

Security Agency; Federal aid for day-care centers in defense areas; Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools; emergency maternal and infant care, S. 1245; defense housing and community facilities, H. R. 2988 and S. 349. (3) A mimeographed newsletter entitled "Washington Report on Legislation for Children." About 250 copies, 6 to 8 times a year. Mimeographed by Parents' Institute, Bergenfield, N. J. (4) Salary, \$416.66 per month. Anticipated expenses for taxicabs, incidentals, probably less than \$50 a month.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Applicant is paid and is to receive a salary of \$9,450 per annum, effective December 1, 1951, paid by the above employer, and is to be reimbursed for all actual expenses incurred in connection with her work.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Applicant is paid and is to receive a salary of \$8,715 per annum effective December 1, 1951, paid by the above employer, and is to be reimbursed for all actual expenses incurred in connection with his work.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

Eternal God, in this still moment, pausing reverently at this altar of prayer, make us vividly aware of Thy divine invasion through all the areas of our yearning lives. Give us the grace of hospitality to the highest. As citizens of a world that carries on its bent shoulders a burden of suffering greater than humanity has ever borne, make us inwardly adequate to be Thy ministers of reconciliation. May the poisoning evils which now blight the earth not devastate our own inner lives, subduing us to its low standards, confusing us by its chaos, or crushing our faith under its tragedy. Clothed in the undefiled garments of love's pure vestment, humbly may we walk with Thee in white as in the spirit of the Master we face the infinite pathos of this troubled world we fain would serve before we fall on sleep. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 26, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 26, 1952, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2119) for the relief of Claudia Tanaka.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Also on request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate the remainder of this week.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement which provides that beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock noon today debate on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to recommit, with certain instructions, Senate bill 50 shall be limited to not exceeding 4 hours, to be equally divided, and controlled respectively by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. In accordance with the agreement the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business, without debate, the time not to be charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 32

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

Whereas the Federal Government has abused the taxing power to the point of confiscation, the General Assembly of Vir-

ginia respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration; provided that in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall not apply during hostilities while the United States is in a state of war declared by Congress and shall be subject to the further qualification that in the event of a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

"SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on income for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourth of the several States; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted by the keeper of the rolls of the State to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Agreed to by the house February 5, 1952.

Agreed to by the senate February 21, 1952.

A true copy:

E. GRIFFITH DODSON,

*Clerk of the House of Delegates and
Keeper of the Rolls of the State.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2390. A bill to amend section 302 (4) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act

of 1940, as amended, relating to penalties; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2485. A bill to provide for the issuance of a distinctive service ribbon bar in recognition of the services of merchant seamen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1216);

S. 2530. A bill to provide certain decorations for outstanding and heroic conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217);

S. 2721. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218); and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2552. A bill to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 1220).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1221).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 3401. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222).

WELFARE OF COAL MINERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1310) amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, with the recommendation that the bill be passed, and I submit a report (No. 1223) thereon. The bill was unanimously ordered reported by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RELATED PROBLEMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with an amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) providing funds for a study of the Railroad Retirement Act and related problems, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The amendment simply corrects a typographical error by substituting the word "Eighty-second" for the word "Eighty-first," in line 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2746. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for a Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to be elected by the Commission, and in whom administrative authority shall be vested; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 2747. A bill to provide for more effective administration of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2748. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY:

S. 2749. A bill for the relief of Leonard Lewis Buhler; and

S. 2750. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Kosonoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHOONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 2751. A bill to provide for the exchange of farm units on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. O'CONNOR, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 2752. A bill to require the establishment of actual rates by contract carriers;

S. 2753. A bill to provide additional standards to govern the granting by the Interstate Commerce Commission of certain operating rights; and

S. 2754. A bill to amend the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2755. A bill for the relief of Ferdinando Pambianchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 2756. A bill for the relief of Yoko Okuno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2757. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2758. A bill to amend section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on gasoline); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2759. A bill for the relief of Mariko (Hirohujii) Willis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 90, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 284), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 90, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1952

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1, transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 14, 1952.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 285) submitted by Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN) was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 1, transmitted to Congress by the President on January 14, 1952.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO FREIGHT FORWARDERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2712) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to subject freight forwarders to the requirement for obtaining certificates of public convenience and necessity, and to make applicable to freight forwarders the uniform provisions of the law concerning combinations and consolidations of carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report was submitted:

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive C, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada, relating to the operation by citizens of either country of certain radio equipment or stations in the other country, signed at Ottawa on February 8, 1951; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 3).

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

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Letter of February 27, 1952, addressed by the President to the Second Reorganization Conference of Citizens Committee for Reorganization of the Executive Branch.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

Address delivered by Donald R. Wilson, national commander, American Legion, at American Legion dinner honoring Members

of Congress, at Washington, D. C., February 26, 1952.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Letters received by him from the American Institute of Baking and the Millers' National Federation, taking issue with certain statements contained in Senate Report No. 604, Eighty-second Congress, dealing with the utilization of farm crops.

By Mr. WILEY:

Census report indicating leadership of Wisconsin among dairy States.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "Politics," published in the Lynchburg (Va.) News of February 9, 1952.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, in the absence of the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to recommit the bill with certain instructions. The time is under the control of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming stated that he would yield me a few minutes in order that I might state my position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I to understand that the call for a quorum has been withdrawn?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. After the quorum call had started, I stepped out of the Chamber momentarily. Had I been present I would have resisted the withdrawal of the quorum call, because it is obvious that a quorum is not present. I wish to have it understood that I reserve the right to call for a quorum later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may call for a quorum at any time he wishes, but the time thus consumed will be taken out of his time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with the understanding that the time consumed by the call shall not be taken from the time of either side, since that was the request which was originally made, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No request was made in that connection. There was merely the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, so far as concerns what little I have to say, it does not make any difference to me whether a quorum is present or not.

