume that if the United States can acquire the island of Key West, off the coast of Florida, it can acquire the Hawaiian Islands, off the coast of California.

Another argument against Hawaii's becoming a State has been raised on the grounds of racial characteristics. I believe this argument can be leveled by the simple declaration, Mr. President, that the citizens of Hawaii are Americans. In this connection I shoud again like to quote Senator Newlands, who asserted in 1898—a little more than 60 years ago:

> Hawaii has already, by the peaceful processes of evolution, assimilated itself with us. For years it has been practically American. American ideas, American liberty, American civilization prevail there.

If that situation obtained more than six decades ago, it is all the more pronounced today.

Senator Newlands then prophetically pointed to Hawaii's strategic position as a defensive bastion in the Pacific. He declared:

> With these islands in our possession, no hostile attacking force could reach our Pacific coast from the Asiatic coast.

In 1910, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, Senator Newlands called for larger appropriations for the fortification of Hawaii. Again he demonstrated rare foresight in asserting:

> We are often told that the Pacific Ocean will be the theater sometime of a great naval war, and one of the chief arguments for the increase of our Navy is that in the future we will be menaced on the Pacific; that Japan's growing power there must sometime be met.

The ravage of Pearl Harbor and the terrible war that ensued gave grim testimony to the correctness of Senator Newlands' prophecies.

Another criticism against Hawaiian statehood is that the new State would have too much power because of the composition of its congressional delegation consisting of two Senators and one Representative. This old ghost is perennially paraded, but it evaporates in the face of the wisdom evidenced by our Founding Fathers when they decreed there should be two Senators from each State, regardless of population, as a proper measure of equality.

As the very able assistant majority leader the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said on the floor this week in a colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the designation of two Senators from each State "is the way in which the small States receive a certain degree of protection, and it is the way which equalizes the preponderance based upon population and which the States with large population have in the House."

Opponents of Hawaiian statehood have asserted that Communist influences in the islands are both widespread and threatening. Even if this allegation were documented, which it is not, I believe that Hawaii as a State would be in a far better position to cope with such a problem than Hawaii as a Territory. It is both significant and heartening that our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, under the able guidance of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], gave a unanimous stamp of approval to Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. President, we have a moral obligation that must be fulfilled if Hawaii is to be elevated from its second-class status of a Territory. The affirmative action we take on the pending bill will be heralded throughout the world as proof positive that this great democracy of ours will not tolerate colonialism in any form. In this respect it is important to point out that the islands are America's showcase for thousands of travelers from the Far East. En route to the United States these Asian visitors get their first taste of American democracy when they land in Hawaii.

It follows, Mr. President, that by granting full sovereignty to Hawaii we will be dramatically demonstrating true and undiluted democracy.

In conclusion, I turn again to the remarks made in Congress by my predecessor, Senator Newlands, who declared:

> We wish that this country should live nobly, that it should pursue the high purpose with which it started out, the purpose of establishing within our domain, as far as possible, a homogeneous independent self-respecting people.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his able presentation. I had not previously known that a distinguished former Senator from the State of Nevada spoke with wisdom and foresight to urge the admission of Hawaii as a State, as was so ably and clearly outlined by the present distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

When we examine appendix B and appendix C of the report on the bill, we find, according to appendix B, that since 1935 there have been 22 congressional investigations of the Hawaiian statehood question; and in appendix C, it is noted that there have been 34 separate reports and hearings by Congress. So it can clearly be seen, as the able Senator from Nevada has pointed out, that this is one subject which has been worked upon for 60 years.

As the Senator from Nevada has said, the time has come to take action, in line with the wisdom and foresight of the Senator's distinguished predecessor of more than 60 years ago. Although the proposal was not acted on then, we must not fail, today or tomorrow, to make Hawaii the 50th State.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado. I share his hope. I think our belief is well founded that ere many more hours we shall have seen complete congressional action, possibly, on both sides of the Capitol.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, again I rise on the floor of the Senate, as I have many times before, to speak in support of Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. President, the Members of the 86th Congress have the distinct opportunity and privilege to be recorded in history as voting for the admission of our 50th State. The people of Hawaii and the people of the Nation are anxiously awaiting our action. We have made them wait far too long.

The history of the Hawaiian statehood movement is a record of the undying efforts—for over 100 years—of the people of Hawaii to become a full and equal part of our Union.

In 1851, the King of Hawaii executed a deed of cession to the United States. Three years later, a treaty of annexation was drafted. In 1893, a similar treaty was presented to the United States, and was accepted by President Harrison, but was not acted upon by the Congress.

For nearly 50 years, Hawaii tried to become an integral part of the United States, and finally met with success in 1898, when the islands were officially annexed.

The ultimate intent of the people of Hawaii has been to exchange their independent sovereignty for statehood. Our predecessors in the 55th Congress spent many days deliberating on the annexation of the islands. The underlying argument stressed by the proponents was Hawaii's strategic importance to this Nation and her natural future membership in our Union of States. Mr. President, as long ago as 1854, the Hawaiian people petitioned their monarch to seek annexation by the United States.

In 1900, the incorporation of Hawaii as an organized Territory further demonstrated the manifest destiny of the islands to become a State.

The case for Hawaiian statehood has been argued longer and more exhaustively than has any other case for statehood in our history. Beginning in 1903,

every Hawaiian territorial legislature has petitioned Congress for admission into the Union. Almost half a century has elapsed since the first Hawaiian statehood bill was introduced in 1919. Such bills have been introduced in almost every intervening Congress. The ramifications of Hawaiian statehood have been investigated by almost every Congress in the past two decades. A total of 21 congressional investigations of this subject have been held since 1935. Thousands and thousands of pages of testimony in hearings and reports have been compiled. The record now is complete and voluminous and very little more can be said for the record.

Hawaii is ready for statehood in every conceivable respect. American principles, traditions, and institutions are thoroughly entrenched in the Territory. The vast majority of the Hawaiian people have known only the American way of life. Hawaiians with diverse racial and cultural backgrounds have assimilated harmoniously, and live as Americans under a republican form of government.

They live under the same laws and tax structure that we live under. Their entire body of law and administrative organization is identical in principle to that in parts of the United States. They are subject to the same Federal taxes that are imposed on the inhabitants of our 49 States. In fact, the Federal taxes that are paid in Hawaii in one year exceed the total of those paid in as many as 14 of our present States.

In 1935—24 years ago—the first congressional committee to visit Hawaii found "the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American commonwealth with a political, social and economic structure of the highest type."

In 1937, a joint committee of the House and Senate visited Hawaii, and reported:

> Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories. The Territory has consistently paid into the U.S. Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government has spent upon the Territory * * * (in 1937) Hawaii paid more than did five States combined.

Over the years, thousands of visitors to the islands have, on their return, reported, either officially or unofficially, that Hawaii's economic development has been so rapid that it is inconceivable to expect her people to be content indefinitely with a subordinate position in comparison to the position of the rest of our Nation.

It happens that a considerable portion of the people of Hawaii are of Asiatic origin. This is fortunate for us, because, as American citizens, they are more adept than some of the rest of us in translating the American ideal into terms which will be understood in Asiatic countries. It is to our utmost interest to let the people in the far Pacific know that the application of the people of Hawaii for statehood has been granted by Congress. The granting of statehood to Hawaii will demonstrate to the people of Asia and to the people of all the rest of the world that we are adhering to one of our most fundamental principles—namely, our dedicated belief in self-government and equal treatment of all citizens, irrespective of race, color, or creed.

Mr. President, at this point I feel compelled to mention to my colleagues and to the people of the United States something of great significance which will follow when Hawaii is admitted to our Union: Unfortunately, too many of the people of the United States and too many of the other people in the Western civilizations fail to realize that the great majority of the people of the world—vast numbers of them—are not of the Caucasian race. Last year, Alaska was admitted as the 49th State of our Union. If we fail to act now to admit Hawaii to our Union, we shall be saying to the rest of the world, to all the non-Caucasians in the world, not that Hawaii is noncontiguous to continental United States, not that other questions are involved, but that we refuse to admit Hawaii because it is composed of peoples whose skins are not white.

Mr. President, it is time that the people of the United States oriented themselves in the world, and oriented themselves to the fact that the great, gasping mass of humanity which seeks to find for itself relief from poverty and oppression and seeks to find opportunities for advancement, is not white. It is yellow, brown, and black. It is only a matter of chance that the 600 million or 700 million people in China, the 90 million people in Japan, the perhaps 250 million people in the Malayan States and in the Indonesian Republic, and the 300 million or 400 million people in India are not members of the white race. It is time that we Americans recognize that our primary task is to sell the American ideal to these peoples.

We do not have to convince them that Americans have the ability to outproduce anyone else in the world, or that Americans have more automobiles, more airplanes, more telephones, more televisions, more radios, and greater wealth than does any other nation in the world. They know that. But the most important job we have in the entire world is to convince them that we Americans believe implicitly in the principles our forefathers laid down in our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence, and that we intend to fight for those principles, not only in our own country, but throughout the world. That is our job. By demonstrating that we are willing to accept into full brotherhood in our Union the people of Hawaii who predominately are of other races, we shall prove to all the people of the world who by chance do not happen to have white skins that we have the same will to face up to the ideals of our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence that our forefathers had. Probably that action will prove it better than anything else we could do at this session, and probably it will have a greater impact on them.

Mr. President, as my friend, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], pointed out only a few minutes ago, during World War II and the Korean conflict, the people of Hawaii served and defended this country, alongside soldiers from continental United States. Their performance was as patriotic and loyal as that of other Americans who served with our troops during the war.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post of February 24, 1959, setting forth the facts of the service of the people of Hawaii to the Nation, the editorial being entitled "Congress Owes It to the Nation To Make Hawaii Our 50th State."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OWES IT TO THE NATION TO MAKE HAWAII OUR 50TH STATE

This week a crucial drive is starting in Congress to bring the Territory of Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State after a wait of more than half a century.

If Congress is responsive to the wishes of a vast majority of the people of the 49 States—as well as the wishes of the people of Hawaii—the statehood bill will be well on its way to enactment before the Easter recess.

We like to think that Congress, in acting upon the bill, will be mindful of the importance of the Hawaiian Islands to the Nation.

The strategic value of this Pacific stronghold of the Army, Navy, and Air Force should not require elaboration.

There are other values, of course.

Hawaii pays more taxes into the U.S. Treasury than do nine of the existing States. Its per capita income is higher than that of 35 States. Its area is greater than that of three existing States.

It is booming economically. A $40 million oil refinery and a semi-integrated steel mill are being added to its diversified industry.

It has a larger population than any other Territory had at the time of statehood with the single exception of Oklahoma.

We hope Congress will be mindful of the fact that in the last two wars, the Korean conflict and World War II, servicemen from Hawaii suffered a greater casualty rate than any of the contingents from any of the States, without a single case of cowardice or defection to the enemy.

We trust Congress will understand that Hawaii has reached a stage of development where statehood is essential to its continuing prosperity.

Hawaii is outgrowing its plantation economy. Its expanding population is creating problems in the fields of planning, education and public services which an absentee Government, located in Washington, cannot solve satisfactorily. A vigorous State government with power to act on all problems must be provided.

Congress must be made to appreciate that a Territorial status cannot meet the needs of Hawaii today.

If statehood should be denied, this country will be guilty of colonial exploitation and Hawaii must, eventually, for it own best interests, demand an independent status.

We are encouraged by the fact that more than a majority of the Members of the Senate are now listed as sponsors of the bill for Hawaiian statehood.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN has added to the hopes of friends of Hawaii by predicting that the statehood bill will not be sidetracked in committee.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, has set the pattern for opposition to Hawaiian statehood in this Congress.

He objects because only about one-fourth of the residents of the islands are of Caucasian origin.

He also drags in the old, discredited claim that Hawaii is in danger from Communist-dominated labor leaders.

Hawaii's record during the Korean war and its postwar record of consistently defeating union-sponsored programs in the Territorial legislature should be complete answers to the Communist scare.

U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry make up about one-third of the Hawaiian population.

Many of these are second and third generation Americans by now.

They are as thoroughly American as the people of Louisiana or any other State. They have attended American schools, learned American history.

What Senator ELLENDER may really fear is that Hawaii, where people of many races live together in harmony, would send two racially tolerant Senators and one racially tolerant Congressman to Washington.

But whether or not Hawaii becomes a State, the days of second-class citizenship for nonwhite Americans are numbered. Defeat of the Hawaiian bill would not change that.

But it would be a grave injustice to the 500,000 fine Americans who live in the islands.

It would brand the United States as an oppressor of minority groups in the eyes of hundreds of millions of Asiatics.

And it could, in time, cost us the possession of the Hawaiian Islands themselves.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Communist issue—which involves the question of whether certain alleged Communists or Communist front organizations could in fact control Hawaii or Hawaiian elections—should be faced squarely here on the floor today. There are nearly 200,000 persons in Hawaii who are members of the labor force. Approximately 25,000 are members of the unions alleged to be Communist dominated. Only a few—a very few—of these 25,000 have ever been accused of being Communist sympathizers or Communist Party members.

If this had been proven in the past, the Federal Government, having the authority, facilities, and power to deal with Communist infiltrated unions, would have taken the necessary steps to strip the unions of their collective-bargaining rights.

Such Federal action would free local employers from recognizing these unions in contract negotiations and also permit union members to expel their Communist leaders. No action to this effect has been taken by Federal authorities.

The late Senator Butler, of Nebraska, investigated this problem thoroughly on two separate occasions. In 1947 he opposed Hawaii statehood because he felt positive steps were necessary to mitigate the Communist influence in the islands. In 1952—5 years later—Senator Butler reversed his position. He reported:

I believe the residents of Hawaii have demonstrated by positive action their awareness of the Communist danger and their determination to face it frankly and never let it strengthen its foothold. During these years they have fought it boldly, have restricted its influence, and to some degree have driven it underground. I believe they have shown that they are as well able as the Federal Government to cope with this menace.

Senator Butler's findings are substantiated by reports from the FBI, naval and military intelligence. The FBI in 1953 stated that at no time were there more than 160 Communists in Hawaii. A 1951 FBI report listed only 36 known Communists.

Today it is estimated that between 40 and 60 Communists are left in all the Islands. This is 40 or 60 out of a total population of almost 635,000—at the most, Communists number only 1 out of every 10,000 people in Hawaii.

Other arguments against Hawaii statehood have been based on distance and noncontiguity. The admittance of Alaska discounts both. The speed of modern air travel further lessens the pertinence of such arguments. Hawaii is less than 5,000 miles from Washington, and only 2,500 miles from San Francisco. It is possible to be in Honolulu in less than 18 hours from Washington, and overnight from San Francisco. This is less time than it took to travel from the Capital to California when the latter was admitted into the Union. Jet aircraft will lessen the distance from time even more.

Some opponents of statehood claim that our other territories and possessions will demand statehood if Hawaii is admitted. This is an assumption wholely based on speculation, not proof. I understand that we have had absolutely no indication or requests from any of our insular possessions to be granted statehood. Moreover, it is a congressional tradition that an organized Territory must first serve an apprenticeship as an incorporated Territory with its own organic act before being admitted into the Union. Hawaii is our last incorporated Territory. Our organized Territories can become incorporated only by act of Congress.

I must say at this point, with all frankness and candor, that I do not expect to have my vote interpreted, nor do I wish my vote upon the Hawaiian statehood bill to be interpreted, as being a commitment or a partial commitment in favor of the admission into the Union of States of any other tract of land until such territory has gone through a period of apprenticeship and appears to be qualified for such application.

Deliberations preceding the admittance of Alaska often centered on the new State's lack of population. However, a majority of both Houses justified the grant of statehood on the merits of the case. It is hard for me to understand the use of this same argument against Hawaii when her population of about 635,000 is approximately 2½ times that of Alaska—and more than that of six of our present States: New Hampshire, Delaware, Vermont, Wyoming, Nevada, and Alaska.

Hawaii's apprenticeship as a Territory has more than qualified her for full and equal membership in our Union of States. She has met every conceivable test.

Mr. President, it is our solemn duty, indeed I may say it is one of the greatest acts Congress can take in the interest of our Nation's welfare, to grant to Hawaii statehood at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a collection of editorials from various newspapers in the United States be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABAMA

Gadsden (Ala.) Times, February 9: "'All clear for Hawaii now,' seems to be the word in Congress. The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood, of course, by Alaskan statehood on January 3, 1959. In fact, it has been common for States to be admitted by pairs with little or no time gap: New Mexico and Arizona within six weeks in 1912. Idaho and Wyoming 8 days apart in 1890. In 1889 North and South Dakota on the same day, and then Montana and Washington 3 days apart."

Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News, January 30: "It is generally agreed that Hawaii with its 554,000 civilian population has much to recommend it for statehood."

Decatur (Ala.) Daily, January 25: "Will Hawaii become the 50th State? If we knew the timetable in Washington we could answer the question. This we do know, eventually that Territory will become a State. The pattern was made when Alaska was welcomed."

ALASKA

Anchorage Daily Times, January 6: "Admission of Hawaii should complete the Federal family which started with 13 States * * * It is inevitable that Hawaii will some day be the 50th State. The only question left is timing. If it is to be a State eventually, why not now?"

ARIZONA

Yuma (Ariz.) Sun, February 8: "With Alaska we abandoned the notion that only Territories directly attached to the continental United States could be brought within the fold of States. Once we did that, then what difference whether the spread is 1,500 miles or 2,600? By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

ARKANSAS

Camden (Ark.) News, February 9: "Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn. Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned and that argument has faded in consequence."

Texarkana Gazette, February 17: "A star for Hawaii? The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

CALIFORNIA

San Francisco Chronicle, January 27: "All the arguments against statehood have been persuasively answered. The people of Hawaii have long since demonstrated their adherence to American traditions, ideals, and culture. The allegation of Communist domination in the islands has been proven flimsy, indeed. The population has risen to 635,000, larger than 6 of the existing States."

Los Angeles Examiner, February 5: "It is the position of the Examiner and other Hearst newspapers that Hawaii merits statehood and should receive it at this session of Congress. These are our reasons: In the testimony of Rear Adm. Kenmore M. McManes, Chief of Naval Operations for Administration, the Pentagon has endorsed Hawaiian statehood as militarily desirable. The grant of statehood to Alaska has removed one of the chief arguments in the past. This was the argument of noncontiguity—that is, territories not physically joined with our other States should not be admitted to statehood. The jet age has nullified distances. Both Alaska and Hawaii are frontline bastions of defense. Economically, Hawaii is certainly as well equipped as Alaska to support statehood. Despite fears of Communist influence

in the islands, we have it on the word of such responsible men as Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton that communism is under as strict surveillance in the islands as it is here. There is a Territorial subversive activities committee that cooperates closely with the FBI. We consider that half-hidden opposition to Hawaiian statehood because of the racial mixture of its people as completely insupportable. In fact, denial of statehood would do us tremendous psychological damage throughout the whole Pacific. As W. R. Hearst, Jr., summed it up Sunday in Editor's Report: "My father advocated statehood for Hawaii. That is still the position of the Hearst newspapers.' "

Los Angeles Mirror-News, February 5: "There is little doubt that admission of Hawaii to full statehood will be voted early in this session of the Congress. There is no reason, in logic, to bar Hawaii. With its population well on the way to a million, Hawaii has more people than several States. It pays its own freight, yielding more U.S. income tax than quite a number of our States in good standing."

Fullerton (Calif.) News-Tribune, February 3: "The usual array of arguments advanced in the past against the admittance of Hawaii appear to have been discarded at last. Favorable action now is predicted this session, and is long overdue."

Riverside (Calif.) Press, February 1: " * * * The words of the special subcommittee (of the House Insular Affairs Committee) report are worth noting: 'There are about 25 identified Communists in Hawaii. We have no exact knowledge as to the number of so-called fellow travelers but investigating agencies (including the FBI and the Territorial subversive activities committee) told us they know of no additional Communists since the previous congressional reports. We were unable to find any evidence in the social fabric of Hawaii that communism had made any substantial progress or that the community as a whole was unable and unwilling to cope with the problem. We were told that the FBI investigations, plus the Federal court convictions (under the Smith Act) had crippled the Communist apparatus and it would remain crippled. Fear no longer holds even the vestige of validity as a reason for keeping Hawaii out."

Vallejo (Calif.) Times-Herald, February 3: "In every sense, Hawaii has demonstrated allegiance to the United States and her principles of government. * * * The Nation should welcome Hawaii into the family of States."

Oakland Tribune, January 27: "Launched with the full support of the administration, the annual battle to bring Hawaii into the Union is under way again, and after nearly 40 years, it appears that the 50th star will be added to the flag. There will be some effort to prevent it once more, but the support that already has been announced for the measure in both Houses of Congress indicates that the opposition will be overcome, as it should."

Fresno Bee, February 11: "With Alaska ensconced in the Union, it will be difficult indeed to justify denial of the same status to Hawaii."

Hollywood Citizen-News, January 27: "Hawaii's efforts to control communism were emphasized by Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton yesterday in urging the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to approve a bill to make Hawaii the 50th State."

Turlock (Calif.) Journal, February 5: "The arguments currently being advanced against statehood for Hawaii are few and feeble. Unless some better ones turn up, Congress will have a hard time finding reasons not to make it possible for Hawaii to become the 50th State."

Oakland Tribune, February 5: "The people of Hawaii have been put aside far too long as it is."

San Jose Mercury, February 7: "The Territory has the people, the resources and—above all—the will to become the 50th State. All the legal requirements have been or can be fulfilled readily. All that lacks at the moment is congressional action."

Pasadena Independent, February 7: "The fact that Alaska has become a State is a contributing argument for Hawaiian statehood, but it is only one among many * * *. Statehood is logical, just and necessary."

Bakersfield Californian, January 27: "The islands have become an important part of the Nation's organization, and its economic, social and political life has been closely tied with our own for more than half a century. The events of World War II clearly impressed on the minds of the American people the close connection between the islands and the mainland."

San Jose News, January 23: "If that resounding phrase 'taxation without representation' still can raise anger, then Hawaiians have a right to anger. They are not at all represented. This is idiocy in a modern, democratic western world."

San Bernardino Sun, January 8: "Both Alaskans and Hawaiians have shown unflinching patriotism in times past when the United States has faced major crises. Hawaii also will be most welcome into our family of States."

San Diego Union, January 3: "In the celebration for Alaska, it should not be forgotten Hawaii is equally deserving of statehood. It should be a good thing to approve Hawaii as the 50th State in the flag before major production starts on the 49-star flag."

COLORADO

Fort Morgan Times, February 13: "This Congress should admit Hawaii. Her admission is favored by President Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, Richard M. Nixon, Earl Warren, Paul M. Butler, Fred L. Seaton, Joseph W. Martin, Gordon Allott, and a long list of statesmen expressing themselves from a bipartisan standpoint."

Pueblo Star-Journal, February 8: "By all the fair measures Hawaii is ready for statehood. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

Pueblo Chieftain, February 12: "Comment on Hawaii statehood at Washington, in connection with the committee hearings there, brings out the significant fact: The series of political defeats the ILWU has suffered in Hawaii in recent years is regarded as an asset to the statehood fight."

CONNECTICUT

Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, January 23: "In many respects, we suspect that the Hawaiians are more American than a great many Americans. Certainly Communist efforts to influence the island government have been pitiful failures, and there can be little doubt that participation by Hawaiian leaders in the affairs of Congress would be of great value because of their long and intimate experience in dealing with oriental peoples."

Bridgeport Post, February 9: "The indications are that in the name of justice toward the people, this Congress will soon pass the necessary legislation, and the United States will once again face the problem—but a much simpler one—of adding another star to the flag."

Norwich Bulletin, February 8: "Now that Alaska has been launched as a full-fleged member of the Union, the reasons for withholding such status from Hawaii are even less compelling than in the past. Congress would do well to approve this measure without further delay."

New Britain Herald, January 17: "The case for Hawaii is a good one: American traditions, affiliations, and interests all abound. Further, there is an outright desire by Hawaiians to be Americans, regardless of the tax increases and other problems it will mean."

DELAWARE

Wilmington (Del.) News, February 7: "In Congress even the opponents of the admission of Hawaii as a State are saying they believe it is inevitable * * *. Nothing succeeds like success—nothing, at least, is a better self-starter in almost any field of endeavor. The success of Alaska beams directly across the Pacific towards Hawaii, which is basking in the glow."

FLORIDA

Tampa Times, January 27: "One of the best reasons for bringing Hawaii into the Union is that it will extend the frontier of the United States well into the Pacific and make us a closer neighbor to Asia. The voice and vote of persons who understand the Asian viewpoint may be a valuable asset in Congress. The granting of full statehood to a Territory with such a large Asian population might also serve to favorably impress other Asian nations and combat anti-American propaganda spread by the Reds."

St. Petersburg Times, January 24: "With a Hawaiian statehood bill in effect already 'passed' in the Senate and with hearings on such a measure promised soon in a House committee, the chances are much better than even that our new flag will have to be redesigned before we have become accustomed to it."

GEORGIA

Atlanta Constitution, January 17: "If the United States wishes to show unmistakably and unequivocally that it stands foursquare behind the principle of equality of all men under God, it can do so by admitting Hawaii to the Union."

Columbus Enquirer, January 28: "These points and others made by (Interior Secretary) Seaton before the House committee should convince the members that Hawaii is ready to enter the Union. It is hoped that the group will lose no time in approving such legislation."

Albany (Ga.) Herald, February 11: "All indications thus point to a 50th star for the American flag in 1959. As in the case of Alaska, the Nation will be far wealthier in terms of human as well as natural resources as a result of congressional action approving Hawaii's unrelenting will for statehood status."

Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise, February 3: "Statehood for Hawaii is pretty much assured if public reaction is any token. If the Congress is going to approve the plan, it would seem silly to delay now that Alaska's broken the ice."

Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune, February 3: " 'All clear for Hawaii now,' seems to be the word in Congress. The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood, of course, by Alaskan statehood on and as of January 3, 1959."

IDAHO

Idaho Falls (Idaho) Morning Post Register, February 6: "By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood. The issue has reached a point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

ILLINOIS

Chicago Sun-Times, January 28: "There is no reason whatever why Congress should go slow in granting Hawaii statehood, as demanded by statehood foes. * * * Congress should act to permit Hawaii to join the Union before the current session ends in July or August."

Aurora Beacon-News, January 22: "One of the inescapable tasks confronting the 86th Congress is that of granting statehood to Hawaii, a favor to the islands and to the Nation that has been too long delayed."

Alton Telegraph, January 28: "The United States should welcome Hawaii into state-

hood now; make her part of the country instead of a mere dependent."

Decatur Review, January 28: "In every way, Hawaii is eminently qualified for statehood * * * only statehood will give to the people of Hawaii the full citizenship to which they are undeniably entitled."

Quincy Herald-Whig, January 19: "The people of the Hawaiian Islands have been clamoring for entrance into the Union even longer than Alaska. Congress will find it difficult to withhold statehood from the Pacific islands."

Carbondale South Illinoisian, January 29: "Perhaps the strongest argument for Hawaiian statehood, and one which applied in Alaska last year, is that American citizens in our Territories who pay taxes and serve on battlefronts and fulfill all other duties of citizens deserve a voice in the U.S. Congress where the laws are passed that govern them."

Danville (Ill.) Commercial News, January 30: "Hawaii has earned the star in her crown—and in the American flag. Let us hope she gets it soon."

INDIANA

Madison Courier, January 27: "Hawaii is an enterprising and modern country. It would make a nice addition to the United States."

La Porte Herald-Argus, January 6: "With Alaska officially having become the 49th State, it is appropriate to hope that the new Congress will lose no time in acting to make Hawaii the 50th."

South Bend Tribune, January 25: "Now the number of required States' approvals has been increased by Alaska's admission to the Union, and it is probable that Hawaii also will win statehood in the near future."

Gary Post-Tribune, February 6: "Hawaii's request for statehood is a fine tribute to the American form of government."

Washington (Ind.) Times, February 7: "Industrial development and population growth in Hawaii have gone hand in hand. The island's billion dollar annual gross product should provide enough revenue for intrastate expenses."

Terre Haute Tribune, February 6: "Even that old bugaboo, communism on the islands, has been given the coup de grace by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Noting that the Red menace is weaker than when his group investigated several years ago, WALTER came out for Hawaiian statehood."

Plymouth Pilot-News, February 16: "At long last it seems that Congress will recognize that justice to Hawaii must be done in granting statehood to that Territory."

IOWA

Sioux City Journal, January 30: "Population-wise, the islands are bigger and in many ways better qualified economically and politically for statehood than many of the 49 States were at the times of their admission to statehood."

Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer-Republican, January 15: "Although it required almost a half-century after Arizona was admitted to the Union as a full-fledged State before another Territory finally made the grade into statehood, there seems to be a lot of optimism everywhere before we have the 50th State in the fold."

Delwein (Iowa) Register, January 21: "Five major Pacific commands in Hawaii show the Islands' military importance. Statehood will serve notice to the world that the United States intends to stay in the Pacific."

Fort Madison Democrat, February 7: "Hawaiian statehood should be an immediate order of business in the Senate as in the House."

Burlington (Iowa) Hawkeye-Gazette, February 3: "The odds are that Hawaii will be granted statehood in this session of Congress."

Cedar Rapids Gazette, February 5: "Since Alaska and Hawaii often have been coupled together in earlier bills for admission and, perhaps equally significant, in many party platforms, the point about admission in pairs is well taken."

KANSAS

Wichita Morning Eagle, February 6: "One of the major objections to Hawaiian statehood was erased when Alaska became a State. This was the idea that a territory without borders contiguous with the present United States would be difficult to defend and lacking in common interests with the other States."

Lawrence Journal-World, January 22: "Among the leading Americans who have come out in favor of statehood for Hawaii are President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court."

Wellington (Kans.) News, February 3: "Let's send word to our Senators and Congressmen that there is no need or reason to wait longer to add that 50th star to our flag for Hawaii."

Dodge City Globe, January 28: "Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, former Kansan, told Congress Monday that 'we need Hawaii as an equal partner as much as Hawaii needs statehood.' "

KENTUCKY

Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger Inquirer, February 9: "Reasons and excuses for deferring the admission of Hawaii to statehood are now impotent if not negligible."

Middlesboro News, February 9: "Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn. By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

Winchester Sun, February 16: "One opponent of statehood argued that bringing Hawaii into the Union would be 'a geographical absurdity,' but in an age of swift transportation and communication this in itself is an absurdity."

Ashland Independent, January 6: "In point of population the Hawaiian Islands are ahead of Alaska, having substantially more than 500,000 inhabitants. The territory pays more Federal taxes than 10 of the existing States. Hence its application will be hard to refuse."

LOUISIANA

Lafayette Advertiser, February 5: "Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned, and that argument has faded in consequence. By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

MAINE

Portland (Maine) Express, February 5: "The mood in Congress at this session seems to be 'All clear for Hawaii now.' If the mood lasts, flagmakers will have their work to do all over again."

Bangor (Maine) News, December 18, 1958: "There's no need to review at length the history of Hawaii's long struggle to win statehood status. And we hope members of Maine's delegation to Congress feel the same way and will, to use the slogan of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, 'Help Hawaii become the 50th State in '59.' "

MARYLAND

Baltimore News Post, January 6: "The Hearst newspapers are proud of the part they were privileged to play in the long and vigorous campaign to win statehood for the huge territory which we bought from Russia in 1867 for $7.2 million. The Nation's eyes should now be directed toward Hawaii as a possible 50th State."

Hagerstown Herald, February 6: "With Alaska we abandoned the notion that only territory directly attached to the continental United States could be brought within the fold of States. Once we did that, then what difference whether the spread is 1,500 miles or 2,600?"

Cumberland News, February 6: "It has been pretty common for States to be admitted by pairs with little or no time gap. Idaho and Wyoming 8 days apart in 1890. In 1889 North and South Dakota on the same day, and then Montana and Washington 3 days apart."

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston Globe, January 31: "Hawaii has removed the last plausible objection to admission by writing strong anti-Communist provisions into its proposed State constitution. Both justice and common sense require that she quickly become a State."

Boston Record, February 5: "It is the position of the Daily Record and other Hearst newspapers that Hawaii merits statehood and should receive it at this session of Congress. We consider the half-hidden opposition to Hawaiian statehood because of the racial mixture of its people as completely insupportable. In fact, denial of statehood would do us tremendous psychological damage throughout the whole Pacific."

Boston Traveler, February 7: "Occasionally the United States gets a chance to do itself a real favor and, at the same time, make a big impression on the rest of the world—all without spending a dime. Such an opportunity knocks once again in the bill for Hawaiian statehood, now before Congress."

Boston American, February 6: "It is illogical and unfair to grant statehood to Alaska and deny it to Hawaii."

Springfield, News, February 10: "Hawaii should be admitted to the Union as Alaska's pair. They both belong in the Union, and things won't seem right until we have 50 stars in the flag."

Haverhill Gazette, February 5: "If Hawaii becomes the 50th State this year—and certainly chances now seem favorable—the country will have acquired a pair of States with little time lag in between. There is considerable precedent for such expansion in America."

Springfield Union, January 17: "With Alaska now a full-fledged member of the United States, the logical step is immediate admittance of Hawaii, which has earned statehood along with Alaska."

Christian Science Monitor, January 30: "There are committee processes to be ground out and votes to be taken, but it looks as if mainlanders should be making leis to loop around the necks of incoming Hawaiians."

MICHIGAN

Detroit Free Press, January 6: "We are not through yet, by any means. Before this year is out, we may very well see the 50th star added as Hawaii is admitted."

Detroit Times, February 7: "The House Interior Committee voted 25 to 4 for Hawaiian statehood. The bill to create our 50th State heads next for the Rules Committee, then action by the full House, then the Senate. Though there is some die-hard opposition, the measure should succeed."

Detroit Times, February 4: "The jet age has nullified distances. Both Alaska and Hawaii are front line bastions of defense."

Royal Oak Tribune, January 2: "Maybe pretty soon we will have to change these for 50-star flags, because Hawaii is asking for statehood as well. We hope that this Territory can achieve it soon."

Hillsdale News, January 17: "Deserving Hawaii has been denied statehood much too long."

Muskegon Chronicle, January 20: "Hawaii has waited a long time, much longer than Alaska waited. Within another year our flag is likely to have its 50th star."

Jackson Citizen Patriot, January 29: "Hawaii has some strong arguments on its

side. It has more than double the population of Alaska and is more advanced economically. It is better able to support State government and, like Alaska, is a key bastion in the defense of the United States."

Port Huron Times-Herald, February 9: "It looks as though the chances for Hawaii being admitted to the Union soon are very good."

Albion Recorder, January 30: "Hawaii does, however, by most apparent standards deserve admittance as a State soon."

Saginaw News, February 3: "Both major parties have pledged statehood for several years. Last year they even stood for an 'immediate' grant of statehood. Now it's time that the promise was fulfilled."

Battle Creek Enquirer-News, February 6: "Congress seems to be in a mood to speed action on Hawaii, as it should."

MINNESOTA

Duluth News-Tribune, January 19: "* * * the United States has made itself ridiculous in the eyes of the world by its delay in granting statehood to Alaska for so long and now by its continued delay in making Hawaii a State—after so many pledges."

St. Cloud Times, January 19: "Hawaii has been knocking on the doors of the Union for 55 years. It has more population than Alaska, more industry, more developed wealth. Maybe this is Hawaii's year. We hope so."

Faribault News, January 3: "On this important date for Alaska—official recognition as a State of the Union—we express the hope that Hawaii in the coming months will be admitted as the 50th State."

MISSISSIPPI

Greenville Democrat-Times, February 12: "Our American forefathers rejected being taxed without being represented. The Hawaiians now bear far heavier taxes without representation and send their sons into the armed services via a draft they had no voice in approving. We repeat, the people of Hawaii have too long been denied these rights. This must be Hawaii's year to attain statehood."

Gulfport Biloxi Herald, February 11: "Now it's Hawaii's turn. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

MISSOURI

St. Louis Post Dispatch, February 8: "Everybody who had hoped that Hawaii and Alaska would come into the Union together last year will be delighted with the excellent progress of the Hawaiian cause in a Congress that is barely a month old."

St. Louis Post Dispatch, January 20: "With the 49th State thus working for the 50th-to-be, surely a Hawaiian statehood bill will be an early enactment of the session."

Kansas City (Mo.) Star, January 20: "The great majority of islanders (there are nearly 600,000) consistently have favored statehood. And recent polls show approval by citizens of other States."

Columbia Missourian, January 29: "There is little reason for denying Hawaii admission to the Union at this time."

Hannibal Courier Post, January 29: "It was especially gratifying that Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton appeared before the House Interior Affairs Committee to make a strong case for Hawaiian statehood. He noted that Hawaii has been preparing for 59 years, which is a good deal longer time than was required."

St. Joseph News-Press, February 4: "The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood when Alaska officially became a State on January 3. An over-the-shoulder look shows that it is quite common for States to be admitted to the Union in pairs."

Columbia Tribune, February 3: "The way seems clear for the early admission of the islands territory."

MONTANA

Butte Post, February 7: "Now that Alaska has been launched as a full-fledged member of the Union, the reasons for withholding such status from Hawaii are even less compelling than in the past. Congress would do well to approve this measure without further delay."

Havre News, February 2: "It is pleasing to note that Republican and Democratic Senators are getting together to see if they can get Hawaii into the Union by the end of this year. Most of the stumbling blocks of the past have been removed and a count of favorable senatorial noses leads us to believe that the great day for Hawaii isn't far off. The more realistic Congress gets about Hawaii the more it realizes that statehood for the Territory has been delayed too long."

Great Falls Leader, February 4: "By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

Missoula Sentinel, February 5: "Alaska has broken the ice and changed the flag. Now it is Hawaii's turn."

Billings Gazette, February 4: "Since the measure to admit the Territory of Alaska to statehood was passed at the last session of Congress, it has been taken for granted that the Hawaiian Islands will be voted into the Union during the present session. All reports coming out of Washington on that subject serve to indicate that this prediction will be fulfilled."

NEVADA

Las Vegas Review-Journal, February 5: "A star for Hawaii? * * * This year odds run more strongly for it, though opposition still exists. By all fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Claremont Eagle, February 5: "All clear for Hawaii now, seems to be the word in Congress. The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood, of course, by Alaskan statehood on and as of January 3, 1959."

Nashua Telegraph, February 7: "Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned, and that argument has faded in consequence."

NEW JERSEY

Trenton Times, February 3: "There were good and sufficient reasons for the decision of Congress to grant statehood to Alaska. There are equally good reasons for making Hawaii the 50th State."

Passaic Herald-News, January 28: "With such a favorable finding by the subcommittee and the admission of Alaska as a precedent, the Hawaii statehood bill should stand a good chance of passage."

Asbury Park Press, February 12: "Hawaiian statehood will be voted before Easter, Washington prophets says. President Eisenhower has called for prompt action; the Pentagon says that statehood would help the war effort."

Paterson Call, February 6: "Congress would do well to approve this measure without further delay."

NEW MEXICO

Albuquerque, N. Mex., Journal, February 4: "The opposition to admission of Hawaii has been largely by southern Congressmen because it seems another State added to the procivil rights camp, and would enhance the likelihood of more stringent civil rights legislation. But the green light for admission appears to be fixed, especially since the proponents have picked up the votes of the new State of Alaska."

NEW YORK

New York Times, March 5: "Hawaiians of every background have proved their loyalty by fighting and dying for our country on equal terms with Americans from the mainland. Against that background statehood for Hawaii is an obligation the rest of us have long owed our fellow Americans who live in those beautiful islands."

New York Times, February 1: "There is no reason or excuse to put off statehood for Hawaii. The fact that Alaska has become a State is a contributing argument for Hawaiian statehood but it is only one among many."

New York Journal-American, February 3: "It is the position of the New York Journal-American and other Hearst newspapers that Hawaii merits statehood and should receive it at this session of Congress. As W. R. Hearst, Jr., summed it up Sunday in Editor's Report: 'My father advocated statehood for Hawaii. That is still the position of the Hearst newspapers.' "

New York Times, January 4: "Now we must hope and expect that the 86th Congress will grant statehood to that other Territory which in these days of jet travel lies just across the river that we call the Pacific Ocean, west by south from San Francisco. Hawaii should be next."

New York Journal-American, January 5: "But now our new star in the North is firmly fixed in the flag, and there is room for that Western star that will ascend one day when Hawaii also wins statehood. The Union still grows—and the prophets of doom are confounded."

Mount Vernon Argus, January 6: "So to Alaska, already in, and to Hawaii, knocking at the door, our best wishes for growth throughout 1959 and thereafter along lines which will make their peoples prosperous and happy."

Little Falls, January 22: "Legislation to admit the Territory of Hawaii as the 50th State in the Union has been introduced in Congress, and it is to be hoped that 1959 is the year when this long-sought goal of the islanders will become a reality."

Jamestown Post-Journal, January 28: "The Nation needs Hawaii as an example before the world of American democracy in action. Hawaii should become the 50th star in the flag this year."

Albany Times-Union, January 31: "Hawaii's chances of becoming a State this year continue to look good."

Yonkers Herald-Statesman, February 10: "Now in this promising year of 1959 the newest baby of the grand and glorious galaxy of States was born on January 3. Is Alaska to grow up alone? Or will there be the usual twin? Are you listening, Hawaii?"

Troy Record, January 30: "The admission of Hawaii is only fair and reasonable. The measure deserves speedy support and it is pleasing to observe that Congress seems to also be in the mood to take care of this long-neglected old business."

NORTH CAROLINA

Wilmington, N.C., Star, January 28: "Now that Alaska has attained statehood status, the long-time supporters of Hawaiian statehood are starting the ball rolling for a 50th State. Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton fired the opening gun for the administration Monday when he declared that after a 59-year 'apprenticeship' Hawaii has earned the right to fair and equal treatment with the other 49 States. Apparently, that apprenticeship is about over. And we agree that 59 years is a long apprenticeship not to have a turning."

Burlington, N.C., Times News, January 27: "Prospects for statehood for Hawaii appear bright before the present 86th Congress completes its work and its Members, in recess, journey home again. Hawaii has a stronger bid now that Alaska finally was victorious in the battle for statehood, after many years, in the 85th Congress last year. The barrier was not the absence of justification for statehood grants, but the restraining power of politics."

Durham, N.C. Herald, January 28: "The Nation's new 49-star flag appears destined to

be outmoded almost as soon as it is run up on the flagpoles for the first time officially next July. Congressional support for Hawaii as the 50th State is already showing a strength approaching that which put over Alaskan statehood last year. With Hawaii, as with Alaska, the movement is bipartisan. It is reflected by leaders both in Congress and the Eisenhower administration. Most important, however, it is reflected in prompt action by Congress * * *."

Greenville, N.C., Reflector, January 29: "There is little if any reason for Congress to continue to deny statehood to this Territory of the United States which has been incorporated since 1898. Clearly Hawaii has earned the right to statehood."

Stanford (N.C.) Herald, January 23: " 'Much more than an ordinary newspaper, or a piece of merchandise, is in your hands at this moment. This 1959 progress edition of the Advertiser is an appraisal of the coming year, that looms as bright as that 50th star that seems almost ready to jostle the others in the flag's field of blue.' So begins an editorial in the 62-page Honolulu newspaper issued January 1 for the express purpose of stating Hawaii's case for entrance into the Union of the United States. The paper, a copy of which this week reached our desks, is a brilliant statement of purpose. We read it literally for hours and must confess utter amazement at the power and might and industry which is Hawaii today. * * * Here are some of Hawaii's arguments: Dedicated Americans, Hawaiians look to Congress for full rights of citizenship; jets cut time from San Francisco to 4½ hours; American business capital is pouring into the islands (in Honolulu, as an example, a $50 million shopping center is planned this year); research and diversification in agriculture foretell new vistas of production and sales; and certainly pressure mounts politically on the basis of Alaska's admission. The case for Hawaiian statehood, we submit, is eloquently stated."

OHIO

Cleveland Plain Dealer, February 6: "The overwhelming vote in the House Interior Committee (25 to 4) to admit Hawaii to the Union makes it all but certain that the House of Representatives will speedily approve legislation to make Hawaii the 50th State."

Toledo Blade, February 7: "So if sunny Hawaii becomes the 50th State soon after chilly Alaska's having been made the 49th, Congress will not only be playing fair to the islanders but it will be following a tradition. Let it be another couple soon."

Ashtabula Star-Beacon, February 10: "Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn."

Fostoria Review-Times, February 19: "Statehood would confirm the hope that America believes in the full development of local self-government. Our national policies will be judged in no small measure by the decisions we make in respect to the people of Hawaii."

Dayton News, January 27: "Hawaii has struggled for years for the recognition which she now richly deserves."

Mt. Vernon News, January 30: "Congress should not let the Hawaii statehood bill drag along until near the end of the session when it will become lost in the mad rush to enact essential legislation before adjournment."

Cambridge Jeffersonian, January 31: "The loyalty of the Hawaiian was especially pronounced during World War II. Having fulfilled all qualifications, they are perfectly justified in demanding American citizenship."

OKLAHOMA

Enid Eagle, January 27: "For both the mainland United States and the islands themselves, there is little doubt of the mutual value of statehood, both from an economic and a defense basis. It is to be hoped that this time the dream of statehood will be realized * * *."

Alva Review-Courier, February 8: "There seems little doubt now that Congress will be granting statehood to the Territory of Hawaii."

Norman Transcript, February 10: "Now it's Hawaii's turn. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

OREGON

Portland Journal, January 27: "Supporters of Hawaiian statehood stepped aside last year to let the Alaskan bill go through alone. This year the sponsors of Alaskan statehood, including Alaskan and Pacific Northwest delegations, are solidly supporting Hawaii's bid."

Medford Mail-Tribune, December 16, 1958: "It would be singularly appropriate—from Oregon's standpoint—to have the Hawaiian Islands become a State on the 100th anniversary of Oregon's own statehood (during 1959)."

Astoria Astorian-Budget, January 21: "There is no logical argument against Hawaiian statehood. It obviously ought to be granted and Congress has no valid excuse for neglecting it."

La Grande Observer, February 7: "Hawaii is ready for statehood. The issue has reached a point where much further delay cannot be on reasonable grounds."

Eugene Register-Guard, February 10: "Alaska came in officially on January 3, 1959. It would be appropriate this year to add Hawaii as its twin."

Pendleton East Oregonian, February 6: "Today * * * southern Senators are unlikely to filibuster against Hawaiian statehood."

PENNSYLVANIA

Philadelphia Inquirer, February 1: "Surely the time has come when this Territory should follow Alaska into the Union, as our 50th State. Her people deserve it, they very much desire it, and they would be a valuable addition to the United States of America."

Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, February 3: "The grant of statehood to Alaska has removed one of the chief arguments in the past."

Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, February 6: "It is illogical and unfair to grant statehood to Alaska and deny it to Hawaii."

Reading Times, January 31: "For we hope by the time the 1st session of the 86th Congress completes its chores, Hawaii will be the 50th State."

Ambridge Citizen, February 5: "The arguments currently being advanced against statehood for Hawaii are few and feeble. Congress would do well to approve this measure without further delay."

Oil City Derrick, February 12: "Hawaii should have statehood."

Reading Eagle, February 14: "Quick and overwhelming endorsement of statehood for Hawaii by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives has reviewed hopes of that Territory's 580,000 inhabitants for admission to the Union after 61 years of subordinate status."

Hazelton Standard-Sentinel, February 13: "We need Hawaii as an equal partner as much as Hawaii needs statehood"—Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton.

Lancaster News, January 4: "It seems incredible that Hawaii can be kept out."

Doylestown Intelligencer, February 9: "Why not add another star to the flag—pronto?"

Altoona Mirror, February 10: "Let's aid Hawaii. Alaska is over the hurdle. Now it's Hawaii's turn."

Scranton Times, January 29: "* * * it looks now as if the Nation's flagmakers can get busy shortly on the design of another new national emblem bearing a 50th star."

Scranton Tribune, January 26: "As far as the committee (headed by Congressman LEO O'BRIEN, N.Y., Dem.) is concerned, Hawaii has been 'in training' for statehood for 60 years and measures up on all pertinent points * * *."

Homestead Messenger, January 23: "Remind your Congressmen of plea of Hawaiians: It might result in the addition of a 50th State of the Union."

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, February 5: "Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn. By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

SOUTH DAKOTA

Pierre Capital-Journal, January 3: "Next July we will be flying a flag with 49 stars. That flag ought to have 50 stars by 1960."

Aberdeen American News, February 3: "The United States has made itself ridiculous in the eyes of the world by its delay in granting statehood to Alaska for so long and now by its continued delay in making Hawaii a State—after so many pledges."

Aberdeen American News, February 4: "The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood by Alaskan statehood on and as of Jan. 3, 1959."

TENNESSEE

Nashville Banner, January 27: "Now admit Hawaii. Congress can and should act swiftly, to fulfill a commitment which rests on the merits of the case. The time to do that is now."

Chattanooga Times, February 2: "For years, the prospects have been for Alaska and Hawaii to make it together. Alaska is in; Hawaii should not be far behind."

Oak Ridge Oak Ridger, February 3: "It is wrong to deny any other people rights—as the residents of Hawaii have been denied them for years—just because the votes of their future Congressmen might be in conflict with local sentiments."

TEXAS

Dallas News, January 31: "Statehood for Hawaii has been favored by both major parties by repeated Gallup polls and by three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. The prosperous sugar, pineapple and tourist industries could easily support a State government."

Beaumont Journal, February 6: "Now that Alaska has been added to the sisterhood of States, there is no sound reason for holding out any longer on Hawaii."

Fort Worth Star-Telegram, February 9: "Like Alaska, the 49th State, Hawaii will be an inviting frontier for development when it becomes a State."

Austin American, February 6: "By all the fair measures, Hawaii believed ready for statehood."

San Antonio Light, February 4: "Despite fears of Communist influence in the islands, we have it on the word of such responsible men as Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton that communism is under as strict surveillance in the islands as it is here."

Waco Times-Herald, February 2: "This country and both its political parties are obligated by sentiment and repeated promises to give statehood to Hawaii."

San Angelo Standard, February 5: "A recent team of congressional investigators found the islands unmarked by signs of Communist control. Hawaii more than many States, has fought against this menace and brought them under control."

Austin Statesman, January 30: "Statehood is owed Hawaii. Simple justice demands it."

Tyler Telegraph, January 9: "Hawaii is deserving and the Hawaiians have waited for statehood too long already."

UTAH

Salt Lake City Deseret News, January 27: "While the world generally has pointed very critically at Little Rock, Americans could point with pride at the superb example Hawaii gives of many people of a mixed society living together in harmony."

VERMONT

Barre Times, January 27: "This newspaper implores the Vermont delegates in Congress to support immediate statehood for Hawaii. Sixty years of apprenticeship is enough."

VIRGINIA

Lynchburg Advance, February 19: "Admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the 50th United States appears to be just over the blue Pacific's horizon, if not around the corner."

Alexandria Gazette, February 9: "The arguments currently being advanced against statehood for Hawaii are few and feeble. Now that Alaska has been launched as a full-fledged member of the Union, the reasons for withholding such status from Hawaii are even less compelling than in the past."

Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch, February 7: "The drive to grant statehood to Hawaii has begun in Congress with such vigor as to suggest that flagmakers would do well to avoid laying up too great stockpile of the banners with 59 stars."

Newport News Press, January 20: "Alaska is in and Hawaii is not far behind."

WASHINGTON

Seattle Times, January 29: "Now for No. 50. Now that Alaska is off to a good start as the 49th State, we believe the appropriate legislation in both congressional chambers should be brought to an early vote and enacted into law."

Tacoma News-Tribune, January 31: "Congress should regard the will of the people and put Hawaii's star on the flag."

Spokane Spokesman-Review, January 29: "Nothing, except the vagaries of political contention, now can excuse failure to take final and decisive action on these patient petitioners. There is no good reason why the vote of both houses should fail to be 'yes.'"

Walla Walla Union-Bulletin, February 5: "Congressman Russell Mack, of Washington's Third District, has come out unequivocally for the admission of Hawaii as our 50th State."

Longview News, January 23: "Congress has no reason now for not admitting Hawaii. Certainly no territory has been in as good a position to help the United States build friendship and sound business relations in the Pacific."

Everett Herald, January 22: "The whole matter simmers down to the point that it is too bad the Congress did not vote statehood for Hawaii the same year it voted Alaska into the Union."

Olympia Olympian, February 9: "With Alaska we abandoned the notion that only territory directly attached to the continental United States could be brought within the fold of States. Once we did that, then what difference whether the spread is 1,500 or 2,600?"

WEST VIRGINIA

Bluefield Sunset News-Observer, February 16: "President Eisenhower has called for prompt action; the Pentagon says that statehood would help the war effort. Hawaii's chances look good."

Clarksburg Exponent, February 10: "A star for Hawaii? By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

Morgantown Dominion News, February 5: "Statehood in pairs. The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood * * * by Alaskan statehood on and as of January 3, 1959."

Mullens Advocate, January 15: "Alaska—and now Hawaii? The Territory pays more Federal taxes than 10 of the existing States * * * its application will be hard to refuse."

Logan Banner, February 5: "Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned, and that argument has faded in consequence."

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee Sentinel, February 1: (Editor's report by William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)—"My father advocated statehood for Hawaii. That is still the position of the Hearst newspapers."

Racine Journal-Times, January 30: "This session of Congress owes to the people of Hawaii—and, as Secretary Seaton pointed out, to the people of the whole United States—a vote for immediate statehood for a Territory that has waited 59 years for the privilege."

Milwaukee Sentinel, February 6: "Despite fears of Communist influence in the islands, we have it on the word of such responsible men as Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton that communism is under as strict surveillance in the islands as it is here."

Eau Claire Telegram, February 5: "All clear for Hawaii now, seems to be the word in Congress. Although opposition still exists, the odds are that it will not be strong enough to make an impression."

Oshkosh Northwestern, December 2, 1958: "Now with Alaska in the fold, it seems no more than fair that Hawaii should be granted the same privilege."

WYOMING

Casper Tribune-Herald, February 4: "The old arguments against the island State have been either answered or destroyed by the action on Alaska."

Cheyenne Eagle, February 7: "With the 49th State thus working for the 50th-to-be, a Hawaii statehood bill should be an early enactment of the session."

Sheridan Press, February 11: "Statehood for the islands * * * is about to enter the bill-drafting stage for the umpteenth time. By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

Sheridan Press, February 3: "To all current appearances, however, the curtain has been lifted and Hawaii is on the way in."

Cheyenne State Tribune, February 13: "Alaska has broken the ice and changed the flag. * * * Now it's Hawaii's turn * * * further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Washington Star, January 21: "The territorial form of government is the normal step preliminary to statehood, and Hawaii meets all reasonable standards for admittance now as a full-fledged State. There is no good reason for further delay."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the eloquent and informative remarks which have been made on the floor today by the many distinguished Senators in support of this historic measure for statehood for Hawaii.

As a Senator from the great State of Utah, I am particularly happy that among the first pieces of major legislation on which I am privileged to vote is statehood for Hawaii. For years I have read and studied what I could on the question of Hawaiian statehood. Then, upon becoming a Member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I continued my study of the Hawaii statehood question in the truly voluminous committee records on the subject, and I attended with keen interest the hearings held late last month by the committee on S. 50, of which I am one of the cosponsors.

SIMILARITY TO UTAH'S HISTORY

Hawaii's long, long record of knocking at the doors of Congress for admission as a State struck a most responsive chord in my memory of the efforts on behalf of my own State. For 40 long years the people of the Beehive State sought statehood, and on six separate occasions the Congress denied full equality to them. It was not until 1896 that Utah was finally admitted.

Hawaii, of course, has waited even longer and has petitioned the Congress even more often than did Utah. She became an integral part of the United States in 1900, when the people of Hawaii became American citizens and the Constitution of the United States was extended to her. Beginning in 1903, the Territory, through its popularly elected legislature, has petitioned Congress for statehood on 17 different occasions. Since 1920, no fewer than 66 bills have been introduced in successive Congresses providing for statehood.

STATEHOOD PETITION SIGNED BY 120,000

The legislature's actions have, of course, reflected the desire of the people of Hawaii. In 1954, I recall from my study of the records, the elected delegate from Hawaii and the Governor of Hawaii presented to the Vice President of the United States a statehood roll of honor signed by almost 120,000 citizens of Hawaii exercising their constitutional right of petition to Congress. This gigantic honor roll—it comprises a half-ton of newsprint—was a simply worded petition for immediate statehood for Hawaii. Some 120,000 citizens took the time and the trouble to go to a central place and sign this petition; and often they had to wait in line, sometimes for a long time.

The House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees have been most industrious and thorough in their inquiries into Hawaii's readiness for statehood. The record on the question comprises more than 6,600 printed pages of testimony and exhibits, as I know from my efforts to learn the facts and their signifigance. More than 850 witnesses have been heard in the Territory and in Washington. Seven of the hearings have been held in Hawaii. At least 12 reports have been made, all but one of them, I believe, favorable to statehood.

The question of admitting Hawaii to statehood has been longer considered and more thoroughly studied than has any other statehood proposal that has ever come before Congress. Thirty-six States have previously been admitted to the Union by action of Congress; yet in no single case, not even that of Utah, has there been such a thoroughly careful study of the qualifications of the applicant as in the case of Hawaii.

A more direct link between Utah and Hawaii is the recent dedication at Laie in Hawaii of a $3 million college sponsored by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. That church is one of the most vigorous and rapidly grow-

ing churches in the Hawaiian Islands, and the dedication of the new college symbolizes its vigor and growth there.

THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII

However, Mr. President, the aspect of Hawaii that has impressed me the most in my studies on statehood is the people of Hawaii. I heard it stated during our committee hearings that the more than 600,000 American citizens of Hawaii should not be admitted to stand on a basis of equality with other American citizens in the 49 States because some of them had ancestors that were non-Caucasian. More than 85 percent of the people of Hawaii are native-born American citizens, educated in Hawaii's American school system—which is outstanding in all respects—and are thoroughly imbued with the principles of Americanism and democracy. They know no loyalty other than that to America. They proved that loyalty, indelibly, on the bloody battlefields of Europe and Korea, and in their peacetime services to their community and their fellow citizens.

Mr. President, at our committee hearing one of the outstanding witnesses was an American of Japanese ancestry, Mike M. Masaoka. Mike and I attended the University of Utah together, and I know of my own knowledge what a sincere, thorough-going American he is. For the benefit of the Members of the Senate, I should like to quote from Mike's statement before the committee. He said, in part:

First, as to Hawaii's population of preponderantly non-European ancestry, we submit that this is one of the most potent arguments for—and contrary to those who insinuate otherwise, not against—statehood.

The harsh realities of this troubled, tension-filled world are such that the destiny of free men and of free nations, including our own, may well be determined by the two-thirds of the world's population that inhabit the so-called Pacific Basin.

Both the Soviet Union and Red China are cognizant that the balance of power lies in this vast area, and they are systematically attempting to win the minds and the hearts of men with their economic, military, and psychological weapons.

There is an old newspaper saying that one picture is worth a thousand words.

GOOD FAITH DEMONSTRATED

The Communists have much to say, and more to promise, to the restless peoples of the Far East who, stirred by the spirit of nationalism, are yearning to break the bonds of colonialism and to gain acceptance and dignity among the nations of the earth.

Thus far, we have demonstrated our good faith and our belief in the self-determination of peoples. We granted independence to the Philippines as we promised. We helped reconstruct and rehabilitate defeated Japan along democratic principles and then restored her sovereignty. We made the major contribution to the defense and the existence of free Korea. We are responsible that a free China continues to survive. We have bolstered the fighting forces and the economies of southeast Asia with our foreign aid.

While on one hand we have demonstrated our good will toward those of Asian ancestry, on the other we have continued to deny equality of status and have discriminated against an integral part of our Nation, an incorporated territory for more than 60 years, whose voters overwhelmingly time and time again expressed their determination to be full-fledged, participating citizens of the United States.

To the millions of dark-skinned people who are the most numerous of the earth's peoples, regardless of our explanations, the only reason they understand to deny statehood to Hawaii is because there are so many persons of Asian and Polynesian ancestry resident there. This apparent discrimination is emphasized by Alaska's admittance last year into the sisterhood of States, leaving Hawaii as the only remaining incorporated territory in our country.

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

The grant of statehood to Hawaii, with its many persons of Japanese, Polynesian, Chinese, Korean, Filipino, and other ancestries at this time would—in our opinion—be a positive, constructive step in our efforts to prove that our practices live up to our professions.

To our mind, more than any other single act that might be undertaken by this Congress and Government, statehood for Hawaii would be the picture of democracy in action that will offset the thousands of words poured out by the Communist hatemongers against us.

Hawaii, already a meetingplace for the East and the West, by its very location as the crossroads of the Pacific, could—and should—be our living showcase of democracy.

Indeed, at the present time, thousands of students annually from all of free Asia are invited by our Government to come to Hawaii to study not only our way of life but also our methods of production.

HAWAIIANS FULFILL ALL OBLIGATIONS

One can easily imagine what some of these students must think when they learn that, though Hawaiians pay taxes and fulfill all other obligations of citizenship, they—like so many of their revolutionary fathers on the mainland more than 183 years ago—cannot vote for their own representatives, or executives, or judges. Once Hawaii becomes a State, however, these students would better appreciate the meaning of democracy and would be better able to witness it in action. Then, on their return to their respective homelands, they could better preach the gospel of freedom and equality.

If Hawaii is admitted to statehood, the peoples of Asia particularly would know that persons of their own ancestry are able to participate fully and successfully in the democratic system. Such visible knowledge would give them assurance that this way of life is practical and appropriate for them, too.

Moreover, it will give to the United States and to the free world a new citizenry which, by its very background, culture, and feeling, is best qualified to explain our ideals and our objectives to the peoples of Asia and to interpret for us the hopes and aspirations of most of the world's population. Indeed, considering that we are least informed about these peoples, Hawaiian Americans who trace their ancestries to the new nations of Asia could render our country an invaluable service in establishing mutual understanding and comity.

DISCRIMINATION INCONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. President, I concur most heartily in Mike Masaoka's testimony. Surely the world of 1959 is not a world in which it is consistent with our national security—to say nothing of the moral and spiritual values at stake—for us to relegate to a secondary status 600,000 American citizens who have met each and every one of our historic tests of readiness for statehood because some of them have non-Caucasian ancestors.

Mr. President, I urge approval of S. 50 as reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee so that we may show all the world that the United States practices what it preaches in the way of democracy and self-determination for its own citizens, as well as supporting such principles elsewhere in the world.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, it is quite clear to me that the Senate of the United States will soon grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

At the outset, I think, we ought to commend the men who have through the years made the great fight for statehood for Hawaii. I observe sitting in the Chamber of the United States Senate today, the Delegate in the House of Representatives, from the Territory of Hawaii [Mr. BURNS], whose courage, vision and foresight have contributed in large measure to what I hope will be the passage of the bill by the Senate and what I am informed will be passage of the bill by the other body very soon.

I also wish to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who a short time ago addressed this body in a magnificent speech, outlining the activities in Hawaii of a group of independent Senators not long ago and likewise the recent activities of a very fine House committee, under the able leadership of Representative LEO O'BRIEN, of New York, ably assisted by Representative SISK, of California, and Representative BERRY, of South Dakota.

Mr. President, the able and distinguished Senator from Idaho and I, as members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, visited the Hawaiian Islands in November to determine whether, in our opinion, that rich Territory was ready for statehood.

After our inquiry and talking to many persons in all walks of life; investigating Hawaii's industry and commerce, its potentialities and its important role in the economy of the Pacific, we concluded there is only one answer.

Hawaii should be granted statehood and at the earliest possible moment.

I feel we can no longer delay in adding this 50th star to our flag and still hold up our head in the free world.

The people of Hawaii want statehood. They are prepared to assume all the obligations of statehood. The admission of Hawaii into the sisterhood of States will be a glorious day for the entire Nation.

We have delayed too long in granting statehood, but further delay would be an imposition we could not tolerate as a nation devoted to the cause of freedom. Statehood will bring equal rights to a group of civilized and mature citizens, who no longer can be relegated to the role of second-class citizens. They have earned and deserve the full rights of citizenship with a voice in their own Government. They pay taxes, they furnish wealth to the United States, and

they deserve all the rights and privileges which statehood will bring.

In World War II, volunteer units from Hawaii showed their patriotism and courage. They fought valiantly as Americans. In fact, the 442d regiment from Hawaii was the most decorated regiment in World War II. Again in Korea they showed they were ready and willing to give their lives for the United States of America.

We cannot do less than grant statehood to the patriotic and sincere citizens of the Hawaiian Islands who have been working to that end for many years.

I would emphasize that granting statehood to Hawaii would give us a tremendous lift in the eyes of the world, especially the Asian nations, who look with scorn upon our professions of freedom so long as we retain Hawaii as a colonial possession.

Any further delay in granting statehood will have serious repercussions in the Far East. I say that to live up to our American ideals, we must grant statehood, and at once.

Hawaii is one of the most delightful places in the world. It has a climate without great extremes. Flowers and plants grow in profusion, there are vast expanses of beaches, towering mountains, waterfalls with running streams. Hawaii is one of the near approaches to paradise on this earth. Millions of dollars have been invested in resort hotels and in making Hawaii a visiting place for people from many lands.

It also is a land of vast plantations, of industry, of shipping and business enterprise. It is not merely a playground, and it does not take too long a visit to realize the wealth and industry which abound in the beautiful galaxy of islands.

Moreover, it has a great resource in the intelligent and progressive citizens who call it home. These people have an earnest desire for statehood for Hawaii. They cannot see why this Nation—supposedly devoted to assuring equality and justice to all—has so long delayed in granting statehood.

Few people realize the extensive area which makes up the group of islands. They do not realize the vast amount of wealth these islands pour into the economic life of our Nation. It is not merely a land of glamour and hula girls.

One visit to the islands will dispel the idea that it is only a "never-never land" dependent upon tourists for its existence. Nothing could be further from the truth, for it is a land of industry, of adequate transportation, of modern agriculture, bustling business, and huge office buildings.

There is no discounting that Hawaii is becoming increasingly important in the trend of world developments and international power. The islands hold the key to the stability of a vast area. We cannot afford to fumble again and still face up to our responsibilities as a world power. There has been too much delay already.

I talked with many persons on my recent trip to the islands. Nearly all earnestly desire statehood. It seems to me there is no legitimate excuse for continuing Hawaiian colonialism. There is no reason for denying the people their full rights as citizens.

I desire again to point out that granting of statehood would help us in the present cold war, and the fact that Hawaii has been denied statehood is having serious repercussions while we seek world leadership. Colonialism can no longer be justified in this age, and the sooner we grant statehood to Hawaii the sooner we shall get away from the stigma of harboring colonialism.

Our relations in the Far East are becoming increasingly important. We are justly criticised because of our treatment of Hawaii. The islands are at the crossroads of the Pacific, and when Hawaii is admitted as the 50th State we will gain a tremendous lift in our relations with the other nations in the Far East.

Last fall a subcommittee from the House also made an investigation of Hawaiian statehood. This group, headed by the able Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York, went into all phases of the question.

We, all of us—

The report says—

saw and met in Hawaii an intelligent, gentle, loyal people of whom our Nation should be proud.

I also reached this conclusion, and with the finding "calmly, and soberly, we urge the 86th Congress, as soon as possible, place in the flag the 50th star called Hawaii."

While in Hawaii the subcommittee held hearings, heard hundreds of people, and carefully studied every aspect of the statehood problem. It investigated the claim that Hawaii might possibly be dominated by Communists and found it was a claim without foundation. That also was my conclusion.

I can repeat what the Commission for Hawaiian statehood says:

Hawaii is a Pacific outpost of the American way of life, a window on our freedoms. It is a showcase of democracy * * * proof that the people of the East and West can work together for the good of all under the flag of freedom.

Today, statehood for Hawaii is an ethical rather than a political question.

By embracing Hawaii as a State, the United States would advance three bold steps closer to victory in the cold war against communism in the Pacific and Asia.

1. Bolster Hawaii's role as our defense outpost in the Pacific.

2. Make Hawaii a center where the people of the Pacific basin could study and learn our best American traditions.

3. Demonstrate dramatically that the United States both cherishes and practices the democratic ideal that her citizens stand equal before the law regardless of color or creed. The example of a State of Hawaii would shine in the Pacific for half the world's people to see and to compare with the empty promise of equality held out by the Communists.

From my visit I am confident all those statements are true. But if we deny the hopes and ambitions of these loyal and patriotic citizens the whole Nation will suffer. It will be a blow to our hopes of world peace and security.

Commonsense and fairness demand early approval of Hawaiian statehood. When it is granted we can rejoice that we have shown millions in the world we uphold the causes of justice and equality.

Since my recent trip to Hawaii I feel deeply about the importance of Hawaiian statehood. I am firmly convinced that Hawaii should become the 50th in our sisterhood of States and that every day we delay is injurious to our entire Nation. I hope the question can be brought to a vote and this Territory of Hawaii be given statehood at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice to those who strongly favor granting statehood to Hawaii. I am convinced that passage of the measure before us will be in the best interests of the people of our Nation as well as the nearly 600,000 Americans who today reside in the Territory of Hawaii.

Let there be no doubt about it: By every traditional yardstick, Hawaii is ready, willing, and able to assume the duties and responsibilities of statehood. She has passed with flying colors the time-honored tests for entrance into the Union. Hawaii has demonstrated conclusively, over the years, full respect for the ideals of democracy. The people of the Territory have expressed an overwhelming desire to join the Union. And Hawaii has exhibited an economic development adequate to carry the financial burdens incumbent upon a State.

The time for study of this proposition is over. The issue of Hawaiian statehood is more than 100 years old. Scores of bills embodying this ideal have been introduced in Congress and debated at length. Dozens of hearings have been held by committees of Congress.

Bills granting statehood to Hawaii have passed the House four times in recent years. Every time, however, this body has proved to be the stumbling block. This year I am confident we will not stand in the way of simple justice and honest progress. We can, and will, pin the 50th star on the flag of the United States.

Mr. President, those who have visited the islands can testify at first hand to their beauty, qualities, and potential. The people, drawn from many racial backgrounds, combine a love for America and its principles with a rich heritage born of ancestors from many lands.

While this land is gifted with a unique native culture and lush natural beauties and resources, Hawaii is not merely an enchanted "never-never land." It has all the earmarks, all the energy, all the drive, of a fast-moving, fast-developing, modern American community.

When one meets the people of Hawaii, when one sees their way of life, when one experiences the every day happenings of life in the islands, one comes to the realization that the islands are little different from any average American State. The people share the same ideals, suffer from the same problems,

and work for goals in common with the 49 American States.