However, under the circumstances, if the Senator from Wyoming feels that there should be a quorum present, inasmuch as he was absent when the order for the quorum call was withdrawn, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call may be completed, and that the time be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Another call would have to be begun. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Anderson	Hendrickson	McMahon
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Moody
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Murray
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Nixon
Byrd	Ives	O'Connor
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Clements	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Seaton
Cordon	Knowland	Smathers
Douglas	Langer	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Long	Sparkman
Ecton	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Malone	Taft
Ferguson	Martin	Thye
Flanders	Maybank	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green		Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not feel that I can add anything to what has already been said in the course of the argument in behalf of statehood for Alaska.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to ask the majority leader whether it is his opinion that the motion to recommit Senate bill 50 with instructions has to do only with the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my understanding, Mr. President. Of course, I feel that the arguments made against statehood for Alaska could be made with equal force against statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, namely, is the time for this discussion on the parliamentary status being taken out of the time allotted to the Senator from Florida or out of the time allotted now to the Senator from Arizona by the Senator from Wyoming, who is in charge of part of the time; or is the time now being taken on the parliamentary status not being charged to either side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has the floor, and the time being taken now is being charged to him.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that this time not be charged to either side, in view of the fact that we are trying to get the parliamentary situation straightened out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think there is no question but that the motive involves only the recomittal, with instructions, of the bill proposing statehood for Alaska. However, I think that, very largely, the arguments for or against statehood for Alaska are the same as those for or against statehood for Hawaii or those for or against statehood for any other Territory, as I shall try to develop in the few minutes I have at my disposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Arizona will permit me to do so, I should like to ask him whether he knows as a practical matter that there are a number of Senators who are in favor of statehood for one of these Territories but are not in favor of statehood for the other Territory.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Arizona will permit me to continue for a moment, I should like to say that the argument to the effect that the pending bill affects Hawaii is one of the oldest strawmen used in the Senate of the United States to confuse issues and to compel Senators to feel that they are voting against a bill they favor, when actually they are voting on a bill on which they have different feelings. That is one of the oldest devices in the Senate, through parliamentary procedure, namely, the building up of a strawman beclouding the parliamentary issue.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, to pursue this parliamentary discussion, if I may do so with the indulgence of the Senator from Arizona—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to assure the Senator from Georgia that there is no purpose on my part to becloud the issue. I wish to clarify the issue.

When the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] came upon the floor of

this body on the 20th of February and asked the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to modify his motion to recommit with instructions, and when the Senator from Florida accepted the requested modification, he accepted it in precisely the words used by the Senator from Oklahoma. I read now the statement made at that time by the Senator from Oklahoma:

Would the Senator be willing to modify his motion so as to make of it a motion to recommit the bill with instructions for further study, and also to consider the granting of commonwealth status to these Territories—

The word at that point is in the plural—

if consistent with the later determination of the Congress? It would require a constitutional amendment to establish the new status, in which Territories could approach statehood. If they were not quite strong enough or did not have sufficient population to attain statehood, they would still have a self-governing status. I believe that a motion to recommit should provide not only for the study of the question whether or not these Territories should be granted statehood, but also the question of whether perhaps, another status, between statehood and territorial status, might be proper.

Mr. President, it seems to me that no one can read that language without knowing that the distinguished and very able Senator from Oklahoma meant precisely what he said. He wanted commonwealth status for both Territories. That is borne out by the fact, permit me to say, that only a few days before, the Senator from Oklahoma made a public release in which he made clear that he was opposed to statehood, that he wanted commonwealth status. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], after having heard that precise and unambiguous statement by the Senator from Oklahoma, said the following:

I am happy to modify my motion, so that in addition to instructions to hold hearings on Senate bill 50, the committee will also be instructed to study the question raised by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that is clear, definite, and specific.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me at this point?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that the tenuous argument made by the Senator from Wyoming absolutely confirms my statement that this argument could only becloud the issue. It matters not what is the position of the Senator from Oklahoma on any bill which is on the calendar. It matters not what is the position of the Senator from Florida in regard to recommitment of both these bills. As a cold parliamentary fact, the motion now pending cannot affect any piece of proposed legislation other than Senate bill 50, the bill now before the Senate. It matters not whether the Senator from Oklahoma included in his motion a specific statement that the other bill should also be recommitted, for it would be a parliamentary impossibility to recommit both the bills at the same time.

The only issue now before the Senate is the question of the proposed recommitment of Senate bill 50, the bill providing for statehood for Alaska; and the discussion between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oklahoma is mere obiter, and cannot affect the real parliamentary issue that is before the Senate. The Senator from Wyoming may desire that it have the effect he suggests, and he may make such a motion in the future; but certainly it does not affect the vote of any Member of the Senate on the pending motion, which can only relate to Senate bill 50—and no one knows that better than does the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He has been around the Senate entirely too long to be under any impression that the motion can have the effect of recommitting the Hawaiian statehood bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Ah, Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Georgia. Will the Senator from Georgia now guarantee me and the other Members of the Senate that, when the Hawaiian statehood bill comes up, assuming—which I do only for the purposes of the argument—that the motion to recommit will prevail, that no member of the group which is opposing statehood for both these Territories will fail to rise to say, "Why, we voted to recommit under instructions to study commonwealth status"? Will the Senator give me that guaranty?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that statement shows the desperate length to which my friend has been driven by this tenuous argument—asking me to make a guaranty at this time as to what 95 Members of the Senate might say. I have heard some very foolish propositions advanced, Mr. President, in my time in the Senate, and if I serve the remainder of my 2 years, I shall probably hear a great many more, though I hope I do not hear many as weak as that advanced by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He has now come down to the point of saying that the argument may be used, but its use cannot affect any vote.

What I wished to make clear was the fact that the only effect of a vote on the pending motion to recommit goes to S. 50, and that when the Hawaiian statehood bill comes before the Senate in its own good time, Members of the Senate who feel that they wish to support that bill will have a perfect right to do so; and I doubt that they would be deluded by any far-fetched argument such as the one suggested by the Senator from Wyoming, even though someone might make it. But he has now come to a question based on a supposition that the argument might be made. The argument may be made. I hear a great many arguments made, but even if they were made, I do not think it would be any more fallacious or any further away from parliamentary fact than the original position taken by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Cali-

fornia, that the motion to recommit carries with it the Hawaiian statehood bill. As a matter of fact, as a parliamentary fact, the motion does not affect the Hawaiian statehood bill in the slightest degree; and I repeat, no one knows that better than does my distinguished friend from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may ask the indulgence of the Senator from Arizona for a few more words, I am very much complimented by the many adjectives which the Senator from Georgia has used in discussing what I said, and I am particularly grateful to him for saying that, though he thought the argument was silly, yet when it was attributed to me, it was only weak; so I am very much complimented by that distinction which the Senator has made. But, Mr. President, the point now is clear, that the Senator from Georgia can give no such guaranty. Why can he not give the guaranty? Because this instruction with respect to commonwealth status was conceived and designed to kill statehood for both these Territories. I am willing, with that last word for the moment, to allow the Senator from Arizona to proceed without further interruption from me.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to say that the change of adjectives, as applied to the discussion, grew out of my profound affection for the Senator from Wyoming and my desire to protect him from making rash statements when he is overenthusiastic in a cause which he espouses. I may say further, and then I shall take my seat, that I doubt whether ever before in all history, in any parliamentary body, unless it were the German Reichstag, any one member has ever been asked to give a guaranty as to what other members might say in the course of debate.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield, provided the time is not charged to me.

Mr. LONG. I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that there is at least one Member of the Senate who will assure him that when the Hawaiian statehood bill comes up, although the junior Senator from Louisiana expects to vote against statehood for Alaska, he will support the Hawaiian bill and will vote for it, when it comes to a vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, though I should like to complete my few remarks.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to say that the Senator from Oklahoma unfortunately is not with us today. He is ill, but I talked with him only a moment ago, and his understanding, completely in accord with that of the majority leader, is that the motion to recommit which is now before the Senate, is to recommit S. 50, which includes only statehood for Alaska, with instructions to consider the possibilities of a commonwealth status for Alaska. The Senator from Oklahoma then argued, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia, purely as obiter dicta, that he

thought it would be a good idea for both Territories. But he recognizes that the basic parliamentary question affects S. 50 only.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I was happy to yield for this colloquy, because it has stirred up on the floor of the Senate more interest than I have heretofore seen manifested in regard to this subject; and I have felt that the Senate should take more interest in this important question.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the arguments which have been made heretofore, in regard to statehood for Alaska, are, I think, complete; and, for that matter, I think they are also complete in regard to statehood for Hawaii. The question of the government of Territories of the United States has confronted the Congress ever since I have been in the Senate. There are those who feel that the citizens of the District of Columbia should have the right to vote. Puerto Rico has presented a problem, and it is only a matter of time, of course, until Guam will constitute a problem; because, when I visited Guam, the people of that island felt that they should have a right to govern themselves.

Mr. President, the question which confronted me and which troubled me the most, in considering statehood for Alaska, was that it was noncontiguous to the United States. The same question is involved in connection with statehood for Hawaii. As to the other arguments, I feel that they fall by the wayside, as I shall point out in a few moments. I have considered them carefully. I think that one of the factors which have made the United States great is transportation, the fact that the people of one State may travel cheaply to any other State within continental United States. There is some difficulty in regard to transportation in noncontiguous Territories. It is more expensive. Therefore, in my opinion, there are arguments against statehood on that ground. But there is a highway to Alaska on which people may travel by automobile.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are about to begin negotiations with Canada for the purpose of making preliminary surveys for a railroad to Alaska.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was about to state that it is my hope that, whether statehood is granted or not, a railroad to Alaska will be constructed. The lack of transportation is one of Alaska's greatest problems.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. In connection with the remark just made by the distinguished Senator from Washington, I think he knows that I have been quite as much interested in the development of the proposed railroad to Alaska as has any other Member of the Senate. We have been trying for years to get an agreement with Canada, which is a prerequisite because the railroad will have to be constructed over Canadian soil, but, to date, we have not the faintest

chance of consummating such an agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not agree with my distinguished friend's pessimism in regard to the matter. As Chairman of the International Highway Commission, I went through the same experience years ago in connection with the highway to Alaska; but the highway was finally constructed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, personally I feel that the transportation problem will be solved, and I think it will be solved more quickly if statehood is granted to Alaska. As I have indicated, the fact that Alaska and Hawaii are noncontiguous and there is a transportation difficulty constitutes the most serious objection which can be raised against statehood for either Territory. Of course, sooner or later the question of statehood for Puerto Rico will arise, and we already have taken action on a home rule bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that all the officials of Puerto Rico have clearly indicated to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, when we were considering the authority to draft a new constitution, that they did not want statehood; and furthermore, that question was settled by a plebiscite in the island of Puerto Rico, in which three different parties voted, the Independents, the Coalition Party, and the party of the Government which won by an over-all majority over the other two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield additional time? I shall have to refrain from yielding further.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield the Senator from Arizona 3 minutes additional time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am afraid I cannot finish my remarks in 3 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 5 minutes, if the Senator so desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I was about to state when I mentioned Puerto Rico, Guam, and other Territories, I have come to the conclusion we shall have to decide what is to be done in regard to each of those Territories separately when the question comes before us. We cannot decide everything in one bill. We shall have to determine a policy. What are we going to do with the two large Territories of Alaska and Hawaii? Are we going to keep them forever as Territories and deny their people the right of national suffrage?

That is one of the important questions involved.

I recognize the problem involved in making noncontiguous Territories States but I am of the opinion that this argument does not apply as strongly against Alaska as against some of the other Territories.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have only five additional minutes, and I cannot yield at this time.

I have in my hand a statement which was issued by the Hawaiian Statehood Commission in regard to Arizona, and I want to read from it briefly because it gives a factual history of my own State.

On February 14, 40 years ago, Arizona was admitted as the forty-eighth State of the United States. I now read from the statement:

Arizona, just as many of its sister States, had no easy road to statehood during the 49 years it was a Territory of the United States. In 1906, Arizona Delegate Marcus Smith told the House Committee on Territories that his predecessor had presented a bill for Arizona statehood in the Forty-ninth Congress. "It was also made," he continued, "in the Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh and Fifty-eighth Congresses. During that time we have passed the Arizona bill three times and twice have had favorable reports from the Senate."

But again in 1906 Arizona was to be denied statehood, as it was in the Sixtieth Congress. The enabling act was finally passed on June 20, 1910.

Mr. President, I shall not read the statement in detail, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a part of the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that in 1900 the Census showed Arizona had a population of 122,931, of whom 26,480 were Indians.

The population, according to the last census, was 749,588, and it is now larger.

The mines in Arizona which were once considered of little worth have rendered valuable aid to the United States in its defense effort. Arizona is now the leading State in the production of copper. Its agriculture has grown. Arizona is handicapped because of a shortage of water, but it has under cultivation some 750,000 acres of fertile land and has produced important fibers and food which have been needed in the United States, particularly during the last war, as they are needed in the present emergency.

Mr. President, I personally feel that if Alaska is given statehood, it will advance more rapidly. It has uncounted natural resources, and with statehood it is my humble opinion that the transportation problem will be solved at an early date, and that many persons will go to Alaska to cast their lot with the new State. I feel that the important question is not what the population of the Territory is, but whether its natural resources are sufficient to support a State and to support a larger population.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his courtesy in yielding me additional time.

EXHIBIT 1

ARIZONA CELEBRATES FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF STATEHOOD

On February 14 the youngest State of the Union, Arizona, celebrates the fortieth anniversary of its admittance as the forty-eighth of the United States.

Arizona, just as many of its sister States, had no easy road to statehood during the 49 years it was a Territory of the United States. In 1906, Arizona Delegate Marcus Smith told the House Committee on the Territories that his predecessor had presented a bill for Arizona statehood in the Forty-ninth Congress. "It was also made," he continued, "in the Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, and Fifty-eighth Congresses. During that time we have passed the Arizona bill three times and twice have had favorable reports from the Senate."

But again in 1906, Arizona was to be denied statehood, as it was in the Sixtieth Congress. The enabling act was finally passed on June 20, 1910.