Yet, after more than 50 years of living as Americans, working as Americans, thinking as Americans, acting as Americans, and dying as Americans, Hawaiian residents today are denied the full privileges of first-class citizensip. These fine people deserve the riches which can come only with statehood and its resultant dignity and prestige.

Mr. President, it is time that statehood—for which Hawaii has worked, dreamed and sacrificed—was granted. I find it hard to understand how anyone who has objectively considered all the factors involved and who has studied at length the evidence on this subject, can continue to oppose Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. President, the issue of the noncontiguity and distance of Hawaii has been raised. I find that argument without substantial basis in fact. In the first place, the easy acceptance of Alaska as the 49th State and the lack of problems of communication and transportation in that case argue strongly against this point of view.

Clearly, transportation to and from Hawaii is much more frequent, easier, and often faster than transportation to and from Alaska. The weather factors which make sea and air connections with Alaska uncertain are not as formidable in the case of Hawaii. Clearly, the argument that Hawaii is too far away to be a State is just plain obsolete in this jet age of speedy, efficient, and dependable transportation and communication.

Opponents of Hawaiian statehood have also raised the question of the effect of the admission of a 50th State on the power of Senators from the more populous States. It has been contended that further additions to the membership of both bodies of Congress will dilute unfairly the power of the more thickly populated sections of this Nation.

There is certainly some truth to these statements. As a Senator from the Nation's most populous State, I would presumably be one most likely to suffer. But such a prospect dismays me little. It appears to me manifest that the simple justice and moral obligations involved, as well as the clear fact that Hawaii is fully qualified for statehood, outweigh any arguments which may be advanced about her admission and its effect on proportional representation.

In addition, it should be noted that Hawaii has a population today greater than any one of the States of Vermont, Delaware, Nevada, Wyoming, and Alaska.

It is my firm conviction the United States has a moral and legal obligation to grant statehood to Hawaii. This obligation has been underscored recently by the addition of Alaska to the Union.

Particularly in this body, we must never overlook our historic national principle that government must be based on the consent of the governed and that our failure to grant statehood to Hawaii would raise the serious question of taxation without representation.

On the other hand, we should not forget the good effect the admission of Hawaii would have on our relations with the peoples of the Far East. The grant of statehood would prove to the world, especially Asia, that we practice what we preach. We need the advice and guidance of Hawaiians more and more as we shape our policies and pursue our dealings with the peoples of the Orient.

From the legal point of view, we must bear in mind that our Nation has a historic practice of admitting incorporated territories to statehood when they have achieved sufficient levels of population and development. There are numerous precedents to substantiate this argument.

Another factor favoring statehood for Hawaii is that such a move would surely stimulate even greater economic growth on the islands. Our experience with other newly admitted States gives strong credence to this argument.

Moreover, there is ample evidence that the Federal Government will save money as the new State takes over many of the governmental functions now borne by the United States. At the same time, the burden of the average taxpayer in Hawaii will undoubtedly be increased with the onset of statehood. It is interesting to note that this factor has apparently not deterred native support for the statehood movement.

There have been repeated and serious charges that there are extensive Communist influences on the islands. I would be less than frank if I did not say that this proposition has caused me a good deal of worry during the years when Congress has considered Hawaiian statehood bills. I would never be party to any action which might in any way give aid and comfort to this ruthless band of atheistic expansionists.

However, Mr. President, I am convinced that the issue of communism in the islands should not be a factor in this debate. On the basis of the evidence I have examined, we need not fear that communism is any greater a menace in Hawaii than in other parts of the United States.

Thus, while I feel we must ever be on the alert against communism, in all its subtle ways, shapes, and fashions, I think this aspect has been largely overrated with respect to Hawaii. While Communists do exist in the Territory, they no more control it than they do the mainland. There is ample evidence the people of the islands abhor this evil challenge as we do, and are meeting it as capably and with as much vigor as are any of the 49 States.

The people of the Territory have repeatedly rejected the Communist philosophy and have turned back every attempt of the Communists to influence their government. They have written into their proposed State constitution a broad prohibition against any Communist holding public office.

In any case, it is plain to me that admission of Hawaii into the Union would strengthen, not weaken, the Federal Government's power to fight whatever vestiges of communism there may be on the islands. As a matter of fact, under the Supreme Court's Nelson decision, which I hope this Congress will correct, the Territory of Hawaii—like our States—can do little in the field of anti-subversive activity. Certainly, admission of Hawaii to statehood, no matter what the decision of Congress on Nelson case legislation, will enhance the arsenal of tools available to fight all forms of subversion on the islands.

There is one other issue which has been raised against statehood, which I feel constrained to discuss. That is the specious objection to certain racial characteristics of the population of the Territory. I think it is entirely out of keeping with the American traditions of equality and acceptance that this argument should even be raised. That it should be seriously pressed in some quarters disturbs me deeply.

Let us put the cards on the table. The largest single population group on the islands is Japanese, and there are in addition many people of Filipino, Chinese, and Hawaiian ancestry. The Caucasian segment of the population amounts to about 20 percent of the total.

Opponents have argued that the addition of these racial strains to our Nation would bring adverse effects on our political, social, and economic standards. They have erected one big bogyman, or strawman from this issue, which I feel has no basis in fact or fancy.

To accept the contention that the addition of these new racial strains to the Union would upset any kind of a present "balance" flies in the face of everything I have been taught to believe about this great Nation of ours. It contravenes directly every ideal of our democratic form of government. It presupposes that there is some kind of racial limitation set on being an American. I cannot accept that argument.

American ciitzenship belongs to those who earn it. We are not part of any elite club, with powers to exclude people just because of the color of their skin or the nature of their racial origins.

It is one of the unique qualities of our national fabric that in this country men of all races, all creeds, all national origins have come together here to live in a land dominated by principles of equality and justice, however imperfectly those ideals have been realized in some quarters.

Finally, those who would cast aspersions on Hawaiians because of their largely non-Caucasian nature, are in effect besmirching the memory of those islanders of every background who have proved their loyalty to America by fighting and dying for our country on equal terms with men from the mainland.

Actually, a large majority of residents of the Territory are native-born Americans. The accepted language is English, and all functions and business—government and private—is conducted in English.

Mr. President, the recent admission of Alaska to the Union, in addition to adding impetus to the Hawaiian statehood movement, also increases the arguments for the island. Admission of Hawaii as a State will raise fewer governmental problems because Hawaii has had a greater share of self-government over the years than has Alaska. Since there has been less direct Federal action and supervision in Hawaii than in Alaska,

the process of adaption to statehood should be even simpler for Hawaii.

Mr. President, this Nation has grown great through the infusion into the national bloodstream and addition to the national strength, of new ideas, new energies, new talents, and new outlooks from newcomers to our shores. Historically, such stimuli have come from abroad, but we are presented in the bill before us with an opportunity to infuse new spirit into America by the simple means of admitting Hawaii as a State.

Mr. President, statehood for Hawaii is sound. It is logical. It is just. Let us, today, make possible the addition of that 50th star to the American flag.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I urge the prompt enactment of S. 50, to grant statehood to Hawaii. I know from personal experience the frustration felt by the people of Hawaii when they do not have the full rights of U.S. citizenship, with all the privileges which go with that high status.

For many years I have worked closely with the Delegates to Congress from Hawaii. Both the former Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii have faced similar problems in their efforts to attain statehood.

When the Congress of the United States, after long and careful consideration, conferred full statehood to Alaska, a dedication to the ideals of our country surged in the hearts of our people. Spontaneous demonstrations of enthusiasm for our having attained statehood were in evidence everywhere in Alaska.

It is difficult to express the meaning of full citizenship to those who have always had that privilege, but it is the hope of the people of Alaska that our sister State in the Pacific, the State of Hawaii, will now have that privilege and take her place in the Union.

The die was cast for Hawaii, when Alaska was admitted. Hawaii now is the only incorporated Territory of the United States and the only remaining area which has fulfilled the requirements of statehood.

Throughout our history three standards have been required for admission of a Territory to statehood:

First. That the people of the Territory are imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government.

Second. That a majority of the electorate express a desire for statehood.

Third. That the new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

Hawaii is fully qualified in all these respects. The many congressional investigations which have been held, both in Hawaii and in Washington, provide ample testimony on all facts of life in the islands. I do not intend to go into the statistics which have been gathered together to prove that Hawaii is qualified as a State. The committee report before you gives these.

The people of Hawaii are thoroughly American. The New England missionaries who went to the islands in 1820 established schools and churches, and instilled in the children the American traditions and the ideals of American democracy. These teachings have been carried on through the schools and the homes, and today the population of Hawaii is as American as apple pie. Their records of patriotism are the envy of all of us.

The requirement that a majority of the electorate desire statehood has been satisfied on two separate occasions in the past. The electorate voted 2 to 1 for statehood in 1941. Later, in 1950, the proposed constitution of the new State of Hawaii was submitted to the people and the vote was 3 to 1 in favor. The bill before us calls for a plebiscite on this question by the people of Hawaii before statehood becomes effective, so the people of Hawaii will once more have the opportunity of expressing their sentiments regarding statehood.

As to the next criteria, Hawaii does have sufficient population and resources to take her place in the American economy. She has always paid her proportionate share of the cost of the Federal Government and ably supports her own government. A study of the records reveals that there is no doubt but that Hawaii meets this third standard for statehood.

The Board of Health estimate of July 1, 1958, shows the population of Hawaii to be about 582,000, more than several of the present States. Territorial tax revenues for the last fiscal year amounted to more than $122 million. Federal taxes paid to the U.S. Treasury last year amounted to $166,300,000 which exceeds the amounts paid by 10 of the mainland States. The 1958 per capita income exceeded that of 26 States. Surely this indicates that Hawaii is well able to assume the full responsibilities of statehood, both to the Federal Government and to its own local government.

Only through statehood can the citizens of Hawaii attain the greatest of all assets, that of full suffrage—the right of an individual to express himself at the polls by electing officials who will carry out the wishes of the majority of the electorate. Hawaii, as a Territory, elects its own Territorial legislators, but it has no voice in the Federal Government, as its only representative in Washington is a nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives. But never has there been an instance when the people of Hawaii have not met all the obligations of the Federal laws. They pay full Federal taxes, although they have had no part in making tax laws. When their young men were called into the armed services of the country, the response was tremendous, even though the citizens had had no part in the enactment of the Federal laws for this purpose. There has never been any question but that as American citizens they were bound by all the Federal laws. And they would have it no other way. They are proud of their American citizenship but they should be entitled to the full rights of suffrage in order to have a voice in the Federal Government.

Statehood will bring them the right to elect their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor, who will be responsible to the electorate and not to the administration in Washington, as at present. Appointment to the judicial bench will no longer be made from Washington, but will be by officials of the new State who are directly responsible to the people.

Hawaii has her problems, just as Alaska has, and Maine, New York, California, but she can meet these as a State, just as all the other States do. It seems only a matter of simple justice to give her the rights of statehood.

I have dwelt mostly on the benefits which will accrue to the citizens of Hawaii with the granting of statehood, and will leave to others to point out the effects of such action on our world policy. Hawaii is living proof that democracy as advocated by the United States affords a solution to a major problem facing the world.

Mr. President, I should like to make two comments of a personal nature.

I only wish my friend who served Hawaii so ably and so long as Delegate in Congress could be here to witness what surely now will be the planting of the Hawaii statehood banner on the highest summit. I refer, of course, to Joseph Rider Farrington, who died in office and whose death was surely hastened by the intensity and degree of his efforts to bring statehood to the people of his island Territory.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to repeat here what I said in my testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and elsewhere. That is, I believe it is most doubtful if Alaska would now have statehood or if Hawaii would be so close to it if it had not been for the courageous, statesmanlike position taken last year by Delegate JOHN A. BURNS, of Hawaii, a man for whom I entertain personal affection and who has served so effectively his beloved Hawaii. In the spring of 1958 it was plain to all who would see that legislative action could be expected for Alaska one way or another but that the Hawaii bill was not coming up. Delegate BURNS took his stand on the proposition that if Alaska were to be added, Hawaii could expect affirmative action in 1959. And now his judgment is being confirmed. Heavy pressures—very heavy pressures, indeed—were placed upon him from Hawaii to demand that Hawaii and Alaska statehood proposals be joined. This, very positively, would not have succeeded and might have resulted in Alaska's being downed, too. But many in Hawaii did not understand this. The popular course, the political course, would have dictated a yielding to these demands. Fixed by an iron determination, Delegate BURNS stood his ground. When he returned home after Alaska became a State, to explain all of this to his constituents, they agreed with him. So, thanks to JACK BURNS in particular, Hawaii is about to become the 50th and, I believe, the last State of this great Union of States. We cheechakos from Alaska welcome the cheechakos soon-to-be from Hawaii.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Hawaiian statehood bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to compliment the Senator on his remarks; but more than that, I think we all owe him a debt of gratitude for his very wonderful tribute to Joe Farrington. His remarks with respect to Joe Farrington are certainly true. He probably did hasten his own death by the struggle he put up for Hawaiian statehood. It seems to me that it is peculiarly appropriate at this time that we do not forget such men as Joe Farrington, who for many years made the fight which we hope to bring to a culmination today.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with the Senator from Colorado. Joe Farrington was a great Hawaiian and a great American.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, we are moving toward action on the pending bill in an atmosphere of almost hysterical excitement. We are yielding to propaganda largely promoted for the benefit of those whose ends would be served.

I do not mean to say that all who support statehood for Hawaii have a selfish interest. Many good, patriotic people support Hawaii's admission to the Union. However, there are those who do have a selfish interest, including the Communist world conspiracy; and it is that selfish interest alone which will be served by the grant of statehood to Hawaii, which is not in the national interest of this country.

I understand that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] made the statement that the Bridges union, the ILWU, must be all right, because if it were Communist-dominated, the U.S. Government would have proceeded against it, or against its leaders.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I did not say that Mr. Bridges' union was all right. That is reading into what I said something that is not the way I said it. I said the means were there. I will quote what I said, if the Senator wishes me to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what I should like to have the Senator do.

Mr. ALLOTT. Speaking of the late Senator Butler's findings I said:

> Senator Butler's findings are substantiated by reports from the FBI, naval, and military intelligence. The FBI in 1953 stated that at no time were there more than 160 Communists in Hawaii. The 1951 FBI report listed only 36 known Communists.
>
> Today it is estimated that between 40 and 60 Communists are left in all the islands. This is 40 to 60 out of a total population of close to 635,000—at the most, Communists number only 1 out of every 10,000 people in Hawaii.

Mr. EASTLAND. What did the Senator say about the union? That is the point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall read three paragraphs on that point:

> The Communist issue—which involves the question of whether certain alleged Communists or Communist-front organizations could in fact control Hawaii or Hawaiian elections—should be faced squarely here on the floor today. There are nearly 200,000 persons in Hawaii who are members of the labor force. Approximately 25,000 are members of the union alleged to be Communist-dominated. Only a few—a very few—of these 25,000 have ever been accused of being Communist sympathizers or Communist Party members.
>
> If this had been proven in the past, the Federal Government having the authority, facilities, and power to deal with Communist-infiltrated unions, would have taken the necessary steps to strip the unions of their collective-bargaining rights.
>
> Such Federal action would free local employers from recognizing these unions in contract negotiations and also permit union members to expel their Communist leaders. No action to this effect has been taken by Federal authorities.

Mr. EASTLAND. Such action as could be taken was taken. That is the entire point. Bridges was convicted of perjury on the ground that he had lied when he said he was not a Communist Party member. The leaders of his union were convicted. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled in a case, the name of which I have forgotten, although I believe it was the Yates case. When the Bridges case came up on appeal in the circuit court of appeals on the west coast, the court said, in effect, "We must turn these people loose, because the Supreme Court has made a shambles of the Smith Act."

An attempt was made by the Government of the United States to strip a union of its bargaining rights, because its officials had filed false non-Communist affidavits. That was stopped by the Supreme Court, on the ground that the only person the Government could move against was the signer of the false affidavit, not the union.

Mr. ALLOTT. That was back in the 1940's, was it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember the date. It is absolutely immaterial what the date was. The fact is that the U.S. Government has done all it can. The fact is, also, that the economy of Hawaii is Communist controlled.

Mr. ALLOTT. Would the Senator say that any action had been taken by any branch of the Government in the past 10 years?

Mr. EASTLAND. I say I do not remember the date. The date is immaterial. However, action was taken.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe the date is important.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a fact that this union is Communist dominated, and that the United States Government has gone as far as it can go. There are some very strange influences in the Supreme Court of the United States. In this instance, as in all others, when it comes to communism, the Court throws the cloak of protection around the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to say that I throw no cloaks around communism, no matter where it may be.

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly would not want to leave any such implication about the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know the Senator from Mississippi would not do so. I wish to say further that at one time, within the past 6 years, the Hawaiian Legislature showed by its action that it did deal with a strike there, and dealt with it very forcefully and in a very forthright manner; in fact, in a way we have not employed in this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. And then they took over the Territorial legislature. The speaker of the house showed his subservience to the Communist Harry Bridges by sending his gavel to the Communist Harry Bridges at the convention on the west coast.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say to the Senator that he is speaking of something of which I have no knowledge.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator knew the conditions in Hawaii, he would be the last man in the Senate to vote to admit Hawaii into the Union. I am glad we are educating the distinguished Senator on the danger of admitting that Territory into the Union.

Mr. ALLOTT. I made one trip to Hawaii for the purpose of informing myself on conditions there. I have numerous personal acquaintances in Hawaii with whom I have discussed this question at great length. They did not come to the same conclusion the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has reached.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator speaks about acquaintances in Hawaii. I have been there. I took the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate there. As I recall, there were two Democrats and three Republicans on the subcommittee who went to the Hawaiian Islands with me. Any number of people who have led the fight for statehood will tell the Senator off the record: "That is the very last thing we should have, but we must do it for political reasons." The fact remains that a duly constituted subcommittee of the Senate, established by Senate resolution, which has gone into all the ramifications of the subject, has submitted a unanimous report that the Communist conspiracy has entirely too much influence in the Hawaiian Islands. Later I shall read that report. It is bipartisan. It states the facts.

All the pleas for Hawaiian statehood are emotional in nature. Our generosity is appealed to on the ground that Hawaii has earned statehood. Our sense of justice is appealed to on the ground that if Alaska can be a State, Hawaii has a right to be a State. We are cajoled with vistas of blue waters and white sands and waving palms, which, it is subtly suggested, will become more proudly ours if Hawaii attains statehood. We are

cozened with the assertion that the people of Hawaii are all good Americans, just like the rest of us. I certainly believe that the vast majority are good Americans, as we are. However, the economy of the islands, there can be no question, is Communist controlled, by a few Communists at the top who were convicted by the U.S. Government, and turned loose by the Supreme Court. They have control of the economic life of the islands.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. My distinguished colleague from Colorado, if I may refresh his memory—I refer to a year ago or so—had some reservations about communism in the islands. He has had an opportunity to examine into that question, as has been the case with other persons in the past. I have read his very excellent speeches on the subject. Other Members of the Senate have gone into the question. Members of the House have examined into the question. We have gone to the FBI. We have gone to the police department. We have gone to the Republican newspapers. We have gone to Republican businessmen in every walk of life.

I may say to the distinguished Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the question?

Mr. CARROLL. The question is this: When the Senator makes the assertion that there is a Communist conspiracy in the islands, does he really think that that conspiracy is so dangerous that it could injure the Nation?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do.

Mr. CARROLL. If so, why?

Mr. EASTLAND. Because the Communists have influence in electing high public officials. Let me tell the distinguished Senator from Colorado that a duly constituted subcommittee of the Senate, who are just as patriotic and just as nonpartisan as any other Members of this body, went to Hawaii and held hearings. The subcommittee filed a unanimous report in the light of all the facts which were uncovered.

I will not stand here and say that someone slipped up to me and whispered this to me, as statements to that effect have been made. But I can say that the very persons who are the leaders in the movement for statehood will say privately that it is the last thing that should happen. They will say, "We are not ready for it because of the influence of the ILWU."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator refers to the fact that the Communists have elected high public officials. We found on a recent trip to Hawaii, only a few months ago, that the high officials who were elected are Democrats. There was a Democratic sweep in the Hawaiian Islands. I myself, in the town of Hilo, in the Hawaiian Islands, spoke both with Democratic and Republican leaders.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall discuss that matter in a few moments. There are two factions in the Democratic Party in Hawaii. The minority fraction today is Communist directed. This is not solely a Democratic matter, because the Republicans in the legislature lined up with the Communist-controlled Democrats, and overthrew the Democratic organization, to control the election of the speaker and other officials in the Territorial legislature, as I shall show later.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. It has been said by some persons that there is a minority section of the Democratic Party in our own country, but that does not mean they are Communists.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it does not mean that they are Communists; certainly it does not mean that they are Communists; but in Hawaii there is a Communist organization. There have been many fifth amendment cases. We showed, even, that Communist propaganda was being put into the school system. We showed that Communist propaganda from the Soviet Union, Red China, and the satellite countries was flooding the Hawaiian Islands under the auspices of the ILWU. I say that that union is a Communist union and has entirely too much influence in the Democratic Party in Hawaii. I shall show that in detail in a few moments.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for one question; yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Representative LEO O'BRIEN, who is a distinguished newspaperman from Albany, N.Y., and a Republican; Representative BERRY, of South Dakota; and I visited the FBI only a few weeks ago. We asked the specific question: "How many known Communists are in the Hawaiian Islands?"

Mr. EASTLAND. What does the number mean? I ask the distinguished Senator, What is there in numbers? We have seen, all over the world, a small minority of Communists taking over one country after another. In Hawaii, the leaders are Communists who control the economic life of the islands. That is the point. Whether there be 4, 5, or 50, they have too much power.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator permit me to propound my question? We were informed by the FBI that there were 25 known Communists in the Hawaiian Islands. Now I put the question: Considering the great expanse of area, considering the nature of the population and the nature of the economy, does the Senator from Mississippi think those 25 Communists could form a conspiracy which would injure the Territory of Hawaii if it became a State?

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly do, because they control the economic life of the island. I notice that the Senator from Colorado made no reference to the influential and powerful positions which Communists have in the island. That is the key to the whole subject. What are their powers? What is their influence? I am very much amazed that the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado did not go into that phase of the question with the FBI.

Mr. President, as I have said, we are moving toward action on this bill in an atmosphere of almost hysteric excitement. We are yielding to propaganda largely promoted for the benefit of those whose ends will be served. I do not mean to say that all who support statehood have a selfish interest; many good patriotic people support Hawaii's admission, but there are those who do have a selfish-interest—including the Communist world conspiracy—and it is the selfish interests alone which will be served by a grant of statehood to Hawaii, not any national interest of this country.

All of the pleas for Hawaiian statehood are emotional in nature. Our generosity is appealed to, on the ground that Hawaii has "earned" statehood. Our sense of justice is appealed to, on the ground that if Alaska can be a State, Hawaii has a right to be a State. We are cajoled with vistas of blue waters and white sands and waving palms which, it is subtly suggested, will become more proudly "ours" if Hawaii attains statehood. We are cozened with the assertion that the people of Hawaii are "all good Americans just like us." We are threatened with the prospect of being declared racists if we oppose Hawaiian statehood for any reason at all. As I say, we are confronted at every turn by emotional arguments. But I have not heard anyone tell how the national interest will be served by making Hawaii a State.

But I can tell you, Mr. President, how the Communist interests will be served if we pass this bill.

Mr. President, we are threatened with the prospect of being declared racist if we oppose the bill for Hawaiian statehood for any reason at all. As I say, we are confronted at every turn by emotional arguments, but I have not heard anyone tell how the national interest will be served by making Hawaii a State. I can tell the Senate how the Communist interest will be served if we pass the bill.

Six years ago, I pointed out that in one respect the proposed Hawaiian constituition was tailormade to expedite Communist control of the islands. That constitution provides that a simple plurality is all that is required to elect a Governor of Hawaii. Under that constitution, the person receiving the largest number of votes will be made Governor. In a two-candidate election, that would be a majority. But suppose there were three, four or more candidates.

With the genius which Harry Bridges and Jack Hall have shown for organizing the workers of Hawaii, and the superb organizing ability of world communism, one can readily visualize what would happen with several candidates running for Governor. Such a situation would be made to order for the manipulation of bloc voters under unscrupulous, ruthless Communist leadership.

Harry Bridges and Jack Hall would hold the balance of power.

I state categorically that they hold the balance of power in the Territory of Hawaii today. Let no one think that a Republican Senator will be elected from Hawaii, either.

The Communists of Hawaii cannot show the full strength of their position until the proposed constitution goes into effect, following the grant of statehood. But if statehood is granted under the proposed constitution, never doubt that they will take full advantage of the opportunities thereby provided them.

Given a Communist Governor, or even a Governor who is a Communist captive, the way would be cleared for Harry Bridges and Jack Hall, by manipulation, by intimidation, and by corruption, to send a Communist controlled or influenced Representative, or two Communist controlled or influenced Senators, to the Congress of the United States.

It is hard to believe that the United States Senate will fall into such a trap as this. The American people will not gain from the granting of statehood to Hawaii. The Territory will gain nothing. World communism will be the sole beneficiary; and what a tremendous victory it will be.

I cannot say that Communist influence put this provision in the Hawaiian constitution. I do not know. But it is there.

Is it significant that in January 1950, it was announced that all units of the ILWU had been notified to establish political committees before February 1, and that these committees were to function in connection with the election of delegates to the Hawaii State constitutional convention to be held in April 1950, and were to remain intact for the fall elections as well? Is it not likewise significant that in the constitutional convention election, 2 of the 63 offices were held by Richard M. Kageyamo, a former member of the Communist Party, and Frank G. Silva, one of the "reluctant 39" who took the fifth amendment before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. They were two Communists who helped draft the proposed Hawaiian constitution.

Another point with respect to the Hawaii State constitution which has been presented to us for ratification merits attention.

This constitution includes what has been referred to as the "loyalty oath" provision, though this provision does not in terms require a loyalty oath. What this provision says is that—

> No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

Inclusion of this provision in the Hawaiian constitution is a recognition by the constitutional drafters of the extreme importance of the Communist problem in Hawaii, and is an effort to meet it. Unfortunately, this provision cannot be taken as a guarantee against either the growth or even the continuance of Communist influence in the islands. It must, rather, be regarded as an abortive effort to deal with the situation.

The reason this is so is that the Supreme Court of the United States has handed down decisions which, when applied to this provision of the Hawaiian Constitution, would appear certain to result in having it declared unconstitutional.

In the Yates case decision, which construes language of the Smith Act which banned the teaching or advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, the Supreme Court of the United States developed the theory of "mere abstract advocacy," and declared such language ineffective against Communist activity not shown to include specific and current "incitement" to action. In more than one case, the Supreme Court of the United States has developed the doctrine of a new first amendment right, which it has called "freedom of association," and has referred to membership in the Communist party as "a mere matter of belief and association."

It is not the fault of the drafters of the Hawaiian constitution that this provision against the holding of office by Communists must be considered ineffective. It is the fault of the Supreme Court of the United States. But the fact remains that the provision is, and will be, ineffective.

Furthermore, this situation raises another point: Should we in the Congress approve a constitution containing a provision which, under existing decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, is unconstitutional?

I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point. I personally favor prohibiting Communists from holding any office, not only in the government of Hawaii, but also in the Government of the United States or in the government of any State or political subdivision of this Nation. But this is one of the points on which I differ from the majority of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Insofar as this provision of the Hawaiian constitution might be considered the basis for a loyalty oath—for instance, if in implementing this provision it should be decided to require candidates for office to make a disclosure respecting membership in the Communist Party—the Supreme Court of the United States also has spoken adversely. Similar loyalty oath requirements in California, based upon a comparable California constitutional provision—one dealing, however, not with State officers, but with tax exemption—was invalidated by the Supreme Court only a short time ago, on the ground that such requirements violated the due process of law provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

So the efforts of the constitutional draftsmen of Hawaii to meet the Communist problem through a constitutional provision must be considered as thwarted by decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, and must be considered also as raising a question respecting approval of the Hawaiian constitution with this provision in it, since the provision is at variance with the current doctrines laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court.

COMMUNIST FRATERNIZATION

Mr. President, one of the greatest danger signals of the Communist threat in Hawaii is to be found in the toleration of Communists and the fraternization with Communists by many non-Communists, including officials of the government and leaders of civic and business organizations. In spite of the fact that residents of Hawaii who serve on committees with top Communists, who make it possible for insidious Red propaganda to be smuggled into the public schools, through scholarship contests—which was true in 1954—who give financial and moral aid to the Communist Party and Communist objectives, through paid greeting advertisements in the Communist press, and who help give the Communist Party face and respectability in these and many other ways, are doing more harm to their community and to the Nation than they would if they harbored in their homes, bank robbers or murderers, there are many such.

Today, a major drive of Communist activity on the mainland, as well as elsewhere, is toward respectability and acceptance. In Hawaii, social and political fraternization between highly respected leading citizens of the community, on the one hand, and vicious and sinister enemies of our country, on the other, exists to a degree that is unparalleled anywhere on the mainland, and would be incomprehensible here. As long as treason remains respectable in Hawaii, it is going to be difficult to deal with the Communist menace there.

On the point of communism in Hawaii, I shall have a good deal more to say later. At this time, Mr. President, I wish to discuss a question of precedents.

NEW PRECEDENT

Mr. President, it has been said that by the admission of Alaska we have set a precedent which requires that the Territory of Hawaii be made a State. But this is not a fact. The admission of Alaska is not a good precedent for the admission of Hawaii. Making Alaska a State did involve extension of the boundaries of the United States. It did involve the acceptance as a State of noncontiguous territory, but it did not involve going outside the American Continent. Granting statehood to Hawaii would involve exactly the latter.

It is a plain geographical fact that the 20 volcanic islands in the North Pacific Ocean which make up the Territory of Hawaii are not part of the American Continent. No area not a part of the American Continent has ever been admitted as a State. Our very Constitution recites, in its preamble, that it is ordained and established "for the United States of America." If we admit Hawaii as a State, our country will no longer be the United States of America; instead, it will be the United States of America

and the Pacific Islands. Or perhaps, as Mr. Willis Carto suggested in his testimony before the Territories Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we should then call our country "the United States of Anywhere," so as to be able to retain the initials "U.S.A."

In view of the fact that the Constitution was established for "the United States of America," how can it be extended beyond America without a constitutional amendment? I do not ask this facetiously. I think it is a serious question. There may have been a time when the preamble to the Constitution was thought to have no force as law, but the general welfare clause, which is part of the preamble, has long since been recognized as a basis for legislation. How can we deny effect to the declaration, in this first paragraph of the instrument itself, that our Constitution was established "for the United States of America"? Admission of Hawaii as a State would not be following the precedent established by the admission of Alaska. On the contrary, a grant of statehood to Hawaii would be setting a new precedent, one which would plague us through countless years. The precedent we would be setting by making Hawaii a State is the precedent that land or islands unconnected with the American Continent and inhabited by people of radically different backgrounds from those of the majority of Americans are eligible to become a State.

This is the necessary result of our action, if we act to admit Hawaii as a State. And when we have set this precedent, where will we stop? Will we deny statehood to Puerto Rico, upon request? To Panama? To Guam? To the Virgin Islands? And if to any or all of these, why not San Marino, or Ghana, or Cyprus? Panama is in a way more "American" than Hawaii. Puerto Rico, and Guam, and the Virgin Islands, are just as "American" as Hawaii is. And if we are to go outside the American Continent for new States, why stop with the Pacific Ocean or any segment of it?

We are told that the people of Hawaii have a "right" to statehood. We are told that Congress must grant statehood to Hawaii because the people of Hawaii want it. Why, Mr. President, if we accept that argument, and if we establish the precedent of going outside the American Continent and accepting as a State a territory whose inhabitants are as radically different in background from the majority of Americans as are the people of Hawaii, then we shall have to grant statehood to Panama or the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico, or even Ghana, if the people there want it.

This is the road of empire. We must not take it. If we go down this road, we move toward world government, toward the gradual fading and ultimate obliteration of the idea of American nationality; and there will be no turning back.

Every time we add a new State, we add two Members to this body. How many new States must we add outside the American Continent before we have a substantial bloc of Senators whose interests are centered outside America? How many decades will it take before we shall have developed a group of such Senators powerful enough to bring about ratification of a treaty surrendering the sovereignty of the United States to a world government?

I do not ask these questions in a humorous vein. I am serious. This is the direction in which we move when we grant statehood to Hawaii. This is the precedent we set.

Should we move down this road because it is said that the people of Hawaii have "earned" statehood? Mr. President, statehood should never be regarded as a reward. Admission of a new State should always be justified on the basis of the national interest. There is no other basis upon which we may sanction it, in consonance with our duty to act for the best interests of the Nation we serve.

I have said that the granting of Hawaiian statehood will put us on the road to empire. It might be said also that it will put us on the road to colonialism. Once we jump the boundaries of the oceans, and pass beyond this continent, there is no limit to where we may stop. If we accept the Territory of Hawaii as a State this year, what argument shall we have next year against accepting as a State the island of Formosa, if the people of that island should wish it?

Oh, yes, Mr. President; we would have one argument against that: The argument of national interest. But if the argument of national interest is going to be considered valid at some later date, in connection with the application for admission to statehood by Formosa or Ghana or Puerto Rico or Guam, or any other territory outside of America, why is not the argument of national interest a valid one now? And what national interest will be served by granting statehood to Hawaii?

The answer is, Mr. President, there is no national interest which will be served by granting statehood to Hawaii; on the basis of national interest, all of the considerations are against granting statehood to Hawaii.

If any one of my colleagues who plans to vote for Hawaiian statehood thinks I am wrong about this, and believes he can justify the admission of Hawaii as a State on the basis of the prospective benefit to the national interest which will result, I hope he will tell us for the record how he arrived at that conclusion. I wish I could be sure that no Senator would vote for Hawaiian statehood unless he felt he could justify it on the basis of national interest. If that were the case, I know the Hawaiian statehood bill would be defeated in this Chamber by one of the largest majorities ever registered. The vote might be a unanimous "nay."

COMMUNISTS FIRST FAVORED STATEHOOD

It is significant that the first active agitation for Hawaiian statehood came from the Communists. Before 1936, the Communst Party line was to agitate for Hawaiian independence. In 1936, a top strategy decision was made in Moscow that Communist purposes would be best served by Hawaiian statehood; and from that time on the Communist Party line was to favor statehood. It was an implementation of this policy decision and this new Party line that the Communist Party of Hawaii was merged with the mainland party in 1936.

If the Communists had thought at any time since 1936 that it no longer served their purposes to work for Hawaiian statehood, we can be sure that the line would have changed again and that Communist support for statehood would have been withdrawn. There has been no such change.

COMMONWEALTH STATUS AN ALTERNATIVE

Mr. President, the alternatives with respect to Hawaii do not lie between granting statehood and maintaining the status quo. If the present territorial status is to be changed, there is another alternative than statehood, and one which has many factors to recommend it. I refer to commonwealth status. I have discussed the benefits of commonwealth status at considerable length on another occasion, and will not labor the point now.

But let me summarize: Statehood would place additional economic burdens on Hawaii, while solving none of its problems. It would increase the present local tax burden, already too high. It would give the international Communist conspiracy additional opportunities for power and prestige in the islands, and for infiltration of the mainland through or from Hawaii. Furthermore, statehood is a step that, once taken, can never be revoked. On the other hand, commonwealth status would mean a new era of prosperity and economic expansion for Hawaii, giving the islands a future filled with hope and unlimited opportunities. At the same time, opportunities for Communist expansion and infiltration would not be increased, and Congress would remain free to take any emergency steps which might be needed to meet new or increasing dangers from Communist activities in the islands. Between these two choices, therefore, it is clear that in the national interest, as well as for the sake of the islands themselves, the granting of commonwealth status is vastly preferable to statehood.

Every Communist in the islands, and all the puppets of the Communists, are for statehood; they all oppose commonwealth status. They know that growth of Communist power could be checked under commonwealth status, whereas under statehood the lid would be off.

And, if the lid goes off, who will rule Hawaii? The man who rules Hawaii today. And who is he?

Every Senator knows who he is. His name is Harry Bridges. He has been a carrier of the Red baccillus throughout a whole generation. As long ago as 1934, he and his fellow Communist agents threw the people of San Francisco into the convulsions of a general strike. American Communist leaders boasted of the deeds done in that general strike, when they went to Moscow in 1935 to attend the infamous Seventh World Congress of the Communist Internationale. Just last month, Harry Bridges was in Moscow at the time of the 21st congress of the Communist Party, U.S.S.R.

In 1950, a Federal jury found that Bridges had committed perjury when he swore that he had never been a member of the Communist Party. The conviction was reversed by the Supreme Court, only on the ground that the statute of limitations had expired before the charge against Bridges was brought. But there is no disputing the finding of the jury. There is no disputing the fact that he did commit perjury when he denied that he was a member of the Communist Party. Everything in his record confirms this fact. Everything in his record proclaims that he is a mortal enemy of the Government and people of the United States and the whole free world.

We are being asked today to help stabilize Harry Bridges' power in the Hawaiian Islands. We are being asked to vote Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State, so that men under Harry Bridges' domination may come here and sit in these Halls.

The evidence shows that Harry Bridges is not an ordinary trade union leader primarily concerned with the improvement of the wages, hours, and working conditions of American longshoremen, but that he is an integral part of and the prime mover in international Communist strategy in the transportation field. In the event of a possible conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, this assumes vital importanc to our national security.

In recent months Harry Bridges has been organizing a conference of Communists and left-wing waterfront workers' unions to be held in Tokyo on April 15. Among those participating are the Communist Australian Waterside Workers, the Communist Indonesian Maritime Union, left-wing unions of Japan and Madras (India), and the Communist-dominated ILWU.

On February 13 of this year, in Moscow, Harry Bridges gave a newspaper interview in which he declared that Soviet trade union elections were "more democratic than many American ones."

Said Bridges:

> I have studied the activities of the Russian All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and 23 trade unions and have come to the conclusion that the organization and system of elections in Soviet unions are democratic.
>
> In this respect Soviet trade unions are more democratic than many American ones.

Bridges, who had just completed a week in the Soviet Union as the guest of Soviet trade unions, added that members of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations should visit the Soviet Union for "they would learn that everything the worker in America heard about the U.S.S.R. is nothing but lies and slanderous propaganda."

Three days later, Harry Bridges met with union officials in East Germany. Head of the East German group was Rudi Kirchner, secretary of East Germany's trade union organization. After the meeting, Bridges was quoted as having said that his union planned further contacts with the East German unions, including an exchange of workers' delegations.

An illustration of the present-day power of the ILWU in Hawaii is to be found in the formation of a new political coalition in the territorial legislature.

This legislature convened in mid-February, with 36 Democrats and 18 Republicans in its house of representatives. It would have seemed logical to expect the Democrats to organize the house. But the Democrats were split into factions. One of these factions was headed by a young attorney named Vincent Esposito. There are 26 Democrats in this faction. The other Democratic faction, with 10 members, is headed by one Charles E. Kauhane, who is part-Hawaiian. This is the same Kauhane who was speaker of the house 4 years ago, and while acting in that capacity won some notoriety by sending a gavel, with his compliments, to Harry Bridges. The gavel was presented to Bridges at the annual convention of the Communist-led ILWU convention in San Francisco, the presentation being made by one of Hawaii's delegates to that convention, identified Communist Newton Miyagi. Incidentally, this was the same Newton Miyagi who last year was elected to the board of directors of Hawaii's chapter of the American Red Cross, and who was a hostile witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommitee during its hearings in Hawaii in 1956.

Mr. Charles Kauhane, who leads this 10-man minority faction within the Democratic majority in the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature, is currently considered a spokesman for ILWU leader Jack Hall, who was convicted under the Smith Act of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, but who got off the hook by virtue of the Warren Court's decision that such conspiring is no crime.

Like Kauhane, the other members of Kauhane's 10-man minority bloc in the 1958 Hawaiian House of Representatives are known to be closely tied up with the ILWU.

It would have seemed logical that with a two to one majority over the Republicans, the Democrats would have organized the Hawaiian House of Representatives. But what actually happened was that the 10-man Kauhane bloc of Democrats was joined by the 18 Republicans to defeat the 26 Esposito Democrats in their plans to organize the House.

Some Republicans in Hawaii have defended this action. Others have deplored it. There have been some refusals among Republicans to approve on any basis action which made the Republican members of the Hawaiian House political bedfellows of the Communist leadership of the ILWU.

As an indication of the effect of the coalition, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point the text of a news story appear in the Saturday Star-Bulletin, of Honolulu, for February 28, under the caption "Coalition Could Let ILWU Rule Labor Committee," and which describes "Kauhane's followers on the labor committee" as "Representatives Yoshito Takamine, vice-chairman, ILWU agent on the Big Island; Pedro Dela Cruz, ILWU agent on Lanai; Akoni Pule, close associate of Kauhane and counted in the ILWU camp; and Oahu's John C. Lanham whose election hinged partly on ILWU support."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COALITION COULD LET ILWU RULE LABOR COMMITTEE

Organization of the Territory's house, at last accomplished yesterday, put pro-ILWU forces solidly in control of the chamber's labor committee if the Democrat-Republican coalition extends into the field of legislation.

The organization also left three dissident Democrats minus important committee posts—at their own insistence.

The dissident Democrats, led by Oahu's Representative O. Vincent Esposito, found themselves in the minority on 21 of the 26 house committees, and brickbats began to fly before the ink was dry on the settlement agreement.

The Esposito faction held out until the last minute, it was learned, on the make-up of the labor committee through which all labor legislation—including the ILWU-sought repeal of the dock seizure law—will be channeled.

STRONGLY

As the labor committee wound up, it contains four strongly pro-ILWU Democrats—followers of Democratic Representative Charles E. Kauhane—to three Republicans and two Esposito Democrats.

It was the house Republicans who teamed up with the Kauhane Democrats to beat out the Esposito forces for house control through a coalition that put Maui Democratic Representative Elmer F. Cravalho in the speaker's chair.

Kauhane's followers on the labor committee are Representatives Yoshito Takamine, vice chairman, ILWU agent on the big island; Pedro Dela Cruz, ILWU agent on Lanai; Akoni Pule, close associate of Kauhane and counted in the ILWU camp; and Oahu's John C. Lanham, whose election hinged partly on ILWU support.

As an indication that not all Democrat intraparty fighting was ended, Esposito himself turned down the chairmanship of the economic development committee in which faction had been strongly interested.

It was learned that Representative David C. McClung, another Esposito man, turned down the vice chairmanship of the youth and general welfare committee and was replaced at the last minute by Robert W. B. Chang, a colleague in the Esposito camp.

Representative Thomas P. Gill, closely allied with Esposito, reportedly refused several posts offered him.

The committee memberships as originally announced were amended today to correct errors that, according to the Democratic agreement for proportional representation, had put one too many Kauhane men on the important county and judiciary committees.

FAIRLY FIRM

The Republicans have yet to name a member due them on the education committee, but otherwise the assignments seemed to be fairly firm.

A grievance committee representing the two Democratic factions was to meet today to shift assignments of house employees so that one group's colleagues wouldn't be working for another faction, and it was understood there would be no firings.

NO AGREEMENT

Both the Republicans and the Cravalho-Kauhane faction claim they made no coalition agreement on legislation.

But in a prepared statement issued after the committees were announced, Esposito said:

"We disapprove of many of the chairmanships and we disapprove of the formation of several committees.

"One, for example, in which we have expressed strong disapproval is the structure of the land reform committee. * * *"

Esposito said his group had assurances from coalition leaders that the coalition is ended and that Democratic Party bills will never be "iceboxed."

"We hope so. We will be watching and fighting," he said.

HIGHLIGHT

Highlights of committee assignments were:

1. Esposito Democrats were given the chairmanships of 16 of the 26 committees, including the important finance and judiciary committees.

2. Representative Manuel S. Henriques, of Kauai, who last week called the Esposito land-reform program radical, got the chairmanship of the land reform committee.

The makeup of the committee was such that a majority of its members are likely to oppose the heart of the Democratic land reform program now in the house hopper.

ILWU MEN

3. Members of the Cravalho-Kauhane faction who have active ILWU connections received the chairmanships of the agriculture, airports and harbors, and public health committees.

4. Esposito accepted posts on six committees, including land reform.

5. Representative Thomas P. Gill, who was slated to head the land reform committee combined with the judiciary committee under Esposito's organization plan, accepted a seat on the committee.

6. A separate Honolulu city charter committee is composed exclusively of Oahu members.

7. The Esposito group was given the balance of power in two committees, economic development and traffic safety.

The house met briefly yesterday morn'ng before a joint session of the house and senate was addressed by Governor Quinn.

A recess was ordered shortly after noon until 2:30 p.m. but the recess was later extended to 3:30 p.m.

Cravalho then called the house into session and made the committee announcements.

The house was adjourned until 11 a.m. Monday.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the committee assignments of the House of Representatives of the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature, as printed in the Saturday Star Bulletin, of Honolulu, on February 28, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

Because of errors in making appointments, last-minute changes, and one misunderstanding about the number to be assigned to one committee, the committee makeup has been changed slightly since its announcement.

The following list has been changed to show the latest decisions on changes as well as decisions yet to be made.

Names of legislators are grouped according to membership in the two Democratic factions, one led by Representative O. Vincent Esposito and the other by Representatives Elmer F. Cravalho and Charles E. Kauhane, and the Republican minority in the house.

Committee	Esposito	Cravalho-Kauhane	Republicans
Finance	Stanley I. Hara, chairman; Takeshi Kudo; Howard Miyake, James Y. Shigemura, James H. Wakatsuki.	Charles E. Kauhane, vice chairman; Manuel Henriques; David K. Trask.	S. Austin, Robert Teruya, Webley Edwards, Clinton Shiraishi.
County and municipal affairs.	Donald Ching, vice chairman; Akira Sakima; Jack Suwa; Raymond Kobayashi; Sakae Amano.	David K. Trask, chairman; Manuel Henriques; George Okano (either Yoshito Takamine or Akoni Pule).	Joseph Garcia, Barney Tokunaga, Frank Judd, Yoshiichi Yoshida.
Agriculture	Takeshi Kudo, vice chairman; Akira Sakima; James Shigemura; Jack Suwa.	George Okano, chairman; David K. Trask; Charles Kauhane.	Joseph Garcia, Samuel King, Yoshiichi Yoshida.
Judiciary	Hiroshi Kato, chairman; Bernaldo Bicoy; Robert Chang; Thomas Gill; David McClung; O. V. Esposito.	John C. Lanham, vice chairman; Manuel Henriques; Yoshito Takamine.	John Milligan, Clarence Fong, Wadsworth Yee, Ambrose Rosehill.
Land reform	Sakae Amano, Robert Chang, Thomas Gill, O. V. Esposito, David McClung.	Manuel S. Henriques, chairman; David K. Trask, vice chairman; Charles E. Kauhane.	Samuel King, Wadsworth Yee, J. H. Worrall.
Statehood	Tadao Beppu, chairman; James Shigemura, James Wakatsuki, Donald Ching, Raymond Kobayashi, Jack Suwa, O. V. Esposito.	Manuel Henriques, vice chairman; Charles Kauhane, Ray Adams, Akoni Pule, John C. Lanham, Yoshito Takamine.	Stafford Austin, Samuel King, Flora Hayes, Yasutaka Fukushima, Ward Russell.
Economic development	Howard Miyake, chairman; Hiroshi Kato, vice chairman; James Wakatsuki, O. V. Esposito, Thomas Gill, Al Ezell, Sidney Hashimoto.	Ray Adams, Akoni Pule	Stafford Austin, Wadsworth Yee, Clinton Shiraishi.
Printing	Robert Chang	Akoni Pule, chairman; Ray F. Adams, vice chairman; John Lanham.	Yoshiichi Yoshida.
Housing	Sakae Amano, chairman; James Wakatsuki, vice chairman; O. V. Esposito, David McClung, Thomas Gill, Sidney Hashimoto.	Ray Adams, Manuel Henriques, Charles Kauhane.	Clarence Fong, Robert Teruya, Ambrose Rosehill.
Youth and general welfare	Robert Chang, vice chairman; Donald Ching, James Wakatsuki, Akira Sakima.	Walter Harada, chairman; Ray Adams, John Lanham.	Robert Teruya, Dorothy Devereux, Yoshiichi Yoshida.
Tourism	James Wakatsuki, Al Ezell, Raymond Kobayashi, Bernaldo Bicoy, Takeshi Kudo.	John C. Lanham, chairman; Manuel Henriques, vice chairman; David Trask, Charles Kauhane, Yoshito Takamine.	Barney Tokunaga, Webly Edwards, Clinton Shiraishi.
Veterans	Jack Suwa, chairman; Howard Miyake, vice chairman; Takeshi Kudo, Al Ezell.	Pedro Dela Cruz, John Lanham	Wadsworth Yee, Frank Judd, Clinton Shiraishi.
Public health	Sakae Amano, Akira Sakima, Robert Chang, Donald Ching.	Pedro Dela Cruz, chairman; George Okano, vice chairman; John Lanham.	Barney Tokunaga, Flora Hayes, Dorothy Devereux.
Airports and harbors	Tadao Beppu, vice chairman; Jack Suwa, Al Ezell, Bernaldo Bicoy, James Wakatsuki.	Yoshito Takamine, chairman; Manuel Henriques, Ray Adams.	John Milligan, Webley Edwards, Clinton Shiraishi.
Education	Sidney Hashimoto, chairman; James Shigemura, vice chairman; Raymond Kobayashi, Howard Miyake, Robert Chang, O. Vincent Esposito.	Ray Adams, Manuel Henriques, Yoshito Takamine.	John Milligan, Flora Hayes, Dorothy Devereux (another Republican yet to be named).
City charter	Donald Ching, chairman; Akira Sakima, vice chairman; Bernaldo Bicoy, Sakae Amano.	Charles Kauhane, George Okano	Howard Worrall, Frank Judd, Ambrose Rosehill.
Public lands	Raymond Kobayashi, vice chairman; Thomas Gill, Akira Sakima, David McClung.	Charles Kauhane, chairman; Yoshito Takamine.	Joseph Garcia, Samuel King, Flora Hayes.
Public institutions	James Wakatsuki, chairman; Raymond Kobayashi, Howard Miyake, Stanley Hara.	Akoni Pule, vice chairman; David Trask, George Okano.	Stafford Austin, Barney Tokunaga, Dorothy Devereux.
Natural resources	Al Ezell, chairman; Bernaldo Bicoy, vice chairman; Donald Ching, Thomas Gill.	John Lanham, Charles Kauhane	Joseph Garcia, Samuel King, Howard Worrall.
Labor	Raymond Kobayashi, chairman; David McClung.	Yoshito Takamine, vice chairman; Pedro Dela Cruz, John Lanham, Akoni Pule.	John Milligan, Robert Teruya, Ambrose Rosehill.
Accounts	Raymond M. Kobayashi, Howard I. Miyake	Ray F. Adams, chairman; George M. Okano, vice chairman.	Barney Tokunaga.
Government efficiency	Bernaldo Bicoy, chairman; Jack Suwa, vice chairman; Howard Miyake, Al Ezell.	Manuel Henriques, Ray Adams	Clarence Fong, Dorothy Devereux, Howard Worrall.
Civil service	Robert Chang, chairman; Sakae Amano, vice chairman; Donald Ching, Raymond Kobayashi.	David Trask, Manuel Henriques	John Milligan, Ambrose Rosehill, M. Yoshida.
Traffic safety	James Y. Shigemura, chairman; Al Ezell, Jack Suwa, Robert Chang, Bernaldo Bicoy.	Ray Adams, vice chairman	C. Fong, Howard Worrall, Frank Judd.
Utilities	Takeshi Kudo, chairman; Sidney Hashimoto, vice chairman; Al Ezell, Bernaldo Bicoy, James Wakatsuki.	George Okano, Pedro Dela Cruz	Stafford Austin, Wadworth Yee, Frank Judd.
Public improvements	Akira Sakima, chairman; Bernaldo Bicoy, vice chairman; Sakae Amano, Takeshi Kudo.	Pedro Dela Cruz, Akoni Pule	Clarence Fong, Flora Hayes, Webley Edwards.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, there is substantial evidence that the political coup which resulted in the ILWU-Republican coalition in the Territorial house of representatives was initiated by Jack Hall, Communist ILWU leader. The Honolulu Advertiser of February 3 reported that Jack Hall had held a meeting with eight legislators at his home on Sunday, January 25, in what the paper described as "a last-ditch attempt to get major control of the Territorial house." The newspaper said the meeting lasted from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The newspaper said the meeting was attended by Representatives Charles E. Kauhane and George M. Okano of Oahu, Akoni Pula and Yoshito Takamine of

Hawaii, David Trask, Jr., of Maui, Pedro Dela Cruz of Lanai, and two others whose names were not learned.

Among the recent indications of Communist influence in Hawaii was the order of the Supreme Court of Hawaii filed July 28, 1958, appointing a committee to assist the supreme court in the preparation, revision, promulgation, publication, and administration of the general rules of criminal procedure. One of the persons appointed to this committee was Myer C. Symonds, who was a "fifth amendment case," as I recall, when the Internal Security Committee went to Hawaii. The Supreme Court of Hawaii appointed him to help in the preparation, revision, promulgation, publication, and administration of the general rules of criminal procedure.

It is a Communist who has that power.

This was an amazing appointment. Myer C. Symonds is a Honolulu attorney. He was born in Sydney, Australia. He practiced law in San Francisco for about 10 years and went to Hawaii late in 1946. He was a Communist before he left the mainland. He attended the beginners' class of the professional section of the Communist Party from August 17, 1943, to September 3, 1943. He subsequently became membership director of the Lawyers' Club of the Communist Party in San Francisco. He was a member of the professional section of the Communist Party when he joined the U.S. Army in 1944. He was placed on military leave from the Communist Party during his Army service, and after leaving the Army in 1946 he resumed his position of membership director of the Lawyers' Club of the Communist Party. That same year he became a member of the Haymarket branch of the Communist Party.

Myer C. Symonds appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in Honolulu in December 1956, and refused to answer questions about his Communist connections, claiming his privilege under the fifth amendment as a basis for such refusal. Yet the Supreme Court of Hawaii in July 1958 named this man as a member of its criminal procedural rules committee. He is an attorney for the Communist Harry Bridges' union, Mr. President, and yet some say that Communist union does not have tremendous influence over the political and economic life of the islands.

Unanimous conclusions of the full Internal Security Subcommittee, as reported to the Senate in 1957, after hearings in Hawaii, included these:

Persons in Hawaii who have been shown to be Communists are acting in concert in an active conspiracy to further Soviet purposes in these islands.

These conspiratorial forces, by their control of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU—and United Public Workers—UPW—are in a position to choke off the flow of all oceanborne commerce upon which the islands depend, and exercise a significant influence on the political life of the islands.

Unions under the domination of unregenerate Communists have a monopoly in handling cargo shipped from all our western ports and through our lifelines on the vast Pacific and on the Hawaiian Islands.

The measure of control exercised by the ILWU, as presently constituted, over the economic life of Hawaii, is a serious threat to the internal security of the United States.

Mr. President, that was a unanimous finding of a 9-man subcommittee, composed of both Democrats and Republicans.

Nothing has happened—nothing—to disturb those conditions.

Any talk about communism having been defeated in Hawaii and the dangers removed is not only wishful thinking but is very dangerous to the security of our country.

It is unfortunate that there are those in Hawaii who want to obtain statehood at all costs. They know that to expose communism in Hawaii would endanger the chances of statehood. Therefore, they would like to conceal evidence of this frightful danger, belittle the Communist menace, sweep it under the rug and hope it will go away. Of course, it will not go away; and the only way to deal with it is to bring it all out in the open. Until this has been done, and until the people of Hawaii have broken the Communist power in the islands, there should be no grant of statehood to Hawaii.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, during September 1958, my wife and I took our first vacation in 10 years. Inasmuch as we had a daughter and a son-in-law in Hawaii, we decided to go to the islands.

We spent about 5 weeks there. I shall never forget the gracious hospitality extended to us by many residents of the islands, including former Governor and Mrs. Oren Long; Mr. and Mrs. Walters Martin; Dr. and Mrs. Gregg M. Sinclair; Mr. and Mrs. Robert Dodge; Miss Elizabeth Keyes, of Honolulu; Mr. and Mrs. Clarence J. Olds, of Kaneohe; and Mr. and Mrs. Norman Olds, of Hilo.

I had an unusual opportunity to visit and talk with many of the residents of the islands. My son-in-law, who is a lieutenant in the Marines, and my daughter were living in a house off the Marine base, at Kaneohe, and among the residents of the islands. Their nearest neighbors were Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Olds. Mr. Olds' grandfather had gone to the islands from New England in 1852. He is one of the finest and kindest men I have ever been permitted to know. As a result of his being a neighbor of my daughter and her husband, I contracted a very warm friendship with him.

He took me about Oahu, and enabled me to see, on intimate terms, many of the residents of the islands.

There is one thing very significant about the islands, and that is the fact that they are the only Territory, originally independent—save and except the Lone Star Republic of Texas—which, of their own volition, and by their own choice, applied for permission to become a part of the United States. I think that is a very significant thing, because it is certainly a rarity in human history for the people of any area voluntarily to request that they be permitted to join another nation.

I was much impressed by the people of the islands and by the process of Americanization, which has reached an obvious fulfillment there. I was particularly impressed on this score by watching the children of the islands, many of whom had the features of orientals, in drugstores and shops. I noticed that the little children of the orientals, the Hawaiians, the Americans, Filipinos, and other residents of the islands went into the drugstores and shops in much the same manner as do little children in America. They purchased ice cream cones, lollipops, and comic sheets.

I was also impressed by the political activity in the islands. During the time I was there the political races were in progress. I have never in my life seen in America a greater interest in public affairs than was manifested by the candidates of the two parties for the various elective offices. They showed a devotion to the concept of government of, by, and for the people.

Another thing which impressed me was the stories I heard about the fidelity of the people of the islands after Pearl Harbor. While a large proportion of the people of the islands are of Japanese origin, they manifested complete loyalty to the United States.

My friend, Clarence J. Olds, has served in the Armed Forces of the Nation in the First World War and in the Second World War, as well as in the Korean conflict. He took me to a very beautiful place known as the Punch Bowl, which overlooks the city of Honolulu and constitutes the Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific. There I saw the graves of hundreds of natives of the islands who had gone out into the Pacific war and into the European areas during the Second World War, and had paid the last full measure of devotion to this country we call America.

One thing which I will treasure among my memories as long as I live was a visit to a Buddhist temple in what is called the Big Island, the Island of Hawaii, which gives the entire chain its name. In that Buddhist temple I saw plaques hanging upon the wall which gave the names of 23 men, natives of the islands, who bore Japanese names, who were members of that little Buddhist congregation in a sparsely settled area, and who had paid the last full measure of devotion to our Nation in the Second World War and in the Korean conflict. As I stood in the Punch Bowl and saw those graves, and as I stood in the Buddhist Temple, where I saw the memorial to 23 members of the congregation who had died for our Nation, I could not help but think of the words of the heroic poet, Rupert Brooks, which applied to them, just as they applied to thousands upon thousands of other American boys who have made the supreme sacrifice for the same country:

These laid the world away; poured out the red
Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be
Of Work and joy, and that unhoped serene
That men call age, and those who would have been
Their sons, they gave their immortality.

I am convinced from my own personal observation that the people of the islands are just as devoted to the America we know and love as we are. They have demonstrated that they believe in government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They have demonstrated their complete loyalty to America by their devotion and their sacrifices on the field of battle for our country. They have convinced me that they are entitled to statehood, and for that reason I expect to support the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, although there have been 22 separate investigations and hearings in connection with statehood for Hawaii, beginning in 1935, during most of which time I have been a member of either the House or Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Appropriations subcommittees handling the Interior Department budget, I regret that I did not participate in any of those hearings.

However, I do not intend to sound a discordant note at this time. When the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a few weeks ago reported favorably a bill for statehood, I voted for statehood. However, during the discussions which preceded that action by the committee, I made some inquiries of the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], concerning the application of the Sugar Act to the new State of Hawaii.

The opinion has been expressed that statehood would not affect in any way the existing provisions of the act as it has applied to Hawaii while a Territory. However, there is a lack of clarity and some uncertainty as to the application of the Sugar Act following the granting of statehood. Two sections of the Sugar Act might be affected by statehood for Hawaii. By section 1112(a)(2)(A) of the 1956 amendment, continental beet and cane sugar may now receive an additional quota each year of 165,000. Hawaii does not now get any of this increase. If Hawaii as a State were included in the continental group and received part of this increase, it would mean less for the States of the mainland.

The other section which might be affected by statehood is section 1107(a) of the Sugar Act, dealing with entry of direct-consumption—refined—sugar from Hawaii and elsewhere.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee to clarify the legislative history on this particular point. I have no inclination to oppose the continuance of the status which Hawaii has had as a Territory in the application of the Sugar Act. However, I should like to inquire whether it is possible that Hawaii will, as a State, continue to enjoy special privileges which have existed under territorial status when it becomes a State, and whether it will be possible for Hawaii, as a State, not only to retain these benefits but to participate to the same extent as other States in the application of the Sugar Act and possibly acquire additional benefits.

I should like to have a clarification of this point at this time. I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether he has any clarification on this point, particularly from the Department of Agriculture, which has the responsibility of enforcing this act.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum dated March 5, 1959, from the Associate Solicitor for Territories, Wildlife, and Parks of the Department of the Interior, addressed to Legislative Counsel.

The question came up in the subcommittee, and the subcommittee had a definite understanding at the time from a representative of the Secretary of the Interior that the act of statehood would not add or substract from any rights the Territory of Hawaii now has in connection with the Sugar Act.

The memorandum to which I refer states, in part, as follows:

> Assuming the enactment of statehood legislation containing a provision similar to that set forth in section 15 of S. 50, I believe that no change will arise in connection with the Sugar Act.

I should like to read further from the memorandum, and this is very important:

> In this instance, however, it seems to me clear that the Sugar Act provisions relating to Hawaii result from considerations other than its Territorial status. Because of its climate and terrain, it is an area peculiarly suitable for sugar production. Because of its geographical location and its isolation from the continental United States, its sugar problems are susceptible to handling in a fashion which differs from the procedures applicable to sugar producing areas of the continental United States.

It is my understanding from a reading of the memorandum that the passage of S. 50, granting statehood to Hawaii, will maintain the status quo. As counsel has pointed out in the memorandum, the rights of the Territory of Hawaii under the Sugar Act stem not from the fact that it is a Territory, but from the fact that it is an area peculiarly suited for sugarcane. It was on that basis that certain rights accrued to Hawaii. Therefore it is my understanding, I will say to my distinguished friend from Idaho that if there had been any other understanding we would have made changes in the statehood bill. Under the circumstances, we are proceeding on the assumption that the status quo will be maintained.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I understand the explanation to be that as a State Hawaii would continue to receive the benefits which it now enjoys, and, likewise, will not gain any additional benefits by the admission as a State, under the terms of the Sugar Act.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1959.

To: Legislative Counsel.
From: Associate Solicitor for Territories, Wildlife, and Parks.
Subject: The effect of Hawaiian statehood upon the Sugar Act.

You have requested my views on the question whether the admission of Hawaii into the Union will have any effect upon the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and particularly whether the quota provisions of that act will be affected. Assuming the enactment of statehood legislation containing a provision similar to that set forth in section 15 of S. 50, I believe that no change would arise in connection with the Sugar Act.

Section 15 of S. 50 provides in pertinent part: "* * * the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States. As used in this section, the term 'territorial laws' includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii) all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and the term 'laws of the United States' includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Hawaii at the time of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, (2) are not 'territorial laws' as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provision of this act."

Substantially the same language appears in section 8(d) of the Alaska Statehood Act (72 Stat. 339, 344). As you know, section 8(d) is the subject of a memorandum from me to the Assistant Director of the Technical Review Staff, dated October 24, 1958, which sets forth our views concerning the meaning of section 8(d). That memorandum has been approved by the Department of Justice and has been distributed by the Bureau of the Budget to interested departments and agencies of the Government and, so far as I am aware, has been uniformly adopted by them in construing section 8(d).

The October 24, 1958, memorandum deals, among other things, with statutes which prescribe treatment for Alaska different from the treatment accorded other States of the Union. It concludes that distinctive treatment, so long as it is based upon considerations other than the legal status of Alaska, remains acceptable notwithstanding Alaska's admission. This result is based upon the third sentence of section 8(d), which sentence is the same as the last sentence of section 15 of S. 50 quoted above. The memorandum states, in pertinent part, as follows:

"There remains for consideration * * * those laws * * * which prescribe distinctive treatment for Alaska attributable to some factor other than the Territorial status of Alaska. This, we think, is the type of law to which the third sentence of section 8(d) was directed, in that such laws are laws that '(1) apply to or within Alaska at the time of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provisions of this act.' The distinction may have been made, for example, because of area, population, climate, terrain, or any of a number of other factors. We think it entirely compatible with statehood that those distinctions be preserved until such time as the Congress manifests an intention to the con-

trary. It is our conclusion, therefore, that these provisions of law are laws of the United States which will continue in force and effect after the admission of Alaska to the Union."

In connection with the statement that no necessary incompatibility exists between statehood on the one hand and distinctive treatment on the other, the memorandum further states that this conclusion does not conflict in any way with section 1 of the Alaska Act (and the same statement is contained in section 1 of S. 50), providing for admission "on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever." The memorandum points out and cites authority for the proposition that such a provision guarantees a new State equality with respect to its sovereignty and political rights, but it does not operate to restrict Congress in the enactment of legislation within the sphere of its plain power.

We also noted in the memorandum that difficult questions of statutory construction and legislative intent will arise in applying the foregoing to specific statutes prescribing distinctive treatment, and that if substantial doubt exists as to whether distinctive treatment arises as a result of legal status, rather than other factors, a submission of the question to the Department of Justice would be appropriate.

In this instance, however, it seems to me clear that the Sugar Act provisions relating to Hawaii result from considerations other than its Territorial status. Because of its climate and terrain, it is an area peculiarly suitable for sugar production. Because of its geographical location and its isolation from the continental United States, its sugar problems are susceptible to handling in a fashion which differs from the procedures applicable to sugar producing areas of the continental United States. In the Sugar Act, the Congress saw fit to prescribe quotas for the domestic beet sugar area, for the mainland cane sugar area, and for Hawaii. It doubtless could have included Hawaii in either or both of the first two categories and it may in the future see fit to do so. But Congress doubtless recognized that it would be easier to administer a law which recognizes the fact of Hawaii's location outside the continental beet and cane producing areas. I can see no reason why this technique would be less acceptable in the light of Hawaii's admission than it has been during the period of Hawaii's Territorial status.

A. M. EDWARDS,
Associate Solicitor, Territories, Wildlife, and Parks.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The bill now before the Senate involves an action which has been delayed for about 105 years. In 1854 a treaty for the annexation of Hawaii to the United States was completed between Secretary of State Marcy and King Kamehameha III. However, due to the death of King Kamehameha and certain objections in the United States, unfortunately the treaty was not carried out.

Of course, Hawaii had prior to that time shown its capacity for self-government in the union of all the islands under King Kamehameha I in 1795, under their written laws of 1824, their first written constitution in 1840, and then under their liberal constitution of 1852.

After the 1854 annexation treaty again in 1870, we negotiated a treaty which set up a virtual protectorate in Hawaii, where the people had again shown their capacity for self-government. But this Senate rejected the treaty, and Hawaiian admission and statehood was again delayed. Neverthless these people of the Territory have been denied admission to their Territory as a State.

In his book on the westward expansion of the American people, the historian, MacCaleb refers to what he describes as "race unconsciousness" the unconscious urge of the race to expansion of their territorial boundaries. He deals with the fact that some peoples have an instinct for expansion while others do not. In our own country some people react slower than the rest of the country in the acquisition of new Territories or new States. We may well wonder that our Nation is longer on the eastern seaboard than it is on the western seaboard. That is due largely to sectionalism among our people. Due to slavery, the southern part of the United States did not want to expand in the Pacific Northwest, whereas the Northern States, opposing slavery, did not want to expand to the Southwest.

The result has been that as we have expanded westward we have developed a rather narrow boundary on the Pacific coast as compared with our land on the Atlantic coast; we contracted instead of expanding our boundaries as we went westward—political considerations pulled our boundaries in, against the instincts of the people.

Ever since American sailors first landed in the islands in the 1700's, and through later settlements by New England missionaries there has been a close bond between us and the Hawaiian Islands.

Despite the relatively small size of the Hawaiian Islands, our act of admitting the islands is nothing more than an act of historic justice. It is the carrying out of an historic commitment, a historic act that should have been done long ago.

The Hawaiian people have shown their capacity for self-government. After having been a united monarchy since 1795, Hawaii became a republic in 1893. It was annexed by the United States, on July 7, 1898, and it became an organized Territory in 1900. The people of Hawaii have had a form of self-government in their islands since 1900, under a type of territorial organization which differs from that in existence in any other American Territory.

Mr. President, as a Senator from Texas, a State which was once an independent nation—and I take issue with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, because Texas was never a Territory after she won her independence in 1836—and voluntarily came into the Union as a State when she was then an independent nation—I extend the hand of fellowship and brotherhood to another American Territory, which once had won and maintained its own independence as a nation, first as a monarchy, then as a republic, and likewise accepted the protection of the Stars and Stripes, into membership in this great aggregation of commonwealths which make up the United States of America. Texas welcomes Hawaii as the 50th State. Two independent nations voluntarily surrendered their sovereignty to become sister States in the greatest Union of States this world has ever known.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as I have listened to these interesting exchanges on the question of Hawaii, two thoughts have come to my mind, which I think need to be expressed at this time of the day.

Meritorious as all the historic tradition is behind the case for Hawaii; meritorious as are our military and moral considerations, which have been eloquently spelled out in the Senate today; there are two aspects of the question which I think might further be emphasized before we say our last words and then pass judgment.

The first is our posture before the rest of the world as opponents of communism. We have made it very clear to the world that we are opposed to Communists and communism. We are also agreed that there may be some Communists on the Islands of Hawaii. However, no one whom I have heard speak today is proposing that we dump the Hawaiians into the Pacific, so to speak; that we dissociate ourselves from them in the future. What the proposition comes down to is: How can we best combat Communists and communism?