During those years, the statehood movement for Arizona suffered many of the same ills that statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska are suffering today. Objections were continuously raised by committees of the Congress as to the future of the Territory. It was said that her mines were used up; that her soil would not support any large population; that her people were for the most part Indian and Spanish; that there were too few who could read the Constitution in English.

It was argued that in 1900, the census showed Arizona "had a population of 122,931, of whom 26,480 were Indians."

On the floor of the Senate on June 6, 1910, Senator Alexander S. Clay, of Georgia, said: "For 12 years both political parties have set forth in their platforms in favor of statehood for both Arizona and New Mexico. We were delayed by speeches for 3 months with a view of killing the proposed statehood."

That same day, Senator James B. Frazier, of Tennessee, in an impassioned speech championing the cause of Arizona statehood said: "No State was ever refused admittance into the Union when it had 60,000 inhabitants upon the ground that it did not have enough people. Let no Senator deceive himself, or believe that the country will be deceived if statehood for these Territories is again denied. It has been stated in the press recently that the majority upon the other side, were loath to admit these Territories to statehood, because, forsooth, they might possibly send four Democratic Senators to this Chamber."

After these years of argument, of frustration, Arizona became a State 40 years ago today. And what of the false prophets who saw unarable land?

Today the people of Arizona, a population which has multiplied six times since 1900, have made the desert bloom. Irrigation enterprises have made fertile some 500,000 acres. Citrus fruits, dates, olives are grown commercially. Principal products of the land include cotton, hay, wheat, barley, corn, oats and potatoes. Stock raising is of great importance. A lumber industry cuts millions of feet of yellow pine each year.

And of the useless mines? Today Arizona ranks first in the mining of copper. Some of the largest gold mining camps in America are in Arizona. Other minerals mined include lead, zinc, lime, clay, gypsum, as well as gems and semiprecious stones.

All this today. But 40 years ago, Arizona's delegate to Congress sat on Committee with the Delegate from New Mexico, and two others—Delegates from Alaska and from Hawaii. Arizona's Delegates waited through 14 Congresses until their statehood bill was finally approved. Hawaii's attempts to gain statehood started while Arizona was still a Territory.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I wish to address myself only briefly to the matter pending before the Senate, which I fear has been afforded a maximum of hasty debate and a minimum of calm, logical reasoning. I refer to the statehood bill for Alaska, Senate bill 50.

As preface to my remarks, I want to state that the senior Senator from Nebraska feels the same emotional sentiment toward this great frontier as has been so dramatically expressed by the proponents of this measure. I am certain there is not one of my able and distinguished colleagues who do not join me in desiring to aid this American Territory in every way possible to attain its full stature as a potential member of our family of States.

But it is this very desire to aid the Territory which prompts me to urge caution, reasoning and deliberation in the consideration of this statehood bill.

Mr. President, 6 years have passed since Alaskans were afforded the opportunity to vote on the statehood issue. Many changes have occurred in those years, and thousands of new residents have settled in the Territory.

The 1946 referendum, which favored the general proposition of statehood by the narrow majority of 3 to 2, was voted upon by only 16,452 persons. Of these, only 9,630 voted in favor of statehood. There are now approximately 108,000 residents in Alaska. We have heard no expression of feeling from anything remotely resembling a majority of this population.

Are we to consider burdening 108,000 people with the added cost of statehood when less than 10 percent of those people have indicated they desire statehood?

Mr. President, I do not believe it is fair or in the interests of justice to take any action whatsoever on this bill before we have ascertained beyond any doubt that the people of Alaska not only desire immediate statehood but that they desire the brand of statehood offered by Senate bill 50.

Before taking this momentous step, the Senate must have before it all of the pertinent facts, both for and against statehood. To date we have heard only from the small faction which has made repeated trips to Washington at the taxpayers' expense to present us with their reasons for desiring statehood.

Opponents of immediate statehood, who do not enjoy such ready access to the public coffers, have been forced either to sit at home, some 5,000 miles away, while hearings affecting their entire future were conducted here in Washington, or to come here at their own expense to oppose the measure.

Mr. President, I submit that, in all fairness to the great bulk of the Alaskan populace, the Senate should conduct hearings on statehood within Alaska itself, to give both opponents and proponents equal opportunity to state their case.

I further submit that the 1946 referendum, upon which the Alaska statehood committee bases so much of its argument, is today not the least indicative of the tenor of Alaskan thought.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. If the junior Senator from Louisiana recalls the statistics correctly, actually only about 9,000 people voted for statehood and about 6,000 voted against it, representing a total of 15,000 votes. We are told that there are about 140,000 people in Alaska, or a population at least in excess of 100,000. If only 15,000 votes were cast, how are we to know that that was representative of the actual thinking of the people of Alaska?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that that is the point I was attempting to make in stating the figures I have just cited.

Mr. LONG. Only about 8 or 10 percent of the population voted in that election.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct, and that is based upon the lowest estimated population of Alaska.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that there were before the last session of the legislature in Alaska two resolutions, one of them urging Congress to grant statehood, the other urging Congress to grant the right to Alaskans to elect their own governor?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the legislature did not adopt the one which asked Congress to grant statehood, but did adopt the one asking for the right to elect a governor?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct. I shall refer to that later in my brief statement.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Are those thousands who have moved to the Territory within the past 6 years to have no voice whatsoever in the matter?

It has been 2 years since hearings have been held on this question. And the Senate has never held hearings on the issue in Alaska.

Looking at the question from a purely objective viewpoint, I cannot see how it is at all practical to impose statehood on this potentially rich Territory when so little has been done to develop the natural resources upon which it will have to depend for income to pay the costs of State government.

At the present time, all but three-tenths of one percent of Alaska's land is owned by the Federal Government, and only one-tenth of 1 percent is privately owned.

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

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Did I understand the Senator from Nebraska correctly to say that the United States Senate had never held hearings in Alaska on the question of Alaskan statehood?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. A Senate committee has never held official hearings in Alaska.

Mr. SMATHERS. Then of course the Senate has never held hearings on Senate bill 50.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct. I shall state now, for the benefit of the Senator from Florida, that I doubt if there are more than 12 copies of S. 50 in the entire Territory of Alaska, outside the hands of the statehood committee.

In our desire to aid the Territory, there are other obvious steps we can take to prepare it for statehood before casting upon its people the overwhelming tax load which will surely result.

First and foremost we must give the residents of Alaska the opportunity to develop their country without the hampering controls of the Interior Department. We must remove the restrictions which have hamstrung Alaska for so many years and release from Federal control the vast forests, the potentially rich oil fields, the mineral deposits, and the limited farm lands. Give Alaska her fair share of income from the lucrative Pribilof Islands.

To prepare the citizens of Alaska for the responsibilities attendant on statehood, we should pass legislation giving them the right to elect their own governor.

In that connection, with reference to the remarks just made by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND], I should like to say that I agree with him that the United States Government should adopt a policy that can be followed with reference to the treatment of lands not adjacent to our own mainland. I think we have already adopted such a policy, and it has worked extremely well. I believe it was in the closing minutes of the Eightieth Congress that a bill was passed by the House and the Senate, and signed by the President, giving to Puerto Rico the right to elect its own governor and granting certain other privileges which the people of Puerto Rico had not had up to that time. Since then there have been no more contented people in the Western Hemisphere than the people of Puerto Rico.

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

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. A while ago he said we ought to free Alaska from Government control of Federal lands.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. What would the Senator propose should be done with those lands? Should they be given outright to the proposed State of Alaska?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. No. I would arrange for a disposal of them under lease, perhaps. At this time there is before the Senate a bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], providing for just such an arrangement with respect to lands in some of the States that are now burdened with public lands over which they have no control.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am now speaking about Alaska. The Senator says that there is a large amount of federally

owned land there. What are we going to do with it, in order to get rid of Federal control over it? They are Federal lands, are they not?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. They are.

Mr. CONNALLY. How does the Senator propose to get rid of Federal control of them?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I may say to the Senator from Texas that I have some illustrations I could give, but I did not bring the material with me. If I had known that the Senator was going to ask these questions, I would have brought with me memoranda of applications filed with the Department of the Interior for leases or purchases. These applications for lease or purchase have been before the Department of the Interior not for 1 year but, in some cases, for many years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Perhaps we ought not to do anything along that line. I do not know. I am just inquiring. The Senator from Nebraska wants the Government to release these lands. I am merely inquiring what the Senator would have the Government do with them. They belong to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government ought to retain them.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if Texas or any other State was ever developed by the United States or any Federal agency, or was it done by private enterprise?

Mr. CONNALLY. It was done largely, of course, by private enterprise, but that does not mean that we should give away every foot of land in the Territory of Alaska. That land belongs to the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Neither should we want to keep it bottled up forever.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not what I am talking about. I am asking how the Senator would unbottle it.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I am sure that many ways can be found by which it can be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but we are now about to act on a bill to grant statehood to Alaska. I should like to know what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I do not want to see a bill for statehood passed until some of these questions are solved or answered.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nebraska is not supporting the bill for Alaskan statehood, is he?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to hear that. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. In the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska, would it be a good idea to release this land to the Territorial government of Alaska, or to leave it in the control of the Department of the Interior, so that the land could be opened up to homesteading?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think that would be a great improvement upon the policy which has been followed by the Federal Government. For many years, from the time Nebraska was

granted statehood, there was a large area of Federal land in Nebraska, but I do not believe there are many acres of it left, if a single acre, because the land has been taken over by individuals who own it and have developed it.

I think a similar arrangement should be made before we extend statehood to a very small percentage of the Territory of Alaska, which is two and one-half times the size of Texas, I believe—and that is certainly large—with a population of approximately 100,000.

I was referring to the situation in Puerto Rico when the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] asked his question. I made the statement that I think the Federal Government has established a policy of extending to the Territories and the District of Columbia the right to elect their own officers.

Another suggestion which I have made in the past, and which I think is perfectly logical, is to attach a Territory to the State which is nearest to it. I understand that Montana or Washington would be very glad to have the Territory of Alaska attached to its domain and made a part of either State. I think that would be a great improvement over the present arrangement, and also over the pending proposal.

During the last session of the Territorial legislature two memorials were introduced germane to the statehood bill, as was noted by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. One was a memorial urging the Congress to grant immediate statehood. The other urged Congress to permit the Territory to elect its own governor. The statehood memorial failed, and the memorial asking for the election of the governor passed by a wide margin.

I wish it were possible for the 96 Members of the Senate to absorb that one statement. This question was submitted to the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, and it turned down the request for statehood. It passed the memorial asking for permission to elect their own governor.

The bill which I introduced in this body in 1951, Senate bill 105, providing for the election of the governor of Alaska by Alaskans, has not been reported from the committee. Of course the Interior Department objects to it, and I think perhaps other Departments of Government object. So the bill remains in the committee. It will be my intention, at the proper time, if the pending bill is under further consideration, to offer that bill as a substitute for the statehood bill. I suggest that my bill, Senate bill 105, offers a simple solution to one of the Territory's most urgent needs, a need so eloquently expressed by the members of its own legislature during the last session.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LONG. There has been so much complaint on the part of those who advocate Alaskan statehood about bureaucratic control from Washington that it would seem that the Alaskan people would like to have more powers in their own local government. Should there be

any great difficulty in drafting a bill to grant a greater degree of home rule to Alaska, if the Territory wants a greater degree of home rule?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to grant to the Alaskan people the right to elect their own governor, and perhaps further powers which would be in keeping with the policy of the United States.

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

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does it not seem likely, from the argument the Senator is making, that some people simply do not want to improve on the Alaskan government, because any improvement on the government which presently exists would weaken their argument for Alaskan statehood? The proponents of Alaskan statehood like to argue that there is such great difficulty in doing business in Alaska that it should be made a State.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will say to the Senator that it is my opinion that the real purpose of the statehood bill is not statehood itself, because under the provisions of a bill similar to the bill which was passed in the case of Puerto Rico, the people of Alaska could have practically every right which they would have under statehood. The reason for the statehood bill lies in some other purpose, and I leave it to the distinguished Senator to figure out for himself what that purpose is.

The majority of Alaskans must certainly favor statehood in its true sense, whereby the State is master of its own destiny, with the same control over its land and resources as that enjoyed by other States. But it does not follow that the Alaskans must be burdened with a form of statehood which enables the Federal Government and its agencies to own and exercise control over every resource of the land and sea and thus dictate the manner and degree of their development.

Under the pending bill, Alaska would be relegated to the status of a poor and distant relation of the Federal Union.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know whether the Senator was present in the Chamber yesterday when the assertion was made by the proponents of the bill that the bill would free the Alaskan people from Washington bureaucracy. The Senator from Nebraska is a member of the committee and knows all the facts. Will he give us an opinion as to the correctness of that assertion? Would the bill free the Alaskans from Washington bureaucracy?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Is the Senator referring to the bill which I introduced?

Mr. STENNIS. No; I am referring to Senate bill 50.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I do not believe that Senate bill 50 would give them any more liberties than they enjoy at the present time, if as many.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield additional time to the Senator from Nebraska. How much more time would he like?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like 5 minutes more.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield 5 minutes additional to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I have just stated that under the pending bill Alaska would be relegated to the status of a poor and distant relation of the Federal Union. Public hearings previously held on this matter have been confined almost exclusively to the merits and demerits of statehood, with little thought or consideration to the terms under which Alaska should be admitted to the Union.