We have been criticized by many of our friends in the world for being too negative; for being against, without making clear what it is we stand for. I think that in the case of statehood for Hawaii we have an opportunity to make our posture clear and positive before the rest of the world. We have long since learned that we cannot legislate an idea out of existence. We cannot pass a law to destroy the Communist Party. We fight ideas with better ideas.

One of the real ways we have for combating Communists, it seems to me, is to pull one of their propaganda rugs from under them in Hawaii by admitting Hawaii to statehood. This would exhibit an air of confidence by showing that we are willing to share our system of government; that we are not afraid of its contrasts with communism.

While there are those who believe that a few Communists will infect all the democracies in the world, I think it is important that we appreciate the simple truth that democracy is somewhat infectious too. If we would but use it more positively, we would find a new weapon at our disposal for combating communism.

The second aspect is psychological. I refer to the psychology of the peoples of the Pacific nations. We have heretofore exhibited a stature which was not altogether complimentary to us—a superiority in our air. Some aspects of our past history have suggested such superiority. Often Asians give the superior air of Americans as their reason for turning to alternative ways of life. Therefore, it seems to me that we have a chance in Hawaii to seize the psychological initiative in that area of the world. Where they are now concerned with the contrasts between communism and independence, we would go on record

before the world as proposing a peaceful democratic accession at the suggestion of a people or a territory which is largely Asiatic.

We are, in effect, a hundred years after our own secession movement, indulging in a laudable bit of accession. This, in contrast with the colonialism fears in Asia, would strike a refreshing note, I have no doubt, in that quarter of the world. Likewise, it would suggest our own acceptance of the thesis of equality.

By granting Hawaii statehood in our system of government, we will be saying to the rest of the world that we hold no discriminatory views toward Asiatic peoples.

In addition to the many excellent reasons which already have been developed, I appeal to the Senate to consider statehood for Hawaii in the realm of a positive way of combating communism and of a psychological posture which is constructive and helpful and will inure to our benefit in the struggle which is now going on throughout the world for the minds of men.

I subscribe with deep conviction to the views of those who support statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S. 50, which would admit the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. President, I have great respect and admiration for the people of the Territory of Hawaii. Their islands are famous for the hospitality of its citizens, and the lure of island life is so strong that it provides a temptation for many men, young and old alike, to forsake the mad and ambitious pace of competitive living that typifies our North American Continent. I suspect that the tourist information and pictures, which so pleasantly depict life in the Hawaiian Islands, have instilled in many, if not all, of us a fascination and longing for the easy and pleasant life of the beachcomber.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. President, that all of the admirable qualities of the Hawaiian people stem from their traditionally patient and unhurried approach to life, or the recreational possibilities offered by their enviable climate and island geography. Their courage and stamina have been more than proved in war; their industry and efficiency have been demonstrated by the growth and diversification of their peacetime economy. The esthetic of Hawaiian culture is more than adequately balanced by the utilitarian.

Admiration of a people, however, regardless of the degree, is not a sufficient foundation on which to base such an irrevocable and far-reaching political decision as granting to those people statehood in the United States of America. There are many admirable people in the world, and the number of groups which merit our appreciation increases proportionately to our knowledge and understanding of them, and also according to the degree of self-expression accorded to them under their system of government. The English speaking people of the world, generally speaking, enjoy a latitude of political freedom, as we understand the term, which allows self-expression of qualities which, from our earliest training we have learned to admire and appreciate. Other peoples in the world share these qualities, and others that are highly commendable, although, unfortunately, many of them are suppressed to the extent that we are hardly aware of the existence of such qualities.

Looking south from the United States of America, we behold immediately beyond the Rio Grande the Republic of Mexico. Here, too, we observe a people with a more unhurried approach to life than our own, and also a country with the recreational attraction that is common in the more advanced semitropical countries. Here, too, in recent years, is the easy pace of life matched by industry and productivity, as is most graphically illustrated by the competitive position enjoyed by certain Mexican products, among them cotton textiles, which are gaining increased shares of the world market.

This country lies adjacent to our own; in fact, parts of what were originally Mexican territory have long since been incorporated as States of the United States, including our second largest State, Texas, and those States formed from the Gadsden Purchase.

Despite the admirable qualities of the Mexican people, a productive capability which would support and does support State governments, and a parallel, if somewhat slower democratic development, would these factors sufficiently support an application for statehood, even if requested and conditioned on a period of territorial status? Of course not. An affirmative answer would indicate a fallacious and unbalanced concentration on similarities and a neglect of the glaring dissimilarities.

Such a fallacious concentration on similarities has led us too far along the road of no return to Hawaiian statehood. We are so engrossed in the daydream of benevolence and good wishes for these warm-hearted people, that we are in danger of condemnation for what is almost culpable neglect of the basic political factors which should control our decisions. We are not elected to office for the purpose of exercising our emotions; for, at least theoretically, we were sent here to exercise our judgment, individually and collectively, in the best interests of the people of the 49 States in the Union. I propose now, that we consider some of the facts on which our judgment should rest.

The democratic principles of self-government, as practiced in our constitutional Republic, are not the result of merely an enlightened philosophy which our Founding Fathers conceived as an answer to the latent desires for self-determination. The Constitution, itself, while novel in many functional respects, was in reality a formalized implementation of ideas which had been tried, and had been found, from actual experience, to be worthy of implementation. The institutions which comprise our Government were shaped by experiences beyond common recollection; yet the results and lessons which stemmed from those experiences have become ingrained in our political philosophy.

It is appropriate that we review, briefly, at least a few of the developments which have contributed to our rich political heritage, and have, to a surprising extent, without our conscious realization, shaped and formed our basic outlook toward the institutions of government.

Underlying and fundamental to our most basic philosophy is our concern, our respect, for the dignity of the individual. It is so deeply ingrained upon the hearts of the overwhelming majority of the populace of the United States that it approaches the quality of instinct. It is so submerged in our essential character that its origin is often obscured. Origins of such concepts assume tremendous importance in relation to questions, such as those posed by the issue of Hawaiian statehood, which affect the unity of the peoples of the 49 States.

Upon reflection, it is easy for us to realize that our concept of the dignity of the individual could have originated only in Christianity. This concept is only one of the many concepts of the facets of our religious heritage which find expression in our political thoughts and institutions.

Not only is it important to recall the origin of such concepts, in order to put in proper perspective the issue we are considering, but it is equally vital to be aware of the route of transmission of the concepts of Christianity to and through our ancestors, and thereafter and thereby into our very subconscious.

It is imperative that we recollect that Christianity, after its birth on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, spread almost exclusively with the flow of civilization to the West. Its spread was repulsed, and if anything, reflected away from the East and Orient by the solid wall of the possibly older, already entrenched wall of oriental cults and religions. Christianity flowed ever westward, through Macedonia and Rome, and, on the crest of Roman conquest and civilization, to the shores of western Europe and the islands of Britain. The acceptance and embracement of Christianity by the West was so eager, and its repulsion by the East was so aggressive, that in shortly more than a thousand years after the birth of Christianity in the land of Palestine, the Christian crusaders of the West were engaged in holy war to wrest the land of the origin of Christianity from the oriental non-Christians who had surged in from the East. Thus, the Christian religion, born on the border of East and West, found its acceptance in the West, and became a part of the heritage and culture of the West, as contrasted to the East of the orientals.

Our heritage is not of single origin. Although our sense of values—such as the premium which we place on the dignity of man, as well as many other basic ideals which guide our relationships—is largely derived from the teachings of Christianity, other historical experiences have contributed immeasurably to our political and philosophical heritage.

Many of these other influences had their origin in antiquity; many others

are undoubtedly without historical recordings. Lest we doubt their existence in antiquity, and mistakenly attribute them to the astuteness of ourselves or our immediate forefathers, I would cite an example of the birth of one of our political tenets.

During the days preceding and coinciding with the beginnings of the Roman Empire, there roamed over the lands of northern Europe a nomadic people, who were termed "barbarians" by their more civilized contemporaries of the south. But today we recall these barbarians as the ancestors of the men led by the famous victor at the Battle of Hastings, William the Conqueror.

Those early Germans and Saxons lived in a tribal society ruled by chiefs or councils who were thought to derive power from a higher and nonhuman source. Even at that early state of noncivilized development, the value of fixed rules of conduct, generally applicable to all men, were realized. The chiefs or councils, even at that early point in antiquity, unenlightened by the forces of Christianity or civilization, realized that those empowered to govern had limitations; and, almost without exception, they adhered to the philosophy that they, as rulers, had no power to make laws, but, on the contrary, were limited to applying and enforcing existing rules. To remedy the absence of any lawmaking authority which could enact new rules to meet new and changing conditions, those chiefs and councils resorted to the most questionable practice of not creating, but finding, laws not commonly—nor uncommonly, for that matter—known to have previously existed—a rationalization, to be sure; but this early acceptance by German tribal rulers of a limitation on their absolute power to rule grew and contributed to our present-day philosophy that not only is the power of a ruler limited, but government should be with the consent of the governed.

Advancing in point of time from these ancient contributions, political and philosophical crystallizations of thought, though usually uncodified, contributed to definite and positive conclusions in the minds and consciences of Western peoples. These conclusions have descended as a part of our heritage; and many of them have found codification in our basic documents of guarantee, such as the principles of the Magna Carta which were documented for our posterity in the Constitution. Other concepts, while not codified, and perhaps even elusive of precise definition, have become so engraved in our minds and on our philosophy that they are equally a part of our governmental system.

By seeking to recall the contributions of antiquity to our heritage, Mr. President, I would not leave the impression that our political philosophy is without distinct contributions from post-revolutionary days. Our relatively young Republic—and often our conduct suggests childishness—has been blessed with profitable experience. Some of our experience has been severely painful—for instance, it is hard to imagine an experience more dreadful than the Civil War which ravaged our homeland—but each experience has tempered our thought and judgment; and only from the close association with the consequences and effects of these experiences are we able to meet the inevitable problems that confront us with solutions that are in keeping with our basic beliefs.

Our heritage is so rich and rewarding that even a cursory review of its history and formation would require more words than even a U.S. Senator can muster. Its cumulative impact on both our conscious and subconscious, nebulous as it may appear, is the common denominator of our thought process which enables us, even when in disagreement, to reason together for the common good, while safeguarding the rights of the individual. That condition of our mentality permits an intercourse of ideas bounded by the same walls of moral attitude, and permits harmonious interchange of ideas, just as a common language makes possible a comprehensible exchange of words.

Ours is emphatically not the only heritage on earth, and I might add that it has no monopoly on admirable characteristics. Many other peooples than our own share a major portion of our traditions and principles; and theirs differ from ours only in extent and route of development. With some peoples, such as the English, we share almost all of our basic political philosophy; and our differences appear primarily in the political institutions and procedures which are the expression of our very similar philosophies. The degree to which we share our heritage with other peoples obviously depends on the coincidence of ideas and the degree of their acceptance among and by our several ancestors.

Just as there are those with whom we share, to differing degrees, our heritage, there are also in this world those who are the devisees of a totally different heritage, and with whom we have no identity in either antiquity or modern times. There are many shades and mixtures of heritages in the world, but there are only two extremes. Our society may well be said to be, for the present, at least, the exemplification of the maximum development of the Western civilization, culture, and heritage. At the opposite extreme exists the Eastern heritage, different in every essential—not necessarily inferior, but different as regards the very thought processes within the individuals who comprise the resultant society. As one of the most competent, and certainly the most eloquent, interpreters of the East to the West, Rudyard Kipling felt the bond of love of one for the other; but at the same time he had the insight to express the impassable difference with the immortal words, "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet."

The chasm of difference between the two, possibly geographical in origin, ceased eons ago to be geographical in nature. The difference is in heritage, the force that shapes the man to form unchangeable, except, if at all, by the infinite passage of time.

At this point, it behooves us to review briefly some of the influences and occurrences which have contributed to the Eastern culture.

Initially, let us recognize the fact that the Eastern, or oriental, heritage antedates that of the West. A heritage begins, not with the discernible history of a generic group of people, but with the birth of lasting ideas which contribute to the development, good or bad, of a people.

History reveals that even at the time of the birth of Christianity, the Eastern society was completely impregnated with the ideas contributed from ancestors' experiences in prehistoric times. For example, one of the contributions of their heritage which was evident even at that early period was their possession of a high respect for their parents—a quality which persists in an even more refined state today, and which, needless to say, is most admirable.

It is not pertinent, however, to consider here whether the attributes of the Eastern heritage meet with our admiration or our disapproval. What is important is the fact that they are vastly different, and—even more important—the fact that the differences are so deeply embedded as to be practically incomprehensible to the product of the Western heritage, and vice versa.

Our best approach to an understanding of the product is through study of the processes that formed it. As I have stated, the traditions and heritage of the East commenced earlier in point of time than did our own, and have, like our own, continued to the present. It would, therefore, be impossible to attempt to approach any degree of exhaustiveness in treating the formation of Eastern heritage. I shall merely mention a few of the periods of oriental history which contributed substantially to the fabrication of things oriental.

As I have mentioned, one of the facts which most sharply illustrates that, from inception, the heritages of East and those of the West were different, is that the origin of the former antedates the origin of the latter. For instance, although the early history of China is shrouded in fable, it is certain that that civilization was much advanced among those oriental people when civilization was only beginning to dawn on the nations of Europe. In fact, the names of numerous Chinese dynasties which belonged to a period two thousand or three thousand years before Christ are still preserved. The fact that a recitation of the names of those dynasties would strike no chord familiar to us, does not detract in the slightest from the contributions of that early civilization to the composite of what is known to us as the Eastern mind. Probably the earliest Chinese individual whose name has a familiar ring to us was Confucius, who was born in 551 B.C., under the rule of Ling-Wang, in the declining days of the Chow dynasty. That one philosopher and teacher made an immeasurable impact on the formation of the Chinese thought process and outlook, and, indeed, on the entire Eastern world, despite the fact that subsequent to his lifetime, an Emperor, or "Whang," ordered the burning

of all books in China, including those containing the teachings of Confucius. In order to establish that book-burning episode in point of time. we may note that the same Emperor commenced construction of the Great Wall of China. It is also worthy of note that at the time of the book burning in China, written languages were rare, and books were almost unknown in the Western World.

There was no interrelation of the Eastern and the Western heritages; in their early development, one did not contribute to the other. For all intents and purposes, each went its own way, uninfluenced by the other. Apparently, the first time when even the vaguest exchange of ideas occurred was following the visit of Marco Polo to China, in the relatively recent period of the 13th century.

The moral attitudes and rules of human relationships of the East are derived, not merely from the teachings of Confucius, but also from mixtures of Taoism and a form of Buddhism and various superstitions which originated in the fables handed down from a form of civilization that antedated history.

The Eastern heritage cannot be characterized by merely observing its descendancy in China, however, any more than Western heritage can be appreciated by a study of, say, the culture of England, to the exclusion of other Western cultures. A look at the heritage of Japan will illustrate the point.

Japan's early heritage unquestionably lies in the same prehistoric Oriental civilization as does that of China. The development of what we might loosely term the "national temperament" of each is similar to the extent of the similarity of the influences of their early common history. The difference is one of degree, rather than substance, and is attributable to the separate and dissimilar influences of more recent times.

In Japan, as in China, the thinking reflects the influence of the precepts of Confucian ethics, as well as those of Buddhism. The ancient respect for parents is reflected in forms of what we consider ancestor worship. Nevertheless, neither China alone nor Japan alone reflects the ultimate in the result of Eastern heritage, any more than France alone or Germany alone could reflect all the facets of the development of the Western heritage.

One factor about Japan is so illustrative of one aspect of the problem I am discussing, that it cannot be ignored. That is the odd historical fact of the relative isolation of Japan from other cultures during what can be called the medieval history of that country. The effects of that isolation are most ably summarized in the words of George Trumbull Ladd, late emeritus professor of metaphysics and moral philosophy at Yale University:

> In a word, there is probably no other one of the foremost and equally populous nations of the world whose mental characteristics, as developed on a basis of race temperament, are more strongly marked.

We should consider that situation in the light of the fact that the Japanese people are not an ethnologically homogeneous race. On the contrary, they are a mixture of two distinctly different racial groups, the Tartars or Mongolians and the Malayans, along with traces of other indigenous elements. This proves beyond doubt that the temperament and philosophy of a people are shaped by their total heritage, rather than by their racial strains.

Now let us turn to the outward manifestations of what we may generally call the resulting oriental philosophy. There are many such manifestations which illustrate the mental approach inspired by their heritage; but the purpose is served just as well by quoting a conclusion of so eminent authority as George Trumbull Ladd, who concluded that the Japanese temperament is characterized, by, among other things, "a disposition to deal with moral and religious truths as though they are matters worthy of only a passing curiosity, rather than concerned with the profounder insights and most important activities of human life." In the other direction, after noting the fundamental difference between the Japanese moral outlook and the Western moral outlook, Mr. Ladd concluded:

> We may safely declare that the Japanese are as truly moral as any other race of civilized human beings.

It is obvious, then, that the fundamental difference between the heritage of the East and that of the West has, in turn, resulted in the existence of equally fundamental differences in the mental approach to the conduct and regulation of society. It is not necessary for us to attempt to form a judgment as to which heritage will ultimately result in the better society, or which mental approach is superior, if, indeed, we were so presumptuous as to imagine that the devices of either heritage could completely comprehend the thought processes of the other group. History has shown that societies with such differences in heritage and resultant outlook can coexist, and that, in fact, each can profit from contemporary experiences of the other.

The fact of the difference is what we must first recognize and acknowledge. Once this basic premise is accepted, we can better understand, perhaps, why Christianity found ready acceptance in the Western World, but was rejected in the East. Of course, the Eastern mentality is quite probably susceptible to the lure of ideologies which persons of Western heritage are inclined to study and then reject.

Having realized that the various heritages have resulted in fundamentally different mental outlooks, and that they can, and do, peacefully coexist, we must turn to the next question which naturally arises in our minds, to wit: Can two diametrically opposed mental approaches be fused with a harmonious result?

The answer is an emphatic "No." Once again, history has provided a clear-cut illustration of this answer; we have only to consider Japan. Subsequent to World War II, the Americans occupied Japan, where they not only voided the power of the Emperor, but also established, at least in form, democratic institutions of Western heritage. Despite the fact that the Japanese were tutored intensely for a period in excess of 10 years in the operation of these institutions, and despite the ability of the Japanese to copy Western accomplishments, in Japan the development of these borrowed democratic institutions has taken on a peculiarly Japanese flavor, and, to many in the Western World, has been both surprising and disappointing. Political parties in Japan have increased alarmingly, and it has become almost impossible to determine from day to day just who belongs to what party. In Japan, this and other similar circumstances have led to a quality of instability that, from the Western point of view, is most disturbing. Many have attributed these developments to what is naively called lack of experience in democracy. Actually, such developments are due to the fact that the Japanese must of necessity operate these Western institutions from a basically oriental mental approach. Undoubtedly, the Japanese, as any other devisee of oriental heritage, is capable of a democratic existence, but only when that existence is the outgrowth of the mental perspective of the Japanese. A fusion of Western form with Japanese mental approach can never be successful. Only by devising institutions that will be singularly expressive of Japanese ideas and ideals can the Japanese obtain a truly workable democracy.

It is not only in the field of government that a fusion of Western and Eastern mental outlooks is impossible; it is also impossible in all other areas of human relationship. For instance, no institution was more stable than the prewar Japanese family. With the advent of the American occupation, Japanese women were tendered emancipation in the Western tradition. Actually, the Japanese family had played an even more vital role in the structure of the Japanese society than the family plays in Western society. However, the Japanese approach to the subject of sex is totally different from that which prevails in the West. This emancipation of Japanese women from sources without the Japanese heritage, therefore, left in the Japanese structure of society a gaping void, the harmful consequences of which will be felt for generations of Japanese to come. It is quite possible, and even probable, that if left to their own approach, the Japanese would have progressed toward an emancipated status for women which would have been orderly and entirely beneficial. But an attempt to bring about a fusion of Western habits with Eastern heritage in an effort to produce harmonious results, was doomed to failure from the outset.

We arrive, then, at the unmistakable conclusion that the mental attitudes resulting from the different heritages of East and West are fundamentally different; and that while the two mental approaches and the resultant diffused societies are capable of coexistence, nevertheless it is impossible to fuse them with harmonious results.

Let us turn now to the Hawaiian Islands; and, from an examination of their outward characteristics, let us determine how the element of heritages

should influence our judgment on the issue of statehood for Hawaii.

The central Pacific archipelago, known as the Hawaiian Islands, is located approximately 2,040 miles across the Pacific Ocean from the North American Continent. There are eight principal islands and many smaller ones, with a total area of approximately 6,400 square miles. As of July 1958, the civilian population of the islands numbered some 578,000, which was augmented by some 35,000 military personnel.

The population density of the Hawaiian Islands is in the neighborhood of 80 persons a square mile. It is significant, also, that 49 percent of the Hawaiian population resides in the city of Honolulu, and 70 percent of the population is concentrated on the island of Oahu, on which Honolulu is located.

From the standpoint of agricultural development, it is worthy of note that Hawaii has approximately 308,580 acres under intensive cultivation. That figure represents the near maximum potential, because of terrain and rainfall factors. In 1950, there were 5,750 farms, encompassing 2,432,069 acres.

The first contact of the Western World with the Hawaiian Islands was at the relatively recent date of 1788, when the English explorer, Captain Cook, visited the islands. Western intercourse, both commercial and cultural, with Hawaii has been prevalent since about 1820. In 1900, Hawaii was incorporated as a Territory of the United States, and has continued in that status to this time. Although Hawaii has a Territorial legislature elected by popular vote, the Governor of the islands is appointed by the President of the United States, and the islands have one nonvoting Delegate to Congress. The franchise, as to elective offices, is extended to U.S. citizens in the islands who can read and write English.

Turning to population composition, according to the Bureau of Census figures for 1950, we find that approximately 23 percent of the population is Caucasian, having declined somewhat, percentagewise, since 1940. The remainder of the population is comprised of Japanese, 36.9 percent; Hawaiian, including part Hawaiian, 17.2 percent; Filipino, 12.2 percent; Chinese, 6.5 percent; and others, 4.2 percent.

Even when the large numbers of military personnel are included—and they have little, if any, bearing on the facts which should influence our judgment on this question—oriental and Hawaiian groups constitute in excess of 70 percent of Hawaii's population.

This large segment of the population has a heritage allied and similar to that of the Japanese and Chinese—in a word, Eastern. It is a rich heritage, more ancient than our own; but, above all, fundamentally different from that of which we are the beneficiaries. It would be foolish to presume that this heritage of the East, which extends back in time for thousands of years, could be replaced by contact with the West for a century, especially when we consider the fact that ties of culture have also been maintained with the East. To make such a fallacious assumption would be an injustice to these people, for they are not so easily brainwashed of their basic mental approach.

A distinction must be recognized at this point between existence of individuals of Eastern heritage under Western institutions of government administered and directed by people of Western heritage, on the one hand, and Western institutions of government administered by individuals of Eastern heritage, on the other hand. The people of Hawaii under Territorial status constitute an example of the former while the people of Japan subsequent to the occupation represent an example of the latter. They are quite different in result. The former can, and often does, have beneficial results to the people concerned; the latter is doomed to have disastrous consequences. Fortunately, the Japanese have sufficient latitude of self-determination to recover by adapting and modifying the Western institutions imposed on them to suit their own mental processes. If the constitutionally bounded status of statehood is imposed on Hawaii, including the responsibility for conformation to the harmony of political and sociological ideas essential to the successful operation of our peculiarly Western, federated Republic, there will be no room for adaptation, and the attempted fusion will work to the disadvantage of both the people of Hawaii and the people of the previous 49 States. And, lest there be any doubt, the interest of the people of the 49 States, our constituents, bears considerably—yes, primarily—on this issue.

The conclusion which I suggest is not in derogation of the principle of local self-government. Self-government is and should be the aim of all peoples, and it is in the interest of all of us who enjoy it to promote it among other peoples.

I am also conscious of the mutual advantages to the United States and to Hawaii which result from close political and economic ties. The beneficial bonds between the United States and the islands must be preserved.

Statehood, however, is not the only vehicle of self-government; neither must a denial of statehood to Hawaii necessarily sever the political and economic bonds of Hawaii and the United States. It is not because of, but rather in spite of, our heritage that we of the Western World are often inclined to limit ourselves to the rut of unimaginative thinking.

The answer to the desire of all of us to assist Hawaii to realize the maximum degree of self-government and determination, while maintaining—even strengthening—the political and economic bonds which now exist between us is the commonwealth status. Through the mechanics of commonwealth status, Hawaii could realize self-government through political institutions conforming to the dominant oriental heritage and outlook. At the same time, the commonwealth act could provide for the defense and support of the islands by the United States, with the assistance of Hawaiians and Hawaiian bases. Commercial ties of mutual benefit could similarly be preserved.

There is serious doubt in my mind as to whether the Hawaiian people would not be seriously handicapped, possibly even precluded, in defending themselves from such as the Communist-dominated Longshoremen's Union by the imposition upon them of Western institutions of government, since their heritage has not equipped them to comprehend the philosophy essential to the effective operation of these institutions. Left to their own resources with respect to the inauguration of democratic institutions to implement self-government, they would surely achieve more harmoniously, and more effectively, the benefits accruing from self-rule.

There is even greater doubt in my mind that the Hawaiian people could contribute to the degree of harmony remaining in the conduct of affairs of our federated Republic through instrumentalities singularly Western. I am impressed with the difficulty of this operation resulting from the slight differences in heritage across our complex Nation, in spite of our very substantial identity of heritage and ideals. I fear that an abandonment of the United States of America in favor of a United States of America and Pacific—precedenting a United States of the World—would actually benefit no one, but toll the death-knell of our federated Republic.

I move, therefore Mr. President, that S. 50 be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with directions to make such investigations as it deems necessary, and to report to the Senate a bill to provide commonwealth status for Hawaii.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, ever since World War II I have strongly supported the granting of statehood to Hawaii and the Hawaiian people. We do not speak, in this matter, of annexing to our country an area that is not a part of the United States, because it has been a cherished part of the United States since 1898. We do not, Mr. President, speak of incorporating a large group of people into the citizenship of our Nation who are not already Americans, because they have been Americans—American citizens—since 1898.

Mr. President, the last figures from the Census Bureau show that 85 percent of the civilian residents of Hawaii, of nearly 600,000, are native-born American citizens—native-born citizens of Hawaii. Mr. President, the question, therefore, is not a question of annexation of foreign territory or of the incorporation into our Nation of people who are not Americans, who are not American citizens, just the same as we are, but it is a question of whether or not the progress, the development, the record, the history, the traditions of Hawaii and the Hawaiian people entitle them, under our American system, to become full-fledged citizens of a State with rights, standing, and stature equal to that of any other State of the Union.

Mr. President, it is because I have felt that the people of Hawaii, by their record of loyalty and service to America, and their record as American citizens,

have fulfilled in the highest degree the requirements imposed upon the people of any area of our Nation before statehood, that precious ultimate right, is accorded, and it is because I feel they have merited statehood that I have long supported statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. President, I should like to briefly refer to a few of the things which I think have been established as reasons why we should grant statehood to Hawaii.

First is the strategic importance of Hawaii, not to itself, but to the United States of America. We can all think back to December 7, 1941. We can all remember that the first attack of the enemy was leveled not against the mainland of the United States, but against what was known to be our great bastion of military strength in the Pacific, Hawaii.

Mr. President, what happened that day and what happened in the years which followed demonstrated completely that Hawaii is our great, strong, sturdy bastion for the defense and the security of this Nation in the Pacific area. No one would deny that for a moment. Hawaii was the center of our naval operations in the Pacific, the center of our Army operations in the Pacific, the center of our Air Force operations in the Pacific, and the center of our services of supply for all whom we were supplying in the Pacific. Hawaii is the point of highest strategic importance to our Nation in that important area of the world.

The second point, Mr. President, follows the first point closely. In connection with what happened December 7, 1941, and what happened in the months and years which followed, there has been demonstrated beyond any cavil or question the tremendous loyalty of the Hawaiian people. I shall not elaborate upon that point. My distinguished and eloquent friend, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has already spoken feelingly of the crosses he saw on the Hawaiian hills. Let us simply admit as a matter of course that the Hawaiian people acquitted themselves magnificently as American patriots of the first degree and are entitled to be regarded and always held as such on terms of equality with American patriots anywhere else in any other part of our Nation.

Mr. President, the Hawaiians have supremely demonstrated their loyalty and fidelity to America.

What about the economic capacity of Hawaii? I hope all Senators have read the report of the committee. If Senators have read the report, they know that last year, 1958, Hawaii contributed more to the coffers of the United States than was contributed by each of 10 States, all of which are fine States, and all of which are contributing to the extent of their capacity and the extent of the capacity of their people, as required by Federal law.

Mr. President, last year Hawaii contributed $166 million to the Federal coffers. I think it is worthy of note that there has been no time in recent years when the appropriations made by the American people for the development of Hawaii have equaled the amount paid by Hawaiian citizens into our Federal coffers, exactly as citizens of other States pay from their income and from their personal estates.

Mr. President, I think one more point has been established, which is the capacity of Hawaii for self-government. Hawaii has not only been tested under our Federal laws, but has been tested under local laws in maintaining a responsible and republican form of government. Hawaiian citizens have done so for many years. As a matter of fact, the Hawaiians did so before they were annexed to us, at their own request, in 1898.

Mr. President, from every standpoint I think it is fair to say Hawaiians have shown that they fully merit statehood. Mr. President, I am unwilling longer to withhold from a great group of American citizens a right which is a part of the heritage of any such group of American citizens.

Mr. President, I have one more point and then I shall conclude. I will make this point very quickly. Aside from the Hawaiians' own entitlement to statehood, I want to emphasize the point recently made by my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Wyoming, to the effect that it is a matter of tremendous importance to us, in all of that great area of the world where more human beings live than live anywhere else in the world, for us to show that we still believe in those principles which used to be regarded as fundamental Americanism—such as no taxation without representation, such as the right of self-government, and such as the catalog of ancient rights declared so long ago in England and transplanted to these soils, here enriched in the history of our people.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to my distinguished friend from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to make one point in reference to the motion made by my good friend the Senator from South Carolina. I know the Senator would like to have Hawaii put on a commonwealth status, but I am very set against that kind of procedure. I would not like to have the Territory associated with the United States; I should like to have Hawaii made a part of the United States. That is the reason I am in favor of Hawaiian statehood.

Not only that, but Hawaiians have earned statehood, even in making the supreme sacrifice when necessary. Who did better fighting than the native American-Japanese-Hawaiians in Italy or over all of Europe? If those people are good enough to die for the United States, why are they not good enough to be a part of the United States of America, instead of being associated with the United States of America?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend for his very fine comment.

I close with one point, Mr. President. I think it is extremely important that we remember, no longer will the world be satisfied with people who are static and who are content simply to stay within a well-entrenched position and say, "We are going to live here. We are going to govern ourselves. That is all there is to it. We are not going to extend ourselves even if the strongest kind of case is made by our fellow citizens for extension."

Mr. President, I thought we got away from that idea last year when we gave merited statehood to Alaska, which faces the Soviet Union, only a few miles away across a narrow strip of water. I think for the same reason, but perhaps in an even more important way, we will be serving ourselves and the cause of freedom not by following a path of supercaution or even timidity in this matter but instead by demonstrating that the American democracy is not static but aggressive, not timid but fearless, and is perfectly willing to show that American principles of freedom and American justice mean exactly the same now as they meant in the days of Valley Forge—in the trying days when this Nation became the epitome of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. President, I hope statehood will be granted to Hawaii.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for one of the most intelligent and penetrating statements made concerning admission of Hawaii to statehood.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am grateful to my distinguished friend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there a motion pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to recommit the bill to the committee with certain instructions.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few moments. I wish to join with my colleagues who have expressed their willingness to vote for statehood for Hawaii this day.

Mr. President, I came to the Senate 7 years ago convinced that Hawaii had long deserved statehood, and I am still of the same conviction.

I am very happy to be associated with the political party which has forced this issue down through the years, and I am glad that finally the Republican Party's efforts have been recognized by a Democrat majority.

I serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and on the Subcommittee on Territories. It has been my pleasure to sit through many days of hearings on this subject, down through the years. There is nothing I could say about Hawaii that has not been said, and there is nothing I could attempt to say with the vigor of those who have already spoken.

I cannot agree with my colleagues who say that the people of Hawaii are different, and therefore Hawaii should not be made a State. That same argument has been used against statehood in the case of many of the States which have been admitted to the Union. I recall

the arguments which were made against Arizona and New Mexico becoming States, because it was said that we were too recently a part of Mexico. While it was true at that time that the great preponderance of our citizens were of Mexican extraction, I say today that that has been a definite asset to the United States, and has continued to be an asset as we have endeavored to mix the peoples of the world.

The people of Hawaii are Americans, and I believe that because they are Americans they are entitled to be closer to the Republic than they are as a Territory.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am very much in favor of the bill. I have not spoken on it, because I am interested in expediting action on it.

I ask the Senator from Arizona, a man with an outstanding war record, if, to the best of his knowledge, at the outbreak of hostilities in 1941, there was any evidence of sabotage in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator asked that question. From all the reading I have done on the subject, which includes documents of the highest order, I have found no evidence of wrongdoing on the part of any of the Hawaiians in connection with Pearl Harbor Day or any events leading up to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To be specific, there has been no evidence of sabotage on the part of Americans of Japanese descent, or Japanese citizens who were living in the islands?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is eminently correct.

I may add, in deference to citizens of Japanese ancestry, that on the mainland we have found no evidence of sabotage among them, either before, during, or after the war. On the contrary, the people of Japanese ancestry who live in Hawaii served the country very admirably in all the branches of the service, all over the globe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What organization in the war received more decorations and had a higher percentage of casualties than any other group which served in the Armed Forces?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I cannot recall. However, it was an infantry outfit, and it fought in Italy.

Mr. KUCHEL. The 442d Regimental Combat Team.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It was the 442d Regimental Combat Team. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to hear this point brought out. I recall that when the subject of statehood for Hawaii was last before the Senate for consideration, someone mistakenly raised the question as to the patriotism and loyalty of Hawaiian units.

At that time I looked up the facts, and I found that it was a Hawaiian National Guard unit which received the greatest number of decorations and had the highest percentage of combat casualties of any regiment. It was an outstanding group.

I was in Hawaii in December. I was there for a week. I visited many points in the islands. I was impressed by the character of the people, by their energy, their resourcefulness, and their evident interest in getting ahead and doing things.

I was at the field where the Air National Guard unit is now on the alert. When a button was pressed there, two of their fighter planes were in the air in less than 3½ minutes. They were alert. They had a good organization. I am sure that their patriotism equals that of myself or any other Senator.

While I was there I attended a dinner at which a girl who was said to be of Japanese blood sang the "Star Spangled Banner." At the time, I felt as great a thrill as I have ever felt on any occasion upon hearing the national anthem sung. It was inspiring. When Hawaiian statehood is voted, I should like to see that girl invited to sing the national anthem in Washington. I shall endeavor to ascertain her name.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the 442d Regimental Combat Team, which the Senator has mentioned, and which the Senator from South Dakota has extolled, had a slogan to the effect that they "would go for broke." In other words, they would throw everything into their plan of battle, and do everything they could do to accomplish their mission. I hope the Senate will adopt that slogan, and make certain that long overdue statehood is granted to Hawaii.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can the Senator from Arizona indicate how much longer he proposes to occupy the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I am not interrupted again, I should finish in about 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was very glad to have this little colloquy with my friends relative to the loyalty of Hawaiians, because that is one of the questions that has been raised by other colleagues in the Senate. I feel that if we bring the Hawaiian people into a closer tie with the Republic, we can eliminate any subversion which may be taking place in the islands at the present time.

Let me make one further point. The importance of the Far East has been brought up by a number of my colleagues. It is my opinion that the Far East is the future field of victory or defeat in the world cause for peace. I do not look on Berlin with the horror with which many of my colleagues contemplate it. I look upon our neglect of the Far East with far greater apprehension, because I feel that it is one of the most important flanks of our enemy, Russia.

Mr. President, I hope that the great majority of my colleagues will join me and other Senators in voting tonight for statehood for Hawaii.

During the delivery of Mr. GOLDWATER's speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my friend from Arizona may yield to me for the purpose of making a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit the bill was rejected, because the author of the motion was temporarily detained and did not have an opportunity to vote on the motion. He was not aware that the question was being put. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be very happy to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the motion to recommit the bill with certain instructions was rejected? The Chair hears none; and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have put the question on the motion to recommit the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to recommit the bill with certain instructions.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the fervor of my support for the bill admitting Hawaii to the Union were to be measured by the length of my remarks, I would try to beat the endurance records made in recent years on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. One could wax eloquent on the subject of Hawaii and the cause of Hawaiian statehood for many hours.

However, rather than expanding and expounding my oft-expressed views, held firmly for a quarter of a century and particularly since, as Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Department of the Interior, I visited Hawaii in 1937, I prefer, by speaking only very briefly, to contribute to the worthy effort of passing the Hawaii statehood bill today, if possible, and if not then, by tomorrow at the latest.

To act favorably on this historic and epoch-making measure in so short a time in this Congress will in itself be a great achievement.

It will demonstrate the wide and deep acceptance of the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State by the American people, and the warm welcome which they will shortly extend to the last incorporated Territory as a full-fledged member of the family of States.

It will demonstrate the reflection in the Senate of that sentiment and redound to the credit of its leadership, of its committee and subcommittee chairmen, of the members of the committee that reported the Hawaiian statehood bill unanimously, and of the whole body of the Senate itself.

Mr. President, the people of no State since the original 13 have deserved statehood more than Hawaii. Hawaiians have long since met every objection, have passed all tests—those of population, going economy, ability of self-government, and patriotism.

Beyond that, Hawaii has a unique contribution to make to the Nation in this time of trouble and crisis.

Hawaii's admission will demonstrate to the whole world that whatever else America is, America is, above all, an idea. An idea and an ideal. That idea, that ideal, is the American common denominator.

It was the vision of that idea and ideal that drew men and women across the uncharted wastes of the Atlantic Ocean even before our Union was founded.

It is that idea and ideal which, embodied in those immortal documents, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution with its Bill of Rights, created America.

It is that idea and ideal, proclaimed by the great men who founded our Nation, which made the Nation.

It is that idea and ideal which served as a beacon to the oppressed of the world.

It is that idea and ideal which rekindled their hopes and led them to leave their countries and join in the great American experiment.

It was that idea and ideal which led them over the Appalachians, across the prairies, to the Rockies, on to the coast, and beyond that to Alaska.

It is, in short, the materializing of that idea and ideal that is America.

The world has shrunk. Modern invention has changed much, but these great changes have merely emphasized that the American idea will either survive or perish. Shall that idea and ideal survive and flourish, or shall tyranny, whose brutality and ruthlessness make the rule of King George III, against which our forefathers revolted, by comparison a benign and benevolent overlordship?

In the effort to extend and strengthen the idea and ideal which are America, no action which the Congress can take will do so much as to admit Hawaii to statehood.

Statehood for Hawaii will extend the idea and ideal which are America into the far Pacific. And Hawaiian statehood will find that idea and ideal already established in those Pacific isles. Statehood will extend that idea and ideal—which is America—to ethnic groups which hitherto have played a relatively small part, quantitatively, in the materializing of it, although they have played that part qualitatively in Hawaii. They will help us to win the confidence of Asia in the idea and ideal which are America.

Those good Americans in idea and ideal, our fellow citizens of Hawaii, have asked for the great right and privilege of joining their fellow Americans in the supreme task of perpetuating and strengthening freedom. They need the equality of citizenship to serve the common cause effectively. We need them to help us.

One could expand this theme indefinitely. It goes to the heart of the Hawaiian statehood issue. But I prefer to state, as my deepest conviction, that America will strengthen itself immeasurably in admitting Hawaii as our 50th State.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with all deference to everyone concerned, I cannot help entertaining the fear that we are somewhat losing our sense of proportion in passing a measure from which there is no road back, no road of return, and in trying to pass it within a few hours, almost within a few minutes.

I recall that 2 or 3 years ago there was a little lady in my home State who had been in the service. She became paralyzed for life because of a defect in a drug which was administered to her while her husband was in the service and she was a patient in a service hospital. It took me about 3 years, I believe, to have a little bill passed which provided her with the small sum of $5,000, as I recall that is what the amount was finally whittled down to. Yet this evening we are apparently going to pass a measure which is more far-reaching than would be an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Why does the Senator say that we are going to pass the bill tonight?

Mr. STENNIS. The effort is to pass it tonight. I believe I said apparently it might pass tonight.

That brings to the forefront the thought that, as we all know, those who drafted the Constitution of the United States provided that it would take a two-thirds vote of the membership of each House of Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution, and that the amendment would have to be approved in solemn assembly either by State legislatures or in convention by three-fourths of the States before it could become a part of the Constitution. Even then it would be subject to change or repeal. Yet merely by majority vote in Congress additional States can be admitted to the Union, and thereafter there can be no change in its status. In view of the provisions of the Constitution, there is certainly a strong admonition that statehood should not be hastily granted and that we should be careful to act on such a question only after the utmost consideration.

I recall that when the matter was debated before the committee, the committee was in a quandary as to how to define the boundaries of Hawaii, just where the boundaries would be, and what would be the situation with reference to the international waters between the islands which would become a State.

Frankly, I have not had an opportunity to check into that matter much further. I understand the situation is as it was when the bill was debated a few years ago. I understand further that nothing has been done to clear up that point. Perhaps nothing can be done. At the very threshold that point poses one of the most serious points involved.

I heard the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], say it would not do for our country to get into a static phase. If he had heard the proof I have been hearing today as a member of the Preparedness Subcommittee, he would be convinced that we are not in a static stage, and that we are not likely to be in one at any time soon, in view of the Berlin crisis and other very grave questions confronting us, which, frankly, with all deference, I believe should be having our attention rather than rushing through a bill to add a new State to the Union.

I believe that we should be making a very serious effort to balance the budget. I do not say that in criticism of anyone. I notice that newspapers and cartoonists refer to the balanced budget. However, the budget is not balanced. The budget for 1960 is not balanced. Even if not so much as $1 were appropriated, at least a billion dollars in new taxes would be required to balance the budget.

I do not hear any great agitation or see any great urge to pass a new tax bill. If we took a fair measure of our needs, perhaps we could pass one, if we were convinced it was needed.

My point is that I think we are getting the cart before the horse. There are so many other things which immediately demand our attention. There are many grave matters confronting us which should take preference over bills of this kind.

The bill for Hawaiian statehood is also a great departure. It is the first one of its kind, in that it abandons the North American Continent as the area for the United States of America. Not only does it abandon the continent; it goes 2,000 miles out into the Pacific Ocean. Regardless of all the merits of the fine people who live in the Hawaiian Islands, we may be setting a precedent by taking into the American Union this farflung archipelago, the nearest island of which is 2,000 miles away.

I hope the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will remain in the Chamber, because I wish to ask him a question or two in time.

By admitting Hawaii to statehood, we shall set a precedent for admitting other island possessions into the Union. I am certain that most of the fine qualities and virtues which have been attributed to Hawaii can also be attributed to the people of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. We shall set a precedent, if the bill is passed, not only of leaving our territory on the North American Continent, but of going out into a farflung area in the Pacific Ocean. If that shall be done, Congress cannot close the door to further activities of that kind.

There are other nations which are very wise and very fine. There are other nations on the American Continent. I cannot conceive that Canada would seriously consider taking in as a

part of its government a disconnected, farflung area such as Hawaii. I cannot think of a more serious matter than the bringing into the body of the U.S. Government as a State any area which is in another part of the world. I cannot conceive of England taking such a step as that. I know that France did in the case of Algeria, but the inclusion of Algeria in the French nation has been an act of the most severe kind.

I do not predict that what I have suggested will happen, necessarily, if Hawaii is admitted to the Union. I pray that it will not. But the door will be opened for other such admissions to the Union.

The Hawaiian Archipelago, as I understand, extends 1,600 miles from the principal island of that group to the farthest island. It extends all the way out in the Pacific Ocean beyond Midway Island, although Midway is not included among the islands which are to be admitted in the proposed State of Hawaii.

Merely a quick reference to the map of the globe will show what could happen if we started to admit areas in other directions from the present United States. If a line were stretched out into the Atlantic Ocean a distance similar to that which Hawaii is from the Pacific coast, the line would reach approximately to the Azores. If it were stretched to the north from our northern boundary, it would run far beyond Canada, somewhere beyond Baffin Island. If a similar line were extended to the south, it would take in all the area beyond Mexico and reach into South America almost all the way to Peru, somewhere near Lima.

Those distances graphically illustrate the precedent we shall set by admitting Hawaii to statehood. They raise the questions: Just what are we doing? Where are we going?

I do not see how we can simply turn a deaf ear to Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

I heard it stated very emphatically on the floor that we will do nothing about admitting Puerto Rico to statehood. But the admission of Puerto Rico to statehood is proposed in the platforms of the major political parties. It is a solemn pledge, so far as platforms go. But I think, too, that that is a pretty fair comment upon the low status which platforms have reached in recent years, with all deference to those who work hard in preparing them. Theirs is a very difficult assignment, and the utmost effort is spent on it. But we know that statements are written into platforms which could hardly be seriously considered. Nevertheless, once a precedent has been set, I do not see how such a pledge can well be repudiated.

In considering the admission of the Territory of Hawaii we should have in mind not only the distance of the islands from the mainland of the United States, but also the distance of the islands from one another. The distances range from 6 miles to 8, 7½, 22, 26, 15, and 64 miles. Those are the distances between the eight principal islands.

The Hawaiian archipelago itself extends for 1,150 miles beyond the farthest westward of the eight main islands.

Very serious questions have been raised, but have never been answered, as to how far the territorial water extends and the international water starts. Certainly those matters should have been decided more definitely than they are in the bill in its present form.

Much has been said about the Hawaiian people and their very fine patriotism. I am proud to have such a splendid report. I am glad that the Hawaiians have lived up to their opportunities since Hawaii became a Territory. I do not think any U.S. possession was ever more fortunate in becoming a Territory than was Hawaii in that day. I am glad the Hawaiians appreciate their citizenship. With other Americans, I am proud of their very fine war record, which I have heard mentioned, and I commend them for it. But while those fine people were fighting for the United States, there were many fine men and women in the United States who were fighting for the Hawaiians. Hawaiians are not the only ones who lie in unknown, unmarked graves on the battlefields of the world. It happened that the homeland of the Hawaiians was the victim of the sneak attack, the attack which caused President Roosevelt, in an address to Congress calling for a declaration of war, to say that it was "a date which will live in infamy." I have not heard anyone contradict that statement, then or since. So the people of Hawaii had everything to fight for and they fought valiantly.

But all this does not really relate to the merits of the question of statehood. As I have said, there were others who fought, too, and who also had fine war records. I do not discredit the record of the Hawaiians one bit; but there is involved here a serious question because the admission of Hawaii as a State, a State which will be taken to the bosom of our Government, will result in giving it a great measure of control over the affairs of the Nation. It will be given legal representation in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, which have the power to change and modify all our laws. Joining Hawaii to the Union of States as it exists today raises serious questions and problems which might plague us in the future.

During this debate, I have not heard much discussion of the military situation. I do not think it can properly be argued that the admission of Hawaii as a State would increase our country's ability to defend Hawaii. Of course, I want the United States to be able to defend Hawaii—even to the death, if need be. I think one of the great problems which will confront us will be that posed by submarine warfare and the use of the submarine as a new weapon along our shorelines. There may be some way to defend our present shorelines against the possibility of such assaults of the most serious kind, including the use of great numbers of nuclear weapons of huge size. But if that threat has any potential at all, it would be absolutely impossible—even if we were to send all our defensive strength there—for us to begin to defend the area that is proposed, by means of the pending measure, to be admitted to the Union as a State.

I do not think it is argued that the admission of Hawaii as a State will strengthen our military position. On the contrary, in my humble opinion, it would greatly complicate and, in a measure, would weaken us.

This brings me to state that for a long time my idea has been that the proper approach to the Government of that great area is to give it a commonwealth status. I think that would be a compliment to the people of Hawaii; I have never seen any justification for the argument, which representatives of the Hawaiian people have made, that such a status would give the people of Hawaii some kind of second-class status or second-class citizenship. I remember that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] discussed in a very fine way the possibility of providing commonwealth status for this area.

Not many years ago I had the privilege of being one of the representatives of the Senate who served as observers and guests at the British Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, in which every parliamentary body in what was once the British Empire was represented. I remember that the Isle of Man had a representative there; he told us that he was a member of a parliamentary body which had held sessions every year for 1,000 consecutive years. I remember that Bermuda was represented there. Bermuda has had parliamentary sessions for more than 300 years. Many other Crown colonies and Commonwealths were represented at that meeting. Their representatives took great pride in the strength they had developed by their own self-government, and in their continuity of self-government, and in their progress and development. That gave me a very fine feeling toward them and opened my eyes to the possibilities of commonwealth status.

I have never understood the argument of those who say that no change at all should be made in the existing government of Hawaii. Certainly I do not regard Hawaiian citizenship as being of second class. I have never heard anyone suggest such a thing, except when the friends of Hawaii have done so as an argument for statehood. But I do not think that is a sound argument. I think it is not based on fact. I believe it is specious.

Mr. President, I shrink from the idea of creating a State in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, because I believe that area will be the great trouble area of the world. I totally disagree with my friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I do so with sorrow and regret; but I do not see anything but trouble ahead for that great area of the world.

I do not know the extent of our ability to do very much about it. I know there was not much we could do in the case of Indochina. It was the considered judgment of those who wanted us to intervene there that there was little or nothing that we could do there—or, at least, that we could not do enough there.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Mississippi think the United States would do any less in defense of Hawaii if Hawaii were a State, rather than if Hawaii were to continue to be a Territory?

Mr. STENNIS. I have already said that in any case we would defend Hawaii to the very limit. But I am referring now to trouble areas in the world.

I have not heard anyone present any evidence that conditions in Japan have improved; and I look upon Japan as the foremost power in the Pacific area that could have sufficient strength to stop communism. The Japanese people have great industrial know-how and energy; but I have not seen anyone produce any facts to show that, under present conditions, Japan has much chance to grow into a powerful nation—at least, not at any time soon. Of course, I regret that. Especially is that true in view of the fact that the vast manpower and other strength of China has already gone over to the Communist side.

Mr. President, I do not see a rosy picture so far as the Pacific is concerned. I believe the Pacific will be a trouble area for a long time; and I believe it is the area in which communism is going to make more headway. I believe a great fight will be made there to expand communism farther and farther.

Regardless of what may be the situation today in Hawaii, I believe it will be an open door, and will be subjected to tremendous pressure. I shudder to think what could be the outcome. At such a time, certainly it would be most serious to have membership in the Senate and in the House of Representatives open to persons who, under some circumstances, and through no fault of any person now living in Hawaii, might succumb to that threat. In my humble opinion, by that means we would be further developing a situation which would be bound in years to come to give our country the most serious trouble. I have not heard much evidence to the contrary.

We know that over the years there have been very serious communistic threats there; and I believe they will recur. I shall not attempt to speak further now regarding the situation which exists there today.

I found a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, who certified that his agency has no evidence that the conditions which now exist in Hawaii would control a Senator or a Representative; that was about as far as the letter went. I should say certainly that would be true; but that is no evidence as to what probably could happen in the middle of that vast area in the Pacific.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I judge the pending measure to be one of the most serious of all those to come before the Senate at this session, and one of the most far reaching the Senate could possibly pass. It is a measure—one of the very few of this type that the Congress could possibly enact—which would constitute only a one-way street from which there would be no return.

Mr. President, I trust that, on sober reflection and the utmost consideration, the Senate will not pass such a measure, but, instead, will consider giving a commonwealth status to this area and to its people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the backing with which S. 50 comes to the Senate, it would be futile for me to think that anything I may say today will prevent its passage, but before final action is taken I want to go on record once more as believing that granting statehood to Hawaii at this time is unwise.

My reasons for taking this position were outlined at length in three speeches I made in the Senate during the 83d Congress, when the House passed an Hawaii statehood bill and the Senate passed a bill giving statehood to both Hawaii and Alaska, but the House failed to approve the combined bill.

Some of my generalized objections to making either Hawaii or Alaska a State were repeated last year before the Alaska statehood bill was passed.

Reviewing those objections now, even in the light of action which has been taken with regard to Alaska, I still feel that the admission of one of these Territories last year was a mistake, and that to admit the other one this year would merely compound our error.

In the first of the speeches which I made in opposition to Hawaiian statehood on March 12, 1954, I said I believed it would be dangerous and undesirable to expand the borders of the United States beyond the North American Continent. I added that even if this objection were ignored, I still felt Hawaii was not a suitable candidate for statehood under existing conditions, because of circumstances involving the Territory's geography, economics, and population.

In my second speech, on March 30, 1954, I argued that Hawaiian statehood would violate fundamental principles of U.S. foreign policy. My third speech, on April 1, 1954, summarized my objections to statehood for either Alaska or Hawaii, and referred particularly to the precedent we would set that would stimulate future demands for admission of Puerto Rico and other islands in the Atlantic and Caribbean.

I know that in the report made to the Senate on S. 50 an effort has been made to answer the arguments of noncontiguity, of disproportionate representation, of the nature of the population, and of the dangers of Communist domination of the electorate; but what the report offers is more in the nature of denials and pleas of not guilty than factual argument.

The economic condition of Hawaii, which concerned me in 1954, has improved since that time. The population has contiuned to grow, and there is no question about the fine spirit exhibited by Hawaiians who have served in our Armed Forces, and the loyalty to America of its citizens generally.

The geography of the islands has not changed, however, and the influence of communistically inclined labor leaders, while it has been less evident in recent years, has not been eliminated.

But, above all, there remains the objection to including within the United States a territory so remote and separated by such an expanse of ocean over which we have no control. Alaska at least can be approached through our friendly neighbor Canada; but, under international law, we could not protest if the neutral waters surrounding Hawaii were completely ringed with hostile submarines and aircraft, and I can see possibilities of new crises developing involving Hawaii not unlike our present situation in isolated Berlin.

We would defend Hawaii in any case, of course, but I have not been satisfied by the assurances that Hawaii, as a self-governing State, would be as easy to defend as would a Territory similarly situated where Federal powers are more extensive. And, as a firm believer in States' rights, I do not concede that the answer might be to go ahead and continue to assert Federal controls over the new State for defense purposes, because the same principle could then be applied for the destruction of the rights of the older States.

It is not my intention today to review in detail the arguments I have previously made, and to which I have referred. But there are a few statements already in the record which I feel merit repetition.

The argument that we are obligated to give the people of Hawaii statehood as quickly as possible, as a matter of justice to them and in line with our treatment of other Territories, ignores the difference between the way we acquired Hawaii and the way other States came into the Union.

The States formed from the Louisiana Territory resulted from a purchase and the ratification of a treaty. Texas came in after the people of that Republic had voted overwhelmingly for annexation. The people of Hawaii, on the other hand, in the words of one of our colleagues, "crashed their way into our Union as a Territory against every rule of constitutional law and against every precedent then existing."

A treaty with the king of the islands had been proposed as early as 1854, but the ruler died without its being submitted to the Senate. The old treaty was dug out in 1893, and debated in the Senate over a period of years, without favorable action for ratification. Then, in 1897, when the United States was on the verge of entering the Spanish-American War, President McKinley proposed a new treaty of annexation as a defense measure. This was secretly debated over a period of months, but could not win the necessary number of votes.

The naval battle of Manila Bay was fought on May 1, 1898, and 3 days later a resolution to annex Hawaii was offered in the House of Representatives, and steam-rollered through as a war emergency measure, while the treaty proposed in 1897, which had been ratified by the so-called Hawaiian Republic still was pending in the Senate. The House resolution, which required only a majority vote, as compared with a two-thirds

vote for a treaty, was passed by the Senate and Hawaii became a Territory.

In the 1898 debates one Representative said:

Nobody pretends any purpose to take the Hawaiian Islands into the Union as a State, but the purpose is simply and solely, so far as the contention goes, to acquire them for the purpose of assisting us in our military and commercial operations.

Another speaker in the House said:

There is not a man on this floor, there is not a man who hears my voice, who will say that he or this Congress contemplates the acquisition of Hawaii for the purpose of making a State of it. * * * On the contrary, this House is full of men who would not vote for this resolution except with the understanding in their own minds that Hawaii is not to be introduced as a State into the Union.

Those were the sentiments of Members of Congress in 1898, when Hawaii became a Territory, and they echoed a well-established theory that the geographical limits of our Nation should be expanded only with great caution.

In 1845, when admission of Texas as a State was being debated, Daniel Webster spoke of "a very dangerous tendency and of doubtful consequence to enlarge the boundaries of our Government," and added:

There must be some limit to the extent of our territory, if we are to make our institutions permanent. The Government is very likely to be endangered, in my opinion, by a further enlargement of its already vast territorial surface.

Our experience with Texas in itself has not justified Webster's fears, but that does not invalidate the general argument that there are limits beyond which our national territory ought not to be expanded.

When Thomas Jefferson, by the Louisiana Purchase, brought about the expansion of our national border beyond the Mississippi, he wisely foresaw that we could not afford to have a rival nation, especially one under the domination of a possible hostile European power, rise on our western border. The same considerations justified our later expansion through the annexation of Texas and acquisition of the territory along the Pacific Coast, but this argument cannot be applied to inclusion as an integral part of the United States of a group of islands 2,000 miles from our present continental limits, and which themselves stretch over a 1,900 mile area.

Our forefathers who brought this Nation into being through a revolutionary struggle recognized that the American people should be allowed to develop their genius without unnecessary entanglements in the affairs of other continents.

Our first President, George Washington, in his farewell address, pointed out that Europe had a set of primary interests with very remote relation to ours and said:

Our detached but distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance.

Improved communications and transportation have shrunk the world since Washington's day, and of necessity we are much more closely involved in the affairs of other parts of the world. It is true, as pointed out in the committee report on S. 50, that it is much easier to reach and communicate with Hawaii today than it was for those in the older States to reach California when that State was admitted to the Union, but all these changes are proportional. When California was remote from Virginia, it was much more remote from Europe and from Asia, and while Hawaii is now much easier to reach from the continental United States, the people of the islands cannot get in their cars and take vacation trips to one of the States or share in our national life in a way comparable to people of the existing States, excepting only Alaska, to whose statehood I interposed the same objections.

Therefore, I say, there still is validity to the idea expressed by Thomas Jefferson in a letter commenting upon the revolt of South American colonies against Spain, in which he said:

The European nations constitute a separate division of the globe; their localities make them a part of a distinct system; they have a set of interests of their own in which it is our business never to engage ourselves. America has a hemisphere to itself. It must have a separate system of interests; which must not be subordinated to those of Europe.

That theory was the heart of the Monroe Doctrine and, again, while modern conditions have modified the application of that doctrine and we must now concern ourselves more intimately with the affairs of the other hemisphere, I still feel it is a mistake for us to demonstrate to the world an inclination to take in areas outside of this hemisphere as integral parts of the United States.

John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State in 1823, warned the Russian Minister in Washington that "we should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subject to any new European colonization establishments."

Now, when we are giving protective custody to some areas in other parts of the world where free governments are threatened, it is especially important for us to avoid any appearance of desire to indefinitely expand our own territory. The final step of admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State should, in my judgment, at least be deferred until a less crucial period in international affairs.

The argument I am making was well summarized in an editorial in the Richmont (Va.) News-Leader in May 1953 which said:

For the United States to abandon fixed and definite borders—unchanged for more than a century—in order to take into the Union an island group 2,500 miles away would be a mistake of the gravest nature. * * * To extend statehood to Hawaii would be to undertake a fateful change in both the physical nature of the Union and in a basic political policy by which the United States has conducted its affairs since the time of Monroe. * * *

Once the step of statehood is taken, it cannot be taken back; and once Hawaii were admitted a precedent would have been established—new rules would have been laid down and old doctrines abandoned—by which the claims of Alaska and Puerto Rico would become far more difficult to resist. At one time Australia talked of petitioning for admission to the Union. And if Australia, why not New Zealand, New Guinea, Indonesia, Formosa? At some future time almost any nation anywhere might logically urge upon the United States the same new rules that are now urged for Hawaii.

These are not remote and speculative contingencies. Hawaii was quite literally scared into seeking annexation to the United States by Spanish pressure in 1898. Since then, international pressures have grown more ominous. Once new standards of degree were established, many an Asiatic nation might offer a consistent plea: If it were sound to take in Hawaii, 2,500 miles away, then why not Guam, some 5,000 miles away? If it is sound public policy to admit Hawaii, with a Japanese population of 37 percent, then why not Japan itself, with a Japanese population of 100 percent?

May I point out, Mr. President, since that editorial was printed, Alaska has become a State, and the fact of Alaska statehood now is presented as a logical reason for granting the same status to Hawaii. This bears out the prediction that breaking the line of contiguity in one place makes it easier to breach it in another. If we go beyond the continental limits of North America to take in Hawaii, we ease the way for further expansion along the line which this editorial suggests.

As I said at the outset of these remarks, I have no hope of blocking favorable action on the pending bill, but I do want to remind the Senate once more of the dangerous principle involved and to express the hope that somewhere in the RECORD there will be recorded statements that we are not throwing open the gates and inviting membership in a United States of the World, but that having given full statehood status to our last two Territories, the United States of America will devote itself to cultivating that form of constitutional liberty which is our precious heritage and which we offer to the rest of the world as an example to be imitated, but not diluted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have cosponsored Hawaiian statehood legislation since 1951, and I supported it even before that. This is a good example of the frequency with which good proposed legislation must be reintroduced and fought for in Congress after Congress before it can be enacted.

Last year, when the Senate debated Alaskan statehood, I spoke about the noncontiguous argument used against admission of Alaska. In particular, I compared with modern Alaska the extent to which Oregon and California were separated from their sister States when they were admitted back before the Civil War.

Since the same argument—that it does not border upon the continental United States—is often heard against Hawaii, I wish to repeat some of the facts about the history of the settlement of the West.

I quote from my remarks of June 27, 1958:

The history of the settlement of America is evidence of the conquest of time and space

by modern transportation and communication that we have achieved.

The fact is that most of the west coast became part of the American Union when the people living there were far more isolated from their fellow citizens than Alaskans are today.

The pattern of orderly, progressive settlement of the United States stopped at the Mississippi River. From its banks westward lay the treeless Great Plains, then the Rocky Mountains, and great deserts. It was the lush valleys of California and Oregon that attracted settlers, and they crossed hundreds of miles of what was then tortuous country to live in California and Oregon, and make them States.

The settlers who crossed the middle of the continent to settle the west coast in the 1840's and 1850's, had to start in April in order to reach the Willamette Valley in Oregon by the next November. Many of their trains were delayed by weather or hostile Indians at the military outposts in Nebraska and Wyoming and they had to wait until the following spring to continue their trip. The hazards and trials they underwent have been vividly recorded by such great writers as A. B. Guthrie, and this epoch of our history lives today in every medium of our entertainment.

There were few attractions for settlers between Missouri and the west coast. The Territory between was nominally under the jurisdiction of the United States, but it was inhabited only by Indians, most of them hostile. Trappers, explorers, a few miners, military stations, and stage stations along the traveled routes were about the only representatives of western civilization. The Great Plains and the Rockies were regarded only as obstacles to be overcome in order to reach the coast. Aside from the trials of nature, the wandering Indian tribes regarded the whites as invaders—and rightly so—who imperiled their way of life, and they were always a threat to travelers, not to mention settlers. Little protection from Indians existed, except near the Army forts.

Yet California became a State in 1850; Oregon became a State in 1859; both were many hundreds of miles from the nearest neighboring States and even the nearest organized Territory of Nebraska. Texas was 650 miles from California; and except for California on its southern border, the nearest State to Oregon in any other direction was Iowa, well over 1,000 miles distant.

California and Oregon were separated from their sister States by vast spaces that were crossed by courageous pioneers, but not either by telegraph or railroad. Except by stagecoach, the quickest way to reach them from the east coast was by sailing around Cape Horn, and the record for the trip was 97 days.

The first telegraph service did not cross the continent until 1861, nor the first train until 1869.

Now, 100 years later, we are linked to Alaska by instantaneous communication from all parts of the United States. Radio, telephone, telegraph, cables, mail schedules, the all-weather road from Great Falls, Mont., to Fairbanks, and air and steamship travel render meaningless the geographic distance so far as statehood is concerned. Today it is 20 hours by air from the east coast to Alaska, and only 5 hours from Seattle to Anchorage. In the 1840's the fastest stage connection between Missouri and California took 24 days, and that was a rarity.

The fact that California and Oregon did not border on their sister States nor on the rest of the American community was no bar to their admission in 1850 and 1859. I think most Oregonians would share my own reaction to the noncontiguous argument, which is simply: "So what?" The 1,000 miles that separated Oregon from Iowa in 1858 were far more difficult to overcome than the 600 miles between the west coast and Alaska are in 1958. Does anyone deny that it is easier to travel through Canada to Alaska now than it was to travel through Indian Territory to California or Oregon or Nevada when they first became States? Intervening land and water have simply not been shown to have any particular bearing on the statehood issue.

We in Oregon and the rest of the Pacific Northwest are tied to Alaska by the ties that really matter. A great many of the Oregon citizens who have written to me in support of Alaskan statehood have mentioned the friends and relatives they have there, and their capability of running their own affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an editorial entitled "Hawaii and Oregon," from the Milwaukee Review of February 12, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII AND OREGON

One hundred years apart the halls of Congress echo to the selfsame arguments over statehood for an aspiring Territory. In 1858 and 1859 it was the Oregon Territory; in 1958 and 1959 it is the Territory of Hawaii.

Oregon was too remote. Oregon was too hard to defend. Oregon was too thinly populated. But most of all, Oregon presented hard-to-handle aspects of the conflict over Negro slavery. The last-named was the real rub, and the other arguments were only the pretexts for delaying full statehood.

Substitute "Hawaii" for "Oregon" and the arguments are the same. Hawaii, some say, is an island, not a part of the main (although in fact it is far closer to the other 49 States than Oregon was 100 years ago). Hawaii may indeed be hard to defend, but restive Oregon of 1859 was a far greater problem because of the deep split of Oregon opinion on slavery as the Civil War approached. No one knew exactly what Oregon's population was in 1858, and much of the debate is given to arguments on both sides over population "guesstimates"; Hawaii, we know almost exactly, has enough to give it two Congressmen—by far the largest population of any State at the time of admission since Texas, 110 years ago.

Underneath the diehard and now about-to-be-defeated hostility to admission of Hawaii as our 50th State is race prejudice. Hawaii, alone among American Territories, has a majority of its population drawn from Asiatic and Polynesian stock, rather than the European, African, and Latin American sources of the other American States. In the world we live in today this is one of the mightiest arguments for immediate statehood for Hawaii as an earnest to the world that all peoples can flourish under the Stars and Stripes.

Only a few years ago a Nebraska Senator blurted out his real opposition when he told his Senate colleagues: "Why the next thing you know we'd have a Senator Yamamoto sitting here."

Some of the more racistic southerners have made it clear, too, that they oppose Hawaiian statehood because no member from Hawaii will ever help maintain southern segregation practices. Both the Nebraskan and the old-school southerners unintentionally add to the reasons why Hawaii should be a State.

As Oregon celebrates this Saturday its 100th birthday, the greatest practical purpose to which we can put our celebration is to extend the helping hand to Hawaii. We have been associated from the earliest days, when Polynesian workmen labored and many died here, since the shipping route took our earliest settlers to the Sandwich Island en route to the mouth of the Columbia. "Owyhee" and "Aloha" among our place names are traces of our common history. The era just ahead will bring vast new association between us in commerce and tourism.

The State of Hawaii will be a tonic to America's body politic. As we revel in our centennial recollections we can do great things for our Nation by assisting the new State of Hawaii—as old as Oregon in American tradition and culture, but 100 years our junior as an equal Commonwealth.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the admission of Hawaii will strengthen the Union. It will add diversity to our population and culture. Yet the people of Hawaii are basically American in their culture and will continue to be so. They are certainly tied closely to the American Continent in the things that count—in their political institutions, their news media, their forms of entertainment, and in their economy.

Let me add that I only wish I could be as confident that the District of Columbia will achieve true home rule during this session of the Congress.

The demands of justice will be served when the people of the District are permitted to elect their own mayor, just as they will be served when two Senators from Hawaii are seated in this Chamber.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it is not my intention today to go into any lengthy documentation of the case for Hawaii statehood. The record is formidable. It is replete with testimony that demands that the 86th Congress act without fail to make Hawaii our 50th State. For a number of years, as a member of the House committee dealing with Territorial matters and as its chairman for 4 years, I was deeply involved in the question of statehood. I am convinced without question that the Territory of Hawaii has long been ready for statehood and that we will be guilty of grave dereliction if we delay any longer to bring it about.

The smokescreen of spurious arguments advanced by the opponents of Hawaii statehood has been thoroughly pierced, and in its disintegration it has been shown up for what it is—a device to hide the personal motives of the opponents of statehood.

The favorite line of the opposition has been to impugn the loyalty of Hawaii's citizenry, but the evidence shattering their accusations continues to grow in volume and strength. In June 1953, Senator Hugh Butler, onetime foe of statehood because of possible Communist influence, made this statement at a Senate hearing:

I believe the residents of Hawaii during the past 4 years * * * have demonstrated by positive action their awareness of the Communist danger and their determination to face it frankly and never let it strengthen its foothold. During those years they have fought it boldly, have restricted its influence, and to some degree have driven it underground. I believe they have shown that they are as well able as the Federal Government to cope with this measure.

James Michener, in his article in the December 1958 Reader's Digest, came to this conclusion after an extensive study:

Hawaii does suffer from a Communist threat. So do San Francisco and Balti-

more—and all America. Hawaii's problem is no different from that of any other area.

Hawaii is not a captive of the Communists. It is fighting back exactly like any mainland community. Its record is impressive.

It is no longer necessary to answer the argument of "noncontiguity." It was answered firmly and finally when Congress last year made Alaska our 49th State. And there is no need to dwell on the argument of "small population." It has been soundly refuted by the fact that Hawaii's 550,000 population exceeds that of 5 of our present States.

There remains, then, the basic question of whether Hawaii is economically, socially, and politically ready to become a State. These tests have all been met. There is no disputing the cold hard facts and figures that point up the economic prosperity of Hawaii. There is no mistaking the American culture and philosophy that dominates the lives of Hawaii's polyglot mixture. And there is no disputing the political maturity of the men and women in the legislative halls and the executive corridors of the Territory of Hawaii.