In that connection I should like to read from page 5 of Senate bill 50, beginning with line 9:

Said convention shall provide in said constitution:

Second. That said State and its people do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to any lands or other property not granted or confirmed to the State or its political subdivisions by or under the authority of this act, the right or title to which is held by the United States or is subject to disposition by the United States, and to any lands or other property (including fishing rights), the right or title to which may be held by any Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts (hereinafter called natives) or is held by the United States in trust for said natives; that all such lands or other property, belonging to the United States or which may belong to said natives, shall be and remain under the absolute jurisdiction and control of the United States until disposed of under its authority, except to such extent as the Congress has prescribed or may hereafter prescribe, and except when held by individual natives in fee without restrictions on alienation; and that no taxes shall be imposed by said State upon any lands or other property now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States or which, as hereinabove set forth, may belong to said natives, except to such extent as the Congress has prescribed or may hereafter prescribe, and except when held by individual natives in fee without restrictions on alienation.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Alaska shall be assumed and paid by said State and all debts owed to said Territory of Alaska shall be collected by said State.

Fourth. That provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Fifth. That all provisions of this act reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property herein made to said State, are consented to fully by said State and its people.

Sixth. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

In connection with the question which was asked by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] a moment ago, the public-land States are having their problems in connection with the control of property within the State boundaries which is owned and controlled by the Federal Government. The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] understands that situation. On February 25, a day or two ago, he introduced Senate bill 2723, to which I invite the attention of Senators. So far as I can see at the moment, it is a bill which should be enacted. It provides a method by which federally owned lands may become the property of the people within the State where they are located.

The people of Alaska are almost completely uninformed as to the provisions of the pending measure, since the only public hearings held on the statehood question within the Territory were on a measure so different from Senate bill 50, which is now under consideration, that any similarity found between them is entirely coincidental. I seriously doubt if there are more than a dozen copies of Senate bill 50 in the hands of the rank and file of the people in the Territory of Alaska. I am personally well acquainted and on friendly terms with a great many of the leading citizens of Alaska, from whom I receive constant indications as to the trends of thinking and action within the Territory. Every source of information at my command leads me to the unalterable conclusion that Alaskans are being asked to plunge blindly into an impossible situation.

I hold great affection for the people of Alaska. As a body, they are the living symbol of the character, daring, and fortitude which distinguished the pioneer spirit of our founding fathers. On the whole, they are an alert, awake, and industrious people. They are deserving of help, but they are also deserving of our confidence. We must make certain that every resident of the Territory has had the opportunity to read and study this bill and pass judgment upon it.

Mr. President, I cannot understand the urgency of taking up the statehood question at the present time. There is no pressing emergency requiring the immediate granting of statehood. There is not the slightest need for haste on this matter. We have pending before us many other bills of a complex and pressing nature which we should consider and get out of the way before settling down to what will undoubtedly require many weeks of study, consideration and debate.

This question of immediate statehood is very familiar to the senior Senator from Nebraska, through his acquaintance with the history of his own State. Nebraskans, too, were very enthusiastic and emotional over the prospects of statehood during the Civil War. But Nebraskans had to wait until the war was over before Congress would consider their application for admission to the Union.

This was as it should be. "First things first" has always been a logical rule to follow.

In summary, Mr. President, I propose that the Senate postpone action on this

bill until the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has had the opportunity to conduct hearings within Alaska on the question. I submit that the vast majority of Alaskans have never indicated their feelings on statehood, and that they should be given the opportunity to do so. I further submit that there are other means, less costly and harmful to Alaskans, by which this Congress can help them develop their resources and prepare themselves for eventual statehood.

Let us proceed, Mr. President, to the urgent business of the day, rather than bog this assembly down with a matter which, by the very nature of the hasty action that is being urged on us, threatens to deprive a group of Americans of their fundamental right to be heard in the councils of their Government.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with whom I have worked very pleasantly over many years presented several documents for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in support of his position. I have had several studies made with respect to the subjects of corruption, use of the public purse for private gain, use of the public purse for political gain, bureaucratic pressure on voters, the statehood referendum, the statehood committee, irresponsible propaganda, manipulation of the native vote, and imperfections in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the statements which have been prepared with respect to these subjects, together with a foreword, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

FOREWORD

The Alaska statehood bill has been the unfinished business before the Senate for nearly a month. During that period there have been many sincere and able arguments offered on both sides of the question.

The debate on statehood has been related to the national defense, Alaska's potential wealth, the Territory's financial condition, its future development and the desires of the Alaska people themselves.

Eloquent argument that the Congress has an obligation to grant statehood to the Territory, dating from its purchase from Russia, has even been tossed on the swaying scales.

But these are intangible questions and subject to honest differences of opinion.

There has been little said here regarding Alaska's present administration, the honor with which it has acquitted itself, or the manner in which it has prepared the people of the Territory for statehood.

Yet these, too, are subjects for consideration by the Senate of the United States.

The material that follows does not pretend to be the whole story, or an appreciable part of the story. It is a beginning.

These facts merely show a pattern of conduct which has many grave implications.

Much has been said here about what Alaska will get from statehood. Little has been said about what Alaska may be expected to contribute to the Federal Union in the integrity of its officials and the dignity and vigilance of its citizens.

It is for this reason that these facts of record are herewith submitted to the Senate.

CORRUPTION

Corruption in the present Alaskan administration has been widespread for many years.

Perhaps the most outstanding example of this was the notorious Palmer land deal.

This transaction was investigated by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Government. The committee found that "as the result of collusion between Territorial and CAA officials there was an attempt to shift the entire cost of the new improvements on the Palmer airport to the Federal Government."

The committee also noted that the case was unique in that it was the first time within the memory of the Members that a subdivision of the Federal Government, namely the Territory of Alaska, has been discovered attempting to secure funds from the Federal Government "in a manner which would do violence to the spirit and the letter of the law."

On the floor of the Senate, the deal has been labeled an attempted fraud on the United States Treasury. The General Accounting Office has to this day refused payment of any Federal funds to the Territory in connection with this project.

Facts developed by the subcommittee showed:

Between 1946 and 1949, the Territorial Government claimed to have spent some \$53,000 on the Palmer airport, located in the Matanuska Valley. Under the Federal Airport Aid Act, this money, spent before the act went into effect in Alaska, could not be claimed as basis for Federal matching funds.

In order to obtain reimbursement for this money, the Territory inflated the value of the airport land from \$5,500 to \$150,000. This inflation was accomplished by an exchange of checks between the Territory and the Palmer Airport Association, in which the Territory paid the association \$150,000, and 6 days later received a kick-back of \$145,000 from the association.

At this point, Alaskan newspapers discovered the subterfuge and publicized the entire transaction. Governor Gruening, in reply to subsequent criticism, defended the deal as "highly intelligent and conservative."

Since the investigation by the subcommittee, two of the officials involved in the Palmer deal have again run afoul of the law.

Shell Simmons, a member of the Alaska Aeronautics Board—the agency which acted for the Territory in the land deal—recently was fined \$5,000 on a plea of nolo contendere to a charge of bribing a Federal official in connection with the disposal of surplus airplanes.

Jack Maze, a member of the Palmer Airport Association and one of three men who appraised the airport land at \$150,000, has been arrested and charged with embezzling funds from the Matanuska Valley Bank at Palmer, of which he was manager. Amount of his alleged defalcations has been estimated at \$160,000.

But the Palmer deal is only one of a long series of incidents of corruption within the Alaskan administration.

Oscar Olson, former Territorial treasurer, is serving a 5-year sentence in the McNeil Island Federal penitentiary for stealing \$45,000 of the taxpayers' money. His shortages were uncovered in an audit made in 1949 by the firm of Arthur Anderson & Co., of Seattle.

This audit, required by Territorial law to be made biennially, had been blocked for 2 years by the Territorial board of administration which refused to provide funds to finance it. Governor Gruening is the head of the board of administration. Immediately prior to the audit, records and supporting data of other treasury disbursements totaling \$762,339 were destroyed.

The audit revealed some 20 other irregularities in the handling of public funds, among them the disappearance of \$20,000 worth of liquor stamps which have not as of this date been accounted for.

Also sentenced to McNeil Island last year was a Territorial tax official, Archie L. Brown, convicted of embezzling \$4,350 during his 3-year term of office as Territorial deputy tax collector at Anchorage.

His successor, Paul A. Odlaug, was indicted last year for stealing \$650 in Territorial tax funds between January 1950 and December 1950.

Both these men resigned before their indictments, and each was given a clean bill of health by the Territorial administration at the time of his resignation.

Just last November, David K. Brower, postmaster of Point Barrow, was arrested after a shortage of \$13,800 was uncovered in his accounts.

These are but a few of the more recent exposures of corruption, malfeasance, and misfeasance in the present administration.

Among others was the removal from office by the Territorial legislature of the administrator of veterans affairs, after irregularities were uncovered in his accounts. They include also the removal of the administrator of the Territorial welfare board by the legislature under similar circumstances.

It is significant that action by the legislature was necessary to remove these men who had remained safely in office for years with the sanction of Governor Gruening.

THE AUDITOR'S REPORT ON TERRITORIAL FINANCES, 1947-48 BIENNIIUM, AS PUBLISHED BY FAIRBANKS DAILY NEWS-MINER

The Alaska Legislature at its 1949 session authorized and appropriated funds for an audit of Territorial finances as required by law for each biennium. Results of the audit were made public by a special legislative committee following receipt of the report from the auditing firm, Arthur Anderson & Co. of Seattle.

It was the first audit report submitted to the people of Alaska in many years, despite the long-time existence of the Territorial statute making mandatory an examination of the Territory's books each 2 years and transmittal of the report to the legislature within 10 days of its convening.

The auditors' findings were carried in full in the columns of the Daily News-Miner at the time of their release and are reprinted in the following pages for the information of the public. For a more complete understanding of the issues involved, also included here is the News-Miner's detailed account of the contents of the report and its editorial comment made at that time.

Only through the widest possible dissemination of such material as this can a repetition of the sorry state of affairs described in the auditors' report be prevented in the future. Only by taking every avenue at its command to make sure that the information reaches the hands of the public can any newspaper worthy of the name fulfill its primary obligation to its readers; i. e., to furnish that check upon the excesses of government which no constitution has been able to provide.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner] TERRITORY AUDIT STORY—REPORT CHARGES FEDERAL FUNDS USED TO COVER CASH SHORTAGES—20 OTHER IRREGULARITIES IN HANDLING OF PUBLIC MONIES DISCLOSED IN STUDY OF BOOKS; VIOLATION OF LAWS IN NINE CASES ASSERTED

The treasurer of Alaska during the 1947-48 biennium used \$23,237.65 received by the Territory from the Federal Government to conceal shortages in the Territory's cash balance, it is disclosed in the recently pub-

lished findings of a special audit of Alaska's finances.

Twenty other irregularities in the handling of Territorial cash are described in the report by the Seattle firm of Arthur Andersen & Co.

The audit, ordered by the last legislature, was completed in mid-July. As a result of its disclosures, the auditors were instructed to extend their examination of the treasurer's records to cover the period from October 1, 1944, to May 7, 1949.

The published report enumerates nine instances in which practices of the treasurer's office were contrary to Territorial laws, as interpreted by the Alaska attorney general.

The auditors reported similar defections in procedures of the offices of the Territorial auditor, department of education, department of public welfare, department of taxation, and the administration of the University of Alaska.

The treasurer, according to the auditors, drew checks totaling \$14,742.80 on Territorial bank accounts which were not in payment of authorized warrants, the return of deposited items or tax refunds.

"The shortage arising from these disbursements," the report stated, "and from similar disbursements made in prior periods was concealed by the treasurer by depositing amounts received from the Federal Government, in payment of railroad income taxes, in the Territorial bank accounts without recording these amounts on the books. Such unrecorded deposits amounted to \$23,237.65 during the biennium under review."

In addition, the report said, the treasurer—

1. Made a practice of drawing checks to individuals in anticipation of warrants being issued by the Territorial auditor.

2. Executed certain refunds of taxes by check without the preparation of a warrant.

3. Left records inadequate to determine whether he had complied with a Territorial law requiring the treasurer to obtain from banks collateral security with a market value of 120 percent of the funds deposited. Records showed a deficiency of \$460,018 in this connection as of December 31, 1948.

4. Informed the auditing firm that he had made no attempt to fulfill the law requiring the allocation of Territorial funds in all Alaska banks in relation to the capitalization and financial condition of the banks.

5. Failed to collect from three banks an interest rate of one-half percent per annum on Territorial funds deposited.

6. Left cash balances showing that money from special funds had been used for general purposes, and

7. Failed to comply with the statute requiring the treasurer to examine and approve all vouchers chargeable to appropriations of the Territorial auditor or his office before the warrants are prepared for payment.

IRREGULARITIES

Four irregularities involving the department of education were specified in the auditor's report. These were:

The sum of \$30,375.40, representing insurance payment after fire destroyed a school at Bethel, was deposited in a bank account under supervision of the commissioner of education. The money was later expended by the board of education for construction of a school at Teller and for plans for schools at Clark's Point and Aniak. The auditors were informed by the attorney general that the insurance money should have been paid to the treasurer as unrestricted funds, and that the board of education had no authority to open a special bank account, nor to direct the use of the funds.