Last fall a joint congressional committee visited Hawaii. It went there with open eyes and open mind, self-consciously aware of the need to keep itself free of preconceived ideas and foregone conclusions. Members of the committee walked and rode and flew around the islands, talking to people in every phase of life, and meeting with labor and business groups and with fraternal, political, and community organizations. The committee came back enthusiastic. It came back secure in its conviction that Hawaii must become a State. In its report, the House members of the committee concluded that "admission of Hawaii, with its mixed races and its geographical position, will vastly improve our posture and relationship throughout the vast Pacific area, where we are striving with all our might and means to keep 800 million free and friendly."

Hawaii will, of course, benefit immeasurably from statehood. But let us not underestimate the economic, political, and diplomatic advantages that the United States as a Nation will gain in having as a strong outpost in the Pacific a member of its "family of States." And let us not underestimate the fact that if we fail to bring Hawaii into this family we face the possibility of the Territory becoming a Commonwealth and all that that implies—a nation that belongs to us and yet does not.

In conclusion, I desire to emphasize that the question of Hawaiian statehood is as much an international issue as it is a domestic issue. The nations in the Far East and elsewhere are watching us very closely on this. If we want to maintain their faith and confidence in us as a great democracy, we cannot afford to equivocate on this matter. There is a gap here between our pretensions and our performance. Let us close the gap by waiting no longer to make Hawaii our 50th State.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I regret very much to see the Senate rushing through at this time such an important measure as statehood for Hawaii. I remember this proposal has been before the Senate on other occasions. A few moments ago I was looking at the RECORD of 1954. At that time the proposal for Hawaiian statehood was discussed on the floor of the Senate at length.

As I remember, and according to the RECORD I have before me, I spoke for about 2 hours, opposing statehood for Hawaii at that time. There were many reasons why I then opposed statehood. I feel just as strongly today about everything I said on that occasion in opposition to statehood for Hawaii.

Some time ago the Internal Security Subcommittee saw fit to conduct an investigation concerning communism among the Hawaiians. It will be found, if the report is read, that the committee made a finding that, while the Hawaiian people as a whole were not Communists, a great many leaders in the unions were sympathetic to communism, and some of them, in my opinion, were nothing but Communists themselves. To a large extent, I think the same thing is true today. I do not believe there has been very much of a change since that time.

However, there are other reasons why I believe statehood should not be granted to Hawaii at this time. One of the main reasons, as I have always contended, is that the United States of America should really be the United States of America. When we reach out to a distant Territory—in this instance it is a group of islands—located approximately 2,500 miles from our western shore, and admit it into the Union as a State, I want to warn Senators who vote for such a bill that no nation in the world which has ventured out so far to make a Territory a part of itself has done so without being destroyed because of such action. We can observe what happened to the Roman Empire.

There is another reason for my position. I look at the matter purely from the standpoint of the good people of Hawaii. What do we find? It might become a little burdensome for the people of Hawaii to finance statehood. I think the Alaskans are feeling that way to some extent right now. Some of the people of Alaska are beginning to feel the pinch of statehood. If we could wait a couple of years more I think the people of Hawaii might find out from the people of Alaska what it means to be a State.

Government employees stationed in Alaska are receiving extra pay under the civil service law provisions. That happens, I know, because I am chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We pay people who go to Alaska and who stay there an extra amount of money because they go outside the United States to work. What are Senators going to do about that when the question comes before the Senate? Are we going to treat one State any different from another State? The same thing will be true with respect to Hawaii. What are we going to do? Are we going to give preferential treatment to people who work in the United States? That is a question which is going to come before the United States Senate very soon. I for one, think all States should be treated alike in regard to matters of that kind.

Yes, I oppose statehood for Hawaii at this time. Of course, the Hawaiians have been told it is a great thing. I have contended Hawaii should become a Commonwealth. The Hawaiians could do as Puerto Rico did, and they would be far better off.

I make the prediction that the majority of the people of Hawaii will be saying that is true in the next 2 or 3 years.

There is not involved the question of making the Hawaiians inferior citizens simply because we do not make Hawaii a State. We have other islands. What are we going to do with respect to the other islands when they ask to become States? What is the limitation?

Mr. President, realizing that what I may say here today, tomorrow or the next day, should this go on, is going to have very little effect upon the votes in the Senate, if any, to conserve time I am going to ask the Senate to grant unanimous consent that I may print some remarks on this subject in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a serious matter, Mr. President, that we have under consideration today, when we are preparing to vote on the question of whether we shall admit a Territory which is located thousands of miles out in the Pacific Ocean. If we admit the Territory of Hawaii to statehood, what can we say to Puerto Rico when she desires to come into the Union? What can we say to Guam when she desires to enter the Union? What could we say to the Philippines if they should desire to enter the Union as a State?

I am warning the Senate that the areas I have mentioned, and many more, will be knocking at our door. I predict that requests for statehood will come from as far away as Italy. Italy will want to be a State of the United States. That is already being talked about in Italy. I am warning the United States again that if we try to spread out we shall begin to deteriorate.

Study the history of other nations which have arisen in the past and note that when they extended their borders unduly, they met their downfall.

What is best for these United States is the question that concerns me. Glossy statements about the example we may set for the rest of the world, and in the Pacific area in particular, have not the slightest appeal either to my reason or sentiment. Such puerility of thought should be addressed to the kindergarten classes. I am here, to use the favorite expression of another of my predecessors, as an ambassador to the U.S. Senate from the sovereign State of South Carolina, to help legislate and formulate a national policy for the good of the United States. The rule for my conduct is what the people of South Carolina and of the United States think of me as I perform my duties in keeping with what light and conscience the Almighty has seen fit to endow me.

What others may think of me—in foreign lands, in the Pacific, in Russia, in the Far East, or in Hawaii, if you please, or elsewhere—influences me very, very little. I am not at all persuaded by an internationalist press nor by any of its wings, left, right, or center. We are here to legislate for what is good and for what is best for these United States as a whole. If not, we ought to go home. That is our sworn constitutional duty, our prime responsibility, and the main purpose for our presence in this body.

My record on the foreign "giveaway" programs is singularly consistent. This proposal, in my judgment, is just another phase of a philosophy of looking out for the welfare of others and utterly neglecting our own.

Mankind has made great and unique progress since July 7, 1898, when these islands were dealt to us under the table as a Territory. But 12 inches still make a foot; 3 feet still make a yard; 24 hours still make a day. The Constitution of the United States, so far as admitting new Territories and new States is concerned, remains unchanged. The precepts and warnings of our great forebears still remain the wisest counsel.

I am thankful that the admission of the Hawaiian Islands as a Territory, on that hot day in July of 1898, was not then, and is not now, considered a party question. Both parties have endorsed the proposition. Neither has been right.

I am one who feels that generally party platforms should be followed; but a platform is something on which to try to get into office, and is not used thereafter, anyway. All of us know how the planks of a platform are adopted at national conventions. I have attended conventions. We are told, "We must adopt this. It will not do any harm, so let us put it in." Of course, that is not said openly, but it is true, nevertheless. Neither convention apparently has studied the proposition with sufficient care to pass impartial judgment on it. Someone sometime ago said that our Republic would have been destroyed long ago if the party in power had adopted all the political planks in its platform. I believe that statement to be true. The admission of these islands as a Territory, in my judgment, constituted a fraud in 1898. If we admit them now as a State, we perpetuate that fraud. Nowhere in the Constitution is there power to expel a State. That is something which must be remembered. The Constitution makes it easy for a Territory to come into the Union, but once a State, it is impossible to get it out. When the Constitution was adopted, our Founding Fathers never had in mind anything such as is now proposed ever happening. If they had, they would have included some protection. But it must be remembered that the Thirteen Original States were closely knitted together.

Now it is proposed to separate the United States. Someone has said that a country divided against itself will fall, or words to that effect. Certainly the United States will become divided if a Territory far out in the Pacific Ocean, 2,100 miles from the mainland is to be admitted as a State. The most we should do is to guarantee it a republican form of government. Sovereignty over these islands now is vested in Congress. If we divest ourselves of it, it will be gone not for a while; it will be gone forever. Our ability to recall a mistake will be forever lost, if this bill passes. If a Senator has in his mind any doubt at all about this proposal he should vote against admission, because he never will have an opportunity in the future to undo his mistake.

I cannot scan the debates on the admission of these islands as a Territory without a feeling that all the precedents theretofore established for the admission of new lands as Territories were violated; even, I conclude, the intendments and spirit of our Constitution were violated. Once having been violated, to admit the islands now as a State would be merely a prolongation and perpetuation of an original wrong. Shall we give our stamp of approval to an improper act?

In conclusion, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that every great nation which finally has fallen or disintegrated first had passed through a period of annexation and expansion leading to a state of weakness. I hope the United States of America will not have that experience. After all, today the United States of America is the strongest nation in the world, not only financially, but from the standpoint of having one of the best governments. Taking the people of our country as a whole, I think they are the best in the world. Certainly I believe the United States of America is the most Christian nation in the world.

Regardless of the Senate's decision on the pending measure, I believe that so long as the United States leans upon God for guidance and help our Nation will continue to exist. However, if America expands, becomes greedy, and forgets God, she will be destroyed.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at a point prior to the vote on the Hawaiian statehood bill a statement which I have prepared on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

As one of the many cosponsors of S. 50, I join my colleagues in expressing deep satisfaction that the U.S. Senate has played a noble part today in providing for the early admission of the State of Hawaii to the Union. Hawaii has met every legal test and precedent for statehood. Its people have met the test of loyalty to this Nation's institutions and flag by unparalleled valor in battle, and devotion in times of peace. The heterogeneity of her people will add new sources of ability and creativeness to enrich our Nation. We can congratulate her people and the Nation on the admission of Hawaii as a State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute. I served for a short time in Hawaii during World War II. I wish to pay my tribute to this great Territory, which I hope very much and expect will very shortly become a State.

Mr. President, taking into statehood this outpost in the Pacific, with its heterogeneous population is one of the most outstanding contributions we can make to the foreign policy of the United States. By doing so we are demonstrating to the world the fact that this is a dynamic and virile nation. We are not static. We have a warm heart and understanding for all people.

I think this will become not only a historic admission to statehood but a historic landmark in the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. President, I congratulate the people of Hawaii. I know they will perform their obligations and their responsibilities to the people of the United States with the same dignity and capacity—indeed, with the same heroism—which they evidenced in World War II, when I saw them at close range.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. The pros and cons on this issue have been debated thoroughly. There is nothing I can add which will affect the outcome. I merely wish to congratulate the country on the addition of a new State, and to welcome Hawaii as a State on a parity with the other 49.

This is an important day for our people and our country, and I ask that the Senate now proceed to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

I also anounce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further anounce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—76

Allott	Frear	Mansfield
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Bartlett	Green	Morse
Beall	Gruening	Morton
Bennett	Hart	Moss
Bible	Hartke	Mundt
Bridges	Hayden	Murray
Bush	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Neuberger
Cannon	Hruska	Pastore
Capehart	Jackson	Prouty
Carlson	Javits	Proxmire
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smith
Clark	Kerr	Symington
Cooper	Kuchel	Wiley
Cotton	Langer	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dodd	Long	Yarborough
Douglas	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Dworshak	McGee	Young, Ohio
Engle	McNamara	
Ervin	Magnuson	

NAYS—15

Butler	Hill	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	Robertson	Talmadge
Fulbright	Russell	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—7

Aiken	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Curtis	Humphrey	
Gore	Martin	

So the bill (S. 50) was passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Hawaiian statehood bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Washington to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, first I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for his diligence and effectiveness in connection with this very important piece of legislation. Except for his diligence we would not have passed the bill as it has been passed by the Senate.

I also wish to commend and congratulate my good friend, Delegate BURNS, of Hawaii, whose outstanding statesmanship displayed since coming to Congress as a Delegate has brought about the happy result we have witnessed this evening. I thank the Senate for its prompt action.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Texas will agree with me in what I have to say. Of course, my colleague from Washington has done a grand job on this bill. However, I believe that the Senate should pay special tribute tonight to one of the great Members of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. He is the first Senator, I understand, in 46 years who has presided over a committee which has reported bills admitting two States to the Union. I know my friends from Alaska will join me in that tribute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since our distinguished friend from Montana has brought in two States, I hope he will not become too generous before the session is over. [Laughter.]

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank and congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their expeditious and reasoned consideration of statehood for Hawaii. I believe that a thorough study of Senate proceedings will show that we have set a record for major legislation, from hearings 2 short weeks ago to passage tonight.

Mr. President, this record was made possible by the full and complete support of the bill by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] in scheduling it promptly for Senate consideration, ably supported and assisted at all times by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I believe it is important to repeat from my opening statement today that no one can accuse the Senate of acting in mad haste by passing on Hawaiian statehood after a single day of debate. The reverse is true. The swiftness with which the Senate has acted and with which the House is acting is evidence that all aspects of statehood for Hawaii have been considered thoroughly.

We have done a noble thing. We have kept faith with our fellow Americans in Hawaii. We have demonstrated again the dynamic nature of our American democracy.

Statehood for Hawaii is a significant victory, not only for Hawaii, but for all America and for freedom-loving people everywhere.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks previously made by the distinguished majority leader with reference to the wonderful assistance given by the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS]. I, too, wish to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who has won great honor as chairman of his committee in seeing two States admitted into the Union in less than 1 year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very proud that the report of the committee in reporting the statehood bill to the Senate was a unanimous report. I congratulate the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for their work. The junior Senator from Montana did noble work on the floor of the Senate today in helping to bring about this result.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that for the record it might be well to call attention to the fact that when the debate on the Hawaiian statehood bill started, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] was presiding over the Senate, and that when the debate ended and when the vote began the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] was presiding. It indicates rather clearly that the new States know how to fulfill their full functions in the Senate. I congratulate both of them for their activities in this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in the compliments being paid to everyone except the compliments that are being paid to me.

I especially wish to commend my distinguished senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for the statesmanship he has shown and for the drive and the initiative he has manifested in bringing two statehood bills to the floor of the Senate in less than 1 year.

I also wish to pay a special tribute to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who, as in the case of statehood for Alaska, worked hard and diligently in behalf of statehood for Hawaii. The Senator from Idaho has made a real contribution to the betterment of our country in helping to bring these Territories into the Union.

In addition to the tributes which have been paid to the Democratic members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I believe we should not lose sight of members of the committee such as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], each of whom made a distinct contribution. The report of the committee was a unanimous report. I am delighted that on this great day for Hawaii the Delegate from Hawaii should be in attendance at this session, because he has done so much to further the cause of statehood for Hawaii.

I hope that the House on tomorrow will follow suit in the action the Senate has taken today, and that soon the bill will receive the President's signature. I hope that before long we will have two Senators from the State of Hawaii, and one Representative in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the tribute paid to the minority leader and to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in addition to the tributes which have been paid to the other Senators, in which I join, I should like to pay tribute also to the majority leader, under whose leadership we have resolved some of the most difficult and trying problems which this Nation has had to face.

During the 10 years I have been in the Senate, it has been my privilege to support statehood for Alaska and statehood for Hawaii in connection with the bills which have been placed before us.

Unfortunately, although those bills were debated for a long time, nothing ever happened. Now we have settled the troublesome issues of Alaskan statehood and Hawaiian statehood, and we have done so with less discussion than in previous years was required merely to talk about one of these bills. It is a great tribute to our majority leader. He has a way of getting people to work and pull together to achieve something with less wasted effort and more results.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make three comments. The first is that there comes to mind the rather tumultuous discussion we had about changing rule XXII. Here is evidence of how the Senate can work its will if it wishes to do so.

Secondly, I should like to say that our distinguished Vice President was in the chair when the vote was taken both on this action, and when the Alaska statehood issue was resolved in the Senate.

Finally, I wish to congratulate and compliment my colleagues on the minority side. On the entire vote there was only one dissent on the minority side, and I am genuinely proud of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say that it would not have been possible to bring about the result which has been brought about except for the complete and thorough cooperation of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on this bill, as on all others. I appreciate his help.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

BUSINESS REVIEW IN CERTAIN CITIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a business review made in cities in America in which a corporation in which I am interested does business. This review will serve to show my colleagues who are downhearted that there are bright spots in the country where people wish to help themselves.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Business review in Atkins' cities [1]

	Annual rate, latest month		Extent of unemployment, January 1959	Employment compared to year ago, percent	Department store sales compared to year ago, December 1958, percent
	Average worker's income [2]	Income compared to year ago,[2] percent			
Albany, N.Y., area	$4,934	+1.7	Substantial	−4.6	+2
Baltimore, Md	4,878	+6.4	do	−1.0	+10
Boston, Mass	4,352	+6.3	Moderate	−1.6	+9
Charlotte, N.C	3,512	+9.6	do	−.3	(3)
Hartford, Conn	4,782	+7.4	do	−1.3	(3)
Philadelphia, Pa	4,702	+4.4	Substantial	−2.1	+12
Providence, R.I	3,710	+5.0	do	−.8	(3)
Richmond, Va	4,011	+3.2	Moderate	+1.2	+2
Rochester, N.Y	4,871	+3.9	do	−3.6	+12
Washington, D.C	4,968	+8.7	Slight	−.5	+13
Chicago, Ill	5,096	+5.5	Substantial	−4.6	+8
Cincinnati, Ohio	4,801	+6.5	Moderate	[4]−3.5	+3
Cleveland, Ohio	5,330	+3.3	do	[4]−11.6	+5
Dallas, Tex	4,210	+4.1	do	[4]−4.0	+6
Grand Rapids, Mich	4,825	+5.3	Substantial	[4]−3.1	+6
Indianapolis, Ind	(3)	(3)	Moderate	−4.8	+10
Kansas City, Mo	4,876	+5.6	Substantial	−1.9	+13
Knoxville, Tenn	4,297	+4.4	do	−3.3	+9
Memphis, Tenn	3,761	−5.7	do	−2.1	+13
Milwaukee, Wis	5,043	+4.5	Moderate	−4.0	+5
New Orleans, La	4,402	+7.2	do	−3.2	+5
Omaha, Nebr	4,848	+11.0	do	−.7	+11
St. Louis, Mo	4,994	+7.0	Substantial	−3.2	+9
Denver, Colo	4,993	+6.2	Moderate	−.3	+10
Los Angeles, Calif., area	5,176	+6.4	do	+.2	+11
Phoenix, Ariz	5,068	+12.6	do	+6.6	+9
Salt Lake City, Utah	4,646	+3.6	do	+.7	+12
San Diego, Calif	5,409	+12.2	do	+2.4	+8
San Francisco, Calif., area	5,352	+6.8	do	+.5	+4
Spokane, Wash	5,605	+13.5	Substantial	−1.3	+6
Median	4,871	+6.2		−1.6	+9

[1] Frederick Atkins, a buying office, 11 West 42d St., New York City.
[2] Factory earnings.
[3] Not reported by Government agencies.
[4] Factory employment only.

NOTE.—"Slight" unemployment means less than 3 percent of labor force, "moderate" means 3 to 5.9 percent, "substantial" means 6 percent or more.

Source: U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 20, 1959.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE GARRISON MEMORIAL HOSPITAL AT GARRISON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Garrison, N. Dak., together with a statement I prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, GARRISON, N. DAK.

Whereas the Garrison Junior Chamber of Commerce is an organization comprised of young men who accept the responsibility of constructive action in the affairs of their community; and

Whereas the Garrison Memorial Hospital is in dire need for added facilities to accommodate for the large number of Indian patients it is taking in, which will in turn enable them to better care for all patients in the hospital; and

Whereas under Public Law 85–151, the Garrison Memorial Hospital is trying to receive aid, through the Federal Indian Agency, to increase their facilities, to better care for the large number of Indian patients they take in; and

Whereas the city of Garrison would be an excellent location for this hospital addition, due to the fact that most of the Indian population comes to the Garrison Hospital to receive medical care and treatment; and

Whereas the city of Garrison has a hospital which was so constructed that it could be added on to quite easily, if the need arose; and

Whereas the Garrison Memorial Hospital has one of the finest groups of medical doctors, surgeons, and technicians for any town our size in the State of North Dakota; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Garrison Junior Chamber of Commerce duly assembled in general membership meeting, this 17th day of February 1959, do hereby support, and go on record as supporting, the Garrison Memorial Hospital in their request for Federal aid for this hospital addition; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, bearing the signature of the president and secretary, be forwarded to all Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota, the Indian health area officer, the North Dakota State Health Department, and to the delegate and councilmen, National Congress of American Indians.

DARWIN W. JOHNSON,
President.

RICHARD RASCH,
Secretary.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Sister M. Angele, O.S.B., administrator of the Garrison Memorial Hospital, Garrison, N. Dak., on behalf of her hospital, has been in constant touch with me pertaining to obtaining Federal assistance under title VI of the Public Health Service Act as part of the Hill-Burton assistance program.

The hospital serves a large number of Indian patients as well as non-Indian patients in that area. We have received many letters and petitions from North Dakota constituents, urging that everything be done to facilitate the obtaining of funds under Public Law 85–151 which permits funds for construction of additional facilities.

Representative of the letters and resolutions that we have received is one from the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Garrison, N. Dak., which I ask unanimous consent that it be entered at the end of my remarks.

I am happy to report that Dr. James R. Shaw, assistant surgeon general, Chief, Division of Indian Health, as well as other aids in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, have been most cooperative in this matter.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as ranking Republican member on the U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency since its inception, I have had an opportunity to hear the country's outstanding experts on juvenile delinquency. The subcommittee has done a remarkable job in trying to stem the tide of this No. 1 social menace in our country.

We know that juvenile delinquency has been increasing at a rate of approximately 7 to 8 percent each year since the beginning of 1949 which, over a 10-year period, has reached a phenomenal total of approximately 70 percent over the statistics for the year of 1948. This, of course, includes only the known cases of juvenile delinquency and not those that go unapprehended.

This evening I do not intend to go into full discussion of the problem of juvenile delinquency but would like to confine my remarks on a recent article and editorial in the Washington Evening Star, which commented on the testimony of the judges and other experts on juvenile delinquency in the New York City area at a hearing before the U.S. Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. The newspaper articles highlighted the fact that these witnesses related to parental delinquency as a primary cause of the juvenile delinquency problem.

The GAPA, a civic organization, wrote a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star raising numerous questions that must be resolved in order to correct adult and parental delinquency if the premise is that juvenile delinquency is caused primarily by adult and parental delinquency.

The letter to the editor is as follows:

To the EDITOR:

Your article and editorial referring to the testimony of judges before the U.S. Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee relating to parental delinquency is timely and goes to the very heart of the juvenile delinquency problem. If the premise is that juvenile delinquency is caused by adult or parental delinquency, then what should be done to correct adult or parental delinquency? Here are some questions that must be resolved.

1. Is each community providing adequately trained family and child guidance clinics to reach families that cannot cope with the many family problems that may lead to delinquencies?

2. Is each community or neighborhood adequately cleaning up the existing conditions which foment into adult delinquency and parental delinquency, resulting in certain amount of juvenile delinquency?

3. Is each school, public or private, providing guidance to the soul as well as guidance to the brain?

4. Is each parent aware of his parental responsibility to his child; and then is he competent to cope with that parental responsibility?

5. Is each church providing adequately trained marriage and parental counseling services for parents and prospective parents?

6. Is each church exerting its fullest effort to encourage church and Sunday school attendance of youth who may have delinquent tendencies? Are parents of these children encouraged to attend church regularly?

7. Is each church providing adequate programing for the youth membership to assure moral guidance?

8. Is each church assuming its obligation in accepting referrals, from the juvenile bureaus of juvenile courts, of youth of its faith or denomination?

9. Is each church providing use of its church buildings and grounds for youth recreation, especially in underprivileged neighborhoods or does each provide expert recreational and guidance leadership to aid their youth?

10. One expert noted that 10 percent of the families are provided with 90 percent of public welfare and social welfare services and that many delinquents come from these families. Will concentration on alleviating the problems of this 10 percent of families curtail juvenile delinquency?

11. What can be done to reach the parents of the well-to-do families who do not know the difference between loving and pampering a child; and further between disciplining and punishing a child, resulting in needless cases of juvenile delinquency among well-to-do families?

The Greek American Progressive Association (GAPA) endorses the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's program of uniting all national service and fraternal organizations into coordinating their efforts in an all inclusive program to wipe away adult and parental delinquency and thereby aid in curtailing and controlling juvenile delinquency. GAPA offers its services locally and nationally in solving our No. 1 social problem.

GREEK AMERICAN PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION,
JOHN BROUMAS,
Honorary President.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. President, of course we cannot blame all acts of juvenile delinquency against the parents, for there are many parents who love their children, give them the best of everything, including parental love and discipline, and yet acts of juvenile delinquency are committed. Recently such a situation occurred in the home of one of the greatest catchers in the history of major league baseball—a fine gentleman and man who has been an outstanding workers in juvenile delinquency programs—namely, Roy Campanella of the Los Angeles Dodgers.

Roy Campanella gave his children good schooling, a good home life, and the fine attributes that he always displayed on and off the baseball field; and as he stated:

I try to teach my own youngsters the right way in life.

In this instance we have to look beyond just the issue of the role of the parents in rearing their children and consider the role of the community, of the church, and of the schools who have very much to do with the character building of every child. That is why I believe that the questions raised in the above letter are so apropos.

Mr. President, I direct the Senators' attention to a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 6, page 8232, on the subject of "The Role of the Church and Community in Rearing Youth." This article points out what must be done by the churches and its members as a community group in properly rearing their children and thereby combating juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, it is only when each individual parent who, combined with other individual parents, individually and as a group, become so aroused to the problem of juvenile delinquency that effective action and measures will be taken to control our No. 1 social problem.

An aroused, alert, and coordinated community can do most anything. Corrupt governments and despots have been overthrown; gangsters have been run out of town; gamblers and houses of ill fame have been shut down. Cities have been saved from raging floods and disease-infested areas have been cleared to save the people from plagues.

The combating of juvenile delinquency requires funds, expert personnel, coordinated activity by public and private agencies, by public relations and education. To get funds and expert personnel, it requires concerted effort by the people of a given community to impress upon the city council, the State legislature, or the Congress of the United States, the great need for these funds and the expert personnel.

Therefore, if we want our children to be protected; if we want to assure ourselves that our own children will not be drawn into this spiderweb of delinquency and crime; then the parents, the church members, and the community members must become an aroused and constructive group so that they will gain the support and the funds needed to afford the proper facilities and trained workers through a centrally guided administrative body to wipe from the face of the map this raging disease and menace called juvenile delinquency.

For years I, as well as other Senators, have been urging for such action. Congress can help by passing the several Senate bills directed toward providing Federal funds to match State funds to control juvenile delinquency throughout the country.

A FRESH LOOK AT FOREIGN AID—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE CHESTER BOWLES, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the Edmund A. Walsh lecture which was delivered last evening by Representative CHESTER BOWLES. This speech is an outstanding contribution to the discussion of foreign assistance and deserves wide attention as Congress begins the consideration of the mutual security program for the coming year. The address sets forth the objectives which our aid program should encompass and provides standards against which we can judge our national effort in foreign aid.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FRESH LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

(By Hon. CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut)

It is an honor and pleasure for me to come to Georgetown as the Edmund Walsh lecturer. Almost everyone who considers our diplomatic corps and its role in administering U.S. foreign policy is reminded of Edmund A. Walsh and the Georgetown School of Foreign Service.

This is not only because the school itself is now the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service. It is because these two names have been closely connected for 40 years. Both have had special roles in providing competent Foreign Service officers in sufficient numbers to carry out the growing international responsibilities of the United States.

It is, therefore, fitting that we meet here today to discuss our foreign economic programs which have become so closely integrated with the day-to-day work of American Foreign Service officers in our Embassies throughout the world.

Clearly our new generation of American diplomats will face problems that will range far beyond the scope of our Foreign Service tradition. Among the many new capabilities which our foreign representatives must have is a broad understanding of the increasing role that America must play in world development and world economics.

For want of a better term, what we call foreign aid has been a major instrument of U.S. foreign policy since lend-lease helped lay the economic foundations for winning World War II almost 19 years ago.

Then UNRRA moved in to help shoulder the immediate and staggering task of relief which followed the war. Next, the Marshall plan gave a necessary helping hand to European economic reconstruction.

Then the mutual security program was designed to help our allies in Western Europe rearm in the face of renewed threats of Soviet aggression. This program was later expanded to non-European areas and coupled with technical assistance.

Each time we have added a new chapter to the saga of foreign aid, we have had an opportunity to think through our national purposes and to estimate the values and limits of our foreign economic program as an instrument in helping us to realize these purposes.

We have often neglected to utilize these opportunities fully.

We now engage in a wide variety of programs to help other nations build the economic foundations for sound and orderly political growth. But these programs have again reached a crossroad of history. Unless we face up frankly to our mistakes as well as to our achievements, I am afraid that our efforts may begin to lose much of their relevance to the great world problems now facing us.

The reexamination of the scope, motivations, and nature of our economic aid efforts on which I shall embark tonight is necessarily limited and oversimplified.

I offer it with humility in the hope that it may encourage others to do likewise, and thereby promote the responsible public debate and reappraisal which is so long overdue.

For one thing is sure as we in Congress approach the mutual security legislation of 1959: If those of us who believe that this effort is utterly vital to the creation of a peaceful world society fail to speak out constructively, unregenerate opponents of the program will capitalize on its inadequacies to destroy it.

As background for this analysis, I shall first consider briefly the worldwide situation which we now face.

THE NEW CHALLENGE

Since World War II a revolutionary upheaval has been taking place which has directly affected two-thirds of mankind and which may prove to be the decisive overall influence in shaping the next century.

A billion and a half people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are now striving to create or to reaffirm their national identity.

At the same time an exploding technology in agriculture, public health, engineering, and communications has created expectations of a new and better life in the most remote villages. Yet because both capital and trained people are lacking, the slow increase in production in most areas is barely able to keep up with population growth.

In the meantime the more fortunate nations of Western Europe and America are enjoying a living standard unprecedented in history. Although the American people constitute only 6 percent of mankind, we are producing nearly 40 percent of the world's manufactured goods.

The contrast between the rich prosperous Western nations with some 15 percent of the world's people and the depressed 70 percent of mankind now living in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, is made all the more explosive by racial differences. The first group is largely white and the second group is largely colored.

Advancing toward the center of the world stage is the Soviet Union with an economy that is now expanding nearly three times as fast as ours, with more than double our annual output of technicians and professional men, and allied to a Chinese government which is regimenting 650 million Chinese under a tight-fisted Communist dictatorship.

THE COMMUNIST OBJECTIVE

Thirty-one years ago Lenin proclaimed that "the road to Paris lies through Calcutta and Peking." Five years later Stalin said, "The backs of the British (meaning the West) will be broken not on the river Thames, but on the Yangtze, the Ganges, and the Nile."

For 25 years Stalin's efforts to undermine Europe and isolate America by the expansion of Communist influence in Asia and Africa were ineffective. They failed because the Kremlin lacked an understanding of Asian and African cultures and also the necessary capital resources and technicians for export.

Today these deficiencies have been removed. No one can deny that the Kremlin thoroughly understands what is going on in the underdeveloped world. Nor can anyone deny that it has the able technicians, the capital, and the will to implement the strategy that Lenin laid down more than two generations ago.

In the forefront of the resulting struggle are the two most heavily populated nations on earth—China and India.

Under a tough totalitarian government, the Chinese are being driven at a furious pace to create a new first-class industrial power. Inevitably it will become a nuclear power as well, unless an international control system is established including China.

In the eyes of Asians and Africans the only underdeveloped nation that is remotely capable of meeting the challenge of China is India. Yet India's economic and political handicaps are staggering.

As a democracy, she cannot tax her people past a certain point without revolution.

As a democracy, she must provide some recognizable year-by-year improvements in the living standards of her people.

As a democracy, she must give free reign to an opposition which is often disruptive and irresponsible.

The adequacy of our economic efforts in the coming decade must be judged against the background of these unprecedented revolutionary forces. Our long-term capacity to survive as a free people may largely be measured by our ability to cope with them.

FOUR COUNTS OF FAILURE

I suggest that our present economic efforts are failing on four counts.

First, our stated purposes of foreign aid fail to do justice to our real goals in world affairs. More basically, they fail to take adequately into account the new dimensions of the international political situation and therefore the new dimensions of peace.

Second, instead of focusing our efforts on the political and economic forces which I have described above, our aid program is overbalanced much too far toward the military.

Third, because we have failed to distinguish between the needs and present capabilities of the 60-odd countries receiving our aid, large sums have been misdirected and even wasted.

Fourth, our financial commitment and our administrative performance are both grossly incommensurate with the challenge.

These shortcomings are not sudden or new. I have called attention to them in the past and so have other observers.

They have now become acute. It is no longer possible to gloss over them or to pretend that they are unimportant.

It therefore behooves us to examine each of these points in detail.

I. THE PURPOSES OF FOREIGN AID

The stated purposes of our economic aid programs are negative and narrow. In some cases they imply such an oversimplified view of world realities that they are logically bound to be futile.

That they have not been even more futile is only because the day-to-day actions of the administrators of these programs have often been more adequate than the terms in which they justify those actions before congressional committees. But let us consider our official purposes.

We assert, for instance, that our economic aid programs are primarily designed to block Communist expansion.

In defining our objective so narrowly for domestic political consumption, we have inadvertently appeared to offer a premium to those countries which have the most Communists. We have thus turned communism into a national resource.

To a struggling government, hungry for outside assistance, the local Communist minority has become worth its weight in American dollars.

Nations that have been able to produce sufficiently frightening statistics on their indigenous Communist agitators have often been urged to take more assistance than they could properly use. Other nations, less well endowed with Communist troublemakers, have received little or nothing.

This curious premium on communism is actually written into the preamble of the Mutual Security Act which says that "the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered (by) international communism" and that it is "the policy of the United States to continue" the aid program "as long as such danger * * * persists."

Communists are not often blessed with a sense of humor. But some Communist leaders who are, have said to the people of Asia and Africa:

"The Soviet Union offers loans and technicians to speed your development. For this you are grateful.

"But you should be equally grateful to Moscow for the aid the Americans give you. In their own official statement of purpose, they frankly state that if they were not so frightened of us Communists, they would give you nothing."

Buying friends

Another mistaken reason often listed as a purpose of our foreign aid program is that we will bring military allies to our side, or at least win their support for whatever political position we may choose to take in the United Nations.

This argument is also hollow and futile. It is no more possible to buy the long-term loyalty of a nation than it is to buy the enduring loyalty of a friend. To attempt to do so can lead only to frustration and antagonism.

Suppose a wealthy resident of the little New England community in which I live should offer to build a swimming pool for our children, a new library, and an extension of our townhall, provided only that my neighbors and I support his views willy nilly in our town meetings.

What would we do? We would invite him to take his money and go live elsewhere.

Unfortunately, we Americans have often and inadvertently placed ourselves in the position of the richest man in the world community, naively trying to buy friends and supporters for his views.

Is it any wonder that our economic aid program is often suspected, if not rejected by proud, suspicious, newly free peoples?

Well-fed rebels?

Still another mistaken argument in support of foreign aid grows from the false assumption that we can turn Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans into orderly supporters of the status quo simply by filling their hungry stomachs. This is a kind of Marxism upside down.

Yet any experienced authority on economic development will tell us that a landless laborer or a tenant farmer who lacks a sense of belonging and a sense of justice will not be satisfied with marginal economic gains.

Instead of turning him into an unthinking supporter of the political status quo scattered material improvements, granted to him by a suddenly beneficent government within the old political and social framework, will simply create an appetite for the full citizenship to which he now believes he is entitled.

For instance, consider Iraq. Before the revolution last year, no country in the Middle East was making such rapid economic progress. Yet the citizens in the bazaars, villages, and small factories were given only a meager share in the gains.

Consequently their sense of injustice increased. In their lives the much-advertised progress has little meaning. Eventually the political pot boiled over.

Our foreign aid programs are supposed to create mutual security. But when aid is given for negative and mistaken purposes, it fails to generate the public support which it must have here in America. Moreover, it deprives the receiving country of the essential sense of partnership with us, unless that country happens to view the Soviet threat in the same largely military terms that we do.

Before we call willy-nilly for committed nations, let us remember that such a requirement leaves out most of the non-Communist world.

Our earlier experience

Our foreign aid program has not always suffered from such poverty of purposes. There is an important lesson to be learned from a quick backward look at lend lease and the Marshall plan.

We all know that history does not repeat itself, and that the success of these earlier programs does not mean they are infallible models for 1959. But the underlying conception and operating methods of these programs are instructive. Indeed I believe they may hold a key that will open new doors in

our search for a more reliable approach to our economic relations with the underdeveloped nations.

Like the mutual security program, both lend lease and the Marshall plan were initiated because they were held necessary to protect our own national security.

Neither represented an outpouring of pure altruism. But after this has been said, the earlier programs provide several dramatic contrasts to our present mutual security concepts.

First, lend lease was designed to protect the most vital interests of the other participating governments just as much as it protected the vital interests of the United States. It was true international cooperation on the central issue—national survival for all concerned.

Second, lend lease was not simply a holding operation to minimize the Axis conquests. Instead it was an engine that powered the allied drive to defeat the Axis.

Thus lend lease became the tangible, positive symbol of a dedicated and far-sighted U.S. leadership in a common struggle for a more secure and peaceful future.

The vision of the Marshall plan

The Marshall plan had the same essential ingredients, expressed in a different way, that took account of the changed international situation.

In his historic speech at Harvard in June 1947, Secretary of State Marshall spoke of the destruction, the poverty, and the chaos in war-scarred Europe.

He said that Europe's needs for food, machinery, and raw materials were much greater than she could satisfy with her own resources. Without aid principally from America, Europe would face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character.

Secretary Marshall assured the world that U.S. aid policy was not directed against any country, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos.

"It's purpose," he said, "should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist." He offered American aid, but first he called for self-help and cooperation among the European countries.

Secretary Marshall's words could be applied today with equal relevance to other parts of the world.

"It would be neither fitting nor efficacious," he said, "for this Government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe.

"The role of our country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so.

There was a wideness in Marshall's vision that far transcended the more narrow although altogether vital American interest in preventing the European Communist parties from gaining power in the wake of economic chaos.

Here was an offer of strong, purposeful, and effective American leadership in cooperation with other countries.

Here was a positive American response to the crisis that jeopardized the economic and political interests of both Europe and America.

Here was an eloquent expression of hope that by cooperative action nations could build a better future for themselves.

Here was a call for a comprehensive plan for European economic reconstruction. Although American aid was to be an integral and essential part, we were counting on Europe itself to push its own resources to the limit.

Our mutual security program today lacks these clear purposes and operating principles. If we are to achieve our crucially important objectives, we must return to them.

Not an easy task

I do not pretend that this will be easy. These principles must be applied in parts of the world where most governments are far less well prepared for effective cooperation than Europe was in 1948. Our ties with many of these governments are less close. But we must take into account the same variables on a new world stage.

We must rethink the nature of the present crisis, the stakes involved, the governments and the people concerned, and above all, the available areas of vital mutual interests.

This is not simply a problem of semantics. Our new purposes must be reflected in our day-to-day actions, in our policies, in our appropriations, and in our administration. Unless the words we speak are reflected accurately in the things we do, we will continue to blunder.

This brings me to the central question: At what point do our vital interests meet those of most of the nations in the non-Communist world?

Again we may borrow Secretary Marshall's words and say that our purpose should be to foster the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist.

The area in which our vital interests intersect with those of the non-Communist world is not simply anticommunism or membership in an anti-Soviet bloc. It is rather a common interest in independence and in promoting maximum freedom of choice.

While we in America have tended to become bewitched with a negative, military-oriented, holding operation against communism, most of the rest of the non-Communist world has been concerned with establishing new societies designed to provide a better future.

Yet when we take time out to consider our objectives more closely, we find that we share with most non-Communist countries, underdeveloped as well as developed, the same basic objectives.

We are all trying to maintain true national independence.

We all wish to avoid unwelcome foreign interference.

We all seek to build and maintain the foundations of stable, responsible national governments.

And, of the utmost importance, we all know in our hearts that these national purposes cannot possibly be realized in isolation, we know that cooperation is essential.

All of the less developed countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America urgently need technical assistance and most of them need investment capital which we and our Western allies are in a position to provide.

We, in turn, need continued access to their raw materials and markets for our own produce and manufactured goods—access to which the Kremlin now seeks to deny us by the end run tactics which Lenin advocated.

But because of the accidents of geography and experience, the non-Communist underdeveloped governments see the world from differing perspectives.

Some feel that their national security is directly endangered by overt aggression from the Sino-Soviet bloc or indirectly by internal subversion spurred on by local Communist parties. Others have their eyes on more immediate economic problems that threaten not only their hopes for a better life, but their actual political survival.

In each case we must seek to develop those points of common concern where our mutual interests intersect and we must root our programs of economic assistance in these mutual objectives.

To do so will require a fresh breadth of vision in a new world of extraordinary complexity. It will, of course, require a genuine sense of concern on our part for the welfare of those beyond our own shores. But one of the most obvious ironies of our time is that unless we interpret our own national interests more generously, we will fail to secure them.

Without a broader perspective, we will almost certainly interpret our vital interests so narrowly that we fail to help others secure their own interests, even when their security is in fact connected with our own security.

If the purposes of our foreign economic programs are to be squarely based on the cooperative securing of our long-range vital interests, we should start by giving our foreign aid statute a less negative name than the Mutual Security Act.

I suggest we call it the Act for International Cooperation. Its stated objectives should be the cooperative development of the conditions of freedom and the maintenance of national independence.

This would place the emphasis where it belongs—on cooperation and partnership. It suggests that America's long-term national purpose is broader than saving our own skins.

II. MILITARY VERSUS ECONOMIC AID

Let me move on now to the second major question facing our foreign aid program.

At present most of our foreign economic aid is military aid. Even our nonmilitary aid largely concentrates on supporting the military programs.

The segment set aside for pure economic aid, moreover, concentrates too narrowly on measurable material development. It fails to recognize that such growth, however valuable, is only a partial answer to the problems now facing the less-developed countries.

Let us briefly examine the breakdown in last year's mutual security legislation. Total foreign-aid appropriations were $3.3 billion. Of this $1.5 billion, or about 50 percent, went straight for military aid.

The second largest sum, $750 million, went for defense support. This is the name we now give to extra aid for countries receiving military aid, extra aid to help their economies support the cost of an enlarged defense estabilshment.

Such economic aid, in other words, is not officially designed for economic development purposes at all, although it obviously may assist such efforts inadvertently.

Special assistance accounted for $200 million and the contingency fund for another $155 million. While grants under these accounts have been given for economic development, the general categories cover odds and ends of purposes that cannot really be classified in advance as earmarked for either military or economic development aid.

This left mighty little for straight economic development and technical assistance—only $400 million for the Development Loan Fund and $171.5 million for technical cooperation.

Thus we see that less than $600 million, or only 18 percent of more than $3.3 billion, was provided expressly and directly to help raise living standards and foster orderly political growth through technical cooperation and economic development. Even allowing for the economic development aspects of other programs, our mutual security effort, as it is conceived today, still remains largely a military aid program.

It follows that the administration and the Congress apparently still consider the major threats in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to be military threats, and that the principal danger against which we are attempting to

insure ourselves in these areas is the danger of overt Sino-Soviet military aggression.

The hard facts do not support this assumption.

Vietnam, Korea, and Taiwan, to be sure face the clear danger of invasion from Communist China or its satellites. Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia remain essential to the NATO defense line. All these nations will continue to need military assistance.

But the primary problems facing most countries of Africa, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and the Far East are not military problems.

Their problems are mainly concerned with the laying of the foundations for orderly political government. They are problems of national development in the broadest sense of the word.

In my opinion, our emphasis on military spending in such areas represents in large degree a waste of public funds. In some cases it feeds the disruptive internal forces which represent the principal threat to national security.

It compounds local tensions between nations otherwise friendly to ourselves.

It diverts governments faced with pressing problems of internal economic development into a strident military escapism.

I believe that military aid should be separated from development aid.

Furthermore, I believe that Congress and the public should be given a more realistic picture of what our aid program has accomplished and what it has failed to accomplish.

Time is running out

However, the weaknesses of some of our country-by-country programs are not my primary subject tonight.

What concerns me most is our continuing failure to understand, much less to cope with, the revolution of rising expectations which is now sweeping the non-Western World.

Many societies which have been slumbering for centuries are being jolted out of their traditional ways and are energetically seeking to escape from the shackles of the past.

People that have always accepted their poverty and hunger as unavoidable are now convinced that they can have a better life and have it soon.

They have observed that with industrialization come wealth, power, prestige, and security. So they also want to see their countries industrialized—soon.

As we have seen, the crucial question which ought to draw together the less developed countries, Europe, and the United States is whether this economic and national development will take place under totalitarianism or under governments based on the consent of the people.

The inauguration of foreign aid programs by the Sino-Soviet bloc in 1954 is tangible proof that they recognize what is at stake. The question is, do we recognize what is at stake?

Communist extremists persuasively promise the underdeveloped nations a quick ride up the escalator to economic development. Just look, they say, at what is happening in China.

Soviet aid in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is already pushing the $2 billion mark. It may be expected to double and then to triple in the next 5 years.

Unless the non-Communist governments of the less developed countries are able to meet the demands for agricultural and industrial development by the methods of freedom and consensus, they will almost certainly be replaced by governments which are prepared to follow China's example.

Economic progress not enough

I have said that economic development is by no means the complete answer to the problems facing the less developed countries today. If there is to be orderly political growth, economic development must be accompanied by educational, social, and political changes which give people an exciting new sense of participation and of increasing justice.

If these factors are missing, economic development may actually increase the disruptive tensions within the country by opening up expectations that cannot be met. It will almost certainly increase the explosive gap between rich and poor.

The problem of the less developed countries is to build themselves into viable nations. This is a tall order at any time. It is made doubly difficult today because these new lands are caught in the strong conflicting currents of world politics.

What are the essential requirements for a viable nation?

Most important of all, its people must develop a personal stake in the survival of the national government. They must come to believe that the state can help protect and promote their interests, and that they will receive justice at its hands.

Colonial government was primarily organized to serve the interests of a foreign ruler. The people had no stake in its survival.

That was especially so because colonial peoples had little or no sense of participation in the process of government. In their minds the government was they and not we.

When freedom comes, the exciting days of marching, singing crowds and of single-minded opposition to the colonial aggressor quickly fade into history. New governments are faced with the sobering and infinitely greater task of rallying their people in support of constructive programs that will kindle in their countries the desire to grow and endure as free nations.

What is the proper role for the United States in this difficult process?

We must understand the many-sided nature of the problem. Then we must tailor our economic efforts clearly to meet the broad category of problems that are encountered on the way to nationhood.

These needs include raising the level of literacy. An educated people can more easily be persuaded to support a responsible government while doors are opened to enrichment of individual lives.

They include land reform measures so that a higher percentage of the land will be efficiently used for food production and more individual farmers may have the satisfaction of owning their own property.

They include the development of a free, responsible labor movement.

They include programs of community development projects in the rural areas to help increase food products, control disease, build roads and schools, and create small village industries.

They include transmitting insights into modern public administration so that the new governments will be able to operate effectively with due respect for public freedom.

If our efforts are to succeed, we must recognize that Secretary Marshall was wholly right when he said that in working toward these objectives the initiative must come from the people and governments of the countries we are seeking to help.

Although we cannot force these developments, we can stand ready to help intelligently and seriously when our help is requested.

III. DIFFERENT PROGRAMS FOR DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

All too often we tend to think of all the less developed countries as one vast frustrating blur. This obscures the vital differences in importance, needs, and capacity for growth.

It has caused us to set up standards for providing aid and then to attempt to apply them, willy-nilly, to all situations and nations.

Our own specially created democratic process is not necessarily or automatically the best model for an Asian or African country that lacks our historical background. The essence of democracy underscores the need for each people to create its own pattern of social, economic, and political life within the guidelines of its own heritage.

There will be much borrowing of ideas and forms from foreign countries to be sure. But let us have the humility to understand that the guiding institutions of the American way of life are very special ones and that our methods cannot be transported in full to other unique people.

Among the less developed nations themselves, these differences go far beyond physical and social forms. Almost all of the less developed countries stand in need of economic development before they can be viable, modern nations. But it is foolish to expect them to be equally able to absorb United States development help.

Why is it that a dam can be built and operated with great success in one country, while in another country a similar dam is a miserable failure?

Why is it that modern equipment can make a vital contribution to increasing agricultural and small industrial productivity in some countries while similar machinery, sent to other countries, lies rusting on the docks?

In most cases it reflects basic differences between the countries and the governments in question—differences which our program planners and our legislators have lamentably failed to take into account.

The underdeveloped countries fall into many categories. The most favorable opportunities for American assistance exist in those countries which are not only determined to build the economic and social foundations of viable, new, independent nations, but which also have the built-in capacity to implement their plans.

In such countries, which unhappily are altogether too few, we should be prepared to make bold, long-term investments of our capital and our skills.

At the other extreme are those nations which because of lack of farsighted leadership or of administrative ability, or both, are clearly incapable at this stage of meeting the minimum practical requirements of meaningful economic development.

Long-term loans or grants for the general economic development of such countries are foolhardy. Efforts to force the pace beyond their capacity to use the funds effectively will almost certainly fail, and failure will lead to frustration on our part and bitterness on theirs.

Between these extremes there are many variations. Although a particular country may not be ready for a long-term investment commitment, it may nevertheless be making an honest effort. This and the local political situation may combine to warrant a program of modest encouragement with the assurance of more substantial help as the administrative performance improves.

India is clearly the outstanding example of a country in the first category, where maximum aid can be used for maximum benefit. Moreover, India also serves to illustrate the standards by which I believe we should measure the capacity of each country to use our long-term economic development assistance.

Five standards for judgment

1. The most important standard is the standard of self-sacrifice. To become eligible for substantial long-term assistance, a nation should demonstrate as India has demonstrated, that it is making a substantial effort to finance its own national development.

Evidence of this willingness for self-sacrifice includes a reasonably effective program of national taxation, controls over the importation of luxuries and nonessentials,

and a determined and continuing effort to provide the maximum number of peasant families with their own land.

2. A country's political importance also must be taken into account. This may be measured by its population, the size of its territory, and its location. India again is the best illustration.

With her 400 million people, her strategic geographical location and her democratic institutions India is not just another underdeveloped country. It is a continent comparable in size, population, and potential influence to Europe.

Moreover, India alone rivals China in Asia. Although each is rushing forward to develop its resources, each is following a totally different path: India has chosen to follow the path of maximum freedom; China, the path of totalitarianism.

If the Indian democratic experiment fails, most Asians will be convinced that, like it or not, the Communist approach to economic development must be accepted as the only effective way.

3. To qualify for major investment assistance, an underdeveloped nation should have put together a practical, comprehensive plan of objectives and itemized the allocation of resources necessary.

Only in this way can the important tasks be given priority, the development program related to private and public income, and the need for international help judged more accurately.

If there is already a significant private business sector, it should be considered side by side in such a plan with Government-sponsored agricultural, power, and transportation projects in formulating a national development scheme.

India is now in the midst of her second 5 year development plan. It includes both private and Government investment, and private investment is successfully carrying the major share of the load.

4. A qualifying country should have a substantial number of able civil servants. Without good technicians, honest tax collectors, and experienced administrators, large amounts of investment capital cannot be used to economic advantage.

One of the great residual advantages of British rule in India is the excellence of today's Indian civil service. We ought not to treat it as a wasting asset.

5. In order to qualify for long-term investment assistance, a country should have a relatively stable government with popular roots. As the largest democracy on earth, India obviously qualifies to a special degree. We should not, however, stretch this point to bar long-term assistance to all nondemocratic governments.

As I have suggested above, we cannot reasonably expect all underdeveloped nations to develop in a democratic image to the degree that India is now striving to do. The decisive point is the responsiveness of each government to the public interest.

Rightwing dictators whose power is based on feudal landlords are extremely bad risks. By foregoing the support of both the middle-class center and the non-Communist left, they open the door wide for the revolutionary extremists. And when they fall, our prestige and influence may tumble down with them.

On the other hand, Ataturk in Turkey demonstrated that an authoritarian government that is to the left of center can put through effective reforms and thereby hold the support and participation of its people.

Encouragement to others

Measured against these five standards I have listed, India qualifies to a special degree for American economic aid. So do several other nations. On this basis they should be assured of our intensive long-term investment support for their economic development programs.

As other countries approach these criteria, they should receive more aid because more aid can then be put to effective use.

But countries which are clearly unable to meet minimum standards should tactfully be told that they cannot expect investment assistance from us until they have created their own internal basis for development.

This does not mean that we should turn our backs on them.

We can recommend to them the creation of a comprehensive economic development plan.

Directly and through United Nations agencies, we can help provide tax experts, survey engineering teams, and other technicians to help them to create a workable administrative base.

We can urge them to inaugurate land reforms and suggest expert advisers with experience in introducing these critically essential programs previously in other countries.

We can also help them to finance individual projects which are worth while in their own right, that are not dependent on the economy of the country as a whole, and that are clearly in the people's interest.

A new modern hospital in the national capital is a good example of such a project, or an expanded and improved university or agricultural experiment college.

I must, however, stress that no set of criteria can solve all the problems of allocating American economic assistance.

Occasionally some economic aid will be needed for straight political support purposes or to backstop military aid, or as an expedient rental fee for the use of a military base.

But let us separate such aid in our thinking and in our programing from our major effort of constructive development assistance.

Let us recognize it for what it is: an expedient and, we hope, temporary, byproduct of the cold war.

This approach will enable us to avoid much of the waste that comes from trying to promote a broad-scale development program in a country that is not ready for it, and that is unwilling or unable to make a genuine and reasonably effective effort to help itself.

Some will suggest that the standards which I have proposed may be construed and resented by many friendly, unprepared nations as political interference.

Some resistance is inevitable. But I do not believe that it will be of serious proportions. Tactful American negotiators, supported by a firm congressional mandate, could convince most governments that these criteria are essential in their own long-range interest as well as in ours.

Indeed, I believe that many of these governments will actually welcome such standards as a lever with which to persuade reactionary elements within their own countries to cease blocking constructive reforms.

IV. MONEY, METHODS, AND PEOPLE

Let me conclude with some general suggestions on our economic development assistance which I believe are pertinent to the overall effectiveness of this effort.

To whatever extent it is politically practical, we should channel many of our economic programs through international agencies.

International agencies

Most of the underdeveloped countries are deeply concerned about being politically whipsawed between the Communist and Western blocs. Although they are in desperate need of economic assistance, they are not unmindful of the political implications of our relatively new interest in their well-being.

By all odds, the brightest spot so far in the economic development effort has been the World Bank. This institution has achieved a unique position in the underdeveloped continents. Its operations are widely applauded as hardheaded, practical, honest, and nonpolitical.

The unique role of the World Bank has been made possible by a happy combination of circumstances. These include the remarkably able leadership of Eugene Black and his associates, the bank's ability to raise capital funds from the world money markets, and the fact that its administration is not bound to any government or legislature.

The World Bank should be closely consulted on development projects throughout the underdeveloped world. In many cases, as in India, it can effectively coordinate aid programs from different nations and sources.

The specialized agencies of the United Nations have also made a major contribution to economic and social growth in many areas. In some of these agencies, however, there has been a tendency toward bureaucratic overorganization, which will continue to challenge the able administrators who run them.

The United Nations Special Fund headed by Paul Hoffman is a heartening new development. It should be given the money and facilities necessary to enable it to handle its highly important responsibilities.

I hope that it will soon broaden those responsibilities to include not only studies and surveys of specific areas, such as river valleys, but assignments in the field of overall national economic planning.

In addition, I would like to see an increasing proportion of our technical assistance programs handled through the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance.

Here, as elsewhere, United Nations aid is usually more readily acceptable to the underdeveloped countries. This is particularly so when a strong Communist opposition is in a position to make political capital out of the government's technicians from the United States.

Moreover, United Nations administrators are often in a better position than we Americans are to press recipient governments toward the changes in their tax, trading, or planning policies that are important to the success of their development programs.

A United Nations civil service in the field of technical and development assistance would help to attract and hold able men by providing steady employment and pensions on retirement. Special technical education scholarships in our country and in others might encourage young people to make world development their lifetime careers.

Food for peace

We should also consider the value of an international mechanism for the maximum use of our agricultural abundance.

Imaginative new legislation in the United States has recently made it possible to translate much of our excess agricultural products to constructive use abroad in return for local currencies. The result has been major savings on the part of Yugoslavia, India, and other countries for food that would otherwise have had to be purchased for hard currency.

I hope that we will consider some way of developing a formal world organization to handle such transactions. Perhaps the time has come to take seriously the various proposals which have been made for a world food bank, to serve as a device for the international exchange, sale, or other utilization of our agricultural abundance and that of other countries.

The Development Loan Fund

The World Bank and the U.S. Export-Import Bank (which finances purchases made exclusively in America) provide so-called hard loans to many underdeveloped countries. These loans must be repaid in dollars, pounds sterling, or other easily negotiable currency.

However, such loans cannot possibly meet the minimum capital needs of the developing countries.

Therefore, we must provide an additional source of loan funds which may be repaid with local currencies, such as rupees, which are less easily transferable.

There are two essential requirements for such a program: The amounts available must be substantial and the loan fund must be set up to permit the long-term commitments necessary for long-term development planning.

I have always believed that the ideal solution would be for the more prosperous Western nations to set up such a loan fund on an international basis with a management relationship to the World Bank. This would eliminate the basis for any charge of manipulation by America for political purposes.

However, as a practical matter, I do not believe that we are politically prepared to take this step. Therefore, I propose that we substantially expand our United States Development Loan Fund with assurances for operating capital for at least 5 years.

May I say again this long-term commitment is absolutely essential for effective long-range planning. No private corporation could operate efficiently on an uncertain year-to-year basis. Nor can the harried new governments of the underdeveloped nations.

The Development Loan Fund was formed in 1957. It makes loan capital available for presumably sound economic development projects in the less developed countries which for one reason or another do not qualify for loans from private or other Government sources.

Loans from the Development Loan Fund have an important distinction from conventional loans: they are repayable either in local foreign currency or in dollars and at much lower interest rates than are available elsewhere.

Already the Fund has committed its $700 million of initial funds granted by Congress. Well over $1 billion in acceptable requests are awaiting further funds.

Well administered and adequately capitalized on a long-term basis, the Development Loan Fund can become a key instrument in our international cooperation programs for national development.

The role of private capital

For more than a hundred years Great Britain played a dominant role in promoting world peace and encouraging world development.

During the long Pax Britanica, the British probably invested 10 percent of their gross national product overseas each year, plus a major fraction of their ablest men and women.

If our capital investment abroad today were on a comparable scale, we would now be investing $50 billion annually beyond our borders:

We are living, however, in a world that is economically and politically very different. For instance, the absence of any income or corporation tax in 19th century Britain meant that substantially greater private savings were then available.

Even more important is the fact that most of the areas into which British investments were directed were under tight colonial control which largely eliminated the political risks.

Because of uncertain political conditions, American industry is today reluctant to invest in the very parts of the world where its capital is most needed. Therefore, we must develop new administrative and economic techniques to help increase the flow of private capital and qualified industrial experts to the less developed countries.

This year Congress will be asked to omit income taxes on nonrepatriated foreign earnings of U.S. companies to the extent that they have been excused by the foreign government involved and to the extent reinvested abroad.

At present the U.S. Treasury insists on collecting taxes on profits earned abroad, even when they have been excused by the foreign government in an effort to lure private investment to their countries.

If the proposed change is accepted, it should provide greatly increased incentive for private capital to flow to the less developed countries.

Recently our Government has been able to negotiate agreements with some of the less developed countries guaranteeing that private foreign investment earnings can be transferred home. Other plans also have been devised to increase the security of private capital invested abroad.

Yet, so far, we have merely scratched the surface in our search for ways to bring private American investment capital and American industrial managers to bear on the problems of world development.

Regional development groupings

Another promising device to improve the effectiveness of economic development assistance programs is the formation of regional coordinating organizations.

In addition to encouraging the freer flow of goods and capital within the region, these authorities can help to coordinate the efforts of the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Development Loan Fund, and the various United Nations agencies.

This should be particularly useful in Central and Latin America, where there is a high level of regional understanding and a long record of cooperation through the Organization of American States. The administration has recently announced its support of a Latin American bank.

The level of cooperation which is possible in the Americas is not possible everywhere. Nevertheless, there is an encouraging trend in the direction of regional cooperation in east, south, and west Asia.

The urgent need for able people

Finally one of the tragedies of recent years has been the flight of competent men from the Government service, and the reluctance of others to take their places. I do not mean to reflect on the capacity of many of those who remain. I am simply saying that many more able and dedicated men are needed.

What has gone wrong?

During the war America's best minds and skills were effectively mobilized to do what was required of us.

The creative, dynamic period of the Marshall plan again brought hundreds of outstanding administrators and technicians to Washington to work long hours under heavy pressure and for limited salaries.

Yet recently, when the President was asked at his press conference to comment on the turnover in ICA (foreign aid) administrators, he replied:

"That's one that after a while everybody gets worn down about * * *. They have a very hostile type of atmosphere in which to do their testifying and to seek their appropriations.

"It is a very worrisome job that they have and I can't blame them much, although I hate to lose Mr. Smith (the most recently departed Administrator), and I don't know who I am going to get to take his place."

What is missing here in Washington is a sense of purpose.

There is nothing wrong with the American people. They are patiently waiting to be told the score.

When our Government explains to them what we must do to seize and maintain the initiative in behalf of freedom, they will respond.

When this occurs, our country will again come alive, and able men will be clamoring to play their part.

COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES AT THE IX PLENARY ASSEMBLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL RADIO CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 74, Senate Joint Resolution 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) providing that certain communication activities at the Ninth Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Prior to the taking of action on the motion, I should like to remind the Senate again of the unveiling of the portraits of the five great Senators at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11 (legislative day of March 9), 1959:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Rollin D. Barnard, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

UNITED NATIONS

Henry J. Heinz II, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

George W. Abbott, of Nebraska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

HAWAII

Edward Elliott Johnston, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Jesus sanctioned the words of the lawyer found in Luke 10: 27: *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself.*

Great and gracious God, our Father, may our love for Thee be eternal, plenary, and complete. Strengthen this love from day to day as we study Thy word and realize more completely Thy great sacrifice.

Dear God, may this great body always experience a deep and abiding love for fellow man.

May the love that exists between us and our South and Central American neighbors continue to grow and be magnified.

We make these petitions in the name of our Holy Father, God. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1096. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY LT. COL. JOSE MARIA LEMUS, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of the Republic of El Salvador, into the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency the President of the Republic of El Salvador.

His Excellency the President of the Republic of El Salvador, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege, to be able to introduce to you the President of a neighbor and a friendly country. The United States of North America does not want to be a big brother, nor does it want big brothers or little brothers; it wants to be a good friend of all good people. [Applause.]

I have the honor to present to you the President of the Republic of El Salvador.

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY LT. COL. JOSE MARIA LEMUS, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR

President LEMUS. Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives, honorable President of the Senate, honorable Members of the Federal Congress, honorable members of the Cabinet, honorable Justices of the Supreme Court, their excellencies the members of the Diplomatic Corps, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor for me to be with you, at the invitation of the Federal Congress of the United States. I deeply appreciate the cordial welcome I have received, and the noble expressions of friendship for El Salvador. In behalf of my country, I, in turn, wish to convey the warmest of greetings to the distinguished representatives of the American people, who are gathered here today in this venerable Hall of Congress.

I also wish to take advantage of this opportunity in order to emphasize the profound admiration of El Salvador for the institutional system of the United States, particularly for the solid structure of its congressional establishment, and its adherence to the ideals of democratic government. [Applause.]

Every day it becomes easier to perceive the boring from within, and the threat from without, that seek to implant a way of life which is foreign to our two American Continents. It would be the height of simple-mindedness to think that in any determined region communism does not exist because it has not shown itself to possess a numerical superiority, or because it does not participate in the deliberations of the democratic system. Its task there is surreptitious and crafty, but efficacious in its capacity to stir up subversion. It is thoroughly acquainted with all techniques, including the coup d'etat, the riot, and sabotage. It even possesses aptitudes for gaining control of the collective conscience of the people.

Acting in accordance with the idea of Lenin, that the mass is an instrument but not a decisive force, and that political power can be captured most easily by the action of audacious and determined minorities, the truth is that it operates with efficient strategy and tactics. Its few men, whether visible or invisible, gain influence over public opinion. They push into the educational structure, and penetrate labor unions and enterprises that disseminate the spoken and written word. They infiltrate into political parties, and scatter themselves everywhere and among all elements of the population, to carry on an effective task of undermining and weakening democracy.

It would be well to recognize that communism has some valuable allies in this work. They are social injustice, disorder and political errors, the impoverishment of nations, and the wretchedness of great groups of human beings whom a weakened economy is not able to protect fully, nor offer them comforting prospects.

In this regard, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower summed up the existing state of affairs in our countries very recently, when he affirmed:

Poverty and dependence on one sole product of exportation, with the consequent marked fluctuations in their revenues, characterize the economy of the countries of this vast area.

At this point, I am approaching the consideration of a situation which it is very important to clear up. It is frequently said, and this prejudice is found even among some respectable elements of U.S. public opinion, that we Latin Americans, when we allude to our economic and political situation and the problems which grow out of it, always seek to place an artificial emphasis on the facts, with the purpose of making the importance of our countries appear greater in the realm of global strategy. These persons claim that we thus seek to obtain, not the reasonable moral and economic support which a powerful ally would be under obligation to provide, but concessions which approach a condition of privilege, rather than one of justice.

Then it is said almost outright, that we employ tactics of intimidation. But this judgment does not correspond to the truth.

The real fact is that our conduct in this regard is without either fantasy or exaggerated fear. Our actions are those

of people who recognize the value of all honest alliances, and therefore do not hesitate to speak the whole truth to their ally.

What we say, with all frankness, is that the United States must need aid itself and strengthen its own national security, and in a certain sense its economy, by offering respectful aid to its natural Latin American allies in solving their grave problems of an economic and social nature.

It is sometimes thought of us, and this is true even among respectable elements in the United States, that we Latin Americans play the role of a mendicant who comes to the pantry of the rich relative.

On our part, the recriminations against the United States are even more abundant, and at times picturesque. The Americans are accused of being responsible for our poverty, our backwardness, our total confusion when we find ourselves face to face with certain problems. They are even accused of being responsible for the spectacle of tyranny and political disorder, which in reality is typically of our own making.

In the latter regard, which is perhaps one of the most delicate ones, the United States has been led to a situation almost approximating one of conflict, and this fact has an unfavorable repercussion on the good progress of relations.

On the other hand, one must note as a definite tendency, opposed to the fomenting of friendship and the tightening of relations, the action of certain groups which desire to create a gulf between the peoples of the United States and Latin America. Such groups are, perhaps, those who cause the greatest trouble in inter-American relations. They even go so far as to make believe that any unselfish act of cooperation by the United States is a manifestation of imperialism.

Those who look on inter-American relations with this type of mentality see the United States as imperialistic at all moments, and many of the rulers of Latin American countries as embezzlers, and as rapacious and dishonest men. They hold to this point of view despite legitimate proofs of correct administration and strict probity in governmental affairs.

With such an unsettled atmosphere, in the midst of charges of imperialism, rapacity and delivering of one's country to a foreign power, the progress which different and varied forms of cooperation might bring to our peoples is held up. Meanwhile, totalitarian demagoguery takes advantage of the bad conditions and lack of conformity which exist in our countries, and uses them for its campaigns aimed at discrediting democracy and inter-American solidarity.

My greatest hope is that this good will trip which I have made to the United States of America at the invitation of His Excellency, President and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, may contribute toward shedding some light on the problems of inter-American relations, and toward consolidating the friendship and mutual liking between this Nation and El Salvador. [Applause.]

I have left for the end the matter of referring to my country, where one may see an example of what, on a greater or lesser scale, is happening or may happen in the underdeveloped countries of our hemisphere, which by reason of the nature of their economy have had to suffer the impact of the decline and lack of stability of the prices of the products and raw materials which they export.

Due to those circumstances, these peoples have seen themselves suddenly paralyzed in their march toward progress and in their economic and social development. They shall have to suffer the consequences of total economic dislocation if an effective cooperation does not give new life to their economies, and the organizations which devote themselves to such activities fail to aid them in putting a halt to the violent impoverishment into which they are falling.

In spite of this, the programs of my government have been carried out, up to the present day, with full precision.

The reduction in the prices of our two chief products, coffee and cotton, and the instability of those prices which grows greater every way, are directly responsible for this situation. In this connection, I should like to quote a paragraph from the report of Dr. Eisenhower, which was presented to the President of the United States:

> At present there is an overproduction of coffee. Production has been increased at a more rapid rate than consumption. Production is growing at the rate of more than 5 percent a year, while consumption is increasing by only 2 or 3 percent. For that reason, the prices of coffee, regarded even now by Latin America as too low, are threatened in the future. In one of these countries, 1 percent in the reduction of the price of coffee causes a loss of $8 million in the revenue from its exports. This is catastrophic for a country which has contracted for loans, and also has a very low national revenue.

The severe situation now in effect, however, has not halted our march toward progress. During the last 2 years, projects clearly benefiting the populace have been carried out.

I wish to emphasize the fact that we also have met our economic obligations. The public debt has been amortized entirely according to schedule, and in a manner which gives us the right to say that we display a high sense of responsibility in maintaining our foreign and domestic credit standing. [Applause.]

But if up to this moment, the decline has not succeeded in producing a major dislocation of our economy, it is not to be doubted that it exerts pressure on the list of projects, which my government has drawn up, following a detailed study of the most urgent needs of the Salvadoran people, so as to satisfy those needs in due form.

Together with the other producing nations, El Salvador has cooperated in the search for adequate solutions to stabilize the prices of coffee, even though temporarily. At the opportune time, I took the liberty of suggesting a four-point plan, which attracted international support, and also consideration by the Organization of American States. Some hope is still held for the adoption of the measures proposed. Under that plan, amplified and complemented by other measures, it would be possible to draft our program of action for the defense of prices of the crop for the 1959–60 season. Perhaps our faith and the continuous efforts of the experts of all the countries interested in the future of coffee may halt the sharp descent for the time being.

The public state of mind is fundamental in this emergency, during which we must save not only our economy but also our morale and our principles, since we could not employ certain measures of action or of force without falling into the category of economic dictatorship, nor curtail our regime of liberty by imposing controls or carrying the State toward an undue interference in private business. Neither do we desire to manipulate our sound currency, which has been stable for many years past, nor have recourse to any of the artificial forms of economic adjustment. [Applause.]

The correct solutions, therefore, are few in number. Barely perceptible on the horizon is a long-term solution: the economic unification of the five counties of Central America. Some steps have been taken in this direction, which may ultimately prove to be of a decisive nature, such as the signing and ratification of a Multilateral Treaty of Free Commerce, and another for the Regulation of Industries of Unification. These documents are aimed at establishing a common market of 10 million persons, and carrying out a plan of effective industrial expansion. This would permit the entire region to amplify its commerce, both domestic and foreign, diversify its production, establish solid industries, and abolish the practice of placing chief reliance on only one crop. [Applause.]

The creation of a regional economic unit which naturally excludes all intransigent nationalism would contribute to the strengthening of the economy of our countries, whose situation is described indirectly but eloquently in the report of Dr. Eisenhower from which I quote:

> If each State of the United States were an independent nation, each one with its own tariff laws and other barriers, the population of this country would presently have a very low standard of living. But we have a vast common market available for ourselves at any moment, which permits each industry to attain a greater efficiency of production and to sell, without restriction, some great quantities of its production to a population of 176 million people. Over a long period of years, our growth has enabled us efficiently to improve the quality of the products and to offer low prices (in terms of a stable dollar), in such a way that the essential articles, and also the luxury items, shall be available for the majority of citizens of the United States.

[Applause.]

If the unity of Central America had not been dissolved during the days that followed the winning of independence, most surely the picture in our own area would be different now. But it has not been until the present times, under the

pressure of urgent economic problems, that our region is seeking to return to the path of its historic destiny; and thus it is that, with the aid of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, and other international organisms, such as the Organization of Central American States, which has its headquarters in San Salvador, a really determined effort is getting under way to achieve economic unification.

Thanks to the spirit of foresight of our legislators, El Salvador is a country with its doors completely open to capital of good will, which desires to locate there in productive projects, whatever their size may be.

The risks which ordinarily drive away the foreign investor, such as expropriation, nationalization or confiscation, do not exist in our system. The tax setup is just, and there are no foreign exchange controls nor restrictions of any kind whatsoever as regards the distribution and exportation of profits. [Applause.]

For the technical resources which facilitate industrialization, we have a plentiful supply of capable labor, and an atmosphere of political stability which guarantees investments. Social benefits have been provided in a spirit of justice, which works for harmony among the different interests involved. The policy of my government is to give reasonable attention to the claims of the working classes, which naturally aspire to enjoyment of better living conditions. It wants them to attain those conditions through means based on order and legality, but without asphyxiating the enterprises which employ them, nor leading to violence for the nation. We have issued frequent calls for the humanization of wealth, for a change, which in great part we have effected, in the mentality of the capitalists as regards their labor relations, in order to guarantee that conflicts may be as infrequent as possible. American enterprises and services already established in El Salvador may well testify to the good conditions prevailing.

The other thing that might hinder an intense current of investments toward our country does not depend on ourselves. There are problems such as that of double taxation and others, which have been dealt with at various international conferences. Outstanding business leaders have expressed their opinion with regard to them, and have suggested the measures desirable.

I sincerely believe that any group that may be interested in exploring new fields of investment will be highly rewarded by its success in El Salvador.

In the foregoing outline, honorable Members of Congress, I have wished to show you a situation which, although it refers specifically to my own country, seems to be a picture common to a great majority of the Latin American Republics.

I should have felt my mission, and the purpose of my trip to the United States, to be without completion, and my presence here to be in vain, had I not sought to refer to these circumstances, animated by a sincere spirit of Pan American solidarity. In them are interwoven values of a human, ethical, political, and strategic nature, to point out the necessity for a new attitude of decided attention toward Latin America, on the part of the United States. [Applause.]

Without a doubt, it is impossible to view with indifference the situation of peoples that are ambitious, enthusiastic and aggressive in their quest for happiness, and that, in spite of the fact they are fighting with all the material and moral resources at their command to overcome their conditions of underdevelopment and low living standards, have been forced in recent years to face the obscure possibility of seeing cut short the programs of development which are vital for them.

The paralyzation of economic progress, naturally, has had undesirable repercussions in both the social and political fields. This fact serves to emphasize, consequently, the need for a more effective cooperation of all the inter-American system which, in accordance with the aspirations shown of late by our countries, should extend outside the juridical and moral spheres, and reach to the economic sphere, in a search for solutions common to a situation of dislocation which exists all over Latin America.

Certainly, within the American democratic form of government, it would be impossible to oblige private capital to take part in financial investments in Latin American countries, above all if the attractions offered by those countries were small and the guarantees of limited scope.

However, it cannot be denied that a careful and undivided reexamination of so complex a situation might smooth away many of the difficulties, taking into consideration the fact that present credit resources are difficult of access, and delayed and limited in their action; and that the countries which find themselves in a critical situation need new systems under which the loans may benefit not only certain areas, but the whole of the economic structure, in order to produce a result which is indispensable for giving new life to that structure. The formulas may come out of the joint study, if there is an earnest desire to consider everything that economic maladjustment, which will continue to accentuate itself in the days to come, may mean for the defense and security of the hemisphere.

I believe that this is not an hour for recriminations, the placing of blame on others, nor refutations, but rather a time when good will may ensure the triumphs of a system whose dislocation might set the world in a very difficult situation.

My trip to the United States constitutes an act of fraternity, aimed at reinforcing our traditional friendship and mutual understanding. [Applause.]

I did not come to promise, nor to negotiate anything in particular for my country. But I shall feel myself deeply flattered, if any one of the ideas expressed in this Hall of Congress, where on so many occasions the destiny of this Nation and of the world have been decided, should at any time come to exert an influence on the course of our relations, and for the necessary strengthening of the inter-American system. [Applause.]

In the presence of the worthy representatives of this Nation, I wish to reiterate my greeting to the people of the United States, my own personal gratitude, and the gratitude of my country, for the honors and distinctions which I have received during my stay on United States soil. Among those honors, this memorable opportunity to be received by the Federal Congress holds an especially esteemed place. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m., His Excellency the President of El Salvador, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p.m.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 207) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings which took place during the joint meeting be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRICE CONTROL ORDER NO. 1

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the President's proclamation of yesterday regulating the importation of crude oil and its principal products into the United States under the national security clauses of the Trade Agreements Act constitutes, in effect, "Price Control Order No. 1."

While the Executive by this action limits the importation of oil, the Texas Railroad Commission, controlling most of the domestic production of oil in America, is limiting production to 11 or 12 days per month. Thus, by combining restrictions on imports along with restrictions on domestic production, the supply as well as the price of oil and petroleum products is a completely controlled commodity in the United States and the consumer takes it on the chin.

The Eisenhower administration has succumbed to another Texas tribute at the expense of the American people.

Combining the clarion call for national security with special protection for the already pampered and overprotected domestic oil industry is ludicrous. If we desire to protect the national security, it would seem more prudent to discover our oil resources and keep them stored in the ground for future emergencies when shipping routes may be closed. In the meanwhile, it would seem wise for us to consume foreign supplies while they remain easily accessible and out of Soviet dominion. As a matter of fact, the continued use of foreign supplies is in the national interest since the shutdown of American imports would probably force the oil export nations into the Soviet markets with their ultimate dominion by the Soviet bloc as the proximate result.

If the administration is carefully studying the impact of imports on domestic industries essential to the national security, why should oil be necessarily first? Are we to overlook the impact of foreign trade on ceramics, textiles, heavy electric generating equipment, plywood, automobiles, or steel? Why should oil be first in line for protection, or is that to be expected?

KING ALFRED DAFFODILS

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, 15,000 King Alfred daffodils grown in Oregon's Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, arrived in my office late yesterday. It is my privilege today to distribute them to you and the other Members of the Congress and to the President on behalf of the Umpqua Daffodil Growers.

These golden centennial samplings of the Oregon springtime are only a very small part of the 5 million grown yearly by the Umpqua Daffodil Growers.

Freshly cut and mailed from Oregon Sunday, the daffodils brillantly illustrate part of the beauty of Oregon during this centennial, or any other year. The Golden West abounds in gold—only a part of it beneath the ground.

A flower long known to the poets—Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Milton, for example—the daffodil with its stately beauty and glorious yellow hue is a splendid ambassador from my State.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Oregon is celebrating its 100th birthday this year. Oregon's sons and daughters are finding many ways to tell their friends everywhere about our centennial and the beauties of the State.

On behalf of the Umpqua Daffodil Growers, who are members of the West Coast Daffodil Cutflower Growers' Association, I invite you to come to Oregon. You are most welcome.

LEGISLATION TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the persistent unemployment in various sections of our country that has caused hardship to many families. At the present time the Committee on Banking and Currency is holding hearings on legislation which, among other things, will establish an effective program to help alleviate conditions in certain economically depressed areas. Communities which have been hit by economic misfortune have made efforts to solve their problems locally, but they are in need of outside economic assistance. The resources of our Government should be made available to them to remedy this serious situation. The economic health of our country is in peril unless jobs are available for every able-bodied worker who is willing to work and provide for his family.

Unemployment in itself is unhealthy, but it leads to the wasting away of physical resources, such as churches, schools, homes, hospitals, and so forth, that have taken years to build. Too often it is necessary for families to move from their community to other areas where employment is available, and the community begins to die.

Our Nation can ill afford the loss of production that would add to our national wealth and strength if jobs were provided for all willing workers. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should assist economically depressed areas and take steps to plan and finance their economic redevelopment. Thus, industries, communities, enterprises, and individuals will be in a position to achieve improvements and increase the domestic prosperity by the creation of new employment opportunities. This could be accomplished by assisting them in providing new employment opportunities and by expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

I hope that legislation which holds out the prospect of employment, new jobs, increased production, expanding business and commerce, healthy community life, utilization and development of our Nation's human resources will receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR REFORM

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fair Labor Standards and the Subcommittee on Labor and Management, sitting as a joint committee on labor reform, be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE ANSWER TO URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Dallas, R. L. Thornton, has announced a do-it-yourself revitalization program for west Dallas as a private enterprise local government answer to the city's worst slum problem. The area encompasses 599 acres—houses without plumbing or paved streets. Here is the answer to urban renewal—local initiative, pride, responsibility, and local resources, not Federal aid.

The experiences of many other cities have benefited Dallas citizens in their study of urban renewal. It is my hope that this Dallas answer to slum clearance will help others, in turn. In that spirit I call the attention of my colleagues to Monday's RECORD, March 9, 1959, page 3606, in which is presented the basic urban renewal problems facing us all, and as I see it the answer, culminating in the decision of the city of Dallas.

Let me mention several problems facing exponents and opponents of urban renewal with Federal aid. We all approve urban renewal, the rehabilitation of rundown property. It is the question of Federal aid that brings these dangers to the fore.

First. To those who believe in constitutional government in eminent domain—that private property can be taken for public use for just compensation—let me point out that now private property can be taken through eminent domain for private use.

Second. To Supreme Court critics let me point out that this Supreme Court

has redefined eminent domain so that private property can be taken for spiritual and esthetic reasons as a 15-man Redevelopment Board may decree, or for reasons of well-balanced planning.

Third. To those interested in small business, let me point out that the two-thirds shrinkage value Federal expenditure holds the greatest possibility for windfall profit at John Doe taxpayer's expense that big businessmen have ever been extended.

Fourth. To those who favor constitutional appropriation of public moneys let me point out that urban renewal sets up procedures for direct Federal expenditures bypassing Congress.

Fifth. To those who criticize public housing for whatever reasons, let me point out that public housing is, by definition, part and parcel of the relocation problem, so decreed by the urban renewal administration.

These are some of the dangers and problems facing us in the urban renewal problem, just below the surface, like the lurking danger of the iceberg, and there are other dangers.

It is my hope that my colleagues in good conscience, can find time to scan these brief studies of urban renewal I submit for your consideration.

RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF STANDING FIRM IN BERLIN

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to find the American people are solidly back of the President in his determination to hold the line in Berlin.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the following resolution in support of such a policy passed by the Board of Associated Republican Women in Seattle, Wash., on March 5, 1959, and sent to me by the board president, Mrs. Henry B. Morris:

Whereas the Berlin situation is clearly the most dangerous and explosive issue facing the Nation and the world at the present time; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Associated Republican Women stand firmly behind President Eisenhower in his determination to hold the line against any move that might weaken the Western position and thereby increase the influence of the Soviet Union.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 205) providing for the consideration of H.R. 4221, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed six hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 205 makes in order the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) providing for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, as introduced by Congressman O'BRIEN of New York.

The House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees have held 22 hearings on the subject of statehood for Hawaii since 1935. More than 850 witnesses have been heard in the Territory and in Washington. Seven of the hearings were held in Hawaii. In addition, at least 12 reports have been made.

The question of admitting Hawaii to statehood has been longer considered and more thoroughly studied than any other statehood proposal that has ever come before the Congress.

The area of Hawaii, or the Hawaiian Islands, is comprised of a semitropic archipelago in the north Pacific Ocean and is composed of a series of islands stretching over 1,900 statute miles approximately of the size and length and area of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. There are 8 main islands which are situated within a distance of 350 miles of each other and they are populated by over 600,000 people. This statehood bill refers to these 8 main islands. The history of Hawaii in connection with the United States is most interesting.

In 1820, New England missionaries introduced the Christian religion to Hawaii. From that time forward the ties of trade and friendship between the United States and Hawaii grew progressively stronger. In 1940 the people of Hawaii adopted their first constitution, modeled along the lines of the United States Constitution. A treaty was drafted at the request of President Pierce in 1854, including in its terms the assumption that the constitutional monarchy would become a State after the example of California and Texas. Although this treaty was never ratified because of the death of the Hawaiian King, the idea of statehood propounded by the President of the United States did not die.

A revolution later established a Republic of Hawaii and annexation was again urged, but the treaty then pending in the U.S. Senate was withdrawn by President Cleveland upon his inauguration. On September 9, 1897, the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii ratified the treaty between Hawaii and the United States which had been signed the previous June. The following year Senate Joint Resolution 55 of the 55th Congress was adopted and approved, annexing to the United States the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies.

Beginning in 1903 the Territory of Hawaii, through its legislature, has petitioned Congress for statehood on at least 17 different occasions. Since 1920 no fewer than 66 bills have been introduced in successive Congresses providing for statehood.

In June 1947, the House of Representatives passed legislation approving statehood for Hawaii by a vote of 196 to 133. This was the first time either House of our Congress had acted on a Hawaiian statehood measure. Although President Truman indicated that he would sign the bill, the Senate committee decided on further investigation.

In March 1950, the Hawaii statehood bill again passed the House by the overwhelming majority of 262 to 110. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported the measure out in June 1950 but because of pressing matters of international concern the bill did not reach the Senate floor before adjournment.

Before the 82d Congress was 5 months old, the Senate committee had repeated its endorsement of the Hawaii statehood bill, but again the bill was not brought up for debate.

On March 10, 1953, the House of Representatives for the third time passed and sent to the Senate a Hawaii statehood bill, by a vote of 274 to 138.

On April 1, 1954, the Hawaii-Alaska Enabling Act was passed by the Senate by a vote of 57 to 28.

In the 84th Congress statehood for Hawaii and Alaska was considered jointly in comprehensive hearings. On May 10, 1955, Congressman ENGLE's bill, H.R. 2535, was recommitted by the House to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by a vote of 218 to 170.

On August 23, 1958, in the closing days of the 85th Congress, the committee, by a vote of 22 to 4 reported H.R. 49, introduced by Delegate BURNS, but the bill was not scheduled for floor debate.

An interesting question now comes up in connection with statehood: What does it amount to? What does it mean to a Territory to become a State? It means the following:

A State has two Senators, and in this instance Hawaii will have one Representative in Congress. They will elect their own State government, Governor, and constitutional officers; they will be able to participate in the choice and the election of the President and Vice President of the United States. Automatically they participate in Federal grants to education, health, highways, and other public improvements. They will be governed by officials of their own choosing, rather than by a Federal administrator. They will have latitude in lawmaking by their own legislature without the discretion of the President and the Congress; and they will be free from the overlapping of Federal and local authority. Judicial functions will be carried

out in their own courts by the local authorities rather than by Federal employees, and they will enjoy the enhancement of prestige and pride of becoming and being an active American able to participate in his government.

During the years that I have been in Congress here I have in the past voted in opposition to Alaska. I voted in opposition to Hawaii. I went along with the arguments of noncontiguity, that I did not believe Alaska should be admitted, and I did not believe Hawaii should be admitted. I wondered about the economy of the area; I wondered about the population, as to whether or not it was fair to us in the case of Alaska with only 150,000 people that they should have 2 Members of the Senate, while New York, with 16 million inhabitants, has only 2 Senators; and in the case of Hawaii why they should have 2 Members in the Senate and 2 Representatives in the House with a population of 600,000, whereas Massachusetts with a population of 5 million has but 2 Senators.

And I wondered about the stories I heard of communism and Communist influence in both Alaska and Hawaii.

In the past I voted in opposition to the admission of Hawaii to statehood and last year I opposed Alaska. I can truthfully say that I have become a convert, but I believe that Hawaii is more deserving throughout the years to be admitted to statehood than is Alaska. We have the problem of land. Ninety-eight percent of the land of Alaska was owned by the people of America. In Hawaii the land is owned by the people who live in Hawaii. The economy of Hawaii is excellent.

During World War II it is interesting to note the distinguished record established by the men of Hawaii. The Chief of Staff referred to it as being written in the American Battle History in Europe and Asia. In World War II, for example, the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team from Hawaii, composed of so-called Japanese-Americans, formed what has been described by Gen. Mark Clark as the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States.

When we have people of that caliber in Hawaii, I have no fear of the Communist problem that may exist over there.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides 6 hours of general debate and it is an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am sure, realize that the gentleman from Massachusetts has made a very thorough study of the problem in regard to Hawaii. He is familiar with the history and is certainly correct when he says that the people of Hawaii have petitioned the Congress of the United States to become a State in the Union since 1903. He was also correct in saying that the Legislature of Hawaii has petitioned the Congress to become a State 17 times since 1903.

But the fact remains that during those years, over 50 years, there must have been some good reason why past Congresses hesitated and did not permit Hawaii to become a State. So I believe I say in good grace that inasmuch as 25 or 30 previous Congresses have not seen fit to permit Hawaii to become a State, I may state my objections and why I do not believe Hawaii should be permitted to become a State.

Many objections have been brought forth during this half century. Let me say at the start that the life blood of Hawaii is shipping. Many witnesses appeared before the Rules Committee in regard to that point, and no one so far has contradicted them. Even though I asked several to contradict these witnesses to rebuke those accusations, I found that without exception every witness said that Harry Bridges and Jack Hall, men I have never known, control the life blood of Hawaii. It was said by several witnesses that Harry Bridges for certain reasons was ordered to be deported from this country at one time. They say that without question they are the rankest labor leaders and not only control the labor unions of Hawaii but also are very influential perhaps in controlling the cultural activities of the Territory of Hawaii.

So, I say, that is one of the objections. And, I am sure that you all realize the importance of shipping as far as Hawaii is concerned. It is different in the States. Furthermore, we have powerful labor leaders in this country who probably are just as leftist as Mr. Hall or Mr. Bridges, but the fact remains that Hawaii's economy is based principally on shipping, which cannot be comparable to shipping as it affects the various States of the Union, because various other means of transportation are to be had. But, in Hawaii it is strictly a shipping proposition.

Another objection that was heard throughout the years against Hawaii being brought into the Union was that many Congresses have felt that inasmuch as the people of Asiatic descent greatly outnumber the people of white blood, that that is also a question that should be taken into consideration. The fact that there are so many more people of Asiatic descent there in those islands undoubtedly had some influence in previous Congresses for not permitting them to come into the Union.

Now, in regard to contiguous territory, I personally am aware in the organizing our 48 States they went across the continent to build a greater America. So, for that reason, these States like Nevada and others were permitted to come into the Union, because they wanted the territory to become States to reach all the way to California, even though the population of these States were extremely small. And we are all aware of the importance of the development of the West and its benefits.

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts also mentioned the matter of representation. Now, as we know, in the State of New York, for instance, they have 16 million people; California about 14 million people; and Illinois about 10 million people. The 1957 census showed the population of Hawaii to be 613,000. That total of 613,000 people has to be reduced, because there are 57,000 military men in Hawaii. They are nonresidents; they are nontaxpayers of Hawaii. So, you reduce that 1957 figure by 57,000, and that is also true of 25,000 civilian employees over there who do not vote. Many are there temporarily. Many are not residents; many are not taxpayers. They cannot, to any degree, be classified in regard to Hawaii's future economy. So, when you get down to the facts as to the actual population of Hawaii, you have 445,000 men, women, and children in the Territory. And they would receive two Senators and two Representatives. We just admitted Alaska with considerably less population than the people in Hawaii, and for the combination of Alaska and Hawaii, with about 700,000 or 800,000 people, they will have four Senators combined, to more than offset the population of the great State of Pennsylvania, my good friend JOHN SAYLOR'S home, or New York with 16 million people. So, I say to this Congress that certainly 25 previous Congresses have taken that into consideration when they turned thumbs down on Hawaii in regard to the population and in regard to the money that comes in to the Treasury of the United States down here.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Will not the gentleman admit that the sons and daughters of Hawaii were very loyal during World War II and fought with bravery?

Mr. ALLEN. I certainly would. I would say that most of the sons and daughters of Hawaiian people were most loyal.

I would say that what they did 12 or 15 years ago should be taken into consideration. Certainly, they were loyal to the United States, they were brave, and that should be taken into consideration on the question of whether they should come into the Union as a State. But that should not be the final or the sole reason. We should not say merely that anyone who is loyal to us, whether they are in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, should be allowed to become a State. Their loyalty should not be the only condition for statehood.

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

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Would the gentleman say that the soldiers who came from the 48 States were any less loyal than those who came from Hawaii?

Mr. ALLEN. I certainly would not. But I do want to go on record as saying that I certainly agree with my able friend, the majority leader, that the Hawaiian people and the Philippine people were certainly loyal. I personally could not tell you of a single instance of disloyalty. But I do not think that should be the final and the only reason for our decision as to whether a group shall be allowed to come in as a State, because, if that were the only condition then we would probably have other Territories whose people would say, "What did we

ever do that was disloyal to the United States?"

We started with Alaska. Alaska, with Hawaii, would have four Senators in the Senate of the United States. That is a very important matter to the economy of our Nation. Do we want to give Alaska and Hawaii four Senators, when New York, with 20 times more people than both Alaska and Hawaii, has only two Senators? New York probably pays 100 times more in income tax than Alaska and Hawaii combined.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that I feel previous Congresses for over half a century took into consideration when they rejected the various petitions for statehood for Hawaii. I say we should consider those matters among others, and then finally vote our honest convictions.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am going to vote against statehood for Hawaii. I am not going to ask for any rollcall on the rule. I am not fighting the rule in any way, but I felt it incumbent upon myself to state these facts which have caused me much concern.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I really had not intended to make any extended remarks on this subject, and I do not know that I shall, but I do not like the idea of this piece of legislation being rushed through the Congress without some consideration and some debate.

I do not think there is a thing in the world that I could say here today that would influence anyone or change a single vote, because I gather the full political import of this action. Both parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, way back there, in an effort to get delegates, have been advocating the admission of Hawaii as a State. Now payday has come. The way has been paved by the admission of Alaska.

I stood in the well of this House when Alaska statehood was up for consideration and I pointed out then that if Alaska were admitted you would be opening the barn door, and Lord only knew where we would stop. That is exactly what we have done. The biggest argument you can hear today as to why we should go out into the far-flung reaches of the Pacific and bring in to the bosom of the States that island is: "Well, we have given it to Alaska and we promised that we would give it to Hawaii as well."

I never have believed that two wrongs when added together would make a right. I said in the Alaska debate, moreover, that if I had to choose between Alaska and Hawaii I would certainly take Alaska, because it at least has the virtue of being on the American Continent.

I hope you will stop, look, and listen a little bit before you embark upon this new adventure into the faraway reaches of the Pacific, to bring in not alone the Hawaiian Islands, because that will be just a part of it; you are going to be faced with this some day. They say it is discrimination, you are making second-class citizens out of the people of Hawaii if you do not give them admission to statehood. What are you going to do with that other string of islands out there that go to make up Hawaii that are not taken in here as a State? When they come in, or one of them asks to be made a State, are you going to turn them down? Can you, when you have adopted the doctrine of nondiscrimination? Certainly that would be the rankest kind of discrimination.

Again, however, I am not so concerned about that as I am about where you are going from there. Here is the Virgin Islands, here is Puerto Rico, here is Cuba, and here is Samoa and Guam. Where are you going to stop?

Let us go back a little bit. When the Original Thirteen Colonies wanted to throw the yoke of the tyranny of Great Britain off their necks, they got together and formed the United States. Listen to this. You have read it, although I do not know whether or not you have read it recently. Let me refresh your memory. This is the preamble of the Constitution of the United States:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution—

For whom?—

> for the United States of America.

They were not talking about somewhere out in the Pacific or out in the Atlantic or on the other side of the world or into outer space. They were talking about the continent of the United States of America.

If we propose to bring Hawaii into statehood should we not first amend the Constitution?

I opposed the admission of Alaska because I said Alaska could not afford the luxury of statehood. You are going to have bills coming before you that are going to justify that statement because the Federal Government is going to be forced to subsidize the State of Alaska at the expense of your taxpayers and at the expense of my taxpayers. But, I would rather do that with reference to Alaska than to go out to the other side of the world to bring a noncontiguous territory into the sisterhood of States. Mr. Speaker, to me this is a very serious thing. I do not see how you, the representatives of the people, can throw away this heritage that was given to us at such great sacrifice. Oh, I know we hear a lot about liberalism and we hear a lot about progress and we hear a lot about the world becoming smaller and smaller because of scientific advancement in transportation and communications, but I say to you again, and again, and again, that you are departing from the original concept of the Founding Fathers when you embark upon this expedition. I hope as the debate goes on that you will listen and give thought to this question. There are many who are better prepared to present the opposition to this than I am. I am not a member of this committee. I do not have the facts and figures except such as I have picked up as I ran, but I know there are other phases of this that will be developed. There is the question of communism, the question of the economic stranglehold that this man Harry Bridges, that the House of Representatives on two occasions, when during the war he was denying the sinews of warfare to our boys overseas, passed a resolution deporting him. But, that was killed in the other body. I think it is a matter of fact and a matter of common knowledge that this man, Harry Bridges, has a stranglehold on the economy of Hawaii. Now let us be liberal. Let us be progressive. But, let us also be sane and let us be a little sound. Let us think about where we are going and let us think of the precedents you are setting here today because just as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow and the next day, you are going to be faced with one of these other outlying islands coming in here and saying that they do not want to be discriminated against either.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York, the author of the bill [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to speak very briefly. First, I wish to thank the Committee on Rules for giving us this rule so that we may proceed in an orderly fashion on this historic question. I do not at this time propose to debate the issues because I am most hopeful that we will adopt the rule and then we can discuss the issues fully. But, I will say to those who may have been impressed by what they have heard so far that the members of our committee and other Members who are supporting statehood for Hawaii are prepared to meet head-on some of the questions which have been raised. We will not duck the question of communism in Hawaii. We will not duck the question which has been raised about the admission of Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands or, perhaps, Formosa or Venus or Mars. We shall meet all those matters at the proper time.

I simply want to say to the gentleman from Illinois who was so concerned about two Senators for the population of Hawaii that I happen to be a Representative from the State of New York which has a population of 16 million. I feel very strongly that when I vote in favor

of statehood for Hawaii the great majority of the 16 million people in New York State will not feel that I am voting to take anything away from them and that they will support the vote I shall cast.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I know of no further requests for time. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 338, nays 69, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—338

Adair	Corbett	Horan
Addonizio	Cramer	Hosmer
Albert	Cunningham	Hull
Alger	Curtin	Ikard
Andersen Minn.	Curtis, Mass.	Irwin
Anderson, Mont.	Curtis, Mo.	Jarman
Anfuso	Daddario	Jennings
Arends	Daniels	Jensen
Ashley	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.
Aspinall	Dawson	Johnson, Colo.
Auchincloss	Delaney	Johnson, Md.
Avery	Dent	Johnson, Wis.
Ayres	Derounian	Jonas
Bailey	Derwinski	Jones, Mo.
Baker	Devine	Judd
Baldwin	Dingell	Karsten
Baring	Dixon	Karth
Barr	Dollinger	Kasem
Barry	Donohue	Kastenmeier
Bass, N.H.	Dooley	Kearns
Bass, Tenn.	Dorn, N.Y.	Kee
Bates	Doyle	Keith
Baumhart	Dulski	Kelly
Becker	Durham	Keogh
Beckworth	Dwyer	Kilgore
Belcher	Edmondson	King, Calif.
Bennett, Fla.	Everett	King, Utah
Bentley	Evins	Kirwan
Berry	Fallon	Kluczynski
Betts	Farbstein	Kowalski
Boggs	Fascell	Lafore
Boland	Feighan	Laird
Bolling	Fenton	Lane
Bonner	Fino	Langen
Bow	Flood	Lankford
Bowles	Flynn	Latta
Boyle	Fogarty	Lesinski
Brademas	Foley	Levering
Bray	Forand	Libonati
Breeding	Ford	Lindsay
Brewster	Fountain	Lipscomb
Brock	Friedel	Loser
Brooks, Tex.	Fulton	McCormack
Broomfield	Gallagher	McCulloch
Brown, Mo.	Garmatz	McDonough
Brown, Ohio	Gavin	McDowell
Buckley	George	McFall
Budge	Giaimo	McGinley
Burdick	Glenn	McGovern
Burke, Ky.	Granahan	McIntire
Burke, Mass.	Gray	McSween
Bush	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Byrne, Pa.	Green, Pa.	Machrowicz
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffin	Mack, Ill.
Cahill	Griffiths	Mack, Wash.
Canfield	Gross	Madden
Cannon	Gubser	Magnuson
Carnahan	Hagen	Mahon
Carter	Halleck	Mailliard
Casey	Halpern	Marshall
Cederberg	Hargis	Matthews
Chamberlain	Harmon	May
Chelf	Harris	Meader
Chenoweth	Hays	Merrow
Chiperfield	Healey	Metcalf
Church	Hébert	Meyer
Clark	Hechler	Michel
Coad	Hemphill	Miller, Clement W.
Coffin	Henderson	Miller, George P.
Cohelan	Herlong	Miller, N.Y.
Collier	Hoeven	Milliken
Conte	Hogan	Mills
Cook	Holifield	Minshall
Cooley	Holland	Mitchell
Moeller	Holt	Stratton
Monagan	Holtzman	Stubblefield
Montoya	Randall	Sullivan
Moore	Reece, Tenn.	Teague, Calif.
Moorhead	Rees, Kans.	Teague, Tex.
Morgan	Reuss	Teller
Morris, N. Mex.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, N.J.
Morris, Okla.	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Moss	Riehlman	Thomson, Wyo.
Multer	Rivers, Alaska	Thornberry
Mumma	Robison	Toll
Murphy	Rodino	Tollefson
Natcher	Rogers, Colo.	Trimble
Nelsen	Rogers, Fla.	Udall
Nix	Rogers, Mass.	Ullman
Norblad	Rooney	Vanik
O'Brien, Ill.	Roosevelt	Van Pelt
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rostenkowski	Van Zandt
O'Hara, Ill.	Roush	Wainwright
O'Hara, Mich.	Rutherford	Wallhauser
O'Konski	Santangelo	Walter
O'Neill	Saund	Wampler
Oliver	Saylor	Watts
Ostertag	Schenck	Weaver
Passman	Schwengel	Weis
Patman	Scott	Westland
Pelly	Shelley	Whitener
Perkins	Sheppard	Widnall
Pfost	Shipley	Wier
Pirnie	Short	Wilson
Poage	Siler	Withrow
Porter	Simpson, Ill.	Wolf
Price	Sisk	Wright
Prokop	Slack	Yates
Pucinski	Smith, Calif.	Young
Quie	Smith, Iowa	Younger
Quigley	Spence	Zablocki
Rabaut	Springer	Zelenko
	Staggers	
	Stead	

NAYS—69

Abbitt	Frazier	Norrell
Abernethy	Gary	Pilcher
Alexander	Gathings	Pillion
Alford	Grant	Poff
Allen	Haley	Polk
Andrews	Hardy	Preston
Ashmore	Harrison	Rains
Barden	Hess	Ray
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	Riley
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers, S.C.
Bosch	Hoffman, Mich.	Roberts
Brown, Ga.	Huddleston	Rogers, Tex.
Broyhill	Johansen	St. George
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Selden
Colmer	Kilburn	Sikes
Dague	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Ga.	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Dorn, S.C.	Knox	Taber
Dowdy	Landrum	Thomas
Downing	Lennon	Utt
Fisher	McMillan	Vinson
Flynt	Mason	Wharton
Forrester	Murray	Williams

NOT VOTING—27

Barrett	Frelinghuysen	Scherer
Blatnik	Hall	Simpson, Pa.
Bolton	Jackson	Smith, Va.
Boykin	Martin	Taylor
Brooks, La.	Morrison	Thompson, La.
Celler	Moulder	Tuck
Denton	Osmers	Whitten
Diggs	Philbin	Willis
Elliott	Powell	Winstead

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Smith of Virginia against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr Celler for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Elliott against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Powell with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Hall with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Jackson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4221, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] will be recognized for 3 hours and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] will be recognized for 3 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request that good attention be given to the presentation by the gentleman from New York who is now standing in the well of the House. The gentleman will present the arguments in behalf of and in support of statehood for Hawaii and answer many of the questions which may be voiced later on unless a good hearing is given to him.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank my chairman. May I at the outset express my very deep appreciation to the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for permitting me to manage this bill on the floor. It is a kindly gesture on his part and completely in keeping with the kindness for which he is so well known in this House.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to you today with a bill bestowing statehood upon the last incorporated Territory under the American flag—a bill which would bring to full flower the privileges of the 600,000 American citizens who constitute the population of Hawaii. May I say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that we may as this debate progresses witness a slight distortion of the picture. It is possible for men and women of good will to look upon the same set of facts and by changing a line here or there, like the clever cartoonist, make a caricature out of something that is noble. Let us at the outset realize that we are talking here today about a Territory which is a part of the United States. This is not a part of Asia. This is not a foreign land. This is so much an integral part of our Nation that when we were attacked there we responded immediately, as quickly, as swiftly as if New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles had been attacked. And these people, about whom you may get a certain picture as this debate progresses, are American citizens. Many of those citizens could leave Hawaii and move into your State or my State and run for President of the United States and serve, if elected.

We are not talking about foreigners; we are talking about people who have full privileges of citizenship except for those they seek in this bill. It is not a question of extending the United States of America into Asia; it is a question of bringing the people of Hawaii into full brotherhood, bringing the Territory of Hawaii into the sisterhood of States.

I think it is important that we remember these things as the debate progresses, because there will be a fuzzy idea that we are dealing with something or somebody un-American and alien to us. I believe firmly that enactment of this bill will round out finally the Republic which is the United States. Oh, I know you will be told, as you have been told, that we will be here next year seeking statehood for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other places out in the Pacific. I do not believe that will ever happen. May I point out that in this Congress we have 88 bills pending which would grant statehood to Hawaii, but not a single bill has been offered by a single Member for statehood for any of those other places. They are not incorporated Territories, as is Hawaii, and if we turn down Hawaii we are saying, in effect, that of the two, the only two incorporated Territories, Alaska was welcome, and you, Hawaii, are not.

We all know that less than 1 year ago after a long and memorable debate this House and the other body passed the bill which created the 49th State. During that debate some of you will remember the opposition hammered at three major points: They argued that Alaska was not contiguous to the other 48 States; that its population was too small to warrant statehood, and that its economy could not support statehood. We answered those arguments as best we could, and that debate need not be repeated today. It is sufficient to point out that the 85th Congress did grant statehood to Alaska and that action resulted in a national wave of excitement and approval on the part of the people of our country who are waiting right now for us to admit the Tertory of Hawaii as a State.

I have referred to Alaska only to emphasize that the arguments against Hawaii which revolve around noncontiguity, population, or economic strength, already have been answered by our vote on Alaska. Hawaii's population is three times that of Alaska, and its economic strength as of now is substantially greatest.

I do not propose to engage in any forensic pyrotechnics today; I am not going to talk about second class citizenship or our long failure to keep the promise of the past; each of us is aware of these things and little would be gained by a discussion of them or a reference to the loyalty of the people of Hawaii during times of peril. Instead, Mr. Chairman, I propose to meet head on the principal arguments which will be aired during this debate and to meet with candor some of those which may be only whispered but which can constitute the hidden motive behind the oral arguments. I am very fully aware that before this debate is very far along some Member will rise again to assert the claim, as it has been asserted in the past, that the Communists have a stranglehold upon Hawaii, the Territory, and will dominate Hawaii, the State.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that when those arguments were advanced here in the past, I was deeply concerned because I had no personal knowledge of what actually was the situation in Hawaii. So in last December three members of our committee, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman, went to Hawaii and looked right down the mouth of the Communist cannon. We talked with everyone in Hawaii who could shed any light upon the situation. We talked with the leaders of this ILWU, about which you will hear today. We also talked with the FBI and the Territorial antisubversive commission, the chamber of commerce, and the school leaders. We even conducted interviews on the front steps of churches.

In our report we did not attempt to tell you that there is no communism in Hawaii. Instead we faced up to the fact. We asserted that there is communism in Hawaii. But we found something rather strange in the Territory. We found a people more alerted to the menace, such as it was, than the people anywhere in the United States. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that these Communists who will be mentioned here on this floor cannot operate in Hawaii without the bells going on and the bright lights shining upon them.

You will hear talk here about some Communists in the ILWU. There are some former Communists in that organization. Personally, I do not know whether they have reformed or not. But I will say that when we are given the impression that Hawaii, the State, will be dominated by Communists, that they will send four Soviet agents to the Congress of the United States, you are being misinformed. The ILWU has a membership of 22,000, roughly. It does have some leaders—and I might say they were assigned to Hawaii from the mainland—for whom I have no respect whatsoever, but I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the last election demonstrated that those leaders cannot lead their followers into the voting booths and tell them how to vote. Oh, yes; in some instances people endorsed by the ILWU won in the election, but I know of many places where that endorsement was not effective. I know of places where ILWU leaders ran for public office and were snowed under. I know of the fight they put up against a Honolulu city charter and they were beaten 3½ to 1.

May I point out that the Legislature of Hawaii, which the Communists allegedly control, enacted a law over ILWU opposition providing for the seizure of the docks in the event of an emergency. That same legislature has refused to repeal that act.

May I point out to you, as you perhaps see headlined the conviction of certain labor leaders as Communists in Hawaii, that they were convicted by the people of Hawaii, by a Hawaiian jury, and they were turned loose not by Hawaii, not by the people of Hawaii, but by a ruling of the Supreme Court on the mainland.

How many States have antisubversive commissions created, if you please, by this same legislature the Communists are supposed to dominate? Oh, I know what will be said here. I know the picture that will be drawn. But, let me summon my own witnesses on the other side. Let us take what will be said here at its face value, that if Hawaii becomes a State the Communists will control and send four Soviet agents to the Congress. I say, if that is true, any man or woman who favors statehood is very close to treason; certainly guilty of complete stupidity. Who are the people, knowing the facts best, who are on our side? Who should know better than the President of the United States, with all the information available to him? Not satisfied? What about Admiral Felt, the man in charge of our military posture in 100 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean? He favors statehood for Hawaii. The Secretary of the Interior; the head of the Subversive Activities Commission in Hawaii, who will be quoted a little later on, favors statehood. Our own committee, by an overwhelming margin, favored statehood. So does the Department of Justice, which has available all the information that the FBI possesses. And, in this House, who would say that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is soft toward communism? Who would say that the ranking Republican member of that committee in the last Congress, General Kearney, is soft toward communism? They know the situation in Hawaii. They investigated the situation in Hawaii. Our record will show that the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER and the Honorable Bernard Kearney, the gentlemen to whom I refer, testified before our committee for statehood. I say to you that if one-tenth of what will be said here about communism in Hawaii is true, these men should not have the respect of anyone, nor should the members of our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked already longer than I had planned. I would like to close simply by saying this: We are aware, all of us here, that what we do within the next day or two will be a part of our history. If we decide to place a 50th star in our beloved flag, it will glow there long after we have gone our way. It will shine as the star of the Pacific, if you will, as long as our Nation endures. We live at a time which moves more swiftly than any in recorded history. Almost in the same breath we refer to the atomic age, the jet age, and now the space age. Let it not be said that we in this great land live in a frightened age, fearful of the future, chained to the quiet dogmas of the past. Let us not shrink back upon ourselves thinking that we must never have any change. Let us, above all, leave our children and their children a greater land, a broader Union, and a talent not buried, but used.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. During the debate on the rule, it was stated that this legislation comes before this House at this time too quickly, and that not enough time has been given to consideration of the legislation. Will the gentleman explain just how much time has been given to the subject of statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I think that Congress has compiled a stack of records 10 feet high. We explored the subject last year and again this year, until even the opposition ran out of witnesses. I think the question here is so basic and so simple that the records compiled are adequate for any Member of the House.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that practically the same legislation, with minor changes, has been passed by this body on three different occasions?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. That is true, by an overwhelming majority. And I suspect sometimes it did not go all the way because of certain political currents of the time.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather long, involved question, and I would appreciate the gentleman's answering it at the conclusion of the whole question.

Is it not true that no public hearings were held by this small committee that went to Hawaii recently; that no sworn testimony on the question of Communist influence in Hawaii was taken by that committee; that all three members of the committee who went to Hawaii were in favor of Hawaiian statehood continuously; that no Member who had opposed Hawaiian statehood went to Hawaii as a member of the gentleman's committee; and that at my sugestion the gentleman refused to prepare any hearings in Hawaii, as I requested them to be prepared, by the investigators of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, on the question of communism in Hawaii; that the gentleman was quoted repeatedly prior to going to Hawaii that there was no communism in Hawaii before the committee went there; and that so far as I know the gentleman has never denied that, previous to his going.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Does the gentleman want me to answer all those questions now or any specific one of them?

Mr. PILLION. I think it could be answered very simply "yes" or "no," but the gentleman may answer them in any way he pleases.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I suggest that I will not answer the question "yes" or "no," because the question was not phrased so that such an answer would be complete.

I never said at any time or any place that there was no communism in Hawaii. What I said on the floor of this House and elsewhere, when the gentleman from New York brought up his charges of communism, was that I did not believe the Communists had a stranglehold on Hawaii, and I did not believe that they would send four Soviet agents to the U.S. Congress.

As for our sworn testimony, we went there to investigate the specific subject developed largely by the gentleman from New York, and we believed that we could get more information by talking to more people than if we sat in a room and went around with the same old record spin, that we have in our formal hearings in Washington. But may I say this, that if the gentleman will look at the list of people with whom we did talk he will realize that we would have had to have our eyes and our ears closed not to find out what was going on in Hawaii.

I may say that if I had found there, regardless of my former position, 1 percent of what the gentleman claims, I would be on the floor now opposing the passage of this bill. The gentleman's facts are about 10 percent right and his conclusions more than 99 percent wrong.

The gentleman has never been to Hawaii. He has compiled his case from now-yellowing headlines, he has compiled his case by taking out of context reports by various agencies and groups.

May I say one other thing: There was a Senate committee that went to Hawaii and conducted some rather sensational hearings. It issued a report, upon which the gentleman from New York has leaned so heavily. Yet in the last session of this Congress a highly respected Republican member of that committee, Senator WATKINS, was circulating a petition in the Senate urging statehood then for Hawaii.

So I would say that the gentlemen who heard the sworn hearings came to the same conclusion as the gentleman from New York who did not have hearings with sworn testimony. We believe that we conducted a thorough investigation. We believe that we obtained much more information than if we had had the so-called public hearings under oath. I did not believe nor did my colleagues that we were going to get the true picture by hauling in a half dozen of these former Communists and have them take the fifth amendment a couple of hundred times, because we already knew those people. What we wanted to know was whether the communism that does exist in Hawaii was under control, and we found it was. We found their apparatus was crippled; and we were told that by people responsible for the security of our country.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], who has just preceded me. He has been chairman of this subcommittee for the past 4 years. During that time he has conducted extensive hearings on both Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. We on the minority side have felt that we have been treated fairly in every respect in the hearings on Hawaiian statehood, that both the proponents and the opponents, such as the other distinguished gentleman from New York who has spoken here this afternoon, have been given ample opportunity under his guidance to present their case.

As a matter of fact, the minority Republican on this Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs once had a bill of his own—I believe it was H.R. 3575, if I am not mistaken—asking for statehood for Hawaii. That came before this House of Representatives and was passed by this body by a vote of somewhere in the neighborhood of 275 to 130.

So again, Mr. Chairman, let me offer my congratulations to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]. It is rather difficult to follow him in further expounding some of the facts on Hawaiian statehood and why Hawaii should become a State.

Mr. Chairman, probably few, if any, pieces of legislation to come before this House have been so thoroughly considered as Hawaiian statehood. Since 1935 no less than 22 hearings have been held on the subject by the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. More than 850 witnesses have been heard. The record consists of over 6,600 printed pages of testimony and exhibits. At least 12 committee reports have been made. Three times, when a bill for Hawaiian statehood came before this body as a separate measure, it was passed by overwhelming margins.

The Territory of Hawaii has served its apprenticeship as a Territory longer than any other Territory now a State. Repeated investigations and hearings have shown beyond any doubt that Hawaii is ready to assume its rightful place as a full member of our Federal Union of States.

The three traditional standards for applicants seeking statehood are:

First. That the inhabitants of the proposed State are imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government.

Second. That a majority of the electorate desires statehood.

Third. That the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

That Hawaii more than amply meets these tests has been demonstrated many times. That it meets these tests today is detailed in the report of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which accompanies this bill, H.R. 4221.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 4221 and statehood for Hawaii. Indeed, I think there are few who would disagree that Hawaii meets, and has for many years met, the traditional tests for statehood which I have outlined. But certain arguments have been advanced with respect to statehood, outside of these traditional tests. While these arguments, advanced with great sincerity by their proponents, should not deter us, in my judgment, from enacting this legislation, I believe they should be discussed and answered.

The major points of opposition raised are, first, the danger of Communist control; second, noncontiguity; and third,

the ethnic background of the people of Hawaii.

The issue of communism in Hawaii has been extensively investigated since 1948. It has been thoroughly discussed by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, most recently by a special subcommittee from November 24 to December 8, 1958.

This subcommittee reported that it was "unable to find any evidence in the social fabric of Hawaii that communism had made any substantial progress or that the community as a whole was unable or unwilling to cope with the problem." In a statement before the committee this year, that distinguished fighter against the Communist conspiracy, the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee stated that given the kind of machinery that will come to them in the event Hawaii becomes a State, the people of Hawaii under statehood could better manage the security problems created by Communist activities in the islands than under existing conditions.

I would not want to minimize the Communist danger in Hawaii—or in any of the other 49 States. This is a danger against which we must maintain an everlasting vigilance. Let me say that the matter of communism in Hawaii has given me a great deal of concern. For that reason I have given it my particular attention. Let me assure you I would not come before the Members of this House today if there were any reservations in my mind on this situation. To me the very thought of a State of the Union being under the control of the Communists is repugnant to the extreme. But, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that such has not occurred in the Territory of Hawaii, nor will it occur in the State of Hawaii.

In this connection I think it is highly significant that the constitution of Hawaii, enacted in 1950, is the first in this country to disqualify subversive and disloyal persons from public office, Article 14, section 3, states:

> No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

I compliment the people of Hawaii for putting the provision in their constitution.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, although the record is well known to the Members of this House, I think it is not amiss to call attention again to the magnificent record compiled by citizens of Hawaii during World War II and the Korean war. There is no more inspiring chapter in our history than that of the 442d Regimental Combat team in World War II. The record in the Korean conflict is equally inspiring. Let me briefly summarize it:

Not one case of cowardice by a Hawaiian soldier in the face of the Communist enemy was recorded in Korea.

Not one case of successful Communist brainwashing of any Hawaiian soldier.

Not one case of desertion by a Hawaiian soldier.

There were 426 Hawaiian boys killed in Korea, a death toll four and one-half times as great as the killed-in-action average for the rest of the United States. There were 1,352 total battle casualties from Hawaii, a rate three times as great as the casualty rate per capita for the rest of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I will not labor this point further, other than to say again that the matter of Communist influence in Hawaii should not be a bar to her admission as a State and that indeed the admission of Hawaii would enable her better to deal with the problem.

Turning to the argument of noncontiguity, it is a fallacy to hold that Hawaii should be denied statehood because the islands are not contiguous by land to the continental United States. The admission of Alaska as the 49th State and the facts of modern communication and transportation have shattered forever this contention.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I am well aware of the problem of noncontiguity in my own congressional district. Two of my counties are entirely composed of islands. One county, San Juan, consisting of 172 islands, is accessible only by air or water. In addition, another portion of my district, Point Roberts, can be reached only by air or water or by twice going through Canadian customs. This geographical situation existed at the time of the admission of the State of Washington in 1889, and while I must say that it does add measurably to the problems of a candidate for political office, I am happy to report that these areas are growing and progressive parts of the State of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, the force which the argument of noncontiguity may have had 100, 50, or even 25 years ago, has in this modern age been completely dispelled.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary to comment only briefly on the argument sometimes advanced based on the ethnic origin and racial situation in Hawaii. Hawaii has been a part of the United States since 1898 and American influence began long before then. Hawaii is thoroughly American in every respect. The devotion of the people of Hawaii to America is, as I mentioned a moment ago, shown for all to see in the battlefields of Europe and Korea. It would be a travesty and a tragedy if the people of Hawaii, so ready for statehood in every regard, were to be denied this distinction merely because of the ancestry of a part of that group. We need Hawaii as a State. We need the citizens of the Territory of Hawaii to be citizens of the State of Hawaii. We need them not only for their counsel and advice which they can give us in our dealings with the peoples of the Orient but we need them for the living symbol they will be to the free world and the uncommitted nations, that America believes in and practices the tenets of the American ideal.

Mr. Chairman, those of us here today are fortunate to be caught up in a great moment of history. Though the problems and perils which beset us give ample cause for anxiety, though we must endure stern tests, we are clearly faced with the opportunity for greatness. Such an opportunity is with us as we consider this legislation. I deem it my good fortune and privilege to stand before the Members of this House today and affirmatively participate in that action which will, I have no doubt, lead to the admission of the State of Hawaii as the 50th State in this Union.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to commend the gentleman for his forthright statement in support of this legislation. It was my great privilege to be a member of the committee at the time the gentleman from Washington was appointed a member of the committee.

I have watched with great interest the questions the gentleman asked of witnesses who appeared before our committee prior to coming to the conclusion that he was in favor of Hawaiian statehood. If any Members of this House were in doubt in their own minds and if they would go over the record and read the questions which the gentleman asked of witnesses who appeared before our committee enabling him to make up his mind, they too would come to support this legislation.

Mr. WESTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, after the long and many years of effort and struggle spent in our quest, it hardly seems possible that the supporters of the legislation now before this committee can sense the thrill of success which is apparently only hours removed from this debate of today.

At this time I desire to especially commend to members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]— who have so ably spearheaded the fight for granting the status of statehood to Hawaii—the last of our incorporated Territories. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], is the ranking member of the majority side of the committee which I have the honor to chairman. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], is the ranking member on the minority side of each committee. Each of them has done yeoman service in this program. To them, along with the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS], is due more than to any other like Member of the Members of our body the credit of getting this legislation along so quickly in this session. Also they are due great credit in presenting the bill in the fine form and detail in which it is presented to us. Certainly, I do not desire to minimize the good work done in the interests of statehood for Hawaii by other members of the committee particularly, and Members of the House generally. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], floor manager of the legislation for the minority, has been extremely helpful and constructive with his searching and

meaningful questions which he had propounded during committee consideration.

Without in any way attempting on my part to prejudge the final decision on the legislation which we are now considering, may I say, that, in my opinion, a great majority of this body—truly representing the great majority of the citizens of our Nation—will voice their approval of the bill within the next day or two. Yet, may I say that there are those among us who look with question and fear—and may I add with some suspicion on what the sponsors and supporters of the legislation desire to do. In most instances these questioning and opposing colleagues of ours are most sincere in their opposition. I truly hope that as the advocates of the legislation present their case that the fears and especially the suspicions of our opposing colleagues may be allayed and even removed. Our presentation will be to that end.

Some of my friends have said that the granting of the status of statehood to Hawaii is but the beginning of like attention to be paid to other areas now under our national jurisdiction but not enjoying the status of full membership in our sisterhood of States. I say to those of my colleagues who oppose this legislation for this reason that you have no need for further worry—to be perfectly and brutally frank I say that you really have no logical justification for your opposition founded on such thinking.

Hawaii is the last of the incorporated Territories. With its admission to full statehood in our Union, we shall have filled the galaxy of stars in the field of blue in our national banner. For the foreseeable future there will be no more. It is my opinion that it is most unlikely that there ever will be others. Yet, I know full well that the Members of the 86th Congress cannot speak for the succeeding Congress or Congresses. And, here, may I add my own personal position, which is that I have sufficient faith in those who will be chosen to follow us that they shall do that which is best for the general welfare of our country and its people.

Now, may I explain in some detail just what I mean by stating to you that Hawaii is the last of our incorporated Territories and just what significance must be attached to such statement.

STATEHOOD IS THE NECESSARY CONSEQUENCE OF TERRITORIAL INCORPORATION

The claim that the incorporation of a Territory makes mandatory its graduation to statehood is supported overwhelmingly by historical precedent and the dicta of the Federal judiciary.

Every incorporated Territory—and there have been 31 of them—has become a State except Hawaii. The first of a series of organic acts for incorporated Territories was the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which outlined a policy of ultimate status not only for the Northwest Territory, but also for all the Territories subsequently to be acquired. A basic provision was that when the population of any district within the Northwest Territory should total 60,000, that district was to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original 13 States. Organic legislation which ensued for the Southwest Territory, the Territory of Michigan, the Territory of Illinois, and so forth, incorporated the Territory to which each of the acts applied and made provision for eventual statehood.

One after the other, all the incorporated Territories on the mainland were admitted to the Union; and only last January 3 Alaska joined the great sisterhood. The constitutional status of Hawaii is identical to that of Alaska, as well as to that of each of the other former incorporated Territories. True, the Organic Act of Hawaii does not refer in explicit terms to statehood; but the fact that the act extended the Constitution in all its parts to our great Pacific Territory and thereby incorporated it into the Union was sufficient to guarantee it eventual statehood.

The courts time and again have made it plain that the act of incorporation constitutes a commitment by the Congress ultimately to admit as a State the Territory incorporated. In *Ex Parte Morgan* (20 F. 298, 305 (1883)), an incorporated territory is considered an inchoate State. In *McAllister* v. *United States* (141 U.S. 174, 188 (1891)), territorial government was said to be temporary and destined to be superseded when the—incorporated—territories became States of the Union. In *Balzac* v. *People of Puerto Rico* (258 U.S. 298 (1922)), the Supreme Court said that incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood.

One of the more baseless of the charges long cherished by antistatehood elements is the allegation that Hawaii's admission would be followed, necessarily, by that of Guam, American Samoa, and all the other unincorporated areas controlled by the United States. The very fact that these Territories are unincorporated precludes their admission. Not until the Congress makes them an integral part of the United States, and thereby accords them incorporated status, can they hope to achieve statehood. Such a development is utterly unlikely, at least for the foreseeable future.

The 30 States having previous Territorial status and their respective periods of such status,[1] plus Hawaii, interpolated as of 1959

State [2]	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Years elapsed
New Mexico	1850	1912	62
Hawaii	1900	1959	59
Arizona	1863	1912	46
Alaska [3]	1912 [3]	1959	47
Utah	1850	1896	46
Washington	1853	1889	36
Michigan	1805	1837	32
North Dakota	1861	1889	28

[1] The Thirteen Original States did not, of course, pass through any territorial stage. Vermont, Kentucky, Maine, and West Virginia were formed from already existing States. California and Texas were acquired from foreign governments and consequently escaped the territorial apprenticeship.

[2] States are listed under the names by which they are now known rather than by the name of the Territory from which each was formed.

[3] Alaska was incorporated as of 1868, but its first organic act was not passed until 1884. This first organic act, however, provided only for a "district" rather than a "territorial" form of government. Hence, the organic act of 1912, which created Alaska's first legislature, may more truly be considered the basic act in the establishment of Territorial government.

The 30 States having previous Territorial status and their respective periods of such status, plus Hawaii, interpolated as of 1959—Continued

State	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Years elapsed
South Dakota	1861	1889	28
Idaho	1863	1890	27
Montana	1864	1889	25
Florida	1822	1845	23
Wyoming	1868	1890	22
Mississippi	1798	1817	19
Arkansas	1819	1836	17
Oklahoma	1890	1907	17
Indiana	1800	1816	16
Ohio	1787	1803	16
Colorado	1861	1876	15
Nebraska	1854	1867	13
Wisconsin	1836	1848	12
Oregon	1848	1859	11
Missouri	1812	1821	9
Illinois	1809	1818	9
Minnesota	1849	1858	7
Iowa	1838	1846	6
Louisiana	1804	1812	3
Kansas	1854	1861	2
Tennessee	1790	1796	9
Nevada	1861	1864	8
Alabama	1817	1819	8

Source: Statutes at Large.

We have no more areas which have been or are likely to be designated as incorporated Territories. Hawaii is the last. The people of Hawaii—good, loyal, and patriotic citizens of the United States of America—have served well their apprenticeship. They are ready. They are deserving. We are ready to receive them. Let not any fears of ours deny to our own that which our own is entitled to receive—the blessing and responsibilities attendant with full sisterhood in the United States of America.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I should like to preface my remarks by reminding the gentleman that I have always supported statehood for Hawaii. I followed the excellent chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], in voting last year for the admission of Alaska. However, today a question has arisen on the floor which I know the gentleman can answer readily. Considering the constitutional restriction in existence, would it be possible for Hawaii when a State to annex other territory which is unincorporated but belonging to the United States, without further action being taken by this Congress?

Mr. ASPINALL. It would not.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. On page 5 of the bill there is a provision which says that the President may dispose of land within a 5-year period after Hawaii becomes a State. I am referring to paragraph (e) on page 5. Will the gentleman please tell us the meaning of that provision?

Mr. ASPINALL. That provision provides that the areas now held by the United States, for one purpose or another, may be held by the Federal Government for an additional period of not over 5 years for a determination as to

how much of that area is to be needed permanently by the Federal Government, for defense purposes primarily.

Mr. GROSS. And such land could be disposed of at the discretion of the President of the United States?

Mr. ASPINALL. No; the lands automatically go to the new State of Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. That is not what the provision says.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to call attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Federal lands in Hawii come in two classes; first, those to which the Federal Government has title in fee. Those are not affected at all by this bill. The other lands affected by this bill are those which the United States Government holds under license. These lands are owned by the Territory of Hawaii. Upon the admission of Hawaii into the sisterhood of States, if there is no provision in the bill, all of the rights of the Federal Government in those lands will cease at once. The military, which occupy a large portion of these lands, have appeared before our committee and asked that for a period of 5 years the President be given the discretion to determine which of those lands are needed and which are not needed.

Those which will be needed will be kept by the United States without any payment to the State of Hawaii of any sort or description, and those that are not needed will automatically then go back to the State of Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. Why should they not come to the Congress for the disposal of this land, rather than leaving it to the discretion of a President? That is the way we dispose of other U.S. property, is it not?

Mr. ASPINALL. These properties are in reality properties of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. Then why does a President have any discretion in the matter at all?

Mr. ASPINALL. Because we presently hold possession over these particular areas.

Mr. GROSS. So that we do control the land?

Mr. ASPINALL. Just for certain purposes, that is all.

Mr. GROSS. I think that under any circumstance the authority should be vested in Congress to dispose of any federally owned or controlled land.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think that a statement will be made about that when that part of the bill is under consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any special significance to establishing the minimum voting age under the Constitution of the State of Hawaii at 20 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. I think the gentleman understands that we have always left that decision up to the various States. If Hawaii wishes to change the usual age limit for voting, it may do so, just as the great State of Georgia has changed it.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The question comes up as to what we mean by an incorporated Territory when, for example, Guam has a Governor and a Lieutenant Governor appointed by the President, as well as a legislature; likewise the Virgin Islands. Why is there a distinction between the Hawaiian Islands, for example, and those two Territories? What is the distinction between the United Nations trusteeship we hold over the Marshall and Caroline Islands, as they are Territories under the Security Council of the United Nations? What kind of legal situation is there on those Territories in respect to this particular legislation?

Mr. ASPINALL. We have had these three different approaches to the treatment of our areas classified as "Territories." Of course, an incorporated Territory is by its organic act determined to be an incorporated area.

Mr. FULTON. Why has not Guam, when we have an organic law for them, set up its own organization?

Mr. ASPINALL. We have never by congressional act designated Guam as an incorporated Territory. We have said just the reverse, that it is not an incorporated Territory.

Mr. FULTON. Like an unincorporated village.

Mr. ASPINALL. The same is true of the Virgin Islands.

As far as the trust islands are concerned, we hold possession by conquest, of course, but we have control over them at the present time only by mandate from the United Nations.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, an organized incorporated Territory of the United States is a possession to which the Constitution of the United States has been extended by a congressional act. As a result their native-born inhabitants have become citizens of the United States, the area is entitled to statehood, and enjoy representation in Congress. Hawaii is an example.

An organized unincorporated Territory is a possession of the United States to which the Federal Constitution has not been extended by act of Congress. Organic acts have been enacted for Guam and the Virgin Islands, our two possessions falling into this category.

Neither has a Representative in Congress. Neither is eligible for statehood without additional congressional legislation. Guamanians and Virgin Islanders are citizens of the United States.

American Samoa is an unorganized and unincorporated possession of the United States. It has no organic act, no representation in Congress, and, of course, is not eligible for statehood. Its inhabitants are not citizens but are nationals of the United States, but, of course, are eligible for citizenship. They may travel to the mainland without difficulty. This status entitles the American Samoans to the protection of our flag and the enjoyment of undefined fundamental rights, but does not guarantee to them those explicit rights accorded by the Constitution to citizens of the United States.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is a strategic trusteeship of the United Nations. Its inhabitants are neither citizens nor nationals of the United States, but wards of the United Nations under the supervision of the United States. Since the Trust Territory is not a possession of the United States it obviously could not be admitted to our Union. Its inhabitants have little sense of nationalism and not the least interest in statehood.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Arends	Gubser	Quigley
Ayres	Hall	Randall
Bailey	Hargis	Rogers, Tex.
Barden	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Barrett	Holifield	Smith, Miss.
Barry	Holt	Smith, Va.
Blatnik	Jackson	Spence
Bolton	Kearns	Springer
Bowles	Kelly	Taylor
Breeding	Machrowicz	Thompson, La.
Celler	Martin	Tuck
Dawson	May	Wharton
Diggs	Morrison	Willis
Dixon	Osmers	Withrow
Elliott	Philbin	
Frelinghuysen	Powell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4221, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 379 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, yes; this is an historic event. Today marks another milestone in the decay, in the decline, and in the death of this Nation and of Western Civilization.

May I first point out that this bill is not a simple legislative measure that can later be amended or repealed.

This is neither a regulatory nor an administrative proposal. This is not a law being passed in the ordinary course of legislative businesss.

This measure deals with the basic structure of legislative power—of who shall, in the future, have the power to pass all laws affecting all of the citizens of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, the issue of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii ought to be deliberated from these three broad aspects:

First. The grant of statehood to Hawaii will reduce the political power and the voting rights of every citizen of our population and bestow that power upon another segment of our citizens.

Second. The next phase of this discussion will attempt to refute the arguments advanced in favor of statehood. I will try to demonstrate that the reasoning for statehood is either based upon political errors or is irrelevant or is of emotional origin.

Third. The concluding portion of this statement will deal with communism in Hawaii and its dangerous political consequences.

THE POLITICAL POWER ASPECTS OF STATEHOOD

There is a mistaken popular notion that the people of the Territory of Hawaii are being deprived of their right of self-government. The differences between the powers of the 49 States and the powers of the Territorial Government of Hawaii are insignificant.

Under the Hawaii Organic Act, Hawaii possesses full power to enact laws relating to its property, affairs, and government. Its powers in relation to the conduct of its affairs are substantially as extensive as the powers of the State governments of the 49 States. Hawaii does not lack the power of home rule.

Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove Territorial legislation, no law passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii has ever been invalidated by Congress.

Although the Governor of Hawaii is appointed by the President, there has never been any substantial complaint that the administration of the Governor's Office has been contrary to the best interests of the people of that Territory.

The campaign of the proponents of statehood is based, not upon their need or desire for power to conduct the affairs of the Territory, but rather, in their desire for power to conduct the affairs of the 49 States. They seek the power associated with the election of two U.S. Senators, two U.S. Representatives, and four electoral votes in the choice of a U.S. President.

The membership of this House knows that all governments, good or bad, are mere organizations of political power. The difference between a totalitarian, an aristocracy, or a representative government is merely a difference in the control of political power.

It is a fundamental principle, that our constitutional representative form of government shall give every citizen an equal voice in the conduct of our Government. The right of a citizen to participate in our Government, almost exclusively, rests with his right to vote. But, the essence of the right to vote lies in the effectiveness of the right to vote.

Statehood would entitle the people of Hawaii to two U.S. Senators. It is our responsibility to decide whether this amounts to an equitable apportionment of legislative power.

The population of Hawaii, according to the consus estimate as of July 1, 1957, was 613,000. Of this population, 59,000 were military personnel. An additional 25,000 people are civilian Federal employees. If we consider these 84,000 Federal civilian and military personnel to each have only one dependent, then the basic population figure should be reduced by 168,000. This would reduce the Hawaiian citizen population to 445,000.

With the grant of statehood, the people of Hawaii will be represented by one U.S. Senator for each of its 223,000 citizens.

The 2 Hawaii Senators representing 445,000 citizens would nullify the will and the representation in the U.S. Senate of New York's 16 million people, California's 14 million people, Illinois' 10 million people, Georgia's 4 million people, and of the voters in each of the other of the 49 States.

The framers of our Constitution founded a compound government, combining the features of both a federal and a national type of government.

The plan to give each State two Senators conforms to a pattern suitable to a Federal Government, with limited powers, where the bulk of the sovereign power is reserved to the States.

The plan to apportion Representatives of this House on the basis of population conforms to the framework of a National Government where all power is concentrated in a Central Government.

The grant of equal representation, that of two U.S. Senators, to each State was adopted for the protection of the sovereign powers of the States from encroachment upon their powers by the Central Government. In furtherance of this purpose, it was provided that the U.S. Senate be chosen, indirectly, by State legislatures.

The framers of our Constitution repeatedly stated that the U.S. Senate would represent the States in their corporate governmental capacities. The election of Senators by the legislatures was an integral part of that historic compromise under which each State became entitled to two U.S. Senators.

The 17th amendment to our Constitution was adopted on April 8, 1913. This amendment fundamentally altered the basis for the allotment of two Senators to each State. This change in the mode of the selection of our Senators to that of popular suffrage totally destroyed the justification, the rationale, for equal representation for each State in the U.S. Senate.

There have been drastic changes in our Republic. The framers of our Constitution envisioned a Central Government of limited powers, with the bulk of the residual sovereign power being reserved to the States.

Now, there is no mathematical formula for the measurement of the division of power between the States and our Central Government. However, we can measure the exercise of political power by the expenditures of our governments.

In the year 1957 our total gross national product amounted to $440 billion. Of this sum, $79 billion, or 18.1 percent, was expended by the Central Government. The State and local governments expended $34 billion, or 7.7 percent. The exercise of Federal power costs our citizens about two and one-half times the exercise of State power.

It is evident that there has been a continuing erosion of power out of the States and a continuing concentration of power in our Central Government. We have become a National Government wherein the States are being relegated to mere provinces. We have evolved from a Federal Republic into a national democracy.

Twenty-five States, with a population of 31 million people, constituting only 18 percent of the Nation's population, control 50 votes and have a majority power in the U.S. Senate.

This imbalance of power is a prime factor in our huge Federal bureaucracy, its wastages, and the consequent huge Federal taxes. Our bankrupt agricultural program with Federal subsidies, creating surplus products and Federal subsidies paid to reduce crops, at the same time, is an example of the satisfactions of local interests resulting from excessive localized political power without a corresponding accountability for the national welfare.

The U.S. Senate is accountable to the pressure of their constituents rather than to the preservation of State powers. Their prime interest must lie in expanding national power to satisfy local political pressures.

The alarming growth of Federal aid is another example of the inequitable distribution of Senate power. These programs are a practical means of socializing the wealth of the States and are encouraged by the political power combinations in the U.S. Senate.

Statehood for Hawaii will reduce the effectiveness and dilute the voting rights of every citizen of the 49 States. In the election of a U.S. Senate, it transfers an excessive amount of Senate representation to the people of Hawaii.

The average representation in the U.S. Senate is 1 Senator for approximately 1,700,000 citizens. Hawaii will have 1 Senator for each 223,000 citizens. The voting rights of the Hawaii citizen will be 7 times as effective as that of the average citizen of the 49 States.

POWER IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

In the event of statehood, Hawaii, after the 1960 reapportionment, will become entitled to 4 electoral votes toward the election of a President of the United States. This can be reduced to 1 electoral vote for each 110,000 of its population. The voters in the 49 States will only have 1 electoral vote for about each 320,000 citizens. In the election of a President, the voting rights of each Hawaii citizen will be as effective as that of 3 average citizens of the 49 States.

Again, the voting rights of the people of the 49 States are reduced in order to transfer excessive voting power to the people of Hawaii.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

After the 1960 census reapportionment, Hawaii will become entitled to 2

Representatives in this House. Since the membership of this House is fixed at 435, these two Representatives will displace 2 Members who are presently holding seats in this House. This loss of seats will be in addition to the following latest projection by the U.S. Census Bureau of the loss of seats:

Maine	1
Massachusetts	2
New York	3
Pennsylvania	3
Illinois	1
Minnesota	1
Mississippi	1
Iowa	1
Kansas	1
West Virginia	1
North Carolina	1
Georgia	1
Alabama	1
Arkansas	2

STATEHOOD FOR OTHER POSSESSIONS

Statehood for Hawaii will intensify the demands for representation in Congress for the citizens and inhabitants of all other possessions of the United States.

Since Alaska was admitted with a resident population of about 100,000 people, why isn't Guam entitled to statehood with its population of 59,000 citizens.

If the psychological impact upon the oriental countries is a valid reason for admitting Hawaii, then Guam should be admitted because it is farther west and closer to the oriental cultures.

If Puerto Rico seeks admission, shall we admit her to statehood in the interest of reducing the possible enmities of South American countries.

Senator CASE recently introduced a bill to grant three delegates in the House of Representatives to the District of Columbia which is a prelude to statehood. Are these 800,000 citizens less entitled to two U.S. Senators than the 445,000 citizens of Hawaii?

The Virgin Islands has a population of 30,000. Shall we admit the Virgin Islands on the ground that it will improve our relations with the African countries?

Before we further distort the structure of our Government, we ought to be prepared to deal with these prospective troublesome problems on the basis of a principle that is equitable for these people and is also reasonably fair to the people of the 49 States.

EXTRANEOUS ISSUES

Just about any and every conceivable argument has been advanced by the proponents of statehood. The Territory of Hawaii has carried on a high-powered, soft-sell, campaign for the past 12 years. The Hawaii Statehood Commission is the official agency for the promotion of statehood. Since 1947 it has spent more than $1 million for public relations and lobbying. This sum far exceeds the spending by any other lobbying group.

I would like to comment on some of the arguments being advanced by this Commission.

They have raised the slogan of "taxation without representation." Taxation has never been the test of voting rights. The person who pays no taxes is entitled to one vote just as the citizen who pays $1 million of taxes per year. The alien resident who has no voting rights is still duty bound to pay taxes.

The Hawaiian people received, for their taxes, substantially the same benefits as the people of the 49 States.

No one has disparaged the bravery of Hawaiian troops in World War II and in the Korean conflict, except the Hawaii Statehood Commission. They have raised this issue by attributing it to the opponents of statehood. It is inflammatory, emotional language intended to put the opponents on the defensive and furnishes an emotional impact in Hawaii, coupling statehood with a defense of honor.

The loyalty of the Hawaiian soldier cannot and should not be the basis for the equitable apportionment of representation in Congress.

I might remind our fellow citizens in Hawaii that the people of the 48 States did not hesitate to bravely and completely repel the inglorious attack by Japan, not upon the U.S. mainland, but their attack upon Hawaii. The United States discharged its obligations to its fellow citizens in full measure.

The proponents say that denial of statehood would cause an unfavorable psychological impact upon oriental countries. This reasoning is a political mistake. It is an admission of our weakness. This is a domestic problem that should not be decided by foreign agitation.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission advances the argument that Hawaii has met every test of statehood. The Constitution provides no tests for statehood. Congress has not enacted any tests for statehood. The proponents refer to dicta emanating from the Supreme Court. The opinion of the Supreme Court in this matter is just another unwarranted intrusion upon the constitutional powers of Congress.

The height of irrelevancy was attained by a prominent proponent of Hawaiian statehood. He advanced this argument: "The delectation of visitors, the sweetness of Hawaiian music and the rhythm of its dance." The muscular gyrations of the hula dance is certainly far afield from the crux of the statehood problem.

COMMUNISM IN HAWAII

Mr. Chairman, I have said, in and outside Congress, that in granting statehood to Hawaii, we actually invite four Soviet agents to take seats in the U.S. Congress. I repeat this statement.

These men will bear no visible brand marks. They will not be Communist Party members. All that the Communists demand of them, in return for their political support, is to cleverly follow the "Soviet Party line."

The infiltration of communism in Hawaii continues to influence every phase of Hawaii activity to an alarming degree.

The Communist network is centered in two unions, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU—and the United Public Workers—UPW. From these centers, their influence spreads into both the Republican and Democratic Parties, into the Territorial legislature, into the county and city governments, into the newspapers, the radio, the television, and into every home.

The ILWU has a membership of about 25,000 workers. The UPW has a membership of about 2,700 employees.

Both of these unions were expelled by the CIO in 1950 on the ground that "their policies follow the Communist Party" and that "Communists control these unions."

Gentlemen, the policies of these unions have not changed one iota. I quote from the report of the Territorial Commission on Subversive Activities which was submitted to the Governor this last Monday, March 2, 1959, page 16:

> The propaganda line disseminated by the ILWU has continued to follow and further the Russian international and domestic viewpoint.

These unions continue to be dominated by the same Communist officials as in 1950. The ILWU in Hawaii is known as Local No. 142. The president is that most dangerous and effective international Communist agent, Harry Bridges.

Since last August, Harry Bridges has been actively engaged in promoting an alinement of American labor unions with foreign Communist unions. This, of course, is part of the U.S. Communist Party's and the Soviet Communist Party's present program.

Since August 1958 Harry Bridges has made overtures to: the all-Japan Dock Workers Union, the Waterside Workers of Australia, the Madras Harbor Workers of India, and the Waterside Workers of Indonesia.

These unions are all Communist dominated. He has carefully avoided consultations with any unions who are not Communist controlled.

Since January 1, 1959, Harry Bridges has had conferences with the Communist leadership of unions in London, Paris, Hamburg, Prague, Moscow, Leningrad, and Helsinki.

Bridges has also alined his union with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, headed by James R. Hoffa.

Jack Hall is regional director of the Hawaii ILWU, local No. 142. He and six other Hawaiian Communists were convicted in 1953 for conspiracy to overthrow our Government by force and violence. These cases were reversed under the authority of the series of shocking Supreme Court pro-Communist decisions.

The UPW's officers are Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, Max Roffman and Jeanette Nakama Rohrbough, all identified Communists.

Both the ILWU and the UPW have exploited its members and continue to use the dues and the membership to further the Communist Party line.

The UPW has 235 public employees employed by the government of the Territory of Hawaii. The city and county of Honolulu has 567 employees belonging to the UPW, including 37 members of the sheriff's department.

The county of Hawaii has 279 public employees belonging to this Communist-controlled union. The county of Kauai has 293 and the county of Maui 537. These figures come from the checkoff system used by the unions and these governments to extract union dues.

The ILWU and its conspiratorial Communist partner, the UPW, share the same large office building owned by the ILWU. This nonpublic building was recently exempted from public taxation by the Hawaiian Legislature.

These two unions continue to spend upward of $200,000 annually for propaganda and agitation.

They maintain radio broadcasts in the Ilocano and Tagalog, Filipino dialects, every day of the week.

The Japanese broadcasts are continued on three stations every Sunday.

These broadcasts are completely Communist oriented.

The ILWU continues to operate another propaganda apparatus. It has a book-lending library service that disseminates nothing but Communist literature featuring class conflict and other Communist doctrine. It has a Communist movie loan service. These Communist films are stored and checked in and out by the public library of the Territory of Hawaii. This service to the Communist Party is paid for by the Hawaii and United States taxpayers.

To demonstrate the growing and expanding power of the Communist ILWU, I show you two newspaper clippings.

The Honolulu Advertiser of November 26, 1958, reports the union election among the Foodland supermarket meatcutters.

The ILWU vote was 205.

The AFL–CIO vote was 14.

I show you a report of the Honolulu Advertiser of March 1, 1959, last Sunday, reporting on an election among the clerks of the Foodland supermarket:

The ILWU won with 134 votes.

The AFL–CIO union received 42 votes.

The voting in favor of the ILWU is in spite of the fact that its Communist control is known to every citizen of Hawaii.

This certainly does not show any lessening of the influence of the Communist Party in Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to describe just one incident to show how the Communist Party infiltrates the cultural activities of a community.

The Honolulu Community Chorus is a civic musical organization. It has planned to produce a festival of folk songs this spring in conjunction with the Honolulu Symphony Orchestra. More than 300 vocalists and musicians are to participate.

The choral chairman, Mr. John M. Kelly, Jr., is insisting that the symphony orchestra present the "Song of the Forests" by the Communist composer, Dmitri Shostakovich. This music and words were written in praise of Dictator Joseph Stalin.

Mr. Kelly also insists upon the rendition of "The Lonesome Trail." This music is by Earl Robinson and Millard Lampbell. Both of these men have Communist affiliations for 20 years.

Mr. George Barati, the director of the Honolulu Symphony as of today still refuses to play these two numbers on the ground that they are of poor musical composition.

The inclusion of Communist music, as American folk songs, can be easily explained. The wife of Mr. Kelly is the former secretary to Jack Hall, the Communist director of the ILWU. The secretary of the choral group is Mrs. Ah Qwon Leong McElrath, the wife of the radio commentator for the ILWU and a Communist agent.

There has been a recent change in the Communist tactics in Hawaii. They are now using the soft, velvet approach to gain respectability and acceptance.

Last year, Mr. Newton Miyagi, secretary of the ILWU, was appointed to the Red Cross board. Mr. Miyagi is a diehard Communist who took the fifth amendment 71 times on questions relating to his Communist affiliations before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. Mr. Blissard, the U.S. Federal attorney, was so outraged that he resigned as a member of the board.

Strangely, the Federal judge, there, also a member of the board, criticized Mr. Blissard and defended Mr. Miyagi's appointment. The Federal judge was seeking Presidential reappointment.

On November 8, 1956, Gov. Wilder King forced the resignation of his attorney general for attending a testimonial dinner for Communist Jack Hall. Governor King was not reappointed.

Judge Stainback, a former Democratic governor, vigorously opposed to the Communists, was also refused Presidential reappointment.

In the 1956 elections, Mr. William F. Quinn accepted the ILWU endorsement for the Territorial senate on the Republican ticket. He is now the Republican Presidential appointed Governor of Hawaii to replace Governor King. I show you newspaper clipping of Governor Quinn tendering a public office appointment to Jack Hall, the prominent Communist leader, as a member of the Hawaii Traffic Commission.

It is a well-known political fact of life, that you can't receive the recommendation of the Department of the Interior today under a Republican administration or yesterday under a Democratic administration for a Presidential appointment in Hawaii without the blessing of the Communist ILWU.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by briefly reviewing the political power that is exercised by the Communist apparatus in Hawaii.

In the 1954 elections, the ILWU gave its endorsement to 71 candidates. A total of 58 of the 71 ILWU-endorsed candidates won. Of these candidates, 22 out of 28 candidates for the Hawaii Legislature won.

In the 1956 elections 21 ILWU-endorsed candidates won out of 30 representatives in the Hawaii House of Representatives.

In this last election of November 1958, there were 69 offices to be filled by election. For these officers, 57 candidates were endorsed by the ILWU. Four of these candidates rejected the ILWU endorsements. Fifty-three candidates accepted these Communist dominated ILWU endorsements.

Thirty-seven of the ILWU-endorsed candidates won their elections.

Thus the ILWU succeeded in electing 37 out of 69 elective positions in the Hawaii Territorial Legislature for a winning percentage of 55 percent out of all public elective offices.

The ILWU succeeded in electing 37 out of 53 candidates whom it endorsed and who accepted this Communist support for a winning percentage of 70 percent.

It must be remembered that four identified Communists sit on the ILWU political endorsement committee that handed out these endorsements. Their long-standing Communist affiliations are well known to every person in Hawaii. These four Communists are: Thomas Yagi, Newton Miyagi, "Castner" Ogawa, and "Slim" Shimizu.

Mr. Newton Miyagi is the same gentleman whose recent appointment to the Red Cross board raised such a furor. During the 1956 U.S. Senate committee hearings on internal subversion, Mr. Miyagi invoked the fifth amendment 71 times and declined to answer when asked if he had been in contact with Russian military intelligence agents.

These are the men whose political endorsements are sought for and accepted in order to attain public office. These are the same Communists who will pass upon and either reject or give political endorsement to the two U.S. Senators and the two U.S. Representatives to be elected in Hawaii and sent to our Congress.

We can best judge the political power of the ILWU by comparing the results of their endorsements with the results of the endorsements of the Republican Party.

Out of the 69 offices in which the ILWU endorsed candidates, 37 won seats; the Republican-endorsed candidates won only 24 seats. In other words, the ILWU endorsement is much more valuable than the Republican Party endorsement.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that the power of the Communist Party continues to be so potent that it is a menace to the people of Hawaii and to the people of the 49 States. There is no evidence of the lessening of that power.

In the event of statehood, the Communist Party will, in all probability, exert a continuing tremendous influence on the election of Hawaii's two Senators and two Representatives. The probable election of ILWU-endorsed Representatives to the U.S. Congress will mean that the Communist Party will exert a substantial influence upon these Members of Congress.

The Communist Party will have succeeded in infiltrating the U.S. Congress and establishing a fifth column in this last defense of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, I received this package of Hawaiian newspaper clippings in this morning's mail.

They tell two simple stories.

In the last election, the Republicans elected 18 members in the Hawaii House of Representatives. The Democrats elected 32 members.

The Democratic speaker was O. V. Esposito. The previous Democratic speaker was Charles Kauhane. Mr. Kauhane is one of the members who accepted and was elected with ILWU endorsement and support.

Jack Hall and Charlie Kauhane joined forces and established a coalition with the 18 Republican members. They un-

seated Speaker Esposito and elected their own choice, Mr. Eravalho.

Charlie Kauhane is the same person, who 3 years ago, while speaker of the house, sent a gavel to Harry Bridges, to open an ILWU meeting as a token of esteem for that Communist international agent.

Another portion of this newspaper prints a warm welcome to Hawaii being given to the crew of a Russian ship. This welcome is printed in red ink, and in the Russian language.

Since we are living today under a Khrushchev ultimatum over the Berlin crisis, this warm, fawning welcome to Hawaii for these Russians is a most inappropriate act.

It is further evidence of the spirit of appeasement, tolerance, and encouragement to communism on the part of the citizens of Hawaii.

I make this prophecy, that Hawaii will be the first State whose government will be completely Communist controlled. I further predict that statehood will help to create a rebellious situation similar to that of Cyprus on this most strategic military outpost.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated for the safety and the survival of this Nation.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that H.R. 4221 has my support, just as it had my support when it last appeared before this body for consideration.

I became conscious of the merits of statehood for Hawaii through the dedicated and unremitting efforts of the late Honorable Joseph Rider Farrington. Mr. Farrington came to this legislative hall in the 78th Congress as a Delegate from Hawaii, and, owing to his untimely death on June 19, 1954, departed from our midst in the 83d Congress.

The consideration of this legislation before the House of Representatives today bears testimony to the truth that the good that men do lives on long after they have gone. Indeed, it must be with a great sense of pride that Mr. Farrington's family observes the progress of this principle to which the Delegate from Hawaii gave so much of himself.

The State of Maine can lay claim to many illustrious families, and one of these is the Farrington family. And I feel particularly proud to make known the fact that the roots of this family tree are anchored in Brewer, Maine, a community in the Third Congressional District which I am privileged to represent.

Joseph Farrington was a descendant of this Maine family, and ours was an association that will not quickly be forgotten because it is too easy to remember. I shall always remember him for the fine man he was, and for the enthusiasm he exhibited in his legislative endeavors—statehood for Hawaii was one of these.

It is then with mingled objectivity and sentiment that I lend my strong support to this legislation. That H.R. 4221 has merit, I feel certain—that I can extend this tribute to Joe Farrington brings me a bounty of pleasure and a great sense of satisfaction.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to those who are ably endorsing statehood for Hawaii. The Territory of Hawaii has demonstrated beyond a doubt its ability to develop from colonial status, with the concomitant results of economic oligarchy into what we now know as "modern" Hawaii; a Hawaii able to prosper and develop to the fullest its human and natural resources.

The record will show that Hawaii in 1958 was one of the Nation's most progressive and prosperous areas. It will show, for example, that its broadly based economic life brought into our Treasury $166 million in taxes, putting Hawaii ahead of 10 States as taxpayers. Certainly this fact alone would warrant the right of Hawaii to voting participation in the Congress of the United States, voting in our presidential elections, and to its own popularly elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor.

The record will likewise show that Hawaii is an ever-growing area economically, with a fast-growing population to help in its advance toward continued growth. Stagnation is not the mark of Hawaii. Progress is the word to describe this democratic bastion of the Pacific. Business is developing and expanding continuously and the standard of living of workers has continued to improve. For example, in 1957 per capita income rose to $1,821, ranking Hawaii 25th with the States.

The record will also show that the young people of Hawaii are willing and competent to meet the challenges of the 20th century and this is significant because they are living in "America's showwindow" in Asia. In 1958, 7,000 students attended the University of Hawaii, the highest per population in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have merely highlighted certain facts. There are many, many more that could be used to show that Hawaii has conclusively demonstrated that its own development and contributions to the United States serve as more than prima facie evidence of its right to statehood.

I would like to turn to other facets involved in considering statehood for Hawaii. It is wrapped up in this observation: "The Nation Needs Hawaii." It should certainly be recognized that by embracing Hawaii as a State, the United States of America would be taking a significant and historical step in favorably influencing the peoples of the Pacific Basin, and indeed in other areas of the world. To admit Hawaii to statehood would demonstrate in no uncertain terms that we practice as well as preach the democratic ideal that all citizens are equal before the law, regardless of color or creed. This shining example in the Pacific would permit half the world's people to compare for themselves the deeds of our Nation with the empty promises of equality espoused by Communist propagandists.

The Nation needs Hawaii for another reason—admission of this Territory as the 50th State would bolster Hawaii's role as our Pacific bastion of defense. The courageous, valuable and never-to-be-forgotten contribution of the Hawaiians in World War II speaks for itself. I might add I was in the Pacific area during the war and can personally attest to the valor and determination of our fellow citizens from the Hawaiian Islands. Certainly the home of Pearl Harbor should be granted the dignity it deserves—statehood.

And let us never forget the positive impact of our action when we granted independence to the Republic of the Philippines. This the people of Asia understood. I firmly believe statehood for Hawaii, in which we find a real mosaic of racial strains, would offer an even more positive and emphatic impact on Asian thinking. In addition, I believe the Asians would be impressed by our support of the will of the Hawaiians to develop and practice local self-government, the touchstone of democracy.

Mr. Chairman, these are ethical concepts which I think are important to keep in mind.

In granting statehood to the Americans of Hawaii we would be adding the window of our freedom in the Pacific—Hawaii—to the American home now comprised of 49 States, a home in which it properly belongs.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, some day in the future the Members of the 86th Congress will look back at what we are about to do today and appreciate more completely the historic significance of granting Statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

I consider it a privilege to join our colleagues in support of this long overdue measure. For nearly 60 years, the people of Hawaii have been waiting for this day. In every respect, I believe they have demonstrated their readiness for Statehood and their ability to carry out the obligations statehood imposes. Hawaii has the population, the economic resources, and the tradition of representative government to assure that, as the 50th State of the Union, she will be a proud and worthy addition.

I have considered as thoroughly as possible the objections which opponents of the bill have raised. I do not believe these objections are at all conclusive. Many of them are based on the rather questionable speculations advanced as to the future political behavior of the population—speculations which do not seem to me to be supported by past experience.

Nor do I share the concern of some that Hawaii lies several thousands of miles in the Pacific—a considerable distance from the shores of continental United States. In this age of fast ships, jet aircraft and miracles of electronic

communication, Hawaii is very much a neighbor to all our States.

As we prepare to accept Hawaii as our newest State, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of our action last year in granting statehood to Alaska. At that time, many of us called attention to the pledges both our political parties had oftentime made to both Alaska and Hawaii, and we expressed our intentions to continue working for the admission of Hawaii.

Consequently, it seems fitting to me to look ahead at this time to the next great responsibility of this Congress—the enactment of a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. It is hardly necessary today to review the many reasons why this is important: the need to be honest with the citizens of Washington, the need to relieve this national deliberative assembly from the burden of deciding the most insignificant of local affairs, and the need to raise our Nation's Capital to self-governing status.

As a great American newspaper recently observed, home rule for the District of Columbia would free all Americans from the irony of denying self-government to the Capital of the greatest self-governing Nation in the world.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is to speak in favor of the bill H.R. 4221, which, if enacted, would grant statehood to Hawaii.

I cannot help but believe that if the majority of the Members of this House had visited Hawaii sometime in the past there would be no doubt about the success of the legislation presently under discussion.

Few places on earth are more attractive. Few have the physical advantages Hawaii possesses—the mild climate, abundant natural beauty, and a friendly, heterogeneous population.

I think it was Mark Twain who said of Hawaii, "The most beautiful fleet of islands ever anchored in the sea."

But a Territory does not become a State on the basis of aesthetic criteria. Hawaii merits statehood on more realistic grounds.

No Territory, with the exception of Oklahoma, has ever possessed a population as large as Hawaii's at the time it sought statehood in the Union. Hawaii's population is approximately 600,000.

Thomas Jefferson, in his statement on the qualifications for a Territory seeking statehood, thought that 60,000 was an adequate number. Times have changed, admittedly, but the barriers that once stood in the way of statehood for Hawaii have been eliminated by man's technological and sociological progress.

Distance, for example, was once a principal impediment to the recognition of Hawaii as a State. Yet those 2,200 miles of ocean that separate this beautiful segment of America from the mainland have been spanned in a few hours by jet planes. Telephonic and radio communications place the islands in immediate contact with Washington.

As for sociological progress, Hawaii is made up of people of Polynesian, Japanese, Philippine and oceanic origins. Yet they live together under a system of town government similar to our own. They have free elections, they are subject to our Federal laws, they are citizens of our country, and have been since Hawaii ceded its sovereignty to the United States at the turn of the century.

These people have one thing in common—an abiding faith in the fairness of the United States to grant them the privilege of first-class citizens, and to admit their Territory as a State.

Fifty years ago, with the biased viewpoint of most Americans toward the Asiatic races, such a step would have been impossible.

Today, with the world growing smaller, with man more dependent on his fellow man than ever before, statehood for Hawaii is not only possible but necessary.

Why is it necessary? Because—

Hawaii is our great bastion of democratic strength in the Pacific.

It is the bridge which can unite us with our allies in Asia through ties of understanding and mutual respect.

It has a self-supporting economy.

It is rich in two very much needed agricultural products—cane sugar and pineapples—which produce sales of a quarter-billion dollars annually.

It offers the the only safe harbor for large naval vessels between California and Asia's mainland.

It provides key bases for our Air Force, Navy, Army and Marine Corps in the tremendous area of the Pacific.

The people of Hawaii have proved their right to statehood by every reasonable test of patriotism and good citizenship.

The people of Hawaii are fully qualified to fulfill the responsibilities that statehood would impose upon them and they would do so intelligently, honorably and in the best interests of the Nation.

The Senators and Representative sent by the State of Hawaii to the Congress would not only serve the interests of Hawaii with competence and integrity, but they would also in my humble opinion fulfill their responsibilities to the Nation as a whole with ability and honor.

Statehood would strengthen Hawaii's economic future and contribute to the further political and social progress of these islands.

It is part of America and should not be treated like a poor relative, especially when we recall the sacrifices of its citizens during World War II.

Not a single act of sabotage disturbed the islands. Several thousand Niseis went to their death in Europe to show their affection and loyalty to the country which had given them the opportunities inherent in freedom.

And when the Nisei Regiment which had been shot to bits in Europe was being re-formed and 2,000 more men were asked for, thousands clamored for admission to its ranks so as to do their part for the United States and prove to the world that the Japanese-born citizens of Hawaii were truly appreciative of being citizens of our great country.

Your speaker has talked with many of the Japanese people of Hawaii. They are proud to be Americans—proud of Hawaii—eager for it to be a State. They speak our language, follow our customs, and long for full admission as an integral part of the United States.

The political developments which will follow Hawaii's admission as a State are obvious. But to permit consideration of these developments to stand in the way of favorable action because they might have a certain effect on current legislation is to try to turn back the dynamics of our age and divert the trends of the times.

Hawaii will make a great contribution as a State.

The oft-mentioned communism of the islands—which, by the way, is greatly exaggerated—will eventually pass away in their new found pride in the sisterhood of States.

To let one Communist of importance on the islands stand in the way of statehood is like destroying an orchard because of one blighted tree.

Now is the time to add to our flag the 50th and final star. Now is the time to give fulfillment to the veiled assurances given over half a century that Hawaii would someday become a State.

Now is the time to link that fleet of islands anchored in the sea inseparably to our shores, so that no world event will ever take them from us.

I would like to read an excerpt from an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 3:

> Nothing has been more impressive in the recent discussion of this issue than the flimsiness of the arguments of those who oppose statehood. Sometimes these arguments are directly contradictory, as when some critics charge that Hawaii is in the hands of a few large corporations, while others claim it is really ruled by henchmen of Harry Bridges. Sometimes these arguments enter the realm of fantasy, as when they allege that admission of Hawaii as a State would give Communist propaganda grounds for accusing us of colonial imperialism.
>
> But the most unworthy argument against statehood is the one which stresses the non-Caucasian nature of most of Hawaii's population. This is racism with a vengeance and directly contradictory to every ideal of our democracy. American citizenship is not, and should never be, restricted to white men, to people of European origin, or to any other such narrow "elite." It is the glory of our Nation that here men of every color, origin, and religion have come together to live in freedom and equality, though these ideals have not everywhere been realized. Hawaiians of every background have proved their loyalty by fighting and dying for our country on equal terms with Americans from the mainland. Against that background statehood for Hawaii is an obligation the rest of us have long owed our fellow Americans who live in those beautiful islands.

A previous speaker talking about Hawaii pointed out that it was a small area which would be given four votes—two Senators and two Congressmen. I would like to point out that the same can be said of several of our present States: Vermont is one; Nevada, Delaware, Rhode Island, and so on.

Let me give you some figures dealing with the prosperity of the island.

In 1957 Hawaii experienced the most prosperous peacetime year in history; 1958 was expected to exceed this.

The per capita income of Hawaii residents reached $1,821, higher than in 24 States.

Total income was more than in eight States.

Hawaii paid $166 million in Federal taxes, more than any of 10 States.

The economy earned $23 million more than it spent in 1957.

Retail trade climbed from $612 million in 1956 to $660 million in 1975.

Defense expenditures rose from $285 million in 1956 to $308 million in 1957.

There is one other point I would like to make here.

In 1950 the citizens of Hawaii elected 63 delegates to a convention to draft a constitution for the future State of Hawaii.

Of a slate of 14 candidates endorsed by the ILWU leadership, only 3 were elected. They were:

Richard M. Kageyama, who after his election admitted he had been a Communist Party member in 1945. He was forced to resign as a delegate.

Frank G. Silva, an ILWU business agent on the Island of Kauai. After being elected he refused to tell a House Un-American Activities Subcommittee whether he was a Communist. He was expelled by the convention for "contumacious conduct."

Frank C. Luiz, an ILWU business agent on the Island of Hawaii and a member of the county civil service commission. He voted with his colleagues to oust Silva, his fellow business agent.

The Hawaii State Constitution as drafted included a provision that "no person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment." It will be the first State constitution to contain such a provision.

ILWU leaders strongly opposed ratification of the reactionary constitution. They waged a vigorous campaign to defeat it in the November 1950, general elections. Nevertheless, the constitution was ratified by the voters of Hawaii by better than a 3-to-1 margin, with a plurality of more than 55,000 votes.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have long and consistently supported statehood for Hawaii and I am glad to have this opportunity to say something here in behalf of this measure.

By virtue of its substantial population of good American citizens, its contribution in taxes to the national welfare, its size, its proximity to our mainland shores, and by virtue of its history of good Americanism, Hawaii has earned the right to statehood. A compelling additional reason for admission to statehood is the national defense requirements of our Nation. I firmly believe that granting statehood will be a positive factor for continued growth and stability in the population there, which undoubtedly would be in the interest of our national defense.

During the early part of World War II I had the privilege of spending the better part of a year in the Hawaiian Islands while training for jungle fighting in the South Pacific and performing other military duties in that area. During this stay I was in close contact with a large number of people who have lived in the Hawaiian Islands for generations and I was deeply impressed with their loyalty to America and the fine American principles by which they lived.

The record of individual heroism for America among the Hawaiians is truly outstanding. Gen. Mark Lance once described a Hawaiian regiment of World War II as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." Their superlative record in the Korean war is summarized by the House committee report as follows:

> Not one case of cowardice by a Hawaiian soldier in the face of the Communist enemy.

The statistical record of those Hawaiians giving their lives for our country in the Korean war was unsurpassed by those of any other area.

The role of Hawaii in our defense picture should never be minimized. Statehood can only increase and improve the efficacy of this role. It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be the more successful would be the control and defense of that area in case of a sudden attack. There can be no question that the State and local instrumentalities of law and order would be much more effective than the Territorial administration. Just such reasoning is embodied in a Department of Defense report of 1950, as follows:

> Statehood for Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the overall defense in the event of an emergency.
>
> Gen. Douglas MacArthur says: "Hawaii should become our 50th State." This is also the opinion of President Eisenhower, our chief military and civil authority, in 1959.

It is my understanding that this opinion is shared by the leading military authorities who have studied the question.

So, I find myself completely in harmony with the idea that it is in the national interest of our country to allow self-government in this area. They are already American citizens. They have earned the right to self-government within the Federal structure, and I am glad to raise my voice as a Floridian welcoming to the Union a beautiful sister State, Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it is with the deepest satisfaction that I address the House on this occasion. Today we are beginning for, I hope, the last time, the perennial debate on Hawaiian statehood. For 60 years the good Americans of Hawaii have waited while the Congress has delayed, stalled, considered, and reconsidered their pleas for simple justice. For 60 years they have paid taxes, served in the Nation's Armed Forces, and borne all the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship. For 60 years they have shared with their fellow Americans the hopes, the fears, the aspirations, and the frustrations which have afflicted us all. Yet for 60 years, these people have been singled out as somehow unworthy of the one inestimable privilege which everywhere else has gone hand in hand with those duties—the privilege of the vote. In return for their voteless status, they have enjoyed no special dispensation. They have been taxed without representation, they have been drafted without representation, and almost alone among American communities, they have been bombed without a voice to speak for their problems and without a vote to assert their views on this floor.

Like our newest sister State, Alaska, Hawaii has been ably and eloquently represented by its distinguished Delegate, JOHN BURNS. We who know JOHN BURNS know that any State would be proud to have him serve as one of its Representatives in the Congress. But JOHN BURNS, in spite of his contributions to our deliberations, in spite of his wise counsel, in spite of his devotion to his God and his country, has been a voteless, powerless, spectator of the legislative process. His influence has been felt, but his voice has never been heard in that sacrament of self-government, the rollcall vote.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are turning once again and, let us hope, for the last time, to an attempt to undo this ancient wrong. We are about to vote, not to confer a favor upon Hawaii, but to undo an injustice wrought on ourselves. This Hall, Mr. Chairman, is a shrine of self-government. It is a place which has been hallowed, not by the transient individuals who have served here, but by the fact that here is embodied the principle of self-government. Here is made manifest the idea of Thomas Jefferson that all just governments derive their power from the consent of the governed. In acting, within the confines of this historic Chamber, to govern peoples whose consent is not asked and whose participation is not encouraged, we have weakened by our example what we uphold with our words. Every time the Congress of the United States acts to pass legislation for the governance of a Territory when such an act could be passed by the legislature of a State, we are cheapening our own dignity and demeaning our high office, no matter how generous may be the terms of such legislation. It does not matter that this Congress has been fair and even openhanded with the American citizens of Hawaii. What does matter is that we have, by these 60 years of delay, denied that American citizens are capable of self-government. If the citizens of Hawaii, as American citizens, are unworthy of the vote, then no citizen of any State is worthy of the vote. It does not matter how that vote will be cast. I do not know, and I could not care less, how the

people of Hawaii will vote in presidential elections, or in congressional elections. There are two alternatives, Mr. Chairman. Either these people are worthy of making their own mistakes or our own constituents are not worthy to select us and, hence, we are ourselves not worthy to govern a great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Hawaiian statehood is an issue not confined to Hawaii. It sets before us, unmistakably, the question of our own belief in the American system of government. I mean to show forth my faith in that system and to vote for Hawaii's admission to the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why I favor this legislation providing for the admission of Hawaii as a State in the Union. The primary one is because it is important in the defense structure of this Nation.

HAWAII'S MILITARY IMPORTANCE

Hawaii's place in the military program of our Nation over the years is well known. After the disaster of Pearl Harbor, the islands became the major staging base and fleet service center for the successful prosecution of the Pacific conflict. Later the islands served again as a vital relay station for men and materials used against the Communists in Korea. The islands stand today as a mid-Pacific bastion; headquarters for military defense in the entire central and western Pacific.

Three outstanding military figures of this generation have gone on record in support of Hawaiian statehood. These include President Eisenhower, who endorsed statehood again, during the course of his message to this Congress.

In July of last year Gen. Douglas MacArthur had this to say:

> Hawaii should become our 50th State. No sophistry of political manipulation should delay the conferring of full status of citizenship on this loyal and devoted community.
>
> That a Nation such as ours, founded on the concepts of liberty and freedom, should further hesitate on such a basic question of right and justice is not understandable.

Retired Adm. Chester Nimitz is on record with this statement:

> I have given close study to the islands from a military and naval aspect. I perceive no objection from a military or naval standpoint to the Hawaiian Islands achieving statehood. I have great admiration and appreciation of the complete and wholehearted cooperation they gave me in the war effort.

A Department of Defense report of 1950 said:

> Statehood for Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the overall defense—in event of an emergency.

Today Hawaii's military importance increases rather than diminishes. Five major Pacific commands direct the Pacific's destiny from Hawaii.

At Pearl Harbor the joint air-sea-land Pacific command exercises control of forces from the west coast to Formosa. This command also embraces our scattered Pacific Fleet units. Within 10 miles of CincPac headquarters at Pearl Harbor are command posts for Pacific Air Force, Pacific Army, Pacific Fleet and Pacific Marine Forces.

The Army has six major posts in Hawaii. At Schofield Barracks a combat-ready Army division trains in reserve. Hickam Air Force Base is headquarters for the Pacific Air Force and nerve center for a Military Air Transport System that reaches from California to Saudi Arabia.

A combat-ready regiment of Marines with jet-fighter air arm is based at Kaneohe, Oahu.

Today as we again are faced with a situation in the Pacific that threatens national security, statehood for Hawaii would serve notice to the world and particularly to the troubled free countries of the Pacific rim that we intend to stay in the Pacific.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the other members of the Committee on Interior Affairs for bringing this legislation to the floor today for our action. I want also to commend our distinguished colleague and friend, the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS], for the untiring effort he has given to the matter of statehood for Hawaii for more than 2 years. This action is a tribute to his work and to his skill. We all congratulate him and our fellow Americans in the "Paradise of the Pacific." We welcome them into the Union. We are happy to see this gem of the West rise to the galaxy of Old Glory as its 50th star.

Mr. Chairman, this action is long overdue. It will strengthen America. I rejoice in this historic event. Aloha Hawaii!

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, aside from the overwhelming majority of the people of Hawaii who have struggled for years to gain admission of Hawaii as a State of our great American Union, I feel that I have a better basis than most people for understanding the underlying human values involved.

As the sole Member of this House from the new State of Alaska, my memory is fresh as to how it feels to be a colonial on the outside looking in as contrasted with the fulfillment of being on the inside looking out.

As a youth raised in Alaska, and an adult who has spent his mature years in Alaska, I have never been eligible, until 3 months ago, to vote in an election for President of the United States, or, until 5 months ago, to vote for Senators and a Representative in the Congress, or even for Governor.

The people of a Territory organized by the Congress under the American flag are satisfied for a period of years to conduct a program of limited self-government, under tutelage, so to speak, as preparation for eventual statehood. After having gained experience and a fair degree of political maturity and economic self-sufficiency, the people of such a Territory find themselves eager to be graduated and awarded the full measure of American political rights and responsibilities. Such full recognition is regarded as the achievement of a great goal. This is true because the people of such Territory are stanch admirers and advocates of the fundamental principle of our American system of government, loyal and devoted and patriotic American citizens. Having been for many years incorporated into the Union, and inalienably a part thereof, they have nowhere to go except statehood, other than to remain in the twilight zone of territoriality. Accordingly a denial of statehood for Hawaii at this point in our history would be a great injustice. To grant statehood to Hawaii, which I am sure this Congress is going to do, will build another monument to the greatness of the United States. Concurrently the United States will benefit by enabling full participation by the people of Hawaii in the conduct of our national affairs, thereby obtaining the benefit of the fine contributions which I know they will make as the 50th State of our great Union.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice to those who have spoken so effectively on behalf of statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, the qualifications of the Territory of Hawaii for admission to statehood are self-evident. Its people are industrious, wholeheartedly loyal to the United States, and well educated as to the responsibilities which accompany statehood. The islands themselves represent in microcosm what this Nation as a whole has so splendidly and significantly contributed to the history of civilization: the proven ability of peoples of diverse races and backgrounds to work together and live together purposefully, in harmony, and with mutual respect.

Were these not reasons enough—as I believe them to be—we cannot afford to overlook the tremendous importance of Hawaii to our national defense and security as both a bastion and an outpost in the Pacific.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, as well as for the others I have stated, I happily endorse and urge the passage of H.R. 4221.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, as has already been indicated, I was a member of the subcommittee that went to Hawaii last November. We went there for the purpose of obtaining facts. We spent 2 weeks there, not in holding hearings, not in bringing witnesses in before us with self-serving statements, as our chairman has indicated, but, rather, going to the people ourselves to get their views. We visited with people from all walks of life. We visited with people from all businesses and professions. We went into the ILWU meeting. We went into the

service clubs. We went into the schools. We went to the university and visited with the president, the professors, and members of the board of regents. We went to the FBI. We went to the chairman of the Territorial Un-American Activities Committee. We went to the IMUA organization. We talked with people on the sugar and pineapple plantations and we talked with management and labor, both. We went to the churches. We talked with the ministers and the priests. I do not know how any group could have more fully and completely obtained a cross section of the thinking and the feeling of the people than we obtained in those 2 weeks of hearings, and it is my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to give to this committee a report.

First, as the gentleman from New York has indicated, I did support statehood in the last session, but I did it with some misgivings as to whether or not communism in the islands was something that should be feared and, as my colleagues will confirm, I was like the proverbial man from Missouri, I had to be shown. I came away from the islands convinced that I could in clear conscience support statehood without any reservation. We found there a situation that is unique in the United States. The island legislature has established a Territorial Un-American Activities Committee with a full-time staff, a committee whose purpose it is to talk with the FBI, to work with the FBI and other organizations in seeking out and providing to the Governor of the islands and to the legislature of the islands such information as they are able to obtain on subversive activities in the islands. This organization works very closely with another group known as the IMUA, which is composed of a group of patriotic, hard-working, conscientious businessmen who also have a staff of employees and whose sole purpose it is to keep the people of the islands informed on any subversive activities. They name names. They do a good job not only of informing the people of the islands what the activity may be but also informing the voters on what candidates are receiving political support of ILWU and support of those who have in the past been named as subversives.

On the other side of the coin, however, there is no evidence to indicate that those who have been named in previous congressional committee reports or who were convicted under the Smith Act have actually changed their spots, except that our committee was told by Jack Hall that he and the other five persons who were so convicted would take an oath that they have not been affiliated with the Communist Internationale for more than 5 years. I should point out, however, that none of the six have gone to the FBI or to the Territorial Un-American Activities Committee and attempted in any way to offer their services or their assistance or their information to these organizations in connection with helping to stamp out communism or the effects of communism either on the islands or on the mainland. I do not condone this action or lack of action. On the other hand, I do believe that the situation is under better control on the islands than it is in most of the areas on the mainland.

We were told that there are about 25 people in the islands who, down through the years, have been identified with the Communist movement; but the significant thing is, there has been no new activity since the trials under the Smith Act several years ago. We were told that these trials had crippled the Communist apparatus and that under the white light of publicity in recent years and a constantly alerted citizenry, it would remain under control either as a Territory or as a State.

We talked the problem of communism with everyone in all walks of life from the president of the university to the chairman of the board of regents, to the men in business throughout the islands, to workers, to the owners of the ranches, the plantations, the tourist attraction operators, and almost without exception we were told that communism is no greater a problem on the islands than it is on the mainland, and that this issue should not be used as a valid argument against statehood.

I had the privilege of asking Admiral Felt, the Supreme Commander of the Pacific, what effect statehood would have in the Pacific. His answer was that it was his considered opinion that to refuse Hawaii statehood, after granting it to Alaska, would be a serious blow to our position in the Far East.

Mr. Chairman, I am not supporting statehood because of our international relations. I am supporting it because 60 years ago we promised statehood to these people when they could prove they were ready for it.

Mr. Chairman, they have today proven they are ready for full citizenship and statehood rights, and I am prepared to cast my vote to give it to them and to bring this great area into the Union of United States.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to state for the record that when rollcall No. 9, on the rule for the Hawaiian statehood bill, was taken, I was at the Department of the Interior on official business in connection with the acquisition of lands involved in the Gettysburg battlefield area. Had I been present I would have voted for the rule.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, I realize, being a neophyte, that anything I might say here has been thoroughly discussed in an analytical sense relative to the admission of a State to the Union.

After all, Congress acts purely as the machinery of government toward this accomplishment—granting admission upon the manifest approval of all of the people of the United States. It should not be determined in Congress by sectional division based on political or racial bias.

Hawaii has contributed much to the defense of the Union. Hawaii is a strategic place. We are spending millions of dollars upon various geographical sites for the protection of America. How can we now deny people of the Republic, who are stepcitizens or secondary citizens, the right to what they have earned—a voice in Government?

I say to you that we, as servants of the people, can only analyze this question from the standpoint of what is the fundamental belief of each citizen of the United States relative to the entry of Hawaii; and I am sure that the public press and other disseminators of information—the radio and television—have indicated to us that the people of America are asking that you admit Hawaii into the Union; that you facilitate this matter; that you create, in Hawaii, a spiritual and cultural feeling of contribution to the common cause of the United States; that you, in your honest endeavors, set aside any political question or any question based upon the contribution of the economy of Hawaii to this great Government.

On the other hand, the people of America are asking that you admit Hawaii because they are fellow Americans; that they have a common interest; that they have a constitution similar to our own; that they are a proud State, too, except that, as a Territory, we gave them the opportunity to work toward the successful accomplishment, in the future, of becoming a State in the Union.

Some of us seem to feel that it is a personal opinion for determination, or is related to political questions of our State or on consideration of financial factors, each contributing to a background which might negate or approve the acceptance of Hawaii.

This is a national question—whether Hawaii as a State in the Union will contribute to the common cause of the American citizenry in maintaining its democratic institutions and establishing a firm government.

You cannot deny Hawaii the right to participate in our governmental affairs. In order that she might participate, you must recognize her as a State. It is an edict already determined by the American people.

I thank you very much.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express my support for the Hawaiian statehood bill. The people of Hawaii have proved themselves to be good citizens and good Americans in time of war and in peacetime. They are entitled to full and equal rights of citizenship including voting representation in Congress, the right to choose their own elected officials at all levels of government, and a full share of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

By every type of measurement, the people of Hawaii have proved that they are worthy of statehood. Hawaii is economically strong, industrious, and prosperous. Per capita income is higher than that of 25 other States. Industry is becoming ever more diversified. Its population is growing rapidly. Its agricultural economy is sound. The people of Hawaii pay more Federal income taxes

than 10 other States. Hawaiians are well educated and alert to the responsibilities of citizenship.

As the test tube of democracy in the Pacific, Hawaiians have proved that peoples of varied racial, cultural, economic, and political backgrounds can live and work together to build a truly American society in the best traditions of our democratic system. Admission of Hawaii as a State will serve as an example to the peoples of the vast Pacific and Far East that we practice democracy as well as preach it in our relations with other countries.

Statehood for Hawaii has been endorsed by both political parties and by virtually every important organization representing the views of farmers, workers, and industry. The people of the United States have time and again registered an overwhelming support for statehood in public opinion polls. The statehood bill has been passed by three previous Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Hawaii are ready for the responsibility of statehood. They are entitled to statehood. Let us act now to fulfill their destiny by voting overwhelmingly to make Hawaii our 50th State.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, we are here today to do justice to half a million Americans by granting statehood to Hawaii. The next step, logically and morally, should be restoring home rule to the District of Columbia.

There are those who think we can continue, indefinitely, to deny justice to the nearly 1 million people of Washington. I do not believe this House will accept that argument. In spite of the opponents and the doubters, we have granted statehood to Alaska. We are acting now to grant statehood to Hawaii. We should move on, and soon, to home rule for the District.

Four times in the past 9 years, home rule has been approved by the other body. Each time, it has died for lack of action in this House. The responsibility is ours and we must meet it—and soon.

Under the circumstances, it is ironic that the motto of the District of Columbia is "justitia omnibus"—justice to all. Perhaps this motto was chosen back in the days when the District had its own government. Otherwise it is a cruel joke. What kind of justice is it that prevents 825,000 Americans from running even their own local affairs—takes their taxes but denies them a voice in the spending of their taxes? What right do we have to tell nearly a million people—American citizens like ourselves—that they are second-class citizens who shall have no vote, no voice in their own affairs?

I personally want a chance to vote on the issue. A number of bills have been introduced in this House, with bipartisan backing, to restore home rule to Washington. I trust we will soon have an opportunity to vote on this issue and do justice to all the people of Washington.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as favoring the admission of Hawaii as a State. The 85th Congress will be remembered as the Congress that admitted Alaska to the Union. It would be fitting for the 86th Congress to be remembered as the Congress which granted statehood to Hawaii.

Hawaii is both economically and politically fully ready to assume the status of a State. The argument of noncontiguity has been raised against statehood for Hawaii. This is an outmoded argument in the present air and space age. Since the admission of Alaska as our 49th State the argument of noncontiguity is overruled.

Hawaii is American, and as such its people are full United States citizens and deserve full representation in the Congress as well as the authority to handle local problems locally as a State, rather than as an incorporated Federal Territory.

It is my sincere desire and hope that the 1st session of the 86th Congress will be the time when Hawaii and her people attain the status of first-class citizenship. We should pass the bill for statehood for Hawaii today.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following the question by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] an explanation of the difference between an incorporated Territory and an unincorporated Territory, and the status of the island of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the trust territories.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so be permitted to extend their remarks on the pending bill at the conclusion of general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LIMITATIONS ON USE OF APPENDIX

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a suggestion on how certain changes might be made to facilitate the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If I am correctly informed, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was designed to record the proceedings and debates of Congress, which it does with a remarkable degree of accuracy.

Perhaps I am too critical, and again it may be because I am constantly trying to find ways in which this Congress can save money, but I have some suggestions which I think might serve a good purpose.

During the 10 years I have served in this body I have witnessed an increasing abuse of the privilege Members have of extending their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is becoming more time consuming all the time and from year to year, to attempt to peruse the great volume of extraneous material that appears in the Appendix, and no wonder some Members have felt the need of an administrative assistant, even if he did nothing else than to note the extensions which are made in the Appendix.

However, I believe the need for this additional employee might be lessened, if the Appendix could be edited and classified, and another section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be set aside under a separate title to properly identify material other than remarks of Members and material pertinent to legislation. This in itself might not reduce the cost of printing, but after having some of our extensions consigned to that section of the RECORD, I rather imagine there would be fewer requests for insertions of such inconsequential material that is unrelated to legislation or the actions of Congress. More effective, however, would be the placing of a limitation on the number of times during a session or the amount of space which any one Member might use during a session. At $85 a page, the saving would be no small item in the course of a year. Such limitation would also offer an opportunity to decline requests for insertions of such material.

On Monday of this week unanimous consent for extensions in the Appendix of the RECORD was granted to 1 Member in 10 instances; to 2 Members in 8 instances; to another, 7; to another in 6 instances; to 5 Members in 5 instances; and to 15 other Members in from 2 to 4 instances.

If Congress—and Members of the House of Representatives are not the only ones at fault—persists in wasting the taxpayers money in this fashion, not to mention other ways which have been more widely publicized, how can we expect to convince anyone that we are interested in economy or capable of fiscal responsibility?

NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, few in this Congress are not concerned over Supreme Court decisions in recent years which, whatever their legal merits, cer-

tainly did not implement the obvious intent of Congress in enacting the various laws in question.

In no case has Congress' purpose been more clearly thwarted than by court interpretation of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 in the now famous Phillips Petroleum decision.

I have today introduced, again as in the last Congress, in cosponsorship with the very able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a simple measure which attempts no far-reaching overhaul of basic law. As a matter of fact, it simply restates and so clarifies section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, that all who read it may determine that it means just what the Federal Power Commission, the gas producers generally, and most other moderately intelligent though perhaps legalistically unsophisticated minds had always thought it meant prior to the Supreme Court's Phillips decision.

Section 1 of the act reads:

Section 1(b) (15 U.S.C. 717): "The provisions of this chapter * * * shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas."

FINANCING OF TVA POWER PROGRAM

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Committee on Public Works today relative to H.R. 3460.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the House Public Works Committee this forenoon in opposition to H.R. 3460, a bill which among other things would permit the TVA to float its own bonds.

My statement to that committee follows:

I understand that only 2 days of hearings have been scheduled on this bill, H.R. 3460, one to hear the proponents and one to hear the opponents. Frankly, I am surprised that no more time is being taken on a bill that, if enacted, would have such serious and far-reaching adverse effects on the future of this beloved Nation of ours. It would be just a forerunner of other similar assaults on the principles and standards upon which this Nation was founded in keeping with the Constitution.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, I particularly object to the H.R. 3460 bond issue proposal for future financing of the Tennessee Valley Authority power program. This proposal is nothing more than an attempt to bypass the Appropriations Committee and to eliminate the control of the elected Representatives of the American people, in Congress assembled. It is also an attempt to create a hydra-headed entity that would have a primary obligation to the bondholders and a secondary obligation to the American people. Its control would rest in the hands of three men not elected by the people, who in effect have more power to control the destinies and welfare of the region within which the TVA operates than do the Governors of the States involved.

The proposed revenue-bond method of obtaining funds for TVA, bonds without the full faith and credit of the Federal Government back of them, is something new in Federal agency financing. If permitted, it could be the beginning of widespread extension to other agencies of the Federal Government. It is contrary to the provisions and intent of the Constitution of the United States. It is not in keeping with the principles and standards upon which this Nation was founded.

I believe that Congress has the right and the duty to pass annually upon the financing of the Federal Government and its various agencies. This right is inherent in the Constitution that provides that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Year after year proposals are made to use the back-door approach to the Federal Treasury or to obtain money for Federal agencies or programs by methods not in keeping with the Constitution of the United States.

Believing as I do that this bond issue proposal and many other features of H.R. 3460 are not in keeping with the Constitution and the basic principles on which this Nation was founded, I am dutybound to oppose it with all the strength at my command. I can do no less.

As I read this bill it would have the following effect:

Practically remove TVA from any congressional control.

Set up a method of financing a Federal agency that is not in accord with the Constitution and the principles on which this Nation was founded.

Provide no real limitation on the area in which TVA power could be utilized.

Repeal present law providing for repayment of $1,200 million of taxpayers' funds appropriated for TVA power facilities and replace this requirement with a substitute that would permit up to 120 years or more for such repayment.

Make no provision for payment into the Treasury of an amount comparable to Federal taxes paid by most non-Federal utilities.

Provide for no repayment of, or interest on, the $500 million of the Federal investment made in TVA power facilities through the use of power revenues we have been told belonged to all the people. (Actually a large part of these revenues were derived from Federal agencies.)

Twenty years ago I stood on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and took my first oath of office as a representative of the Seventh District of the State of Iowa. I have repeated that oath for each of the Congresses since that time, and so long as there is a breath in my body I shall honor that oath. You are familiar with the oath but for the RECORD I repeat it here:

"I, BEN F. JENSEN, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

In the Constitution of the United States which each of the people's representatives in Congress took an oath to uphold, our forefathers set up a system of checks and balances so that the rights and freedoms on which this great Nation was founded would long endure.

First, was the Congress itself which was to enact the Federal laws in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution.

Second, was the executive department of the Federal Government which was to carry out, in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution, the laws enacted by the Congress.

Third, was the Supreme Court which was to rule on the question as to whether the laws enacted by the Congress were in accord with the Constitution.

In connection with the matter before us relative to the amendment of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, I think each Member of Congress in passing on these proposals must ask himself: "Is the position I am taking in keeping with my oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States?" It is my belief that the bill under consideration here is not in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. I am afraid that we too often give little consideration to this matter of the constitutionality of laws proposed for passage by the Congress, thinking, in too many cases, that after all, "we have the Supreme Court to rule on such matters." Yet in many, if not most instances, it is almost impossible to get the matter brought before the Supreme Court for judicial determination. And there are those who question whether the Supreme Court itself has of late been properly exercising the powers assigned to it. It seems to me under the circumstances, each Member should endeavor to analyze for himself whether he is acting and voting in accordance with his oath of office to uphold the Constitution of these United States of America.

It is my belief that a servile Congress, in 1933, created in the Tennessee Valley Authority a separate "socialistic empire" within these United States that has now grown into a Frankenstein monster that wants to throw off the controls of the body that created it. I for one will not shirk my duty to fight for the preservation of the constitutional obligation to maintain the congressional authority prescribed by that great document and to regain those controls already relinquished. If the people of the Tennessee Valley and their representatives in Congress, after having been the recipient of nearly $2 billion of the fruit of the labor and sweat of the taxpayers of the Nation, now want to be relieved of further control by the people's representatives in Congress, I would think more of them if they asked permission to secede from the Union. But no, they want to continue to benefit at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation without assuming their fair share of the cost and without being subject to control by the people's representatives in Congress as are other areas of the Nation.

There were voices in Congress when the TVA Act was originally passed that warned of the dangers of approving this socialistic measure. Representative RICH said on the floor of the House:

"We speak today of Muscle Shoals as being the Norris bill and it was suggested here that it ought to be designated the "Norris bill." If I were to designate the bill, I would call it the Norris folly, and I think probably this would be the best interpretation we could give it, because if we are going to start out today on this gigantic plan of putting the Government in business, I believe it is the opening wedge for the greatest piece of socialistic legislation that has come up before the House of Representatives in the past 2 years that I have been here. It is socialism and Russianism on a gigantic scale."

And Representative Eaton said:

"When the great Russian Soviet experiment was launched I made up my mind and have never changed it since, that when that experiment was developed it would have but one rival in the world. That was the wonderful social experiment known as the United States of America. Either the whole

world would become Russian or the whole world would become American. The two principles are as far apart as the poles, as light and darkness. Of course, they will modify each other tremendously in their application. But before civilization has settled down it must and will determine whether it is to be dominated by the Russian principle or the American principle.

"This bill, and every bill like it, is simply an attempt to graft onto our American system the Russian idea and make the Government everything and the citizen nothing.

"The great ideal of American civilization is that the individual is the end of the civilizing process. Our Government exists to give him a chance to make a man of himself. The Government is the umpire in the game. When it takes the field in hurtful competition with its own citizens, it ceases to be American."

Representative Treadway pointed out that the TVA bill was brought up after a few days' hearings on the general subject matter and was to be voted upon with only 2 days' consideration and said:

"In 2 days, therefore, we are to pass upon a program of such magnitude that it is difficult to visualize. Not only are we setting the Government up permanently in the fertilizer and power business, but we are undertaking a program for the general development of one section of the country at the expense of the Public Treasury that may take 50 years to complete. We are committing the Government to an ultimate expenditure that may run into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and because the Executive has asked for this measure this Democratic-controlled Congress is going to place its rubber stamp of approval upon it without even permitting the dotting of an 'i' or crossing of a 't' and without fully realizing the consequences of its actions."

And as Raymond Moley wrote in the booklet "Valley Authorities" published by the American Enterprise Association:

"This grand design, however nobly conceived, could hardly have been sustained either by a reasonably obedient Congress or by the Supreme Court of that time. Hence, the early requests for appropriations were, in the light of what happened later, relatively modest. And the professed purposes in the bill submitted to Congress were hardly descriptive of the immense authority which eventually took form. To suggest that there be lavished vast treasure on a relatively small section of the Nation at the expense of all would have aroused an opposition of other sections that would have quickly manifested itself in Congress. And such a stupendous piece of paternalism could never have been squeezed through the Constitution, despite the fact that the general welfare clause was already opening the crack which was later to be a veritable breach."

How much farther are we to go? Are we to abdicate our responsibilities to the people who elected us? Are we to abdicate our responsibilities under the Constitution which we swore to uphold? And that is just what we will be doing if we pass this proposed bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. It is but another big step down the road to socialism. Norman Thomas, the perennial Socialist candidate for President so aptly described TVA as "the only genuinely socialistic act in the New Deal—a flower in the midst of weeds."

A little of the history of events leading up to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act discloses the underlying objectives of its early proponents.

The Socialist Party platform in 1926 had these planks among others:

"1. Nationalization of our natural resources, beginning with the coal mines and water sites, particularly at Boulder Dam and Muscle Shoals.

"2. A publicly owned giant power system under which the Federal Government shall cooperate with the States and municipalities in the distribution of electrical energy to the people at cost."

All during the 1920's the Public Ownership League (under the active guidance of its secretary, Carl D. Thompson, a prominent Socialist who formerly was head of the Socialist Party Information Bureau) together with the socialistic League for Industrial Democracy (formerly the Intercollegiate Socialist Society) were actively promoting the socialization of all electric power in the country.

The December 1923 issue of the Public Ownership magazine, an official publication of the Public Ownership League, announced the calling of a conference to launch "a movement for nationwide public hydroelectric and superpower for the conservation and utilization of the water powers of the country for the production of electric energy at cost."

And listed the purposes of the conferences, one of which was—

"To draft suitable measures for introduction in Congress, providing for a national superpower system."

It went on to say that—

"U.S. Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, has agreed to introduce and is now at work drafting suitable measures providing for the public superpower system."

Such a bill, S. 2790, was introduced by Senator Norris on March 10, 1924, and, according to the league, the bill was to provide for Muscle Shoals to be a part of the proposed superpower system. This broad bill got almost no support in Congress and was allowed to die.

In 1926 Senator Norris introduced S. 2147, to create a Federal Power Corporation in the Tennessee Valley. The emphasis of this bill also was on power development, not on navigation and flood control, and was not enacted into law. In 1937 a somewhat similar bill, Senate Joint Resolution 163, was introduced and also failed of enactment into law.

Having failed to obtain passage of the bills on Muscle Shoals that gave emphasis to power, the next step was the proposal to develop the Tennessee River under the subterfuge that navigation and flood control would be the primary purposes, with power production incidental.

Ostensibly, the Tennessee Valley Authority was to be a navigation, flood-control, and resource-development agency wherein electric power was to be incidental to these primary purposes. This stated purpose was, of course, a subterfuge to the real purpose of its promoters, who even then intended it to be the beginning of a gigantic socialistic superpower empire, the forerunner of similar empires throughout this beloved freedom-loving country of ours.

The officials of the TVA itself during the early years of its existence tried to keep up this subterfuge during their presentations to the U.S. court regarding the TVA activities and program for expansion. Shortly thereafter TVA began a gradual usurpation and claiming of authority to do the very things TVA had told the U.S. courts and the Congress it would not do.

The record is clear that TVA needs more congressional control, not less. The act should be amended to regain the needed control, not to give away what little we now have.

I think it might be well here to place in the RECORD at this point some excerpts of what TVA told the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, on January 8, 1937. The excerpts follow:

"The Authority has constructed and recommended for construction only such dams as are necessary for the improvement of navigation and control of destructive floods on the Tennessee and Mississippi River systems. * * * There are numerous sites upon the Tennessee River system which are valuable for the development of power, but dams constructed at such sites would not contribute substantially to the improvement of navigation or the control of destructive floods, although their construction would be more feasible for the development of power than any of the dams constructed, under construction, or recommended for construction by the Authority; but the Authority has not constructed or recommended for construction and has no intention and no authority under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to construct such dams.

* * * * *

"It is true that by the terms of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act the steam electric generating plant located at Sheffield, Ala., near Wilson Dam, was turned over to the defendant Tennessee Valley Authority. But the defendants allege that the said steam electric generating plant has not been and is not being operated and that there is no plan or intention to operate said plant now or in the future, or to construct or operate any other steam electric generating plants. The said plant is merely held by the defendant Tennessee Valley Authority as an emergency standby plant for national defense purposes in connection with the munitions plants located near Muscle Shoals, Ala.

"The defendant, Tennessee Valley Authority has disposed of and will dispose of only such electric energy as is generated from waterpower inevitably created by the operation of the said dams for navigation and flood control and which is not needed for governmental purposes and which would otherwise be wasted. * * * By the mandate of the said act, the Tennessee Valley Authority is directed to give preference to public agencies in the sale of power and other public property. But defendants deny that they have promoted public ownership for the distribution of electric energy. The defendants deny that they have incited municipalities, or any other customers of the complainants, or any of them, to breach existing contracts with the complainants or to purchase their power requirements from the defendant Tennessee Valley Authority. * * * The defendants allege that in every instance of applications for service received by the Tennessee Valley Authority from the communities within the area, such applications have been made upon the initiative of the communities involved, without solicitation or incitation upon the part of the defendants."

The record shows that TVA has failed to adhere to any of these solemn statements as to its future operations. Do you wonder why I say TVA needs more congressional control, not less?

A few years after the above statements to the high U.S. Court, which TVA never adhered to, we find Mr. Fitts, a high TVA official who had participated in the preparation of the above-mentioned case to the U.S. Court, now telling a Congressional committee that TVA had the authority to construct steam electric generating plants. He told a congressional committee, however, that such authority was limited to the Tennessee River Valley. Excerpts from his statement follow:

"My own view about the limitations now in the statute are * * * that the TVA is authorized to construct dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries provided that those dams are related to navigation and flood control in a material sense and further, is authorized to construct steam plants to operate in conjunction with those dams within the Tennessee watershed.

Mr. Clason then asked Mr. Fitts:

"Will you refer us to the section that would limit you to the Tennessee Valley watershed?"

Mr. Fitts answered: "Yes, sir. Section 4(j)."

Section 4(j) provides that TVA "shall have power to construct such dams, and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as in conjunction with Wilson Dam, and Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, now under construction, will provide a nine-foot channel in the said river and maintain a water supply for the same, from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control destructive flood waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River drainage basins; and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines. The directors of the Authority are hereby directed to report to Congress their recommendations not later than April 1, 1936, for the unified development of the Tennessee River system."

Mr. Fitts went on to say:

"Now, it is my conception, and it always has been ever since I have been the one assigned to construe this statute, that the power to construct generating plants is contained in this provision, and that it is limited to the construction of generating plants within the basin of the Tennessee River.

* * * * *

"I think it has the right to construct a steam-generating plant that is an auxiliary to an existing hydroelectric system and it is located within the Tennessee River Valley."

Yet the record shows that TVA soon ignored the limitation their own solicitor said was in the law and constructed the Shawnee and Gallatin steam plants outside the Tennessee River Valley and attempted to get a third plant constructed at Fulton, Ky. Only recently, I was told in a letter from TVA that they now consider that they have the authority to construct steam electric plants inside or outside the Tennessee River Valley.

In view of this record of progressive usurpation by TVA of powers and authority which they formerly disclaimed, do you wonder that I say TVA must have greater congressional control, not less, and that the TVA Act should be amended to reestablish those controls inherent under the Constitution of the United States?

I want to quote what Representative Dondero, a learned and beloved former colleague of ours and former chairman of this committee, said on the floor of the House on February 15, 1949, when he decried the socialistic proposal to appropriate money to TVA to construct steam electric plants. His statement is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I want to be recorded, as I have been in the past, that I am not opposed to the development of power in the river basins of our country by the Federal Government. With the demand that exists all over the Nation for power I think that is essential and necessary. What I am opposed to and where we divide with minds in this body is the projection of the Federal Government into the sale of power as a private distributor and in competition with investment already made by the citizens of this country and already serving the area where these new projects may come into being.

"In a hearing before the Committee on Public Works last year the year before it was developed that if the Federal Government were compelled to pay the taxes, overhead expenses, interest involved in borrowing money, payment of dividends, the Federal Government could not produce 1 kilowatt of power cheaper than private industry and private investment is now producing it in this country. It is because of that unfair advantage by the Federal Government in projecting itself into the power field in competition with private enterprise that sooner or later if the step we are taking today is extended and expanded private enterprise in the power field will vanish from the American scene. That is socialization of industry. If it is so desirable to socialize electric power, will someone get up on this floor and tell the Nation why it should not be projected into all the other activities of American life—communications, transportation, mines, food, clothing, and others. But after we have done all of that, we will have brought to America an ideology that is foreign to the standards and the basic principles upon which this Nation stands, and the Republic of the United States will disappear.

Congress is now confronted with a proposal that the Tennessee Valley Authority construct and operate a steam electric generating plant. This is unusual, and in fact an unprecedented request. The Federal Government in the past has constructed and operated steam plants, but in every such case the legal background for such authorization has been on the basis of national defense. The classic example, of course, is the still existing steam plant at Muscle Shoals, created under the War Powers Act of 1916 and constructed for the purpose of the manufacture of nitrates for ammunition. Similarly, in 1940, a large steam plant was constructed at Watts Bar, Tenn., as a part of the equipment of the TVA for the purpose of augmenting the generating capacity to meet national defense demands. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission, at Oak Ridge, has one of the largest steam electric plants in the world, wholly devoted to generating power for the manufacture of atomic bombs.

"With none of these projects has any objection ever been raised as they obviously follow the familiar pattern necessary to national preservation.

"In the case of the pending proposal for the construction of a plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., the matter of national defense is not used as a justification.

"The lack of such justification indicates that the administration is prepared to establish a new precedent: That the Federal Government shall accept as a normal function the business of producing and selling power commercially, not incidental to any other necessary and constitutional functions of Government. The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects.

"Mr. Chairman, I was saying when I was interrupted a few minutes ago that the proposal pending before the Congress is unique in some other respects.

"The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects. For example, it is presented as a deficiency appropriation. Until now, deficiencies, have always been appropriated only for the continuance of enterprises and projects already previously authorized and for which funds have already been appropriated. In this case the Congress not only has not authorized and appropriated money for the steam plant, but in fact only a few months ago Congress by rollcall votes—two in the House of Representatives—flatly rejected the proposal to construct this very same project. No one has yet explained satisfactorily how a deficiency appropriation could be made for a project never originated and for which no money was ever appropriated.

"There is a strong doubt that such an appropriation would be legal inasmuch as there is nothing in the organic TVA Act as amended which permits the construction of new steam plants. Even if the act did so provide, it would be patently unconstitutional. The TVA was created for the purpose of harnessing the Tennessee River so that its facilities for navigation would be improved and so that its floods would be controlled. As Senator Norris once said, 'These are the constitutional pegs upon which the Tennessee Valley Authority Act must rest under the commerce clause of the Constitution.'

"There must be some lurking doubts as to the acceptance of this long step in the direction of socialism in the minds of its proponents. Otherwise the problem would have been approached in the normal parliamentary manner and under normal parliamentary procedure. The atmosphere of candor is lacking in the procedure by which this bill arrives before the House.

"On February 3, 1949, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, acting either in that capacity or as chairman of the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, appeared before the Rules Committee and asked for a rule to obtain debate on the bill on February 4. He appeared before the Rules Committee without a bill. The Appropriations Committee itself had not met to discuss the matter. As I understand it, there had not been a formal marking up of the bill by the Deficiency Subcommittee—although this may have happened among the majority members. Thanks to the wise decision of the senior Member of this House, both in age and in consecutive legislative experience—the chairman of the Rules Committee—the proposal was given short shrift.

"In my long service in this House I recall no incident where the chairman of a committee requested a rule of the Rules Committee before his own committee had even held a meeting to consider the measure.

"This is a house of the representatives of the people of the United States. Whether they bear the label "Democrat" or "Republican," every Member of this House is sworn to sustain the Constitution and to put flag and country before partisanship. On that basis every Member in this House has a right to resent parliamentary tactics that would have been scorned by the so-called, rubberstamp Congresses of the early New Deal.

"A century ago Karl Marx published the Communist Manifesto. The past century has been the bloodiest, the cruelest, and in many ways the most catastrophic century in the history of mankind. The forces let loose by this evil dream of Karl Marx are reaping their harvests down to the present day. Only now a cardinal of the Holy Roman Catholic Church awaits his fate at the hands of a Marxian court because he placed God before the Soviet Caesars. For his courage he may hang, or spend his life in a convict's cell, or in the mercy of this Marxian court his term may be shortened. Marxism in Hungary is no different than Marxism in America, except in degree.

"Socialism is a complete word. It needs no qualification. An activity of government is either socialistic or it is not socialistic.

"This continent was peopled by men and women whose whole philosophy is a rejection of socialism and the planned state idea as conceived by Karl Marx. It was pioneered by men and women who believe in God, and in America.

"This small item in the deficiency appropriation calling for the beginning of construction of a steam plant for the TVA is little in itself, but the potentialities as a precedent can involve enormous sums as the curse of socialized power spreads like a creeping paralysis over the economy of our Nation."

Its proponents had no illusions as to the real purpose of the original act and the contemplated extension to all parts of the country. Representative Byrns in the debate on the bill said:

"Our great leader in the White House has had the vision to see what it will mean to the great section of my own State in the development of the great Tennessee River Valley Basin and he has stated that in his opinion, it is simply the forerunner of similar developments which will take place throughout the country. * * * It means also, that if the investment is to be operated by the Government, it will present a yardstick by which the utility commissions of this country will know, in exact figures, just what it costs to produce power and thereby fix the rate to the great consuming public accordingly."

Nor can there be any doubt that the intent to force the existing private utility systems out of business in the area to be served was contemplated by its proponents at the time of the enactment of the bill. Mr. Almon, who said he, Mr. McSwain, and Mr. Hill had introduced identical bills, had this to say on the bill.

"The enactment of this legislation will make provision for the sale of power at a fair price. The bill as amended is fair to the power interests in that no competing lines will be constructed by the Government unless the power company refuses to sell their lines. This legislation will fix a yardstick for the price of power in that locality, and if the power company does not make their rates to conform to same, let them go out of business in that locality."

In contrast to this the TVA officials in the early days told the Congress that they could operate in conjunction with the local private utilities and would not destroy the people's investment in these companies. The record is clear that this was not true.

TVA said in official press releases and in testimony before congressional committees that it was to be a yardstick for electric power, a fair yardstick that would provide for all the cost that a private utility had to pay, i.e., interest, State, local, and Federal taxes equivalent to the rate private utilities would pay, depreciation, and all other operating and maintenance expenses; and would amortize not only the power investment but the nonpower investment as well. Notwithstanding all the false claims to the contrary, TVA has not done these things it claimed it was going to do. In connection with this TVA yardstick business, Mr. Clapp, Chairman of the TVA Board, even had the effrontery to make the following statement before a Senate committee in 1947:

"Senator FERGUSON. At one time, was it not supposed to be used as a yardstick for private industry?

"Mr. CLAPP. Well, there have been claims made that the TVA power system would set up a yardstick. The TVA has not developed or elaborated on that or made that claim."

Do you wonder why I place little confidence in TVA?

Now I would like to talk a little about the area within which TVA now serves, and the additional area within which it could serve under the present act and under the amendment as proposed in H.R. 3460 and similar bills.

The original TVA Act provided that TVA could dispose of its surplus electric power within transmission distance of the place where it was generated. This was, of course, a rather loose limitation on the area within which TVA could operate. There has been an almost continuous expansion of TVA over the years to the present service area of about 80,000 square miles, or double the area of the Tennessee River Valley itself.

In the TVA annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the future TVA power policy was reported on pages 22 through 24. The areas in which TVA initially and ultimately proposed to serve were outlined as follows:

"To provide a workable and economic basis of operations, the Authority plans initially to serve certain definite regions and to develop its program in those areas before going outside.

"The initial areas selected by the Authority may be roughly described as (a) the region immediately proximate to the route of the transmission line soon to be constructed by the Authority between Muscle Shoals and the site of Norris Dam; (b) the region in proximity to Muscle Shoals, including northern Alabama and northeastern Mississippi; and (c) the region in the proximity of Norris Dam (the new source of power to be constructed by the Authority on the Clinch River in northeast Tennessee).

"At a later stage in the development it is contemplated to include, roughly, the drainage area of the Tennessee River in Kentucky, Alabama, Georgia, and North Carolina, and that part of Tennessee which lies east of the west margin of the Tennessee drainage area.

"To make the area a workable one and a fair measure of public ownership, it should include several cities of substantial size (such as Chattanooga and Knoxville) and ultimately, at least one city of more than a quarter million within transmission distance, such as Birmingham, Memphis, Atlanta, or Louisville.

"While it is the Authority's present intention to develop its power program in the above-described territory before considering going outside, the Authority may go outside the area if there are substantial changes in general conditions, facts, or governmental policy, which would necessarily require a change in this policy of regional development, or if the privately owned utilities in the area do not cooperate in the working out of the program.

"Nothing in the procedure here adopted is to be construed in any sense a commitment against extending the Authority's power operations outside the area selected, if the above conditions or the public interest require. Where special considerations exist, justifying the Authority's going outside this initial area, the Authority will receive and consider applications based on such special considerations. Among such special considerations would be unreasonably high rates for service and a failure or absence of public regulation to protect the public interest.

"Every effort will be made by the Authority to avoid the construction of duplicate physical facilities, or wasteful competitive practices. Accordingly, where existing lines of privately owned utilities are required to accomplish the Authority's objectives, as outlined above, a genuine effort will be made to purchase such facilities from the private utilities on an equitable basis.

"Accounting should show detail of costs, and permit a comparison of operations with privately owned plants, to supply a yardstick and an incentive to both private and public managers."

This and later statements of TVA officials before congressional committees on the subject of the area to be served leave little doubt that TVA considers the availability of electric power the only legal limitation on the area it can now serve. With annual power revenues of over a quarter million dollars and the $750 million from bond issues permitted under H.R. 3460 as written, this power availability limitation would be seriously weakened. The potentially possible curtailment of 3 million kilowatts or more of Federal loads on the TVA system could also create considerable pressure to expand to new markets.

I seriously question whether the area limitation now proposed can effectively resist or prevent the pressure for expansion created by the existence of large surplus power capacity derived through major curtailment of existing Federal loads and the construction of new generating capacity.

Under the present knowledge in the art of electric power transmission, power is now being directly transmitted a distance of 280 miles in the United States and 625 miles in Europe. Plans are underway for the construction of a transmission line of some 680 miles in length in Argentina. Studies and experiments now underway may extend the potential transmission distance to in excess of 750 miles. It can be seen that under the present law, insofar as the physical and legal limitations are concerned, the area within which TVA could transmit and dispose of electric power would be that area within something over 600 miles from the TVA generating plants.

In other words, at the present time the TVA for all practical purposes has an unlimited area within which it could physically and legally transmit electric power if it had the facilities to generate such power. And under their present interpretation of the TVA Act they could, without telling Congress in advance, use power revenues to finance and construct a transmission line to distant markets if they saw fit to do so. Congressman JOHN TABER and I recently asked the TVA to furnish us a map showing the area within which the TVA believed it had authority to transmit and dispose of electric power. This request was made several months ago and to date they have failed to comply with the request, saying that with regard to the TVA service area—

"The TVA Board has had no interest in expanding this area to serve all markets within transmission distance and has never had occasion therefore to try to determine the limits of the area which TVA could legally serve."

It will be noted that TVA does not mention anything about the fact that they might some time in the future decide to construct a transmission line to serve one or more distant markets. They only say they have had no interest in serving all potential markets within transmission distance. It is this sort of evasive answers that TVA officials in the past have used to explain away or later justify actions taken in conflict with previous statements as to future programs or intentions. Do you wonder why I say TVA needs more congressional control, not less?

To prevent the continued expansion of this socialistic empire, which is foreign to the concepts of American freedoms and the basic standards and principles upon which this great Nation was founded, I think Congress should, without further delay, expressly limit the area within which TVA electric power could be transmitted and used. That is the kind of bill that should be before this committee today.

It is said that TVA has a gentleman's agreement not to expand their present power market area. If that is so, then there should be no objection to writing a specific legal limitation on the area within which TVA power can be distributed. Both TVA officials and proponents hold up their hands in horror at such a suggestion. This in itself raises the question as to how valid a gentlemen's agreement would be in the future. The past record does not commend the acceptance of such an agreement. The record shows we need more congressional control, not less.

I could go on and on with the record of the TVA failure to operate in accordance with the way TVA officials and its proponents have said it would. It is a sorry record that its officials and proponents have tried to gloss over and to deny over the years, but it is there for anyone to see if he will but read the entire record. It is a record that cries out that TVA needs more congressional control, not less.

We are told that the intent of H.R. 3460 is to provide funds to construct electric generating plants to meet the needs of the existing TVA service area. If this is so, why does not the bill contain a specific restriction on TVA future service to that area only?

Actually, the bill, as written, invites the expansion of the TVA market area by 30 percent more than the present area and contains loopholes for almost unlimited expansion beyond that.

There appears to be a limitation on the area within which TVA can distribute the power to be generated by plants constructed or acquired under the proposed bond issues or from power revenues, but there is no restriction on power generated at existing plants or those which might be constructed with appropriated funds. While there appears to be a restriction on expansion in connection with future contracts for the resale of power by the TVA distributors, nothing is said about the distance the distributors can transmit TVA power received under existing contracts, many of which have 10 to 20 years to run. Nor does the bill provide any restriction on delivery of power by TVA to potential industrial customers over their own lines. In fact, the indicated limitation on the sale or delivery of TVA power, from plants constructed from proceeds of bond issues or revenues, could be circumvented by construction of the necessary transmission by the potential customers.

The only real limitation would be one to specifically define the area within which the TVA power could be utilized.

H.R. 3460, as written, provides that TVA shall charge rates for power that will produce gross revenue to cover certain specified requirements. The existing TVA power contracts run up to periods of 20 years and the rates for TVA power are specified under such contracts. TVA in the past has told Congress that the Constitution of the United States forbids any change in these contracts or the rates specified therein. With Uncle Sam and the taxpayers holding the short end of the stick, one need not guess who will be shortchanged if sufficient revenue is not forthcoming. This also raises an interesting question as to what happens if there is a default on payment of interest or principal on the proposed bonds and the bondholders take over the operations under the bond contracts. Could they force higher rates from the local power users or from Federal defense agencies who now take over 50 percent of the TVA power? These are but a few of the questions raised by the bill under consideration here today.

Now, as any businessman knows, the first requirement for going into business is to have the capital to construct the needed facilities and to provide working capital. If the capital is borrowed, interest must be paid on it and provision made to repay the loan over a certain period of time. In the beginning the TVA Director and later Chairman, David Lilienthal, told the House Appropriations Committee (in answer to a question by Congressman JOHN TABER) that TVA power rates would provide for 3½ percent interest on the power investment. He also said the rates would provide for all operating expense, depreciation, an amount equivalent to the average rate of local, State, and Federal taxes paid by private utilities, and in addition would amortize not only the power investment but the entire project cost in 50 years.

In contract to these early claims, made to obtain approval of appropriations of the taxpayers' money, the record shows that not one cent of interest has been paid into the Treasury on nearly $2 billion of appropriations made to TVA, of which $1.4 billion was charged to power. Nor has there been any interest paid into the Treasury on the $500 million of Federal funds which TVA derived from power revenues (largely from Federal agencies) and utilized to construct new power facilities.

As noted previously, TVA officials told us in the early days that TVA rates would provide for local, State, and Federal taxes equivalent to the average rate paid by the private utilities of the Nation. Only a portion of such local and State taxes have been provided for and not one cent of Federal tax has been paid by TVA. In fact, when a proposal was made to tax TVA as other property is taxed, Senator Norris, the "father of TVA," said in opposition thereto:

"If we go to that extreme, Senators, you can see that the TVA would be out of business in 3 months."

TVA officials and proponents now tell us that TVA belongs to "all the people", therefore there is no need to pay ourselves interest or taxes. And besides, they say that TVA has been earning a net revenue that is equal to such payments. Of course the record shows that none of said net revenue has been returned to the Treasury of "all the people," to cover such items as interest and taxes on the funds appropriated.

In 1947, as chairman of the Government Corporations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I insisted that there be included a requirement in the fiscal year 1948 appropriations bill a requirement that TVA make certain minimum annual repayments. (H.R. 3460 now seeks to repeal that requirement.) At that time TVA had paid almost nothing back on the taxpayers' investment and showed no signs of making such repayment without being forced to do so.

A total of $185,059,019 has now been paid into the general fund of the Treasury. This was derived from TVA power revenues. In addition, $65,072,500 of TVA power revenues have been used to retire funded debt. The balance of power revenues was used largely to construct additional power facilities for the benefit of the TVA area itself. Thus we find that the so-called TVA net return has not been returned to "the people's" Treasury to provide for interest and taxes on the TVA power system, but has been utilized for the benefit of the TVA area itself. To have title without benefit means nothing to the people of those areas that have been forced to provide the interest-free funds for TVA and whose tax bill is larger because the TVA area does not contribute its proper share.

It is no wonder, of course, that the private utilities which once operated in the TVA area no longer exist. The farmers of my State could not compete in the marketplace with farmers in another State who were given almost unlimited financing to buy the land and the necessary implements and to provide the capital to operate on, all interest free and tax free.

And I know the people of my State and my district do not like to contribute taxes and pay interest on hundreds of millions of dollars to provide well over a million kilowatts of electric generating capacity, required solely to heat, with electricity, several hundred thousand homes in the TVA area—electricity sold at rates below the cost of production and distribution.

I can only say that TVA needs more congressional control—not less. I must, therefore, oppose this bill that would give TVA almost complete freedom from future congressional control.

If TVA had provided for interest and for taxes at rates equivalent to the average percentage of investment paid by the private electric utilities of the Nation, it would now have a deficit of around $500 million instead of a claimed accumulated net income of $468 million.

The TVA area is enticing industry through subsidized power rates, to move to or locate in the TVA area at the expense of these other areas of the Nation that provided the major part of the funds to create and maintain TVA.

How the representatives of the people outside the TVA area can justify voting for this bill which provides for practically abdicating all control over this socialistic empire is beyond my comprehension.

I want to call attention to the fact that there are numbers of persons in the TVA area itself that do not believe it to be the blessing its officials and proponents would have us believe. In this regard, I want to quote from an editorial in the Tupelo, Miss., Journal on June 12, 1953 (Tupelo was one of the first towns to distribute TVA power):

"The time has come for TVA to back up and admit that the fastest growth in the South actually has taken place outside the TVA area and we who live within its borders are still as a whole just about the poorest people in America.

"This, of course, would be quite true. For with the exception of giant projects like the Oak Ridge atomic energy plant that Uncle Sam has plunked down in Tennessee the TVA area has shown less rapid industrial growth than several other portions of the South.

"And in income, the TVA area is still dollar for dollar further behind the national average than it was in 1933 when the Tennessee Valley Authority was first established."

And there is the statement of Dr. Hoskins, president of the University of Tennessee, condemning the TVA for permanently flooding thousands on thousands of acres of the finest land in Tennessee.

TVA was supposed to provide flood protection for the Tennessee River Valley and it has ended up by permanently flooding 300,000 or 400,000 acres of the finest land in Tennessee. Dr. Hoskins questioned whether TVA was really developing the region by its emphasis on power. I quote some excerpts from his statement:

"The proposed construction of the Douglas Dam on the French Broad River above Knoxville and near the Jefferson and Sevier County lines raises an important, even a critical, question involving the welfare of a large section of Tennessee.

"Should this dam be constructed?

"I address myself to this question as a lifelong resident of east Tennessee, thoroughly in accord with our defense efforts, and as a friend and supporter of Tennessee Valley Authority and its great program. Also, I should note that I have no personal interest at stake and that I am approaching the matter from a disinterested viewpoint.

"Let us observe the immediate factual results that will arise from the construction of this dam. Immediately flooded will be some 31,000 acres of land and an equal amount will be directly affected. Some 3,000 and more persons will be removed from their homes. Several large industries, including five canning plants and three flour mills, will be eliminated.

"These are but the rough outlines of damage that will reflect a serious illness of the community, as an abscess may be but the simple and visible evidence of cancer. May I illustrate how deeply the statistical wounds cut into the vitals of a whole area.

"The 31,000 acres of land to be flooded is not merely land. It is the best land in Jefferson and Cocke Counties that is capable of supporting a culture and a government. Throughout east Tennessee the river bottoms afford almost our sole agricultural resource. Blessed with forests, minerals, and power, we are nonetheless dependent upon the soil—and the soil of the river bottoms—for our standard of living. It is not pleasant to contemplate the permanent impoverishment of a region that must begin to import its vegetables and truck crops—to say nothing of the disruption itself. Yet throughout east Tennessee the following areas have already been flooded or now await the rising water.

	Acres
"Chicamauga	39,400
Fort Loudoun	14,900
Norris	40,200
Cherokee	31,100
Watts Bar	41,600
Hales Bar	5,760
Total	172,960

* * * * *

"The actual soil lost to these dams—as significant as this loss is—is perhaps less tragic than the removal of families from their homes. East Tennessee, even in its lush river bottoms, has no corner on soil. Good soil exists elsewhere and for a price it can be had. When a home is destroyed, however, the loss may be irretrievable.

* * * * *

"What provision can be made for these dispossessed? Is a Government check or ready cash any solution of their problem or of the community problem? What wounds will this money heal? What new community, and where, can be founded upon cash? * * * The flooding of these lands destroys a community, breaks it into bits of flotsam and jetsam humanity—and makes no adequate provision even for them—for families or for individuals. There is more than damage here. There is destruction, irreparable destruction, irretrievable loss for some 3,000 persons.

"And what of those that remain, the main stock from which the stem is broken? Upon them falls the burden of government.

* * * * *

"Altogether, this proposed dam will cut a considerable slice from east Tennessee—from its body politic—from its body social—from its body economic. And altogether, too, let us observe—it is a seizure of commonwealth for special purposes.

"And what is all this for? What are the benefits to accrue that would make this social and economic destruction worthwhile? What is our democracy contemplating in thus altering the face of nature and the course of human affairs?

"There are many advantages of course. Otherwise, the proposal would be an absurdity on the face of it. The French Broad is a contributary to the Tennessee River system. It is a power potential—a defense potential. And it lies within the purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority to develop this region.

"Here let us pause before a most critical question. Let us be careful of our words. If it is the purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority to develop this region—what is the meaning of the word 'develop'? If it is democracy we are to defend—what is the meaning of democracy?

"Can we achieve development—can we preserve democracy—by destroying the homes, the commonwealth and community life of our people?

* * * * *

"I appeal to the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the Federal Government for a proper development of the region—for a development that leads to a fuller life for our people—to the welfare and security and defense of our democracy. I submit that democracy has deeper and more enduring purposes than the immediate manufacture of powder and shot. I submit that democracy should defend itself by nurturing its own inner strength. Our country is more than an aggregate of separate parts. It is a living organism and its members are not separable and destructible at will. The hand cannot say to the foot, 'I have no need of you.' The function of east Tennessee is that of a whole democratic community essential to the welfare of the whole. I beg of you to preserve it in this right."

RESTRICTIVE MILK LAWS

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the editorial on restrictive milk laws which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. This editorial pointed out that the District of Columbia milk regulations, which were drawn up in 1925 and have not been changed since 1950, should be reexamined and modernized. While I agree with the Post editorial that milk sanitation regulations need to be revised frequently to keep pace with technical improvements in the dairy industry, the modernization of the District rules would clear up the situation in just this one area. Countless other cities are using outdated and restrictive sanitary regulations as trade barriers against high-quality milk from other milksheds. My national milk sanitation bill—H.R. 3840—which would make the U.S. Milk Code the quality yardstick for the interstate shipment of milk, would solve the problem not only in Washington, but wherever else this situation exists. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the editorial from the Washington Post in the RECORD:

RESTRICTIVE MILK LAWS

The reluctance of the District Commissioners to get into the milk controversy is understandable. But the District milk laws ought to be reexamined. and the Commissioners rather than the Senate or the House District Committee ought to conduct the review. The sanitation regulations drawn up originally in 1925 have not been changed since 1950 when the Commissioners held extensive public hearings on the matter. The new investigation which Chestnut Farms is seeking could lead to a beneficial modernization of the undeniably restrictive milk laws.

Nine years ago the principal change in the regulations affected the prescribed methods of cleaning equipment. Chemical as well as steam cleaning was authorized and now practically all of the sterilization of milk equipment in Maryland and Virginia is done with chemicals.

In 1950 the arguments for steam cleaning and against the chemical method now in use were as impassioned as today's pleas by the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association to leave the present regulations untouched. Now the Association is defending present rules which prescribe the numbers of towels to be used in cleaning a cow and detailed requirements for the construction of milking sheds and barns.

It is interesting to note that the Maryland-Virginia Association, which once maintained that only steam cleaning could assure the Washington area of a quality milk supply, still boasts that the area's milk is the best in the Nation even though the equipment through which the milk moves is now cleaned by the once "unsafe" chemicals. The need for periodic reexamination of regulations like the milk laws is obvious.

LABOR RACKETEERING

Mr. LAFORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFORE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I have seen a number of proposals for corrective labor law reform come before our committee, but most of these measures fail to do the obvious. They fail to attack the problem of labor racketeering at its roots. In other words, they fail to remove the tools that give union officials the power to become tyrants and little dictators. These tools are the vicious secondary boycott and the organizational picket line.

A highly respected authority and close observer of racketeering and corruption in the Teamsters Union also has made these observations. Godfrey P. Schmidt, a court-appointed monitor over the officials of the Teamsters Union, called for the need to stop secondary boycotts and coercive picketing in a letter he wrote last month to Senator KENNEDY, a sponsor of one of the many bills on labor law amendments. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 19, at page 2684, Mr. Schmidt's letter to the Senator can be found. This expert on teamster affairs and union abuses remarked:

> From my conversations with rank and file workers, I am persuaded that they are as convinced as I am that no labor reform can be effectuated unless recognition and organizational picketing is banned.

On the subject of the boycott tool, Mr. Schmidt declared:

> Since the irresponsible power of labor leaders needs curbing (it is this power which gives them the opportunity to play dictator), secondary boycotts, which is a source of this power must be limited.

Unfortunately, the Teamsters Union is not the only organization which uses the unfair secondary boycott to involve neutral parties in labor disputes and organizing drives. Records at the National Labor Relations Board show that the Teamsters and the building trades unions are the greatest boycott technicians, but all unions have the power to use the secondary boycott, and most of them have used it at one time or another.

Today, I shall introduce a bill designed to stop all secondary boycotts and to end the blackmail and extortion picketing which masquerades under the names of organizational and recognition picketing.

My bill attempts to keep as much as possible of the Taft-Hartley format, yet clearly shows that no secondary boycotts should be permitted.

My interest in the secondary boycott problem is more than academic. This union power weapon has affected hundreds of citizens of my State and has terrorized scores of workingmen in Philadelphia, Scranton, Pittsburgh, and other cities in Pennsylvania.

At this very moment a secondary boycott in Pittsburgh is slowly strangling a small packing company, merely because the Teamsters want it to die.

This firm, the Fried & Reineman Packing Co., has been in business since 1897, but unless they have relief from a union secondary boycott they will close their doors forever by the end of this month. More than 400 employees will be out of a job—thanks to a Teamster secondary boycott.

The company's story as told by William Chandler, its general manager, reveals that business was poor and the firm sought to introduce some economies in its delivery service. When they tried to cut costs, their 38 truckdrivers who belong to Teamster Local 249 struck. This was November 3, 1958. The plant has been closed since, and 400 other employees are out of work.

Fried & Reineman then decided to abandon their trucking service and hire a common carrier to handle the job at less cost. The carrier, Kenney Motor Express Co., also employed union drivers who were members of local 249.

The union refused to permit Kenney to take on the new business, threatening Kenney with a strike if it tried to serve the packing company.

Fried & Reineman filed an unfair labor practice charge against the union. Mr. Chandler reports that unless they have relief by March 30, the packing company will go out of business.

Three years ago the Teamsters conducted a terror campaign of violence built upon the secondary boycott. The giant union was seeking to organize 13 Philadelphia auto dealers. When legitimate organizing methods brought no interest in the union by the auto dealers' employees, the Teamsters placed picket lines around several warehouses in which the dealers stored cars for future deliveries.

These warehousemen and their employees had no concern with the teamsters' membership drive against the employees of the auto dealers; yet they became involved.

Violence was the next step. Paint and acid were splashed on new cars and windows were broken in other new vehicles. In all, more than 30 cars were damaged.

The McClellan hearings produced another tragic story of a union secondary boycott in Scranton.

Arnold Schivai, the operator of a Scranton bakery for 35 years, and his employees became teamster boycott victims. This bakery has been in Scranton for three generations, but trouble occurred when the union tried to force itself on the bakery employees.

The union wanted to compel Mr. Schivai to sign a contract requiring that everyone who drove a truck at the bakery must join their local 229. This was an impossible demand because 30 percent of the distributors had their own trucks, paid for the bakery goods and sold them as independent contractors. When Mr. Schivai could not comply, the secondary boycott followed. On April 16, 1957, he described the boycott to the McClellan committee. His testimony is found on pages 1770–72:

> The next morning some of the distributors who buy our product came in the place and they start loading up, and they were confronted with about 12 pickets, plus our own men, who boarded their trucks and told them it was unhealthy to buy their products there from that day on. Some of them made it quite clear that they wouldn't come to the bakery any more. One fellow asked if he could operate one more day. They said OK. They told him that it was unhealthy from that day on to come to our place.

Violence was the next step. Mr. Schivai continued with his story:

> So we kept trying to operate the business; my dad was 63 years old at the time, and myself. When he was eliminated, I had to put my wife on. She drove the car, and tried to take care of some of the accounts. But every place we went, our customers were told that it wasn't very good practice to buy from us, and we kept having trouble right along. I was threatened myself.

There have been many other Pennsylvania secondary boycott victims. The Quaker City Motor Parts Co., of Philadelphia, in 1956 were victims of an organizational picket line by both the machinists and the teamsters.

The Schuylkill Products Co., of Cressona, Pa., manufacturers of concrete pipe and ready mixed cement, have been boycott victims of the teamsters.

In Erie, the Felheim Heating & Roofing Co. was caught between the machinists and the sheet metal workers. Four weeks of construction were lost because of this boycott which occurred back in 1955.

In another Philadelphia organizational picketing and secondary boycott case, the Sandmeyer Steel Co. was the victim. Since April 17, 1958, the teamsters have interfered with deliveries and merchandise pickups. It has been part of another forced-membership drive.

One could find numerous other cases all over the country of unethical and unfair practices by union officials.

In introducing my bill I want to put an end to boycotts and blackmail picketing. It is not possible to publicly endorse legislation to clean up the labor rackets in this country without halting secondary boycotts, because the secondary boycott is the weapon of the labor racketeer. It is economic blackmail against neutral third parties in labor disputes or organizing drives.

The bill also contains provisions to stop coercive picketing—picketing which the labor specialists identify as organizational picketing and recognition picketing. Picketing to organize more workmen or to force an employer to recognize a particular union is economic coercion of the worst type. There is no connection whatsoever with free speech when the objective of the picketing is for organization or recognition. The professional unionists who order such picketing well know it.

The purpose of such picketing is not merely to provide information, but to coerce someone to do something he does not want to do. Generally the economic pressure of such picketing results in an employer recognizing a union his employees do not want, or it results in making employees join a union to protect their jobs. This, of course, infringes and violates the guarantees given employees under section 7 of the act—the right to join or refrain from joining a labor organization.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill is designed to close the loopholes that have resulted in the interpretation of the present Taft-Hartley Act making for legal and illegal secondary boycotts. If the union agent is clever, it is not too difficult to impose an unfair secondary boycott yet remain beyond the prohibitions of the law. The boycott, however, is just as harmful and evil whether it be perpetrated by legal or illegal means.

SUBSECTION 4

Subsection (4) of section 8(b)(4) of the present law is simplified in my bill. Much of the original language is kept, but the words which have resulted in legal loopholes have been eliminated or revised. Note that the new subsection (4) of my bill reads:

> (4) to engage in, or to induce or encourage an employee or any other person to engage in, a strike or a refusal in connection with his employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles or materials, or to perform any services; or to cause or attempt to cause an employee or any other person not to enter or accept employment; or to exert, attempt to exert, or threaten to exert (regardless of the provisions in any collective bargaining or other contract) against an employer or any other person, economic or any other type of coercion, by picketing or by any other means; where an object thereof is: * * *

EMPLOYER PRESSURE

This is a change from the present reading of subsection (4) in that the old language "encourage the employees of any employer" has been changed to "encourage an employee or any other person". This is intended to end the loophole which permits pressure against an employer to make him refuse to do business with another employer. The addition of the word "person" throughout subsection (4) is designed to make it an illegal secondary boycott to induce or encourage an employer, an independent contractor, an architect, a manufacturer's representative, a dealer, a jobber, or a self-employed person to stop doing business with another.

CONCERTED REFUSAL

The present statute uses the term "concerted refusal." In the new bill, "concerted" is dropped. This is to eliminate another loophole which permits a secondary boycott if only one person or a key individual is induced to stop doing business with another employer.

COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT

Another change to close still another loophole is the revision of the present language "refusal in the course of their employment." In certain industries where occasional or per-job employment is the rule, unions have found that they may violate the purpose of the law by

merely refusing to let their members accept work.

Because the refusal is made before the employees actually begin work, it has been held that such a refusal and secondary boycott is not illegal because it was not made "in the course of employment."

By eliminating this language, the present loophole is closed. To be certain that it will not recur, I have added the language, "or to cause or attempt to cause an employee or any other person not to enter or accept employment."

HOT CARGO CONTRACTS

The new subsection (4) would also put an end to hot cargo contracts used so commonly in the transportation industry and in the building or construction industry. The present act makes no direct mention of collective bargaining contracts being used to bypass the intent of Congress to protect the public and neutrals from secondary boycotts. My bill covers this type of contract provision when it makes it unlawful "to exert, attempt to exert, or threaten to exert—regardless of the provisions in any collective bargaining or other contract—against an employer or any other person, economic or any other type of coercion, by picketing or by any other means."

ECONOMIC COERCION

In addition to curing hot cargo secondary boycotts, this same clause attacks attempts by union officials to coerce neutral persons. It is designed to prevent economic or any other type of coercion to force—for example, an architect to discontinue prescribing certain products or services by persons with whom a union may have a quarrel—real or fancied. Unions have tried to compel architects to stop recommending certain products under the threat of labor trouble to the architect's client. This is an extremely vicious type of hidden secondary boycott which a union boss can use to further his monopoly control.

THE SECONDARY CONSUMER BOYCOTT

Another similar insidious variety is secondary consumer boycott. Under the present law a union can apparently picket the customer entrances of a retail store which is carrying a product manufactured by a company with which a union has a primary dispute. Similarly a union can organize a consumer or customer boycott against a distributing firm merely because that company advertises on a radio or television station or in a newspaper with which the union has a primary dispute. Sponsors of radio and TV programs and advertisers in newspapers are threatened with economic pressure and a loss of business by the union unless they discontinue their advertising. These are examples of secondary or consumer boycotts, a potent form of economic pressure, that are intended to be made unlawful by the language of my bill.

SUBSECTION 8 (B) (4) (A)

Section 8(b) (4) (A) of the new bill is simplified to read:

(A) causing or attempting to cause any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization.

Except for the opening three words (A) is the same as the first clause in (A) of the present Taft-Hartley Act.

I have substituted "causing or attempting to cause" for the present "forcing or requiring." Similar substitutions have been made in subsections (B), (C), (D), and (F). The purpose of this change is to insure the full effectuation of the legislative intent to eliminate secondary boycotts. Once the factor of unlawful coercion has been found, the intent of Congress is not to be frustrated because it might conceivably be said that the objective of the coercion was merely to induce or cause a certain course of action rather than to force or require it.

Note that for purposes of clarification and simplicity, I have restricted subsection (A) to one clause. No change in meaning or interpretation is intended aside from that specifically mentioned.

SUBSECTION 8 (B) (4) (B)

Although (B) of my bill is different from (B) in the present Taft-Hartley Act, it is taken from the second clause of Taft-Hartley's subsection 8(b) (4) (A). It reads:

(B) causing or attempting to cause any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person.

The new subsection (B), however, is more compact than the language of the present subsection (A). It also leaves no doubt that it is intended to protect secondary employers such as distributors, dealers, wholesalers, jobbers, and others from secondary boycott pressure.

For example, let us assume that there is a labor dispute between a union and a maker of electrical fixtures. Unable to win its dispute fairly, the union enlists the cooperation of unions engaged in the construction industry. The construction unions advise contractors that they will be courting labor trouble if they continue to use electrical fixtures made by the manufacturer who is having a labor dispute with the electrical union. The construction unions point out to the contractors that they do not have to cease doing business with the jobber or distributor of the electrical fixtures, but merely require the distributor to order fixtures which are not made by the alleged "unfair" manufacturer.

If the distributor handles only one line of fixtures, it means that the contractor is forced to stop doing business with the distributor—both of whom are completely neutral and innocent in the primary labor dispute. Such a distributor faces bankruptcy if the union's coercion is great enough.

Where the distributor handles more than one line of fixtures, it might be contended that the coercion or threat is not designed to force the contractor to cease doing business with the distributor, but that he is merely being asked to provide one brand of a product instead of another.

My bill would make such activity a secondary boycott violation and an unfair labor practice.

SUBSECTION 8 (B) (4) (C)

Subsection (C), except for its first three words, is identical with the present subsection (B) of the Taft-Hartley Act. As I explained earlier the opening words "forcing or requiring" have been changed to "causing or attempting to cause."

The subsection reads:

(C) Causing or attempting to cause any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provision of section 9.

SUBSECTION (D)

Subsection (D) of my bill is designed to prevent recognition picketing. It reads:

(D) Causing or attempting to cause any employer to interfere with his employees' right to join or refrain from joining a labor organization as set forth in section 7.

This language is not found in the present Taft-Hartley law. It is designed to prohibit the use of economic coercion for the purpose of forcing an employer to interfere with the right of his employees to join or refrain from joining a union. These rights, as you know, are the cornerstone of the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Section 7 of the Wagner Act established as public policy the right of an employee to freely select his own bargaining representative. In 1947 the Taft-Hartley Act added to this right—the right to refuse to participate in union activities.

The recognition picketing problem is included in my bill because it is closely allied to the secondary boycott problem.

Studies show that a great many secondary boycotts arise from situations in which a union is trying to organize the employees of a primary employer. Unsuccessful by direct appeal, the union seeks to coerce the employer into recognizing the union by putting economic pressure on the secondary employers who do business with the primary employer.

Although the language in the present act covers situations in which recognition is won through pressure on a secondary employer, my bill would add a necessary element to the protection by stopping economic pressure directed toward the primary employer.

It follows that if a union has the power to compel an employer to recognize it as the bargaining agent, the employees of that employer will be forced to be represented by that union, whether they prefer that particular union or no union.

Neither a company nor a union should have the power to force a bargaining agent upon employees unless the employees want such an agent. Again it follows that an employer should be free from such economic coercion as the secondary boycott to compel him to interfere with the rights of his employees.

SUBSECTION 8(B) (4) (E)

This also is a new section. It is designed to halt organizational picketing—a technique that goes hand-in-hand with recognition picketing covered in subsection (D). It reads:

(E) Forcing or requiring employees to join or refuse to join a labor organization except

as provided in the first proviso to section 8(a)(3).

The purpose of subsection (E) is apparent. It prohibits the use of economic coercion against an employer where an object is to cause employees to join or refuse to join a labor organization. It does not interfere with the right to negotiate a union shop contract.

The present law provides means for unions to organize employees and it provides for elections to determine union representation. Picketing should not be used as a replacement for the already prescribed procedures. In theory there is a hairline difference between recognition and organizational picketing, but the practical effect is the same. The picket line is present in both varieties. Here again, organizational picketing, like recognition picketing, is closely related to the secondary boycott; thus, its inclusion in the bill.

To the employees who do not wish to join a union, organizational picketing is an indirect threat to their loss of employment. If the picketing curtails business, the employer may be forced to go out of business or lay off employees. Call it organizational or recognition picketing, the coercive effect is the same on the workman.

To those who raise the cry "free speech," organizational picketing is more than an attempt to advertise a labor organization. It has become a form of blackmail. I have no intent to infringe on the right of free speech for any organization, but picketing to force membership in a union is far and beyond the scope of free speech.

SUBSECTION 8(B)(4)(F)

The language in this subsection, except for the first three words, is identical to the present language of section 8(b)(4)(D) of the Taft-Hartley Act. As I explained earlier, the change in the first three words is to substitute "causing or attempting to cause" for "forcing or requiring."

The section continues the Taft-Hartley prohibition of secondary boycotts to win jurisdictional disputes between unions. It reads:

(F) Causing or attempting to cause any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class, unless such employer is failing to conform to an order or certification of the Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work: *Provided*, That nothing contained in subsection (b) shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under this Act.

SECTION 10(L)

Because of the Taft-Hartley changes suggested in my bill, it is necessary to make minor and technical revisions in other sections of the law to bring them in conformity with the changes and the new unfair labor practice sections. Section 10(L), a section providing for NLRB priority status for secondary boycott charges and for injunctions to halt secondary boycotts, is amended in my bill. There is, however, no change from its original meaning. The new section would read:

(b) Section 10(L) of title I of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph (4)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E), or (F) of section 8(b), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred."

BOYCOTT DAMAGE SUITS

Section 303 of the present Taft-Hartley Act is the section which provides for damages resulting from the unfair labor practices set out in section 8(b)(4). My bill makes no change in the overall idea of section 303. It merely streamlines it and brings it into conformity with the new changes in section 8(b)(4).

The present section 303(a) is eliminated as repetitious and unnecessary. It is covered by reference to avoid repeating all the unfair labor practices set out in section 303(b) of the present law.

My bill on this section reads:

(c) Section 303 of title III of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any act or acts which are made an unfair labor practice under section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor-Management Relations Act, as amended, may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 of this Act without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and cost of the suit."

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am fully in support of this legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii. This historic action is not only in our national interest, but will be applauded around the globe. It will bring economic, political and social benefits to the people of the United States and to the residents of Hawaii.

I only want to add that we should feel just as strongly obligated to grant the lesser right of local self-government to the people of the District of Columbia.

I am sure none of my colleagues is sponsoring legislation to have the Federal Government step in and take over the government of their local communities. We would all be outraged at the thought. Yet that is what we did to the District 75 years ago—and 825,000 Americans here are still waiting for us to give their local government back to them.

I can see no sound basis for such discrimination against the District. Legislation, soundly conceived and broadly supported, is before the House to restore home rule in the District. It amply protects the Federal interest in the city, while turning over local affairs to the people who should run them—the local people.

We are today approving statehood for Hawaii. I trust that, at an early date, we will have a similar opportunity to approve home rule for Washington.

MILK PRODUCERS DESERVE COMPLETE PROGRAM—INCLUDING MILK SANITATION LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are concerned with the establishment of a nationwide market for milk in which we can establish a national milk income improvement program. Milk producers all over the country deserve and need a total program that will enable them to earn and receive a parity of income for their work, management, property, investment, and risks.

To move toward this kind of program we need, I am convinced that we must enact three major parts:

First. A milk income improvement program for all milk to supplement our Federal fluid milk marketing orders;

Second. Legislation required to facilitate and promote the establishment of a nationwide milk processing, marketing and bargaining enterprise that will give all milk producers the kind of market bargaining power they need to obtain a fair income, as proposed by Gov. Gaylord Nelson and my State; and

Third. The nationwide milk sanitation standards bills that Senators HUMPHREY, PROXMIRE, McCARTHY, and WILEY and 17 House colleagues and I have introduced.

On Monday, March 9, several of the authors of this bill and I discussed its merits before the House of Representatives.

I have today received a letter taking exception to some of my remarks which will be of interest, I feel, to my colleagues. I shall read the letter I received and my reply which taken together speak for themselves:

MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Arlington, Va., March 10, 1959.

Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: We noted with a great deal of interest the political approach which you made to the Washington milk controversy from your sanctuary, the floor of the House of Representatives of the United

States. Our only way to correct your misleading statements which were made for obvious political purposes is to express them in the press to the people of Washington hoping that the facts will be transmitted to Wisconsin farmers.

You stated that milk could be delivered to Washington from the Ninth Congressional District in Wisconsin, which is along the Minnesota border, for $5.50 per hundredweight. You stated that the freight cost would be $1.80 per hundredweight, leaving a gross return to the plant of $3.70. The handling charge for operating the plant would be a bare minimum of $0.75 per hundredweight. The $0.75 handling charge is less than the national average and less than that allowed plants handling manufactured milk under the price support program. When the $0.75 handling charge and the $1.80 transportation is deducted from $5.50, it leaves but $2.95 for the farmer f.o.b. the milk plant. This does not include any cost for hauling milk from the farm to the milk plant.

In another part of your statement, you suggested that the price of milk could be reduced $0.03 per quart which is $1.38 per hundredweight. When this amount ($1.38) is subtracted from the present price of $6.62, less freight of $1.80 and handling charges of $0.75, Wisconsin producers would net $2.69 f.o.b. milk plants in your area. Mr. JOHNSON, we know of no producers in Wisconsin who are willing to sell grade A milk for $2.95, to say nothing of $2.69.

We are perfectly aware of the producers in Wisconsin asking the Government to support their grade B milk at $3.50 per hundredweight under the price support program. We also note that you have introduced a bill which would establish the support level at $3.25 per hundredweight. This is a lot higher than the price that you say producers would accept to deliver milk to Washington. Are you trying to go both ways at once?

We believe that Wisconsin grade B milk is worth every bit of $3.50. We wish there was some way to get that price for Wisconsin farmers. We don't want to see any dairy farmer short-changed on the value of the food product he produces and sells for market.

We are certain that the dairy farmers in your district will be interested in hearing that you are offering their milk to Washington at lower prices than they can receive for manufacturing milk under the price support program for the sole purpose of cutting the rug out from under another bunch of dairy farmers down here. Probably our biggest problem in the dairy business, Congressman, is securing unity in a broad look at the dairy problem to properly price milk for all producers across the country rather than to have a very narrow district attitude such as you have displayed. The divide and conquer technique may serve local political purposes but it cannot be counted upon to improve incomes for the Nation's dairy farmers.

It puzzles us as to just what your objectives are in making such irresponsible statements as were attributed to you on page 3615 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday, March 9, 1959.

The great bulk of the milk in your district is of manufacturing grade and falls short of meeting the requirements of the National Sanitation Act which you are sponsoring in the Congress at the present time. It seems ridiculous to offer grade A milk for less money than the manufacturing milk in your area and we both know that this manufacturing milk cannot be sold in any fluid milk market in the country, to say nothing of Washington, D.C.

There has been too much advancement in the milk industry for any of us to subscribe to your statements, Mr. JOHNSON, if it is your purpose to pass off grade B milk for grade A milk. We don't feel that we want to go back 30 years and start the long grind of progress all over again for the purpose of bringing grade B milk into the District of Columbia.

In addition to the above facts which are based upon simple arithmetic which anyone can calculate, we are wondering what you would expect the people in Washington to do during those periods of the year, such as last week, when milk either stayed on the farm in Wisconsin or was moved out on a bobsled. Washington consumers expect milk of the same quality every day of the week, winter and summer, and they are getting that service. Neither do Washington consumers want to depend for their milk upon the surplus of the Chicago and Minneapolis markets which have first call on that milk when it is needed at home.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. HOOPER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1959.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HOOPER,
Secretary-Treasurer, Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. HOOPER: I have your letter of March 10.

In the interest of keeping the record clear and accurate, I must suggest that you have apparently been badly misinformed concerning milk production, pricing, and handling in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Your letter raises two points of substance concerning my remarks in the House of Representatives on Monday, March 9.

First, without documentation, you question the dependability of Wisconsin and Minnesota as a source of a continuous supply of milk. With upward of 5 million persons now being served with milk produced in these States, winter and summer, there can be no factual basis for your fear that snows in Wisconsin and Minnesota will stop or seriously delay continuous milk delivery. You may be interested in reviewing the telegram I have just received from the chairman of the Wisconsin Highway Commission concerning the keeping of Wisconsin's highways open. The telegram is attached.

Second, you disagreed with the figures I cited to indicate the price at which grade A Wisconsin milk can be delivered to the District of Columbia. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that I made the following statement in this regard:

"Currently, Washington dairies are paying $6.62 per hundredweight for class I or bottling milk. In the past week, I have received letters from two modern dairy plants in Wisconsin's Ninth District. Each of them could deliver top-quality 3.5 percent class I bottling milk to Washington for $5.50 per hundredweight.

"That price includes the cost of transporting the milk from Menomonie and Turtle Lake, Wis., to the District of Columbia. Even taking into account the $1.80 per hundredweight shipping charge, the Wisconsin milk would cost $1.12 a hundredweight less than the bottling milk now being purchased by local distributors. This would represent a saving of at least 2 cents a quart which could and should be passed on to the consumer."

The letters I referred to are a part of the RECORD and are shown on page 3616.

According to the information supplied to me by the manager of the Turtle Lake Cooperative Creamery Association, the farmer cooperatives in my district can pay farmers $3.14 per hundredweight for grade A milk and deliver it to handlers in the District of Columbia for $5.50.

To put this another way, Wisconsin and Minnesota farmers, if not prevented from doing so by artificial barriers, could deliver grade A milk to Washington at 2 cents per quart cheaper than is now being paid for such milk and in doing so would receive $3.14 per hundredweight, 24 cents more than they are now receiving for fully standard grade A milk that has to be made into butter and powder.

If passed on to the Washington, D.C., consumer, this would be a saving of more than 6 percent in their milk bill each month which at the same time would be an 8 percent increase in the gross income of the Wisconsin and Minnesota milk farmer and an increase in net income of probably 15 to 20 percent.

However, your letter draws attention away from the two major points of my remarks of Monday. These were: (1) This Nation should not be divided up into hundreds of little milk markets, each dominated by its own local monopoly, protected by out-of-date and unneeded sanitary codes, each varying in myriad and complex but unnecessary ways from the standards established by the U.S. Public Health Service; and (2) in this era of rapid communication and technological development, it is now possible, and proper, to consider that milk which is pure in one part of the country will be pure in another part.

For this reason I have introduced legislation to make the U.S. Public Health milk sanitation code nationwide in its application so that the standards of purity and quality for grade A milk will be uniformly high in all parts of the Nation.

It is not my purpose to lower the income of any milk producers or to reduce the effectiveness of their cooperative. As you know, I am a strong supporter of legislation to promote and protect the rights of farmers to earn and receive a parity of income. I recognize that for farmers to be able to do so, they must have the right and protection to make use of cooperative bargaining, processing and marketing associations.

However, I do not believe that farmers in any part of the country can be helped by barriers against the products of farmers in other parts of the country or by statements which seem to question the quality, purity or supply-dependability of products produced by other farmers.

I have today requested the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Wisconsin to send the prices of home delivered homogenized vitamin D milk in various cities of our State. The figures are: Eau Claire, 22 cents per quart; Wausau, 22 cents per quart; Green Bay, 21 cents per quart; Madison, 24 cents per quart; and Milwaukee, 23 cents per quart. These average well below the 23½ to 24½ cents figure you are quoted as having given to the newspapers here. A copy of the commissioner's telegram is attached.

I must differ with you when you say, "The great bulk of the milk in your district is of manufacturing grade and falls short of meeting the requirement of the National Sanitation Act which you are sponsoring in the Congress at the present time." The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare bulletin on "Sanitation Compliance Ratings of Interstate Milk Shippers" dated January 1, 1959, lists 104 dairies in Wisconsin on pages 28–32. Fourteen of these dairies are in my district and they are: Baldwin Co-op, Baldwin, Wis.; Barron Co-op Creamery, Barron, Wis.; Boyceville Farmers Co-op Creamery, Boyceville, Wis.; Chippewa County Co-op Dairy, Bloomer, Wis.; Colfax Co-op Creamery, Colfax, Wis.; Ellsworth

Co-op Creamery, Ellsworth, Wis.; Falls Dairy Co., Stanley, Wis.; Land O'Lakes Dairy, Whitehall, Wis.; Sanna Dairies, Inc., Menomonie, Wis.; St. Croix Valley Co-op Dairies, Glenwood City, Wis.; Turtle Lake Co-op., Turtle Lake, Wis.; Wisconsin Co-op Dairies, Inc., Elmwood, Wis.; Wisconsin Co-op Dairies, Inc. (Chicago Shed), Menomonie, Wis.; Wisconsin Co-op Dairies, Inc., Menomonie, Wis. (Wisconsin Shed).

I am at a complete loss to understand why you feel that you need special barriers against Wisconsin and Minnesota milk, in addition to the $1.80 per hundredweight transportation cost. Lacking any other discernible reason for your fearful attitude in this regard, I can only conclude that you are seeking to protect uneconomical operations and high costs of milk in your area.

You may be sure that I would not be seeking to open to Metropolitan Washington markets grade A milk from Minnesota and Wisconsin if I were not fully convinced that the producers in my area could increase their income thereby.

It is in addition my understanding that a farmers' cooperative operating under the Chicago milk order could ship class I Wisconsin milk to Washington under that order in accordance with terms of the Chicago order at $5.50 delivered. I notice that you did not comment in your letter to me on the statement of Mr. FLYNN shown on page 3620 quoting from a letter he had received from the Pure Milk Association of Chicago as follows: "that they can send milk into the District of Columbia at a price of $5.64 a hundred." As you know, such milk would necessarily have to be priced under terms of the Chicago Federal milk order.

I have never had the pleasure of making your acquaintance since I have been in Washington. While I think you are taking a narrow view in your approach to H.R. 3840, we are not going to settle anything by arguing through the newspapers. I will be glad to talk with you to see if there are methods whereby we can work for dairy legislation that will benefit the whole country.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

MADISON, WIS., *March 11, 1959.*

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D.C.:

The following consumer prices regarding retail milk sales in the five Wisconsin cities requested are being sent in response to your telegram this morning. Home delivered prices for single quarts in Eau Claire, 22 cents; Green Bay, 21 cents; Madison, 24 cents; Milwaukee, 23 cents; Wausau, 22 cents. For half-gallons, Eau Claire, 42 cents; Green Bay, 42 cents; Madison, 42–43 cents; Milwaukee, 42 cents; Wausau, 44 cents. Gallon prices at Madison, home delivered, 79–80 cents; Milwaukee, 76 cents. Store prices for single quarts at Eau Claire, 21 cents; Green Bay, 20½ cents; Madison, 21 cents; Milwaukee, 21 cents; Wausau, 21 cents. For half-gallons, Eau Claire, 41 cents; Green Bay, 39½–42 cents; Madison, 39 cents; Milwaukee, 35–36 cents; Wausau, 41 cents. For gallons, Madison, 75 cents; Milwaukee, 67–69 cents. This is for homogenized vitamin D milk testing 3.5 percent at Eau Claire and Madison, and 3.6 percent at Green Bay, Milwaukee, and Wausau. Over half the milk sold in the State at retail is on a multiple unit basis so that prices on the whole would average somewhere between 19 and 20 cents on a quart equivalent basis.

DON MCDOWELL,
Director, Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture.

MADISON, WIS., *March 11, 1959.*

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wisconsin has as excellent a snow removal program as any State in the Nation. Each of its 71 counties is completely equipped with crews and snow removal facilities of every type. As soon as a snow begins, men and machines move out to keep the roads open. First priority goes to heavily traveled State trunk highways and the policy is to maintain snow-free and ice-free pavements.

Highway 12 is a principal artery in Wisconsin and over the past 7 years it has been snow blocked less than half a dozen times, and none of the closures was for more than 5 hours.

Last week, in the heaviest snow in 36 years, the highway was snow-blocked less than half a day.

Mr. Frank Babbitt, of Chippewa Falls, who operates seven tank trucks of milk to Philadelphia per day, reports he has had but one interruption due to snow in the last 2 years, and none in this recent most severe snowstorm.

HAROLD L. PLUMMER,
Chairman, State Highway Commission of Wisconsin.

BALKANIZATION OF NATIONAL MILK MARKET WILL NOT SERVE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to read in the morning paper that the County Council of Montgomery County, Md., is seriously considering adopting the outdated and unnecessarily restrictive District of Columbia milk sanitation code.

I rise merely to point out that this proposed unwise action by a local governing board is a pertinent illustration of the need for early adoption of the nationwide milk sanitation standards bill which has been introduced by 17 colleagues and myself and by Senators HUMPHREY, PROXMIRE, MCCARTHY and WILEY.

Only by adopting such a nationwide milk sanitation code can we be assured that pure high quality milk will be allowed to move in interstate commerce. If every local jurisdiction is allowed to continue to set up barriers against interstate commerce, the end result can only be a Balkanization of our national market for milk to the economic injury of both milk farmers generally and of the general public.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. ABBITT), for Wednesday, March 11, on account of illness.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. FARBSTEIN), for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mrs. DWYER, for 10 minutes, on Monday, March 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include an article.

Mr. KILDAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. BREWSTER.

Mr. BOYKIN and to include a speech by Mr. VINSON.

(At the request of Mr. SMITH of California, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1096. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 12, 1959, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

695. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $2,570,198, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 95); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

696. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

697. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to insurance of ship mortgages, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

698. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass."; to the Committee on Public Works.

699. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the management controls of the District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

700. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve the compensation policies and practices of the Federal Government with respect to civilian personnel thereof, to establish a temporary Commission on Federal Civilian Employees Compensation Policy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4154. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4748. A bill to extend the leasing provisions of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C. 869—869-3), to certain lands in Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 5531. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5532. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5533. A bill to stabilize the domestic market prices of lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5534. A bill to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River near 14th Street in the District of Columbia under the act of July 16, 1946, as the George Mason Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5535. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951, to provide that the police for the National Zoological Park shall receive salaries at the same rate as officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5536. A bill to amend section 12 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5537. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to change the position of elevator operator from level 2 to level 3 of the postal field service schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 5538. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day on the estate known as Terra Rubra, the birthplace of Francis Scott Key, in Carroll County, Md., and at the grave of Key in Mount Olivet Cemetery in Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H.R. 5539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce to 5 percent the manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5540. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5541. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 5542. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 5543. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to continue the eligibility of certain existing retirement associations to make volume purchases at a reduced sales load; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 5544. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFORE:

H.R. 5545. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 5546. A bill to amend the so-called Buy-American Act to provide that the Congress shall have the right to disapprove certain contracts entered into by agencies of the Federal Government for the purpose of acquiring articles, materials, or supplies from abroad; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5547. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5548. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5549. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 5550. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 5551. A bill to amend section 1901 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance to certain seriously disabled World War I veterans in obtaining an automobile or other conveyance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5552. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make stability of prices an explicit part of the economic policy of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 5553. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5554. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas (by request):

H.R. 5555. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5556. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 5557. A bill to provide for the equalization of allotments on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 5558. A bill for the relief of Mill School District, San Bernardino County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 5559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction for certain facilities in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 5560. A bill to amend section 12 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5561. A bill to set aside and reserve Memaloose Island, Columbia River, Oreg., for the use of the Dalles Dam project and transfer certain property to the Yakima Tribe of Indians in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 5562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that the tax on transportation of persons does not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 5563. A bill authorizing the modification of the existing project for Bayou Lafourche, La., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5564. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 5565. A bill to amend section 401(b) of the act of July 14, 1952, to permit applications for moving costs resulting from military public works projects to be filed either 1 year from the date of acquisition or 1 year following the date of vacating of the property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5566. A bill to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5567. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5568. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5569. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of certain medals within 2 years after a determination by the Secretary concerned that because of loss or inadvertence the recommendation was not processed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5570. A bill to provide that the President shall designate one agency of the Federal Government to conduct all security investigations of civil officers and employees of the United States, and of persons who apply for employment as such officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5571. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5572. A bill to permit one-half of the budget surplus for any fiscal year to be applied against the public debt and to provide that one-half of such surplus shall be applied as tax credits against individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5573. A bill to amend section 110 of the Social Security Amendments of 1956 to permit the inclusion of certain additional income in computing social security benefits under the formula contained in that section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5574. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts paid for the medical and dental care of children who have not attained the age of 6 shall be deductible without regard to the limitations contained in such section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5575. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5576. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation, for retired employees of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5577. A bill to establish a permanent Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5578. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain material by a Member of Congress, under his frank, to destinations outside the State or district which he represents; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 5579. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain expenditures incurred in connection with measures submitted to the electorate shall be allowed as business deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5580. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1960, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 5581. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide pensions for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 5582. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 5583. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5584. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 5585. A bill to provide for a 1-year extension of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, and to increase the maximum aggregate amount payable under such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5586. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 5587. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 298. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of August 27, 1959, as Oil Industry Centennial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.J. Res. 300. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 301. Joint resolution providing for printing copies of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.J. Res. 302. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution prohibiting the Tennessee Valley Authority from awarding certain contracts without the prior approval of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 208. Resolution relating to Rural Electrification Administration contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. KING of Utah: Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the Congress to amend Public Law 85-868 to protect the interests of the State in mineral wealth on lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation of San Juan County, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing Congress on the passage of H.R. 2969 or H.R. 3450; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 50th Legislative Assembly of Oregon, which ratifies the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by Congress on February 26, 1869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5588. A bill for the relief of Etelvino MacNamara Migoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 5589. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5590. A bill for the relief of Maurice L. Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5591. A bill for the relief of Bruno Beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 5592. A bill for the relief of Nielsen L. Pollard and Elsie M. Pollard, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5593. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

107. Mr. MONAGAN presented a petition of Unity Council No. 37, Knights of Columbus of Torrington, Conn., declaring themselves unanimously and emphatically opposed to the recognition of the Communist regime of China by the United States of America, and to the admission of Red China to membership in the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 4001, Townsend Plan Amendments to the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I have wholeheartedly joined with Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, in sponsoring legislation embodying the Townsend plan. My bill, H.R. 4001, is identical with H.R. 4000, introduced by Representative BLATNIK. It has been my pleasure to sponsor this legislation in past Congresses.

My reason for promoting this legislation is that, in my view, it is conservative legislation. It is conservative, in the first place, because it involves the smallest possible cost of administration while it expends the greatest possible proportion of the revenue it raises for the purposes of paying social security benefits to the American people. This principle of the Townsend plan—holding to a minimum the part of the money the Government spends and uses, while expending the maximum amount on the purposes of the legislation itself—is of the essence of conservatism.

It embodies the philosophy of government expressed by our great President when he said:

> In all those things which deal with the people be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy, or their form of government, be conservative.

In the second place, this legislation will amend title II of the Social Security Act so that the program under that title will be on a solid and reliably pay-as-you-go financial basis. Pay-as-you-go governmental operation lies at the very roots of conservatism. It is absolutely essential to balanced budgets. The Townsend plan amendments to title II will permanently balance the budget to the extent of the part of the budget concerned with the greatest part of our national social security system.

Furthermore, the amendments to title II proposed in this legislation will contribute tremendously to balancing the budgets of our State and local governments. It recognizes that the problem of old-age retirement, disability insurance, and the protection of widows having the care of minor children—the great areas to which title II is addressed—is an out-and-out national problem. My bill is calculated effectively to solve the problem of these needs without the aid of State programs, such as the present program under title II requires to supplement its inadequate benefits. These State programs, under the public-assistance titles of our Social Security Act, dealing with what is properly a national problem, result in ridiculous disparities, discriminations, and injustices. The result of my legislation will be to end this impractical situation, relieving State and local governments of the financial burden of carrying such misplaced and unworkable programs, thereby offsetting greatly improved opportunities to balance their respective budgets.

In respect to these foregoing points, the present system under title II—namely, old-age and survivors and disability insurance—with its collection of generally far more money from the current economy than benefits currently require—and the use by Government for purposes other than social security benefits much of the money collected in the name of that purpose—this present program violates every principle of sound governmental finance and of just apportionment of the taxload.

The Townsend program for social security provides for the perpetual gearing of benefits to changes in the cost of living and in prevailing standards of living. When changes in either standards or costs occur, this program provides for automatic matching of benefits to such changes, up or down, as the case may be. This feature of the program I hold to be preeminently conservative, because it results from careful analysis of the real problem of social security and the evolving of provisions permanently and effectively to meet it—rather than purely expedient makeshifts, patchwork, temporary provisions which are out of date almost before they can be put into effect.

Mr. Speaker, as coauthor of the Townsend bill, I do not contend that it can never be improved upon. However, I am certainly sure that the Committee on Ways and Means, upon full and objective study of it, will find that it affords them the ways and means for giving the American people and our national economy an incomparably more efficient, effective and beneficial system under title II of the Social Security Act than is afforded by the present program. I am equally certain that, after thorough committee studies and hearing and after full and conscientious debate in the House, it will become obvious to all that these amendments to title II will provide not only benefits affording our aged and other proper groups of people benefits reflecting up to date, just standards of living—but, also, an effective, permanent and, in the true sense, a conservative solution of our national social security problem.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD, with this statement, two statistical compilations of great significance. The first shows the rank discriminations, disparities and almost unbelievable violation of anything remotely resembling standards which the present programs of public assistance—supplementing title II—display. The second item sets forth the facts as to the utter failure of our efforts to date to make any progress toward solution of the social security problem under the means afforded by the present system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance:

Comparative statistics—Old-age and survivors insurance, old-age assistance, for the United States, by States and Territories; and per capita income by States, 1957

Area	1957 per capita income	OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957		OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957				
		Average benefit	Number per thousand 65 years and over	Primary benefit	Wife and husband	Widow and widower	Parents	Number per thousand 65 years and over
United States	$2,027	$60.68	165	$64.58	$34.37	$51.08	$51.87	550
Alaska	-------	63.43	260	63.79	30.07	48.97	70.00	469
Alabama	1,324	38.23	436	55.34	27.28	44.60	47.21	434
Arizona	1,750	55.38	198	64.60	34.17	50.68	49.76	503
Arkansas	1,151	45.72	306	52.84	26.03	42.86	47.99	434
California	2,523	83.16	227	65.07	35.48	51.48	53.60	572
Colorado	1,996	81.74	340	63.08	33.62	50.25	48.18	483
Connecticut	2,821	106.20	71	71.78	39.09	54.44	54.79	657
Delaware	2,740	49.31	52	65.11	36.69	52.37	52.86	632
District of Columbia	2,514	56.41	46	62.50	35.12	49.96	50.00	433
Florida	1,836	54.19	161	66.27	35.40	50.70	49.50	596
Georgia	1,431	43.06	369	55.00	28.40	44.84	46.27	402
Hawaii	$1,821	$51.56	54	$61.17	$30.84	$46.08	$53.45	519
Idaho	1,630	60.55	143	61.51	32.59	46.76	51.35	544
Illinois	2,447	67.82	92	68.17	36.86	52.95	55.60	554
Indiana	2,010	56.94	76	65.00	35.08	50.88	54.02	611
Iowa	1,806	67.36	121	62.13	33.65	48.82	52.86	509
Kansas	1,787	73.04	141	60.67	32.31	47.89	50.21	518
Kentucky	1,372	38.63	216	57.27	28.42	47.16	50.07	494
Louisiana	1,566	63.06	586	57.25	29.34	46.02	47.65	374
Maine	1,663	55.79	123	60.16	32.72	48.39	50.25	650
Maryland	2,156	51.75	49	63.18	35.27	51.32	49.46	549
Massachusetts	2,335	95.83	163	67.86	37.62	52.80	53.73	627
Michigan	2,141	66.23	117	71.08	37.84	54.15	57.00	618
Minnesota	1,850	79.10	149	63.17	33.97	51.18	52.92	522

Comparative statistics—Old-age and survivors insurance, old-age assistance, for the United States, by States and Territories; and per capita income by States, 1957—Continued

Area	1957 per capita income	OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957		OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957					Area	1957 per capita income	OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957		OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957				
		Average benefit	Number per thousand 65 years and over	Primary benefit	Wife and husband	Widow and widower	Parents	Number per thousand 65 years and over			Average benefit	Number per thousand 65 years and over	Primary benefit	Wife and husband	Widow and widower	Parents	Number per thousand 65 years and over
Mississippi	$958	$28.43	464	$49.67	$24.06	$42.27	$47.52	408	Puerto Rico	-------	$8.09	390	$41.98	$17.96	$39.40	$43.51	320
Missouri	1,940	54.53	272	62.46	33.17	50.28	51.42	519	Rhode Island	$1,990	70.61	91	66.61	36.49	51.76	54.55	696
Montana	1,896	61.99	128	64.62	35.20	50.36	50.00	515	South Carolina	1,180	37.52	247	55.42	27.59	44.72	46.71	407
Nebraska	1,818	62.18	110	61.15	32.77	47.83	49.58	507	South Dakota	1,531	49.18	144	61.16	32.79	47.62	51.61	496
Nevada	2,423	67.72	196	64.89	34.63	51.64	50.00	600	Tennessee	1,383	38.03	210	53.95	26.81	44.84	48.34	457
New Hampshire	1,862	68.57	86	63.12	34.61	49.96	51.56	644	Texas	1,791	47.15	337	58.09	29.88	46.93	43.36	425
New Jersey	2,504	80.43	40	70.64	38.97	54.22	57.47	657	Utah	1,694	65.45	164	65.65	35.04	50.59	52.58	541
New Mexico	1,686	53.83	211	58.38	29.41	46.56	49.63	392	Vermont	1,665	50.64	150	60.76	32.82	48.54	54.17	571
New York	2,578	92.08	61	67.72	37.38	52.80	55.35	618	Virgin Islands	-------	18.51	318	46.72	24.32	40.00	-------	206
North Carolina	1,317	36.44	180	55.20	27.44	44.77	47.21	467	Virginia	1,660	35.66	62	57.69	29.57	47.32	48.41	514
North Dakota	1,435	76.33	140	61.74	32.79	47.29	48.33	447	Washington	2,128	84.46	219	65.86	35.07	50.47	50.79	599
Ohio	2,255	64.54	112	68.31	37.18	53.17	54.18	574	West Virginia	1,554	34.05	133	62.42	31.32	48.24	50.15	500
Oklahoma	1,619	72.79	407	58.88	30.30	47.01	50.00	405	Wisconsin	1,920	71.09	103	64.89	34.78	54.23	52.76	585
Oregon	1,914	77.77	109	64.74	34.30	50.44	54.15	648	Wyoming	2,038	69.93	155	62.82	32.96	49.50	59.09	506
Pennsylvania	2,112	52.00	48	68.17	37.03	52.20	53.70	606									

Sources: Survey of Current Business, Department of Commerce, August 1958 table 2. Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, tables 12 and 15; July 1958, tables 6 and 8.

Population increase in adult age groups, United States, 1847 through 1957, income position of aged, 1847 through 1957

Increases in numbers of persons:

A. Aged 14 and over:

1947:	
Men	52,459,000
Women	54,953,000
Total	107,412,000
1957:	
Men	57,583,000
Women	62,219,000
Total	119,802,000
Increase (11.5 percent)	12,390,000

B. Aged 14 through 64:

1947:	
Men	47,403,000
Women	49,368,000
Total	96,771,000
1957:	
Men	50,925,000
Women	54,307,000
Total	105,232,000
Increase (8.7 percent)	8,461,000

C. Aged 25 through 64:

1947:	
Men	35,578,000
Women	36,919,000
Total	72,497,000
1957:	
Men	39,264,000
Women	41,558,000
Total	80,822,000
Increase (11.5 percent)	8,325,000

D. Aged 65 and over:

1947:	
Men	5,056,000
Women	5,585,000
Total	10,641,000
1957:	
Men	6,658,000
Women	7,912,000
Total	14,570,000
Increase (36.9 percent)	3,929,000

Share of money income by persons 65 and over:	*Percent*
1947	*7
1952	*8
1953	7.3
1954	7.7
1955	7.9
1956	7.6
1957	7.4

Sources: Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 5, table 15; No. 30, table 18. *Social Security Bulletin, February 1954, article by Jacob Fisher. Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, table 7 and table 11.

Our elderly population is increasing over three times as rapidly as the rest of our adult population. The income share of the aged group remains static. Since the whole group receives the same total share of income, the economic position of the average member of the group continuously declines.

The part of the income of the aged which is made up of social security benefits increased from 13.9 percent in 1947 to 36.8 percent in 1957. Conversely, the part of their income made up from other resources declined from about 86 percent in 1947 to about 63 percent in 1957.[1] The ability of most Americans to finance their old age through other means than our Federal social security law is shrinking fast and steadily. Our present social security program has failed, not only to better the economic position of our people in old age, but it has even failed to compensate for the constantly shrinking ability of the people otherwise to provide for their old age. These are the facts.

Drastic action on social security legislation must be taken.

[1] Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, tables 7 and 11.

A Valiant Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a press release which I recently issued. The story of the U.S.S. *Maryland* should be of interest to all those who remember how valiantly she served our country during World War II.

This is a story of a valiant lady of days gone by.

The Department of the Navy recently advised the Armed Services Committee that it intended to scrap 43 warships.

The U.S.S *Maryland* is one of the ships destined for the ironpile. I thought it might be appropriate to review her illustrious career.

This ship is the third to carry the name of *Maryland*. The first was a 380-ton vessel carrying 20 guns and 180 men. Commissioned in 1799, she served in the West Indies during the naval war with France in 1800. The second *Maryland* was an armored cruiser commissioned in 1905. She saw duty in the Atlantic in World War I. The present *Maryland* or "Old Mary," or "Fighting Mary," as she was known to her crew, was commissioned in 1921. She saw heavy action in World War II, and was under attack over a hundred times in the Pacific. The Japanese reported her sunk on three occasions.

On December 7, 1941, the *Maryland* and six of her sister battlewagons were moored along Ford Island at Pearl Harbor. The *Maryland* was severely damaged in the surprise Japanese attack of that morning, but 23 days later she pulled into Puget Sound for repairs. She shortly thereafter rejoined the fleet in the Pacific.

The *Maryland* saw further action at the battle of Midway and in the Solomon Islands. She supported the Marine assaults on Tarawa, Kwajalein, and Saipan. At the last of these engagements, a torpedo ripped a gaping hole in her port bow. After repairs, the *Maryland* again joined the fleet and participated in many engagements. The five old battleships which the Japanese thought they had sunk at Pearl Harbor, the *California*, the *Tennessee*, the *West Virginia*, the *Pennsylvania*, and the *Maryland*, met the Japanese fleet at Leyte Gulf. The thundering guns of these old battleships decimated the enemy's forces.

Shortly thereafter, the "Fighting Mary" was hit by a suicide dive bomber and severely damaged. Ground repairs were quickly made. On April 1, 1945, the *Maryland* was given the job of providing close support for the Marine invasion of Okinawa. I personally well remember the part she there played. I was in the first wave of the invasion, and I will always carry the picture in my mind of the *Maryland's* 16-inch guns shelling the coast as we Marines moved in.

The *Maryland* was again hit by a kamikaze, and again dreadfully damaged. In spite of the heavy casualties, dead and wounded, the *Maryland* continued to support the Okinawan invasion. Having been battle damaged three times in the course of 10 months, she was on her way back to strike again, when the Japanese finally surrendered.

Modern warfare has now rendered this grand lady obsolete. She and her sisters are destined for the scrap heap. I do think, however, that it is only proper to recount her gallant service as she is about to go on her last voyage.

Military Retired Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, most Members are receiving a large number of letters with reference to the disparity of retired pay of military men retired before and those retired after the military pay bill, effective June 1, 1958—Public Law 85-422.

Because I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which wrote the bill, Members are inquiring of me as to what is involved in this issue. In an effort to be helpful to my colleagues, I have formulated a number of questions and answers which reflect answers to most of the inquiries made of me.

The information given below is intended to be factual. No effort has been made to evaluate the merits of the issue nor to debate the same.

The questions and answers follow:

Question 1: Is there a material difference in the retired pay of members of the military, in the same rank and same length of service who retired before June 1, 1958, and those retiring after June 1, 1958?

Answer: In the higher ranks there is a very material difference in retired pay. The difference diminishes in the lower officer ranks and enlisted grades.

The following table contains full information as to officer ranks and enlisted grades of those retired with average years of service related to retired grade:

Examples of military retired pay under the Career Compensation Act—Nondisability retirements

Grade	Pay grade	Years of service	Paid prior to June 1, 1958	Paid after June 1, 1958		Increase over old rate		
				Retired before June 1, 1958	Retired after June 1, 1958 [1]	Retired before June 1, 1958	Retired after June 1, 1958 [1]	Difference [1]
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Chief of Staff	O-10	30	$807	$1,015	$1,406	$208	$599	$391
General	O-10	30	807	1,015	1,275	208	468	260
Lieutenant general	O-9	30	807	935	1,125	128	318	190
Major general	O-8	30	807	856	1,013	49	206	157
Brigadier general	O-7	30	725	769	881	44	156	112
Colonel	O-6	30	608	645	739	37	131	94
Lieutenant colonel	O-5	27	453	480	523	27	70	43
Major	O-4	26	385	408	410	23	25	2
Captain	O-3	25	322	341	328	19	6	−13
1st lieutenant	O-2	25	258	274	238	16	−20	−36
2d lieutenant	O-1	27	253	268	212	15	−41	−56
Master sergeant	E-7	23	184	195	201	11	17	6
Technical sergeant	E-6	23	166	176	167	10	1	−9
Staff sergeant	E-5	24	155	164	144	9	−11	−20
Sergeant	E-4	25	137	145	119	8	−18	−26
Corporal	E-3	25	102	109	88	7	−14	−21
Private 1st class	E-2	24	80	84	65	4	−15	−19
Private	E-1	23	61	65	60	4	−1	−5

[1] Not applicable to persons on saved pay at time of retirement.

NOTE.—For brevity, tables concerning commissioned officers with over 4 years of active enlisted service and warrant officers have not been included.

Question 2: Under the 1958 pay bill did persons retired before June 1, 1958, receive any increase in the retired pay previously received by them?

Answer: Yes. Those persons retired before the effective date of that pay bill received an increase of 6 percent of the pay previously received. The dollar amount in each grade and rank is given in the above table.

Question 3: Why was 6 percent increase granted rather than some other percentage?

Answer: The Department of Defense had recommended a formula granting a cost-of-living increase of 6 percent for all those active-duty members not receiving a 6 percent increase under the recommendation submitted by it. The subcommittee did not recommend the formula submitted by the Department of Defense. However, the pay scales recommended by the committee, and adopted by the Congress, reflected with but very few exceptions a 6 percent increase. Therefore, the committee recommended an increase of 6 percent for persons previously retired as approaching the increase in the cost of living.

Question 4: What was the annual cost of the increased retired pay of 6 percent?

Answer: Approximately $36 million per year.

Question 5: What increase for persons previously retired was recommended by the Department of Defense?

Answer: The Department of Defense recommended that the retired pay of those retired before the effective date of the bill not be computed on the new rates. Therefore the Department recommended no increase for these officers.

Question 6: What would be the increased cost if those retired before the effective date of the pay bill were permitted to recompute their retired pay on the new pay rates?

Answer: It is estimated the increased cost for the first year would be between $25 million and $26 million, in addition to the $36 million previously granted. This cost would recur annually, but would be reduced by approximately 2 percent per year due to attrition of personnel on the retired rolls.

Question 7: Did the granting of an increase of 6 percent depart from the previous custom as to retired pay?

Answer: Yes. In the past, persons retired prior to the effective date of any pay act have had their retired pay recomputed upon the new rather than the old pay rates.

Question 8: What is the cost of military retired pay, and what has it been in the past?

Answer: The current and past cost of military retired pay is as follows:

Appropriations or expenditures for military retired pay, fiscal year 1950-60

Fiscal year	Million
1950 appropriation	$219
1951 appropriation	322
1952 appropriation	329
1953 appropriation	356
1954 expenditure	386
1955 expenditure	419
1956 expenditure	477
1957 expenditure	509
1958 expenditure	561
1959 budget	640
1960 budget	715

Statement of Hon. Carl Vinson of Georgia on H.R. 3460

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a short statement which I made before the Public Works Committee today, and also include a good and a great statement by a good and great statesman—one of the finest men I have ever known on earth, a man with whom I have served over a quarter of a century here in the Congress of the United States, where the men that are standing around me at this moment represent every human being in America and where, Mr. Speaker, they all love and respect the great CARL VINSON. It is a joy and a pleasure to place his statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that will be read all over this land and in many foreign countries.

I consider it a good statement; I consider it a fair statement for private industry. All of us love the TVA and the REA and have voted and worked and pulled for them, but we do have to stand for private enterprise. However, I will say no more about this at the moment, but I do hope that many people everywhere will read the great statement made by this man from Georgia, who

has been in the Congress about as long as any man that has ever lived.

This is the statement by the great Congressman, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia:

STATEMENT OF CARL VINSON OF GEORGIA, ON H.R. 3460

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee today to offer an amendment to the bill H.R. 3460.

The basic law establishing TVA has no restrictions upon the area in which TVA may operate.

However, TVA has been operating within its present area for many years under a gentlemen's agreement between TVA and surrounding private utility companies.

I understand this gentlemen's agreement as to their respective areas of operation is on an entirely friendly and cooperative basis between TVA and the private utilities.

It is also my information that TVA takes pride in the fact that it is living up to this so-called gentlemen's agreement with private utilities, as to their respective areas of operation, and that TVA-private utility relations are uniformly congenial.

This bill proposes to give TVA its own legal financing and borrowing powers without congressional supervision or control. I propose through the amendment which I am submitting and advocating that if TVA is to be granted this tremendously broad financing power, Congress should now also write into the law the definite and specific area limitations under which TVA is now operating under its present gentlemen's agreement.

In other words, my amendment converts the gentlemen's agreement to law. That's all it does. If Congress is going to grant such exceedingly broad and unrestricted financing powers, to TVA, it should by all means write into the law definite territorial limitations, as to its operative power, to the area TVA now serves.

If, in the future, it is desirable for TVA to extend its area operation beyond its present territorial area, it should come back to Congress and then let Congress pass on the desirability of such an extension.

This is the sensible and sound way to go about this thing.

I understand that TVA itself is not asking for an enlarged or extended area of operation.

I am reliably informed that while TVA of course might like to have enlarged area of operation, they are primarily interested in being given power of self-financing in their own present area of operation.

If Congress is not going to give TVA further financial aid, TVA apparently needs some kind of self-financing powers if it is to meet expanding demands for power in its present operating area.

And that should be the primary aim of this legislation.

Why tack on to it a provision extending TVA territory 25,000 square miles into areas now being well and efficiently served by private utilities on all sides of the presently TVA-served area?

Why encroach so heavily upon areas now well served by present utilities?

Why upset the present gentlemen's agreement areas and the evidently pleasant relations now existing in these areas?

We should limit the area of TVA operation to that now covered by the existing gentlemen's agreement.

That is all I am asking in this amendment.

It is the sensible thing to do, if we are to grant TVA these wide financing powers.

It is fair to all parties.

My amendment does no harm to anybody or to any private or public utility or to any American citizen. It does not affect in any way the present operations of TVA. It closes no door to future congressional legislation which might be desired as to the area or any other feature of TVA.

And it places safeguards around both public and private utilities, which I believe it is our duty to do.

Mr. Chairman, the wording of the pending bill as to additional areas which TVA could serve is very uncertain and ambiguous.

It is estimated that this additional area of TVA operations as provided in the bill as it is now written is at least 25,000 square miles. This is in addition to the 80,000 square miles now served by TVA under its so-called gentlemen's agreement.

This is an increase of over 30 percent into areas now known as private utility served areas; and there are those who are of the strong opinion that the bill as written even covers a far greater area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, throughout the years, from the very inception of Muscle Shoals, I have always supported TVA legislation. But I've always known the area it could cover.

In considering this vitally important legislation, let us use discretion. Let us limit the area of TVA in this bill to its present area of operation if Congress is going to give TVA these huge self-financing powers. I hope this committee will see fit to adopt such an amendment. That is the intent and purpose of my amendment.

Last year in the report which accompanied S. 1868, this committee stated:

"The committee is convinced that this bill provides a workable solution of the problem of supplying the future power needs of the area served by TVA on a basis which will adequately protect the Federal Government, purchasers of TVA power, and investors in TVA bonds."

I appear this morning in support of an amendment to this bill which will permit TVA to supply adequate power needs in its present area, will adequately protect the Federal Government, will adequately protect purchasers of TVA power and investors in TVA bonds; and will also protect the municipalities of Georgia, the taxpayers of Georgia, the stockholders of the Georgia Power Co., the employees of the Georgia Power Co., as well as thousands of individuals who have investments in private utility companies.

Last July when the president of the Georgia Power Co. appeared before the House Committee on Public Works, he advised this committee that the Georgia Power Co. had 5,008 employees operating its properties which served 95 percent of the State of Georgia in an area of 57,000 square miles.

As of June 1958, the Georgia Power Co. directly served electrical energy requirements of 662,385 customers. In addition, approximately 300,000 Georgians receive electric service from 39 rural electric membership corporations and 50 municipal electric distribution systems who in turn receive electric power on a wholesale basis from the Georgia Power Co. The power company also carries on retail operations with 631 municipalities.

Now let me call this to your attention.

In 1957, the Southern Co., with its affiliates, including the Georgia Power Co., paid a total of $55,946,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes.

I am advised that this was considerably larger than the dividends paid to the stockholders. The affiliates of the Southern Co., including the Georgia Power Co., have over $1 billion invested in their facilities.

The Southern Co. have 21,000 preferred stockholders and 124,000 common stockholders in every State of the Union.

The Georgia Power Co. has over 8,910 stockholders, 6,600 of whom are citizens of Georgia.

Therefore, I am appearing this morning in the interests of the State of Georgia, the municipalities of the State of Georgia, the taxpayers of the State of Georgia, as well as thousands of other citizens of this country who have a vital interest in the preservation of free enterprise.

Now, just to give you an example of what the Georgia Power Co. does for the State of Georgia, and the municipalities of Georgia, let me read to you a newspaper clipping from the Union Recorder of Milledgeville, Ga., my hometown, dated Thursday, February 26, 1959:

"POWER COMPANY DELIVERS CHECK TO CITY OVER $10,000

"A check for $10,276.14 was delivered to the city of Milledgeville, February 19, 1959, by H. M. Woodard, district manager of the Georgia Power Co.

"This payment represent 3 percent of the gross receipts in 1958 from the sale of electric power to commercial and residential customers of the company under the municipal partnership plan. The 3 percent tax is paid by the company in place of occupation and franchise taxes and is in addition to the company's property taxes, which totaled $5,270,000 last year.

"More than $2,135,000 is being paid to the communities of Georgia for 1958 under the municipal partnership plan. This is an increase of more than $117,000 over 1957.

"The company's total tax bill for 1958 was $26,600,000. This does not include the sales tax which the company collects from its customers for the State of Georgia nor the sales tax which the company pays on materials used in its operations."

I want to make mighty sure that Milledgeville, my hometown, and 630 other municipalities in Georgia continue to receive these annual payments. That's the main reason I'm here today with a suggested amendment.

Now, the amendment I propose strikes out the last four words on line 13, and all of lines 14 through 25 on page 2, as well as all of lines 1 through 11 on page 3, and substitutes the following in lieu thereof:

AMENDMENT

"Unless otherwise specifically authorized by act of Congress existing and subsequently built, leased, or acquired power facilities of the Corporation shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power for use outside the service area of the Corporation as it existed on July 1, 1957, except, when economically feasible for exchange power arrangements with other utility systems with which the Corporation had such arrangements on said date."

Now let's see what the amendment does:

1. Unless specifically authorized by an act of Congress, present power facilities and those subsequently built, leased, or acquired by TVA shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power for use outside the service area of TVA as it existed on July 1, 1957. This carries out the existing gentlemen's agreement.

2. The exception to this prohibition, however, is that when economically feasible it will be permissible for TVA to provide service for interconnection with other utility systems for exchange power arrangements, if such arrangements were in effect on July 1, 1957. Such a plan is now in operation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this permits the expansion of TVA facilities within the present service area of TVA.

It is my understanding that the sole purpose of this bill is to allow TVA to finance its future expansions through a bond issue but that that expansion is to be limited to the expansion required to meet the needs of the communities and users of electricity within the present boundaries of TVA.

My amendment permits this; it merely prohibits TVA from going beyond its present service area.

The bill as written provides that power facilities financed with bond proceeds or

power revenues shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power by TVA outside the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin or the service area in which power generated by the Corporation is being used on July 1, 1957. (Lines 13–21, p. 2.)

Although the proponents of the bill represent the intention of the bill to be to confine TVA to its existing service area, with some minor flexibility, the truth is that the provision: (1) Contains a number of loopholes, ambiguities and exceptions which could be used to expand TVA's existing service area virtually without limit; and (2) in addition, in express terms, permits expansion of TVA's existing service area into an additional area of some 25,000 square miles (or approximately 31 percent of TVA's existing service area) which is not now serviced by TVA.

The loopholes, ambiguities and exceptions, which could be used to permit unlimited expansion, are:

1. The provision does not deal directly with the scope of TVA's operations but is drafted in terms of the use of power facilities financed with the proceeds of bonds or power revenues. But existing facilities or new facilities financed in any other way could be used to expand TVA's service area without any limitations whatever.

2. The provision is phrased in terms of "sale or delivery" (rather than use) of power in the defined areas and, except for the proviso which refers only to a "distributor", does not prohibit the purchase of power within the service area for use outside. There is, for example, nothing in the provision to prevent an industrial customer from taking delivery of power within the defined area and using it outside such area.

3. Power may be sold or delivered to a Federal agency wherever located. It is not clear whether the proviso against resale by a "distributor" would apply to a Federal agency. If not, such an agency as Southeastern Power Administration could qualify as a purchaser for resale, and then, obviously, that would permit it almost unlimited expansion of the area in which TVA power could be used so as to include the entire State of Georgia.

4. The bill authorizes a bond issue of $750 million to be outstanding at any one time to assist TVA in financing its power program. What appears to be words of limitation requiring approval by Congress with regard to the use of these bonds for the expansion of TVA service areas, actually constitute an authorization for expansion over and above the areas now served by TVA. This comes about as a result of the language on lines 17 through 19 which says that it is the intent of this act that the facilities constructed with the proceeds of these bonds or power revenues can't be used without prior approval by Congress, "for the sale or delivery of power by the corporation outside the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin."

But the geographical studies show that there are about 8,500 square miles within this drainage basin which are not now served by TVA. Thus what appears at first to be a limitation in the bill is actually an open invitation to expansion.

5. The words of limitation with regard to prior approval by Congress apply only to the power facilities built or acquired with the proceeds of the bond issue or power revenues derived from construction resulting from the bond issue. However, there is no limitation with regard to the utilization of revenues derived from existing facilities. Revenue from these facilities therefore could be used for unlimited expansion because there are no words of limitation applicable to these facilities.

6. In other words, the bill contains no limitation whatsoever with regard to new facilities that may be constructed on the basis of revenues produced by existing facilities.

There are some words of limitation with regard to new facilities constructed on the basis of the new bond issue authorized by this bill or on the basis of revenues produced from the new facilities constructed under the bond issue, but even this part of the bill authorizes an expansion of 8,500 square miles in the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this bill, H.R. 3460, is so cleverly drafted that hereafter TVA is going to keep two sets of books—one set of books will be known as the limited expansion set of books, and the other, the unlimited expansion set of books.

Now, why do I say that?

Well, it is perfectly obvious from the way this bill is drafted, that any facilities built from the $750 million bond issue can't be used for expansion without congressional approval other than the 8,500 square miles of expansion which will result from the language with regard to the counties lying partially or wholly within the Tennessee River drainage area.

Now, any revenues that are derived from any of these new facilities can't be used for expansion other than that I have just mentioned, so they will be kept under the limited expansion set of books.

But if TVA wants to expand without congressional approval, all they have to do is to take the revenues from existing facilities which were not built from the proceeds of the proposed bond issue, and use those revenues for new facilities without any limitation whatsoever and without ever coming back to the Congress to even say, "how do you do."

This is true because there is no limitation in this bill on the utilization of revenues derived from existing facilities.

Now I don't know how TVA plans to operate in the future, but certainly there is nothing in this bill to prevent them from using two sets of books and every time they want to expand into a new area, all they have to do is point to the set of books marked "unlimited expansion" and say, "Congress knew exactly what it was doing. They only restricted us from expanding with the proceeds or revenues derived from the bond issue. They didn't restrict us with regard to the proceeds from existing facilities built before the bond issue was authorized."

It is difficult to understand why the language "the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin" is used unless the proponents are demanding that the present service areas of TVA be expanded.

Geographical studies and maps show unquestionably that there are some 8,500 square miles in this drainage basin which are not now served by TVA.

Furthermore, the bill refers to the whole of counties which are only partially within TVA's existing service area or the drainage basin. This would permit expansion into some 16,500 square miles which are not now served by TVA. By far, the major part of this 8,500-square mile area and the 16,500-square mile area are now served by investor-owned power companies.

The TVA problem faced by Congress arises from the fact that TVA and its supporters have stated that they would need $1.5 billion in the next 10 years to provide for the expansion of the electric power requirements of its existing service area.

TVA and its supporters profess to have no desire to expand its service area geographically. But its supporters have not been willing to accept an unambiguous direction that the existing service area is not to be extended without further congressional authorization.

Congress may have to face the problem of finding some way to provide for the increased power requirements of the area now served by TVA. But Congress can and should insist that this problem be at least confined to that area and that effective limits be placed on further geographical expansion without express congressional approval. No good reason has been advanced to justify the expansion permitted by the bill or, indeed, to justify any geographical expansion at all.

There should be a direct and unequivocal provision confining TVA's power operations to its existing service area. Further geographical expansion should be permitted only after a showing of the need therefor and express congressional approval.

From the standpoint of the Georgia Power Co., this service area expansion problem is indeed a grave one. If not amended so as to fully protect this company, the adoption of the bill in its present form would have a most immediate and direct adverse effect on the company, which, as of June 1958, directly served the electric energy requirements of 662,385 customers.

I say that the language on page 2 of the bill (lines 13–25) provides the expansion of TVA directly or by its power distributors throughout counties in the Tennessee River drainage basin, and other counties in northwest Georgia now receiving TVA power through the North Georgia Electric Membership Corp., to an extent that was never dreamed of, even during the 1930's.

I interpret this language to not only permit, but also to encourage TVA to service directly some of the municipalities which the Georgia Power Co., now serves in northwest Georgia and, in addition, authorizes North Georgia Electric Membership Corp., a distributor of TVA, to extend its sales of TVA power throughout the whole of all of those counties in northwest Georgia in which it operated as of July 1, 1957. Necessarily, a very uneconomic and destructive duplication of already adequate electrical facilities would eventuate. Such an expansion would involve the largest cities in northwest Georgia.

It is for these reasons that I am proposing this amendment, so that the bill will be confined to what the stated need is, and not permit action to be taken which would adversely affect the municipalities of Georgia, the taxpayers of Georgia, the employees of the Georgia Power Co., and the stockholders of this and other private utility companies.

Mr. Chairman, I offer no apology for appearing here today on behalf of the municipalities of Georgia, as well as the Georgia Power Co. The Georgia Power Co. is a private utility system owned by private citizens. It has 8,910 stockholders, 6,600 of whom are citizens of Georgia.

My amendment very clearly protects my constituents who are stockholders in the Georgia Power Co., and most importantly, the municipalities of my district who do business with this company.

If TVA facilities must be expanded to provide for increased power demands within its present area, then let's confine the bill to only that purpose.

Let's not use a steamroller where a simple sledge hammer will do the job.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN, OF ALABAMA, ON H.R. 3460

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before your committee on behalf of myself and the other members of the Alabama House delegation who have the services of the Alabama Power Co. in their respective congressional districts. We are proud of the Alabama Power Co. and feel that it has done much for the betterment of our district and our State. We are also proud that we have the great TVA in our

State. We are for both Alabama Power Co. and TVA and want to help both.

We are all aware of the gentlemen's agreement between TVA and Alabama Power Co., which has been so carefully kept by both parties for so many years. We feel that anything that can be done to continue this peaceful coexistence is all to the good and that it is to the best interest of all concerned that this gentlemen's agreement be preserved by making it the law, as CARL VINSON has suggested.

Order or Disorder in the Space Age?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the United States has achieved a great international status for its accomplishments in the area of managerial efficiency. We have been represented as the model for democratic decision making and speed of production. But as we move into the space age we find great confusion in both the decision-making process and the production process. We are facing the greatest threat to our survival in our history; yet we are not drawing on our genius for organization and management. The time is now if we are to develop the kinds of procedures which will guarantee our national security and enable us to become the leaders in the space age.

Last week I addressed myself to these problems before the Western Space Age Conference in Los Angeles, and I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on that occasion printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVING FEDERAL PROCEDURES IN THE MISSILE AND SPACE CONTEST

(Excerpts from speech by Senator CLAIR ENGLE at Western Space Age Conference, Los Angeles, Calif., March 5, 1959)

I am sure that everyone here is aware that I have only recently become a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—and more particularly, the Aviation Subcommittee which deals with civilian aviation. On the other hand, for a number of years I have taken a great interest in the aircraft and missile business. I have spent three tours of active duty with the Air Force in research and development and the missile field.

But obviously I am not an expert on missiles and aircraft design and construction. And I intend, in these remarks, to stay within my specialty—which is legislation and government. I have spent some 16 years in the Congress of the United States, and I am much concerned with the procedures in government affecting production in the aircraft, missile, and space field. I know that these procedures, both legislative and administrative, have a direct effect on the speed and efficiency with which Government programs are put into operation.

THE SUBJECTS

There are two aspects of administrative and legislative management in the production of aircraft and missiles that I particularly want to mention:

First, the contracts, the continuity of the contracts, stretchouts, and termination; and

Second, the complexity of the governmental organization in the aircraft, missile, and space production field.

THE CONTRACTS

We in California have had brought home to us in a particularly acute fashion what it means when a major defense contract is canceled, or stretched out to any appreciable extent. I do not have to remind you of what happened in the summer of 1957 when the Defense Department canceled the Navajo contract. There have been others that have been canceled more recently.

We need to take a hard look at this situation to see to what extent such contract cancellation and stretchouts are a necessary and unavoidable part of our national defense effort.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES

Clearly there are sound technological reasons why some defense cutbacks are made. The extent to which obsolescence makes this necessary is reflected, for example, in the statement of Assistant Secretary of Defense W. J. McNeil before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress on February 10, in which he listed, on the one hand, the programs which have been or are being phased out or canceled and, on the other hand, work being accelerated.

BUDGETARY PROBLEMS

However, not all defense cutbacks can be accounted for solely on technological grounds. A great deal has in the past depended upon budgetary considerations—and here the record is not so good. Our defense budget, on which our national existence depends, receives less consistent treatment than any other part of the Federal budget.

AN EXAMPLE

As an example, let us review briefly some of the things that happened during 1957 in the way of management of defense funds. In April, the Department of Defense, making new estimates of expenditures through the fiscal year, found that its major programs were moving much faster than they had been aware of, and that expenditures might be as much as $2 billion more than anticipated. To reduce or defer the anticipated overrun of $2 billion, contracting agencies in the Department of Defense were sent telegrams and ordered to curtail or to cease overtime expenditures. Some contractors were asked to withhold voluntarily all or a part of their April, May, and June billings. The result of that was that a budget surplus was created more by deferment of payments than by reduction of obligations. Thus, the Government entered the fiscal year 1958, on July 1, 1957, with a large carryover of bills—and at the same time, new budget appropriations which had in many ways been cut to the bone.

Those contractors who voluntarily or otherwise agreed to deferred payments found themselves with sudden and unanticipated demands upon their working capital, all without additional compensation or profit. The Defense officials found themselves in the awkward position of having to reconcile a large carryover of unpaid bills with orders to hold defense spending to $19 billion in the 6 months from July 1 to December 31, 1957.

AFTER SPUTNIK

After Sputnik No. 1, in October 1957, the Defense Department, faced with a demand for acceleration of defense activity, found itself right up against the debt ceiling, with legally available cash nonexistent. When the new orders really started up after January 1958 contractors had to bid hurriedly and simultaneously on more projects than they could handle. As a result some companies came out overloaded and others had insufficient work.

SPECIFIC REMEDIES

Here are five specific steps I think should be taken:

1. We can insist that the Department of Defense and its branches do a better job in forecasting and budgeting their cash requirements for years ahead. The Department of Defense should provide for an earlier review of the allocation of these needs to particular projects or contracts. This would enable the Congress to make more adequate budget reviews and should facilitate the letting of contracts once appropriations were passed.

2. Carryovers of unpaid bills from one fiscal year to the next can and should be eliminated or minimized. Abnormal peaking of cash requirements in any particular year or period distorts the rate of defense expenditures, gives the Congress and the people of the United States the wrong picture, and accomplishes no more than putting off the day of reckoning.

3. The Congress and the Treasury must make certain that a sound and regular flow of defense contracts is not impeded by the debt ceiling.

4. Recognizing that neither curtailing nor stepping up a firm's production under a defense project can be done without a sizable adjustment of plant, facilities, personnel, and financing, a contractor should have at least 6 months' notice, wherever possible, of requirements to accelerate or decelerate work on a particular contract.

5. If it is found necessary to continue to make limitations on progress payments, as has been common in recent years, the Government should recognize that such limitations involve an increased financial burden borne by the contractor by increasing the compensation allowed him.

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

On the second point—the complexity of the governmental organization in the production of aircraft, missiles, and space vehicles—we find that this governmental organization is often responsible for the difficulties that arise. Especially after Sputnik I, the Government agencies in the missile and satellite field have simply flowered, with new committees, new responsibilities, new people, each one of whom is supposed to exercise an important function in this field. I believe that a member of the missile industry looking at these organization charts and this mass of committees will be just as confused as I am—although as a legislator I have had years of familiarity with organizational charts. The one that Trevor Gardner presented in Life magazine over a year ago showed 90 bases that needed touching for complete coordination of space activities. No wonder we are having difficulty keeping up with the Soviets.

MORE CZARS

The successful firings of IRBM's and ICBM's by the Russians led to the appointment of William M. Holaday as Guided Missile Director; the launching of Sputnik I brought in two czars—Roy W. Johnson as Chairman of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA), and James Killian as the President's special assistant on science and technology; and concern over military domination of space activities resulted in the appointment of Dr. T. Keith Glennan as Administrator of the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Meanwhile, Donald Quarles, Deputy Secretary of the Department of Defense, has responsibilities that tend to put him in direct conflict with all of these people. And we have just scratched the surface of those who are involved in the decision-making process.

AGENCY HODGEPODGE

At the top levels of decision making, we find a proliferation of committees. The NASA law created a Space Council, which is chaired by the President himself. It also set up a Civilian-Military Liaison Committee to coordinate space activities. The Chairman of this Committee is Guided Missile Director Holaday, who has no authority to give orders to any of the members. About all that happens at the regularly scheduled meetings, attended by people from NASA, ARPA, military organizations, and others, is that information is exchanged. NASA itself has 13 coequal committees consisting of 15 or more members each. To complete the jurisdictional complexity and overlap, both NASA and agencies of the Defense Department give assignments to research and development units of the military services. As would appear inevitable, disputes arise on the control of certain projects and the solutions are always compromises which satisfy no one and cause further delays.

VIEW FROM THE PRESIDENCY

If we were to look at it from the vantage point of the President, we would find him advised by so many agencies that he could not possibly know where the decisions should be made. Here is an incomplete listing of the groups he turns to for assistance: The National Science Foundation; the National Science Board; the chief scientific adviser, Dr. J. R. Killian, Jr.; the Federal Council for Science and Technology (proposed); the President's Scientific Advisory Council; the special aviation adviser, General Quesada; the National Security Council; the Federal Aviation Agency; NASA; the Bureau of Standards; and the Department of Defense with all its subdivisions such as ARPA and Guided Missiles and the military services. If Mr. Eisenhower wanted to know about the value of a certain proposal, I doubt if he would be sure where to turn or whether he could get better information from someone other than the adviser he was consulting.

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES

General Medaris: It cannot be doubted that this confusion, overlapping of jurisdictions, and absence of a clear line of command are reflected in aircraft and missile production lags. Gen. John Medaris, Commander of the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency, at a congressional hearing, said: "We have no handicap in the use of our resources once the resources are approved to us and our line of approach is approved." Inherent in the whole process of missile development is the decision-time element, the time required to get decisions as definitive approvals or guidelines on which to proceed.

I asked General Medaris recently how many people—as a minimum—he would have to get in the same room to get a decision that would be firm. He counted off at least five—the Secretary of the Army, the Army Budget Officer, the Secretary of Defense, the Defense Budget Officer, and someone from the Bureau of the Budget. I asked him if he thought he ever could get them all in the same room at the same time, and he said he didn't think so. At the hearing, he cried out rather forlornly: "Some place there has to be one man who can make a decision, who can give a command, and who has the resources to carry it out."

Dr. von Braun: Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency, went even further in criticizing the constant interference with project development. He could not understand why there had to be so many committees. Medaris went from Huntsville, Ala., to Washington once a week to get decisions while Braun visited the Pentagon twice a month for committee meetings. And if that wasn't enough, from time to time the committees visited the Huntsville project.

Admiral Hayward: Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, Director of Research and Development, Department of the Navy, commented at a House Space Committee hearing: "U.S. supremacy in space science is threatened not by lack of talent, but by lack of skill in bureaucracy."

Admiral Hayward believes that we should have one U.S. space program. With regard to the confusion on organization and lines of command, he commented that it was not a question of standing the heat in the kitchen," but "who it was who was in the kitchen." He said, "In the atom business you never had that—you knew who had the responsibility. You knew how it was done, and the military got what we needed."

Admiral Hayward testified that when he had a program he was anxious to see carried out, he would bring it to Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and then he would take it to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development for his approval. He would also go to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Gates. Once it has cleared the Navy Department, the program goes to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, Dr. Herbert York—and then Dr. York may or may not present the matter to Roy Johnson, of ARPA, or to William Holaday, the Director of Guided Missiles.

This isn't a complete count. Admiral Hayward said there were at least 10 places where he could be vetoed. He then went on to say that after he gets the program approved in all these places and even after appropriations are made by Congress, he still has to fight back down the line to get approval for the expenditure—and at any time the Bureau of the Budget may step in and impound the funds for the project.

AMMUNITION—KOREA

That these problems are long standing can be shown by the trouble we had getting adequate ammunition to Korea as the war dragged on. It took 18 months from the time the money was made available to get the first ammunition from the manufacturers. When we look at a chart of the operations of the Army Ordnance Corps, we find that an average of 113 days elapses from the original order for ammunition to the award of the contract to produce it—then it has to be produced. According to ordnance lingo, there are 11 action offices and 35 steps to be taken in the process.

NOT EXECUTIVE BRANCH ALONE

The presentation of this whole range of shortcomings in the defense effort does not mean that I am blaming the executive branch for all of the problems, or that the confusion has been confined to this administration. The ammunition hassle in the Korean war is a case in point. At the time, President Truman told me that he spent 80 percent of his time trying to make the Federal Government work—to keep the gears in mesh. The Congress bears much of the responsibility, since it enacts the legislation creating many of the executive agencies involved in the decision-making process. Furthermore, it has its own overlapping jurisdictions, such as the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee covering much the same ground as the Senate Space Committee.

SUMMARY

I have dwelt today on two subjects:

First: The contracts, the continuity of these contracts, stretchouts, and termination.

Second: The complexity of the governmental organization in aircraft, missile, and space production.

I have not suggested all the answers—I don't know them all. But I know we must get the answers.

If we are to be superior to the Soviets, the first requisite is to have the system of government that can maximize our scientific and industrial capabilities.

Two oceans and time will not be protections from now on. The world is shrinking and we must face the new order in the world. We must move fast.

Our form of government, our way of doing business, is relatively new in the perspective of history.

The question is whether we can stand the test against one of the most efficient examples of the old order—a dictatorship with modern refinements—a dictatorship that has the singleness of purpose, the discipline to override the agony and frustration of the masses, and a straight line of command that can direct the resources, human and material, of a whole and powerful nation toward a single objective.

Both the economic and political structures of this country face the greatest challenge in our history in the short years ahead.

I think we can do it. But we must recognize the challenge. And we must be willing—in sacrifice, in diligence, and in the intelligent application of our talent—to meet the challenge. How we organize to do the job can be the difference between winning and losing the cold war.

Gateways to Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Division of Industrial and Port Development recently published a most informative booklet, entitled "Wisconsin Ports—Gateway to the Upper Midwest."

I commend this publication to shippers and manufacturers who are looking ahead to the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the connecting channels. As the Governor of our State says in the foreword of the booklet:

Completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project will make Wisconsin's coasts frontiers once more, as they were in the days of the French voyagers and later, when the pioneer settlers arrived from Europe by ship. This time the frontiers are industrial, created by the opening of Wisconsin's 14 port cities to ocean ships. Men of vision are planning for the industrial developments that the seaway will make possible and profitable in Wisconsin and the entire upper Midwest.

The booklet points out that—

Wisconsin's 14 ports and harbors are important and promising new gateways to the heartland of North America. They lie at the western end of the Great Lakes Waterway system, now being opened to deep-draft world shipping by the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Oceangoing ships, carrying cargo to and from all parts of the world, bring all the advantages of water transportation to Wisconsin ports, 2,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean. These ports serve as convenient transfer points for a vast and rapidly developing region extending a thousand miles to the west. This region includes all

or part of 15 of the United States and 3 Provinces of Canada.

Of the 14 ports described in detail in the booklet, 6 are located in the congressional district I am honored to represent. These ports are Marinette, Green Bay, Sturgeon Bay, Kewaunee, Two Rivers, and Manitowoc.

These six ports connect with railroads which serve the West and with a well engineered and maintained arterial highway system which joins a network of truck routes serving the upper Midwest. Two of the ports have regularly scheduled airline passenger service; the others are less than an hour's drive from such service. All have harbors already deep enough to accommodate moderate size oceangoing ships, together with the necessary harbor installations, including protective breakwaters, navigation aids, movable bridges, bulkheads, and open storage spaces, bunkering facilities and marine repair facilities. Many have dockside warehouses, grain storage elevators, heavy lift cranes, shipyards and drydocks, customs offices, and Coast Guard stations.

Each of these harbors is actively promoting its future development, and Wisconsin, in 1955, created a division of industrial development, and in 1957, added port development to the division's responsibilities. Assistance to shippers and manufacturers interested in the potential of Wisconsin harbors as new gateways to profits is readily available.

Copies of the booklet describing Wisconsin port facilities may be obtained from the State of Wisconsin Division of Industrial and Port Development. More detailed information concerning the harbors in my congressional district can be obtained from the following sources:

Marinette: Manager, Marinette Chamber of Commerce.

Green Bay: Secretary, City of Green Bay Industrial Development Authority, or chairman, committee on industrial development, Green Bay Association of Commerce.

Sturgeon Bay: Sturgeon Bay Development Corp.

Kewaunee: Office of mayor.

Two Rivers: President, Two Rivers Industrial Development Corp.

Manitowoc: Office of mayor, or harbor commission, city of Manitowoc.

Advertising Most Effective Good Will Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, too often the functions of advertising are misunderstood. This is especially true in the fields of education and politics. Oftentimes sincere and well-meaning politicians and educators make unwarranted and untrue attacks on the advertising profession. It has become a favorite whipping boy for those who want to discredit business and enterprise in America.

As one of the few advertising men in Congress, I was much impressed recently by a speech made by the Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, a distinguished citizen who is well-known for his service as an admiral in the U.S. Navy and as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Secretary Strauss' remarks should be read by every student of economics, and by leaders in Government, too. These remarks present a clear picture of the relationships of advertising to the American system of free enterprise. Under unanimous consent, I include his speech as a portion of my remarks:

ADVERTISING MOST EFFECTIVE GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR

(Remarks by Lewis L. Strauss, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, at the annual New York conference of the Associated Business Publications, New York City, February 26, 1959)

Calvin Coolidge once said, "The chief business of America is business." If that statement is still valid, then Mr. Coolidge's description also depicts the significance and the importance to the Nation of publications designed to assist business.

The more than 2,000 business periodicals with a circulation of approximately 40 million and a $540 million advertising revenue in 1958 constitute a tremendous generative force in our free enterprise system.

You are the eyes and ears of business, collecting news of value to resourceful executives. You also are the voice of business—bringing timely information and stimulating ideas to your readers who range from big corporation executives all the way to proprietors of "Pop and Mom" shops. Indeed, your specialized publications have well been described as the research department of small business.

For these reasons, as Secretary of Commerce, I am happy to acclaim your special service in the practical promotion of private industry. I understand that my great predecessor, Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover, initiated contacts with business editors and worked in close cooperation with them. I shall try to maintain the same relationship.

EXTREMELY VALUABLE PUBLIC SERVICE

Your publications already are performing an extremely valuable public service for the Commerce Department by creating abroad a better understanding of our American free enterprise system and its products. I refer, of course, to the thousands of copies of business and technical publications which you freely contribute to our numerous international trade fairs—from Addis Ababa to Zagreb.

Thanks to the publishing industry, a fresh, new library, numbering around 1,000 volumes of business and technical publications, factbooks and directories, is shipped with each trade mission. These become quick, authoritative reference sources for Government experts and business executives on our trade teams, enabling them to answer questions about American markets, techniques, convention dates, tariffs and other information of interest to potential buyers and sellers.

One of the most effective American ambassadors for good will is the American advertisement.

European and Asian businessmen, women and other trade fair visitors gaze with excited wonderment at—to them—the unbelievable superabundance displayed in the ads. Tourists are intrigued by the pictures; students and authors gain an insight into the American way of life.

The Soviet pavilions at trade fairs generally have information booths but their supply of reference works and publications is meager in comparison with the U.S. exhibit.

Incidentally, in Poland not only were American periodicals eagerly thumbed through from cover to cover, but also every American city telephone directory was scrutinized line for line by the news-starved people, searching for traces of relatives and friends in the land of the free.

In your comprehensive collection of facts for business, I trust that you will find fresh sources of information in the Department's new series of economic censuses now underway. Included are: the Census of Business, of Manufactures, and of Mineral Industries. The Census of Agriculture, which is taken every 5 years, is scheduled for October and November of this year. Next year, we shall take our great Decennial Census.

And while on the subject of censuses, let me express appreciation to the Associated Business Publications for your active assistance, particularly with respect to the Census of Business. Your cooperation with us has helped to insure the cooperation of the millions of businessmen to whom the reporting forms were mailed. It is important for them to realize that this information is being gathered not to harass them but to help them.

Still another vital function of business publications that is becoming of increasing importance is the spread of genuine economic literacy. None can do this job better than you. The success or failure of growth depends primarily on managerial decisions made in more than 4½ million independent American enterprises. The more adequate and accurate the information, the more likely the wise decision. Yours is that opportunity of leadership—to provide the truth—the whole truth on our economy—thus benefiting sound judgment in economic planning and action.

RISING NATIONAL ECONOMY

I hope to contribute a few facts about the economy, which may be of some use to you in further appraising for your readers the recovery, the current business situation, and the outlook. Some of this data is new.

For the past several months, it has been apparent that the national economy is in the rising phase of a business cycle.

The total value of the Nation's output of goods and services—the gross national product—rose from an annual rate of $430 billion in the second quarter of last year to a $453 billion rate in the final quarter.

The American people's purchasing power is at an all-time high. Personal income in January was at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $362½ billion, $2½ billion above the previous month.

In retrospect, now that rather firm figures for 1958 are available, it appears that the gross national product for the year as a whole was very little below the 1957 record total. At $438 billion, gross national product in current dollars was virtually the same, and after adjustment for the 1957–58 rise in prices, was only 3 percent lower.

There seems to be a fairly general feeling among many economists and business executives that in dollar terms the 1959 gross national product will exceed 1958 by about the same margin that 1955 was above 1954—more than $30 billion.

How much the gain will be in real terms depends upon our ability to maintain price stability. It should be evident by now to all Americans—and especially to businessmen—that President Eisenhower, and we of his administration, consider this the most important problem that the American economy has to contend with today.

If the richest nation on earth, in the richest year of its history, refuses to live within its income and pay its bills as it goes, when will it ever get out of the red?

We have in prospect an increase in our population from 165 million in 1955—it is now 176 million—to 195 million in 1965. By 1980 the population may not be far below 260 million.

DANGERS OF INFLATION

I think we are well warranted in assuming—if we do not stunt real growth through runaway inflation or other blunters—that living standards, rather than declining, will tend to rise. This means that the demand for consumer goods will be greatly increased. As that dynamic market expands, production must increase to meet its demands and new jobs will be created.

Our long-range view of the national economy and its prospects ought to be a compound of great optimism and common sense caution. The outcome will depend upon how wisely the government and the people handle the temptation of inflation. The forthcoming expansion of the American economy therefore represents a challenge not only to those who formulate public policy but to the free private enterprise system and all engaged in it.

The prospect also offers to the business publication industry immeasurable opportunities of private and public service.

The keys to our continually rising standard of living are mass production and a high rate of technological progress. But in a land of vast distances and millions of inhabitants, production, unaided, never could reach the entire market. The progress of growth will depend in considerable measure on the pace and breadth of distribution. It is in this field that publishing and advertising supply a driving force.

This fundamental truth often is misunderstood and frequently denied by business-baiters. They like to cite Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, "If a man can make a better mousetrap than his neighbor, though he builds his house in the woods, the world will make a beaten path to his door." This, the pundits say, illustrates why advertising is superfluous. That is nonsense, of course, for if the successful trap manufacturer had the intelligence to invent the better mousetrap in the first instance you may be sure that he also had the good sense to see that the path to his door was well indicated by direction signs attesting to the virtue of his product and tied in with display advertising in all the media of the day.

One of my prized possessions is a copy of Weekly Observer and General Advertiser of Culpeper Courthouse, Va., for May 28, 1858. I prize it because it contains the advertisement of my grandfather who came over from Germany 9 years earlier and had saved enough money to set up in the mercantile business. As advertising copy it isn't much but it shows at least that my respect for the institution of advertising is inherited.

Government and business should stand up for the distribution factor of our economy. Last month, at the meeting of our National Distribution Council, an addition was suggested to be made to the objectives and responsibilities of the Department's Office of Distribution. The recommendation reads as follows: "The Department of Commerce should assume responsibility for disseminating an adequate understanding of the vital importance to our economy of the distribution process in all its dynamic activities; and to take appropriate action seeking to defend it against misrepresentation or attack, from whatever source they may arise."

You may be interested to know that on the council's committee of leading executives who drafted that challenge was your own Associated Business Publications president, William K. Beard.

Those recommendations will be carried out.

PROUD TO CHAMPION ADVERTISING

This is how I feel about advertising. To me it is more than a specialty; it is the bloodstream of healthy growing business. Think of a country without advertising. It would be drab—as drab as Russia. I don't mean just the absence of neon signs and lights and display. I mean the monotony of sterile uniformity. Come to think if it, one of the great differences between our system and the Communist system is well exemplified by advertising. For the significance of advertising is that the buyer has a choice.

It is the very ozone of the free air of freedom—the freedom to choose. "Buy my product," one advertiser will urge, "it sells for less." "Buy mine," says another, "it is more durable," or "king size," or "copper riveted," or "aged in the wood," or better than any one of a thousand different ways.

Choice—something the unfortunate dweller under communism never has. Somebody makes the choice for him—even the choice of candidates. There is no place for choice and therefore none for real advertising in a dictatorship.

Freedom of choice is as important as freedom of speech but in this blessed land we take it for granted. We ought to recognize it as the fifth freedom and advertising is the touchstone which proves its existence and its vigor.

Advertising stimulates competition, which in turn, keeps free enterprise vigorous. It points to where needs can be supplied and adds stardust to humdrum living. As the average modern family budget can cover more than sheer necessities, advertising steers discretionary purchasing power.

The size, quality and news coverage of the daily papers, magazines, radio and television are made possible by advertising revenue. Naturally, the detractors of the profit system and the enemies of private enterprise deplore such commercialism. Some would even prefer government subsidy because with it goes the possibility of government thought control.

You, as publishers, and I, as Commerce Secretary, are proud to champion advertising—because its primary function helps our economy to grow and its revenues help a free press to remain free.

Mismanagement of Military Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1959, I received from the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of a report on the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center at Yokohama, Japan. The report indicated beyond doubt the lack of adequate supply management at the base in Yokohama.

Because of my long interest in this subject I wrote to the Comptroller General on January 30, 1959, and asked him, among other things, if it were not possible for the excellent staff of the Comptroller General to make some systems studies going into all facets of supply management with regard to electronic supplies and equipment and other related fields consistent with the intent of the so-called McCormack amendment to the Military Reorganization Act of 1958 which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to "carry out any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate."

On March 9, 1959, I received a splendid letter from the Comptroller General wherein he states that during the year ending June 30, 1958, over 200 reports were issued by his agency to the Congress and military departments, the majority of which dealt with various aspects of the supply operations of the military services and involved deficiencies in requirements determination, procurement practices, and supply control management.

The Comptroller General makes this significant statement:

> Our previous reviews have disclosed the unreliability of stock records at major supply centers and the consequent lack of sound data on which to base supply decisions; requirement determinations have been improper; inadequate coordination existed for supply matters among the military services; contracting procedures in awarding and administering procurements required improvements; and stocks were being disposed of as surplus when valid requirements existed within the military department.

Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in the subject matter involved in this exchange of correspondence with the Comptroller General of the United States which, without objection, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1959.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: I am in receipt of your report (B-133036) relating to examination of the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center, Yokohama, Japan. This and the other reports which you have furnished to me are of great value and, as you know, relate directly to the so-called McCormack amendment (sec. 3.(6)) (Public Law 85-599).

I note from your letter of transmittal and from the report itself that this one Signal Supply Center has failed to properly discharge its supply-control responsibility in regard to determining requirements. As a result of this failure the Government was placed in a position of buying millions of dollars worth of unneeded stocks.

I also note on page 1 of the report itself: "We did not make an overall appraisal of the activity or its administration. Our work and the related report devote major attention to the identification of deficient areas and the corrective actions taken by the Agency in those areas."

It occurs to me that the findings and conclusions of your excellent report at one supply center indicate a deficiency in the supply system itself in the Signal Corps with respect to requirements determination, procurement, overall inspection and review, and inventory control methods and procedures.

Nor can I help but wonder as to the adequacy of the overall Department of Defense supply demand control system. For example, your report indicates a failure at the one Signal Supply Center in the supply management function involving one item—dry batteries. What is the situation with respect to dry batteries within the Department of Defense? Does anyone relate overall in-

ventory with requirements before procurements are made? Is there concurrent buying and selling?

I am enclosing for your use a copy of the Federal Real and Personal Property Inventory Report issued by the House Government Operations Committee. In analyzing the inventories in the supply systems of the Department of Defense it is noted that communications and signal equipment total hundreds of millions of dollars. It is to be noted also from the distribution of the reported stocks that a large percentage falls into categories that are either designated as being excessive or could reasonably be so considered. Also that each of the major services carries similar categories of stocks which undoubtedly include identical items.

The McCormack amendment to which I referred earlier reads as follows:

"(6) Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate. For the purposes of this paragraph, any supply or service activity common to more than one military department shall not be considered a 'major combatant function' within the meaning of paragraph (1) hereof."

Would it be possible for your Agency to extend the scope of its investigation to all facets of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense? This would mean a study as to the adequacy of the requirements determination, procurement, inventory control, utilization of all available assets before procurement, distribution of stock and disposal of excess or surplus property.

I should also appreciate recommendations which you may be able to make for improvement of supply management across the board in the Department of Defense as contemplated by the legislation to which I refer.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1959.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: Reference is made to your letter of January 30, 1959, acknowledging receipt of our report on examination of the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center, Yokohama, Japan. We are particularly appreciative of your comment that this and other reports which we have furnished you are of great value.

A substantial portion of our adult efforts in the Department of Defense is directed toward the delineation of significant areas of deficiencies in the supply and logistics system, and examination and analysis of these deficiencies in terms of shortcomings in management controls including basic policies and procedures, and recommending to management, and to the Congress when appropriate, such action as will, in our opinion, correct or improve the logistical inadequacies. During the year ended June 30, 1958, over 200 reports were issued to the Congress and the military departments, the majority of which dealt with various aspects of the supply operations of the military services and involved deficiencies in requirements determinations, procurement practices, and supply control management. Our reviews have covered signal supply control agencies and depots of the Army, requirements determinations for ground communication-electronic equipment in the Air Force and various supply installations of the Navy. In addition, we have reviewed selected aspects of the supply operations of the military services in Europe, North Africa, and the Far East.

Our previous reviews have disclosed the unreliability of stock records at major supply centers and the consequent lack of sound data on to base supply decisions; requirement determinations have been improper; inadequate coordination existed for supply matters among the military services; contracting procedures in awarding and administering procurements required improvements; and stocks were being disposed of as surplus when valid requirements existed within the military departments.

The results of our previous reviews can now be applied to a study of all facets of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense, as you suggested in your letter of January 30, 1959, including a review of the inadequacy of requirements determination, procurement, inventory control, utilization of all available assets before procurement, distribution of stock and disposal of excess or surplus property. The broad nature of such a study, which must encompass evaluation of basic policies and procedures of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as the Office of the Secretary of Defense, will also include a review of the operations of the major electronic supply agencies of the military services in the United States and abroad. As significant matters are disclosed during the course of our review, management and the Congress will be apprised of our findings.

We anticipate that as a result of this defensewide study we will be in a position to make appropriate recommendations for improvement of supply management applicable to all three military services. In this report we will, of course, consider the objectives of the McCormack amendment to which you referred.

As a matter of collateral interest, we have today advised the chairman, Military Operations Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, that as a result of the deficiencies disclosed by our reviews of military supply operations, this area may be of interest to that subcommittee in determining the adequacy of action undertaken by the military departments to correct the matters brought to their attention.

We would be pleased to discuss the proposed study in more detail with you or your staff if you should desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

In Support of the Civil Rights Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the text of my statement in support of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1959, which was presented to Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON MARCH 11, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1959, AND RELATED COMMENTS

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss my measure, H.R. 430, the Civil Rights Act of 1959, as well as to offer comment on other major civil rights proposals.

H.R. 430 is a companion measure to that introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, and in the other body by Senators DOUGLAS and JAVITS, who were joined by members of both parties. It is gratifying to see bipartisan support of legislation in the civil rights field. Guaranteeing these constitutional rights does not belong exclusively to one party. It is my profound hope that this Congress will assure to the American people that these rights do apply to every citizen regardless of race, creed, color, or national ancestry.

I think that we are all very much aware that the challenge in this fast-moving 20th century is to bring social progress up to scientific, technological, and material progress. This has always been, down through the centuries, the real and overriding challenge to mankind. And the grave internal and external pressures that face this Nation today further emphasize the need for perfecting our democratic institutions through a recognition that social progress—and certainly implementation of civil rights is part and parcel of such progress—is an indigenous ingredient in democratic concepts and institutions.

Therefore, I resolutely affirm that Congress, in recognition of the challenge, must act affirmatively and expeditiously in the field of civil rights legislation.

Any discussion of my proposal would be lacking in depth and fairness if I only allude to its provisions without any reference to other major legislative proposals that have come before this Congress for its consideration and action. A discussion of the relative merit of various measures will, I believe, offer the best approach in determining the most effective civil rights legislation to implement the law of the land—the U.S. Constitution and the interpretation of it by the Supreme Court. I wish to emphasize that while I feel the measure which I am cosponsoring offers the most extensive and meaningful approach to the problem of school integration, as well as the protection of civil rights in general, I also know that no one has a monopoly of ideas on how best to accomplish this implementation nor does any one person have all the answers. Collective thinking is essential for a clear solution.

For the purposes of discussion, I propose to discuss (1) my measure, H.R. 430, which is the same version of the legislation popularly called the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill; (2) the administration proposals, introduced in the other body as seven separate bills, but introduced in the House as one measure, H.R. 4457, and (3) the Johnson proposal. Although Senator JOHNSON's bill has not been offered in the House, I think it will be useful and helpful to include reference to it in any full discussion of pending civil rights legislation. Parenthetically, may I say that for purposes of my presentation, and for clarification, I shall not refer to my given measure, H.R. 430, but rather to the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill.

In recent days, a very useful and careful summary comparison of the main civil rights bills has been prepared and distributed by the executive committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, comprised of 53 national religious, civic, interracial, labor, welfare, veterans, and fraternal organizations. It should be noted that the organizations involved have more than a fleeting or passing interest in civil rights matters; they all have one common bond: their sincere, studious and enduring interest in and concern about the full implementation of the constitutional guarantees from which should flow first-class citizenship for all. Among

the 53 organizations are the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Improved Benevolent Order of Elks, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the United Automobile Workers, both AFL–CIO affiliates, and the American Council on Human Rights, to mention just a few.

I don't think anyone could properly quarrel with the contention that these groups have had a real and active interest in civil rights matters or that their summary analysis of the proposed bill was done in a perfunctory or superficial manner.

In offering the summary comparison, this group prefaced it by the following statement:

"The summary comparison would appear to justify the following conclusions:

"1. The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill, providing support for the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and technical and financial assistance to assist the process of school desegregation and including an improved version of the old part III stricken from the 1957 bill, is essential to the accomplishment of school desegregation within a reasonable period and to the maintenance of the equal protection of the laws in other fields; it is certainly the No. 1 civil rights bill. The Javits bill, S. 456 (see also Celler bill, H.R. 3148), which is not included in the summary comparison, also contains an improved version of the old part III of the 1957 bill, but the Javits bill does not contain the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. The old part III contained in both bills authorizes the Attorney General to bring injunction actions against those denying equal protection of the laws to anyone because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and is the single most essential part of any civil rights legislation.

"2. The administration school bills omit part III completely and contain an inadequate version of the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. Other administration bills, and particularly S. 957 authorizing inspection of voting records, make advances in the area of civil rights which deserve the support of civil rights organizations, to the extent that support for the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill is in no way reduced.

"3. The Johnson bill, by failing to support the school desegregation decisions and by conciliation provisions that may result in civil rights being bargained away rather than enforced, appears to be a step backward. It seeks to relegate the assertion of rights to equal protection by citizens and defiance of the law by States to the status of a neighborhood quarrel to be resolved only by an ill-defined conciliation procedure. Its other provisions would seem to be better dealt with in the administration and other bills."

Mr. Chairman, may I say in reference to S. 957, mentioned in point two of the above quoted statement, that this proposal is also sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and is contained in the House bill, H.R. 4457, which has incorporated all seven administration proposals. I heartily concur that legislation covering the objectives set forth should be part of a comprehensive civil rights program.

A COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

As stated in my earlier remarks, I shall direct my comments to the three proposals already referred to, the details of which are known to the committee members. Therefore, I think the most logical approach to this matter is to offer what I believe highlights the similarities and/or differences in as concrete and brief a fashion as possible, without perverting the intent.

In broad, general terms, I believe the bills can be discussed under the following headings:

1. Support of the Supreme Court decisions.
2. Federal technical and financial assistance to States.
3. Compliance and enforcement of Supreme Court decisions.
4. Suits by Government.
5. Obstruction of justice.
6. Voting records.
7. Civil Rights Commission.
8. Antibombing.
9. Children of military personnel.
10. Equal job opportunity.
11. Conciliation service.

SUPPORT OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

I think it is significant to point out that the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure is the only one of the three approaches under discussion that expressly endorses the principle of the Supreme Court's antisegregation decisions in schools, transportation, and recreation. It likewise recognizes the responsibility and authority of Congress to uphold these decisions.

While the administration proposal recognizes that the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land, it does not include the findings of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill approving the High Court's decisions, nor does it pledge Congress to support those decisions by all due and reasonable means.

The Johnson proposal does not refer to the Supreme Court's decisions. Indirect recognition is given by the feature of his proposal which notes there are constitutional requirements that give rise to disagreements which require conciliation of such disagreements forthcoming from legal decisions. The conciliation approach is, of course, less direct in assuring compliance and enforcement of the law of the land.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this distinctive feature of the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure may, in some respects, be the most important provision contained in any measure because it is an expression of philosophical endorsement of our national ideals; it is one way that Congress does not leave exclusively to the courts the implementation, as well as the proclamation, of the abiding American belief and conviction that all Americans are equal in the eyes of God which, translated into our constitutional concepts of democratic government, means every human being is entitled to equal protection of the laws.

FEDERAL TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES

The Douglas-Javits-Celler proposal authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to render technical assistance to States and local communities seeking to comply with the High Court's antisegregation decisions.

In addition, the measure which I am supporting makes provision for grants to States and local governmental units for additional school facilities and additional teachers, to mention just two provisions among several. It also provides for grants to local communities, eliminating segregation, when the State threatens to cut off school payments.

To carry out the intent of these sections, the Douglas-Javits-Celler legislation calls for appropriations up to $2½ million a year for a 5-year period for the technical assistance phases of the program; for the program of grants, appropriations up to $40 million a year for a 5-year period.

The administration's program covers the above approaches but is a limited version of the Douglas-Javits-Celler approach both as to extent of the program and the amount of aid to be given. The estimated expenditure has been set at $4½ million for 2 years.

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill sets up the procedure by which the Secretary would be authorized, when other methods fail, to assume responsibility for initiating the development of desegregation plans, with fullest possible local consultation and participation. When the Secretary certifies that all efforts to secure compliance by persuasion and by technical and financial assistance have failed, the Attorney General, as authorized in the bill, would file compliance action.

Neither the administration nor Johnson proposal has provisions in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of the committee members that there is another important section of the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure which calls for the injunction procedure which I shall discuss shortly. However, at this point I wish to bring to your attention that the measure has been criticized editorially in the Washington Post, February 2, 1959, as it pertains to the Federal desegregation plans and the injunction procedure if compliance fails. Indeed, the editorial opposes the injunction features as it applies in this matter and as it appears elsewhere in the bill for the purpose of ending denials of equal protection of the laws.

The editorial stated, and I quote only that portion of it concerned with the subject at hand:

"It sweeps on to authorize the HEW to draw up desegregation plans for communities failing to act on their own initiative. Such plans could then be imposed on the reluctant communities through court injunctions. This sort of carpetbaggery would produce more sectional hostility than desegregation. It looks in precisely the opposite direction from Senator JOHNSON's proposed conciliation agency.

"Nor do we think the time has come to seek enforcement of all civil rights through use of the injunction. Recent events in Virginia indicate that the barriers to desegregation are beginning to crumble. The processes of peaceful adjustment might be gravely upset by undue haste in the application of force from Washington. The wisdom of moving a step at a time in this delicate situation and of converting instead of bludgeoning has been too well demonstrated to be seriously challenged."

The Attorney General of the United States is taking a similar position regarding the injunction provisions, although it should be recalled that the administration program of 1957 included such authority for the Attorney General.

I think this is healthy in our discussion to have such criticism because it offers an opportunity to join the issue and to clarify misconception, confusion, and hasty conclusions. In a letter to the Washington Post, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has done just that. He logically, factually, and legally challenges, and certainly weakens, the argument of those opposed to the HEW desegregation plan authorization and of those opposed to the injunction features of compliance in connection with such plans and with respect to the injunction features elsewhere in the bill which are aimed at ending the denial of equal protection of the laws in other fields, not just in the field of school integration.

Mr. Chairman, because of the importance of the points made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I wish to submit the full text of his letter of February 2, since it covers the issue at hand in a comprehensive and clear manner.

LETTER OF SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS TO THE WASHINGTON POST

FEBRUARY 2, 1959.

EDITOR, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR COLUMN,
Washington Post and Times Herald,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Reasoned analysis and widespread public discussion are prime essentials in arriving at a workable approach to desegregation and full compliance with the Constitution and decrees of the Supreme Court. Your editorial on "Aid, Not Carpet-

baggery" (Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1959), is a long step in this direction and is a welcome contrast to the more superficial treatment, vituperation, or indifference with which such proposals have been met in the past.

To clarify the issues, however, and to correct some misunderstandings about our proposal, may I be permitted to make a few comments on your analysis.

First, I am proud of the civil rights bill which I introduced last week, and I am glad that it bears my name. But it also bears the names of 16 other Senators as cosponsors, including many of the best known and most thoughtful and reasonable advocates of a sane approach to progress in the field of human relations. A number of these Senators gave important help in the drafting of this measure, and it is therefore truly a joint product. A dozen or more House Members, including Judge CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, have sponsored the same measure. The credit—or blame—for the proposal is therefore shared by these other Members as well.

We are naturally gratified that the Post recognizes the constructive character of that part of our bill which undergirds the desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court by a statement of supporting congressional policy. Your support is also welcome for our rather comprehensive authorizations of technical assistance and financial aid through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the States and localities seeking to work out their desegregation problems.

Your criticisms of the proposed authorization to HEW to draw up and issue desegregation plans as being too hasty and sweeping, however, seem to us to reflect an inadequate understanding of what is proposed.

Title IV of our bill which sets up this administrative action first requires HEW to make every effort to persuade the States and local districts to make a start toward eliminating segregation in public education, utilizing the aids and financial assistance previously referred to. It thus first emphasizes the procedure of conciliation, which you endorse, but specifies that it shall be conciliation with the aim of bringing compliance with the Constitution.

Secondly, in preparing such tentative plans the Secretary is required to seek the advice and assistance of public officials, private organizations, and private citizens in the area and of any * * * advisory council.

In the third place, the proposal specifies that such tentative plans shall take into account the need of the particular area for time to make an orderly adjustment and transition from segregated to desegregated schools.

In the fourth place, if the plan thus formulated meets with the approval of the locality and is adopted by it, a beginning can be made, and the various other forms of assistance can be brought into play.

In the fifth place, however, if the tentative plan is not accepted, the Secretary must set up a public hearing upon the plan, and at this hearing, the local authorities, private organizations and private citizens shall be permitted to participate. Only after all of these steps have been taken is the Secretary authorized to prepare and issue an approved plan for desegregation. The detailed requirements for local participation in our opinion make it clear that your rather captious characterization of "carpetbagger" is wholly unwarranted.

But, finally, it is important to recall that these desegregation plans, if still resisted, cannot come into effect until the Attorney General files an injunction suit and the court, after listening to all of the evidence and hearing arguments, issues its decree in line with the underlying decisions of the Supreme Court requiring all deliberate speed. The trial court's determination is further subject to appeal and review right up to the Supreme Court.

The bill thus seeks to use the assistance and advice of executive and administrative agencies and the experience, recommendations and criticisms of the local community in affirmatively formulating desegregation plans. In similar circumstances of bitter-end resistance under the present law, such plans have to be developed solely by the courts in injunction suits brought by the aggrieved persons in behalf of their children. But the proposed plans under our bill would in no case have any legal effect until they had gone through the judicial processes of court hearings and decision, with full right of review. The procedure is not unlike that now provided to secure compliance with NLRB recommendations.

Surely this accepted, reasonable, and deliberate procedure cannot fairly be characterized as a force plan, as your news reports have described it, or bludgeoning as you editorially refer to it.

In opposing our proposal to authorize the Attorney General to seek injunctions to end denials of equal protection of the laws, you cite with favor the recent events in Virginia. But what has brought about—at long last—the crumbling of the barriers of segregation and the peaceful adjustment which you herald there? Clearly, it is a series of court decisions, in cases initiated by individuals. The patient, thoroughly argued, long drawn out legal proceedings and decrees have been the path to progress in that State.

But what is the ultimate sanction under our bill? The answer is again court actions. These could, however, be initiated by the Attorney General. But in this case they must be preceded either (a) by the lengthy HEW procedure I have outlined above, or (b) by the signed complaint of individuals and a determination by the Attorney General that those individuals are unable to seek the effective legal protections for themselves. The injunctive procedure authorized in our bill is thus basically the same as the procedure under which progress is being made in Virginia, except that under carefully specified conditions the Attorney General may file the suit.

Why is it necessary that the Attorney General be empowered to initiate these procedures which can now be initiated only by individuals? This is necessary because without it the weakest, the poorest, and those most subject to intimidation or coercion are required to fight their case with their own resources against all the legal talent, power, legislation, and economic resources which a State opposed to desegregation can throw into the breach. Because of the antibarratry laws, the anti-NAACP laws, school placement laws, and the multitude of other barriers thrown up to resist the law of the land, and the scales of justice can only be evenly matched if these legal and economic burdens of enforcement are borne in part by the Federal Government, whose duty it is to enforce the law of the land. To require—as is now the case—that this burden be placed solely on the backs of the fathers and mothers of Negro children in areas which are overwhelmingly hostile to them is to apply that concept of justice made famous by Anatole France's remark that the law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread.

This injunction procedure is not unique or extreme, for, as I have said in the Senate, it is now so commonplace that it is provided in 39 other laws to bring compliance with various Federal statutes, including the voting rights bill of 1957. This procedure is necessarily coupled with all the usual protections of the exercise of the equity powers of the courts and subject to all of the normal appeals in the higher courts. It has been twice approved in school cases by overwhelming votes in the House of Representatives, once in 1956 by a vote of 279 to 126, and again in 1957, by a vote of 286 to 126 in favor of the so-called part III of the civil rights bills of 1956 and 1957.

If the Attorney General sought to move faster than the Supreme Court decisions provide, the Federal judge would deny or modify his request. Thus, there are adequate safeguards through the Federal district courts and judges—almost all of whom in southern areas are southern born—against "undue haste in the application of force from Washington."

The inadequacy of the conciliation proposal by Senator JOHNSON, which you endorse, is that if the dominant forces of the community refuse to restore peaceful relations in accordance with the Constitution, the Federal Government would then lack the authority to initiate court cases to bring compliance. This failure could invite nullification and the ultimate breakdown of the Constitution.

The sponsors of our bill earnestly hope that the affirmative approaches which provide congressional backing for the Court's decrees, technical assistance, financial aid, etc., will be largely effective in getting the movement toward desegregation off deadcenter and demonstrating to the world that we intend to live by our principles of equal justice. But in the background, just as the historic decisions of the court have been the firm rock upon which we have now begun to break away in both the North and the South from our previous discriminatory practices, so do we believe that the ultimate possibility of an appeal to the courts, initiated by the Attorney General, will be helpful in winning acceptance for these constitutional principles all along the line.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

SUITS BY GOVERNMENT

The outstanding difference between the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill and the administration program is found in the matter of suits by the Federal Government. The difference is this: The provision contained in the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure represents an improved version of part III of the 1957 bill. The significance of this provision lies in the fact that the objective is for preventive rather than punitive action. It would authorize the Attorney General to seek preventive relief to protect persons being deprived of, or threatened with deprivation of, equal protection of the laws, if the persons whose rights are invaded are unable to seek legal relief because of a lack of finances, economic pressures, or fear of physical harm.

The Attorney General would also be authorized to seek preventive relief to assist public officials in guaranteeing equal protection of the laws by enjoining anyone hindering or attempting to hinder such officials or hindering, attempting or conspiring to hinder the execution of any court order involving the equal protection of the laws.

Again, I bring your attention to the injunction features of the bill as explained and ably supported by Senator DOUGLAS.

The Attorney General would also be authorized to intervene in private civil rights suits, as well as to initiate action.

This singular approach is important in comparing this proposal with the other two under discussion because neither makes such provisions in any manner.

OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

It is literally true that the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill does not have a provision contained in the administration proposal: that is, a provision making it a criminal offense to use force or threats to interfere with court orders in school desegregation cases. However, to accept this literally is also to be misled about the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure. The injunction procedure already discussed would come into play in such a

situation, as well as in other civil rights areas. The proposal which I support thus emphasizes preventive rather than punitive action in the matter covered in the administration bill. Since injunctions can be enforced by contempt proceedings, I feel that such an approach is far more effective than the limited usefulness of criminal action.

VOTING RECORDS

Both the administration and Johnson proposals, while differing in given respects, make provision for inspection of voting records.

I shall support an adequately written proposal and on the basis of the legislation at hand it is my belief that the administration bill offers a better approach in that there would be less delay in obtaining voting records where discrimination in voting has been charged, and it also contains the proviso that such records must be kept for 3 years; the Johnson proposal does not, thus not touching on the problem of the destruction of records. In addition, the latter proposal has a more limited application of the subpena power to obtain such records.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Here again, the administration and Johnson proposals contain a feature not incorporated in the Douglas-Javits-Celler proposal: That is, the continuation of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years in the administration bill, and until 60 days after January 31, 1961, in the Johnson measure.

I think it is important that the work of the Commission continue, but that it would be a grave error to claim that such a continuation makes additional legislation in the civil rights area unnecessary.

It is important to consider strengthening the Commission by authorizing it to investigate all denials of civil rights because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

ANTIBOMBING

While antibombing provisions are not contained in the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill, I think it should be noted that I and many supporters of this specific proposal have introduced separate legislation. The administration proposal and the Johnson measure both contain provisions in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into a comparison of how these measures differ, but I do wish to comment that I have introduced legislation which includes residential property in its provisions. This provision has not been incorporated in several of the measures that will be considered.

I am hopeful that effective antibombing legislation will be achieved in this Congress.

CHILDREN OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The administration proposal authorizes the Commissioner of Education to operate schools for children of members of the armed services where local schools are not operating as a result of defiance of the Supreme Court's decisions. It also provides that a school constructed in the future, built in whole or in part with Federal funds, may be taken over by the Federal Government for operation with the latter paying the State rent in line with the State's investment.

The proposal has, in my opinion, certain defects: First, if the goal in administration thinking is only to take care of children of Federal personnel, why limit it to the children of members of the armed services? Why not include other Federal employees? Second the provision with respect to schools constructed under the impacted areas program would be of limited effect, since it would apply only to future construction; thus it would not apply to previously constructed schools. And, finally, the approach offers no provisions relating to desegregating impacted area schools.

I bring to the attention of the committee the fact that the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure has broader application in dealing with closed schools since Federal funds would be offered to local communities where the State has withdrawn school payments; in addition the stronger provisions relating to school desegregation also make the approach more effective.

EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY

The administration propose that Congress create a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, similar to the present Committee established by Executive order. The statutory duties and functions granted to the Commission would not differ greatly from those now exercised by the committee, except that it would be able to make its own investigations and conduct hearings.

While I think this approach could be strengthened, for example, by providing such a commission with subpena power, I would hope that creation of such a commission would be another factor in the further diminution of job discrimination by companies holding Government contracts.

My real concern, however, is that this is only a small part of the concept of equal job opportunity for all. I am proud to state that I have introduced legislation that would prohibit discrimination by companies and labor organizations because of race, color, creed, or national origin. While my proposal will not come before this committee, I merely want to apprise the members of my thinking in the matter.

CONCILIATION SERVICE

Reference has already been made to Senator JOHNSON's proposal to conciliate disagreements by establishing a community relations service. I only wish to pose this question: Will this approach hamper enforcement?

Will conciliation, at the level it is proposed, be a necessary prerequisite of judicial action?

I wish to thank the Chairman and members for their kind attention and to commend the Committee on the Judiciary for its desire to hold full and necessary hearings on civil rights legislation.

May I merely add that I am pleased to have been able to offer my comments and to indicate my support, for the reasons I pointed out, of the Civil Rights Act of 1959.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959

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

Our Father, God, amid all the voices of this vast and varied world save us from the supreme tragedy of missing Thy call.

As in age after age men have heard Thy voice, make us vividly conscious that we, too, can hear it when silence falls and we listen with reverent and obedient hearts.

Help us to know that not only in the haunting beauty of the earth, but also in the poignant want and woe of the world's needs, Thy voice to us is calling.

Turning aside for this dedicated moment from the violence and turbulence of human strife, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish. Rising above the deafening prejudices of these embittered days, may we be the hearers and doers of Thy word and of Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 11, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12:25 p.m. the Chair may declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

REPORT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Institute, for the year 1958, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of Interior, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and the New Mexico congressional delegation to review and revise the policies which permit the excessive importation of petroleum into the United States

"Whereas the entry into the United States of excessive imports of foreign oil serves to