The commissioner of education, after collecting \$1,188.50 in fees for teachers' certificates, deposited \$500 of the amount in an account under "Territorial Office of Education." Part of the \$500 was spent with no supporting data available for examination by the auditors. The attorney general

stated that all such fees should go to the treasurer, and that all education expenses are payable only from appropriations for that purpose on vouchers from the Territorial auditor.

The practice of the commissioner of education of authorizing quarterly advances of 25 percent of the current year budgets of school districts resulted in advances in excess of statutory limitations. The allowable quarterly advance was defined as not more than 25 percent of refunds to the districts and cities from Territorial funds during the previous school year.

The commissioner of education used the current year's enrollment, rather than that of the previous year, as the basis for determining refunds from the Territory to schools.

The Andersen & Co. report cited instances in which the Territorial auditor paid vouchers to the department of education and to the department of welfare without supporting documentary data.

During the biennium, benefit payments by the department of welfare to individuals amounted to \$13,263.40 more than the statutory maximum, the auditors said records showed.

The auditors said they were informed by the attorney general that the University of Alaska, without authority, had borrowed \$211,000 from various sources. Of that amount, \$191,000 remained unpaid as of December 31, 1948.

University records failed to show the classification of all expenditures with relation to the source of funds, whether by Federal grant or Territorial appropriation, the audit report stated. Of 12 student loans with unpaid balances totaling \$2,202.46, 8 loans with unpaid balances of \$1,422.46 were past due as of December 31, 1948.

The auditors reported a shortage of \$555.29 in the accounts of the deputy tax collector in Anchorage on May 9, 1949, adding that the full amount was restored on May 10.

SURETY BONDS

Of 15 wholesale liquor dealers required to provide surety bonds of \$25,000 each to the department of taxation, only 4 bonds were on hand at the time of the auditors' examination, they reported.

The auditors took notice in their summary that the freezing of Territorial funds by the board of administration in April 1947 "did not succeed in keeping expenditures within the available funds."

They also remarked that data supporting grants of \$206,267 to schools for the period July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947, and substantially all applications for unemployment benefits during the year 1947 together with the earning records of claimants were destroyed prior to the commencement of our examination and were not available for our review. Unemployment benefits paid during 1947 totaled \$556,072.

The results of the firm's extended examination into the period from October 1944 to May 1949 will be submitted in a later separate report.

AUDITOR'S REPORT

JULY 15, 1949.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING, GOVERNOR, and HON. FRANK A. BOYLE, Auditor,
Territory of Alaska.

SIRS: We have examined the statements of cash receipts and disbursements of the Territory of Alaska for the biennium ended December 31, 1948. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. The general scope of our examination of the recorded transactions for the period under review is summarized in the following paragraphs.

Cash in banks and on deposit in the Treasury of the United States at the beginning and end of the period, as shown by the records of the Territory (except the January 1, 1946, balance, \$3,752.64, in the unemployment benefit account at the First National Bank of Juneau), was reconciled with amounts confirmed directly to us by the depositors. Cash reported as on hand at those dates was traced to subsequent deposit in Territorial bank accounts. Securities pledged by banks as collateral for Territorial funds on deposit therewith were confirmed to us by the banks and by the custodians holding such securities in safekeeping for the Territorial treasurer.

Recorded receipts of taxes and licenses collected by the department of taxation, the unemployment compensation commission, and the auditor, were checked on a test basis to tax returns and records of licenses issued. Tax and license revenues collected for the Territory by United States district courts were confirmed to us by the clerks of the respective courts. Grants, matching funds, and other funds recorded as received from the United States Government were confirmed to us by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government administering such funds. Recorded miscellaneous receipts of the Territory were tested, where practicable, by reference to records of the departments and agencies collecting such funds.

Cash disbursements for goods and services furnished to the Territory were checked, on a test basis, to payrolls, invoices and other supporting documents. Grants made by the Territory (school maintenance refunds, unemployment benefits and health and welfare payments) were tested by reference to documents held by the administering departments and agencies setting forth the recipients' eligibility to receive such grants. We tested the distribution of expenditures to appropriations and special funds but we did not attempt to pass upon the legality of the expenditures since this would involve legal interpretation of appropriation acts and other statutes which is beyond our purview as accountants.

The unexpended balance of appropriations and special funds at January 1, 1947, are shown in the accompanying statements in the amounts reflected by the records of the departments and agencies of the Territory. Since we have not examined the Territory's accounts for any period prior to the biennium 1947-48, we are not able to express an opinion as to the propriety of balances in the individual accounts.

The cash receipts of the Territory consist principally of taxes, licenses, and grants from the Federal Government which, because of their nature, cannot be measured and recorded prior to collection. Accordingly, it was not possible for us to determine independently that all revenues received by the various departments and agencies of the Territory had been recorded and covered into the Treasury.

Data supporting grants of \$206,267 made by the Territory to independent school districts and school boards of incorporated cities for maintenance expenses for the period July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947, had been destroyed prior to the commencement of our examination and were not available for our review. Substantially all applications for unemployment benefits during the year 1947 together with claimants' earnings records had been destroyed prior to our examination and were not available for our review. Unemployment benefits paid during 1947 totaled \$556,072.

Subject to the limitations upon the scope of our examination as set forth in the preceding three paragraphs, in our opinion, the accompanying statements (schedules 1 through 14) present fairly the recorded receipts and disbursements of the Territory of

Alaska and the source and disposition of such funds for the biennium ended December 31, 1948.

A discussion of the more important matters which came to our attention during the course of our examination together with our comments regarding particular items of receipts and disbursements are contained in subsequent paragraphs of this report. Our comments and suggestions with regard to the Territory's accounting procedures and system of internal control are being submitted in a separate memorandum.

GENERAL

Inasmuch as the various departments and agencies of the Territory, other than the unemployment compensation commission, do not maintain records of unliquidated obligations, it was not practicable to determine the amounts by which appropriations and special funds had been encumbered at December 31, 1948.

During April 1947, the board of administration froze all appropriations except those which were specifically exempt from such restriction. The board's order stated that this step was taken after their survey showed that Territorial revenues for the biennium ending March 31, 1949, would fall about \$3,750,000 short of meeting the more than \$10,000,000 appropriated by the legislature. This action did not succeed, however, in keeping expenditures within the available funds. At December 31, 1948, the records of the auditor's office indicated that there were unpaid vouchers on hand totaling \$729,630.83 as against unrestricted cash balances in the hands of the treasurer of \$7,010.77. At the same date collections held by departments and agencies, which were transferred to the treasurer during January 1949, were as follows:

Held by:	Amount
Auditor.....	\$5,197.55
Department of taxation.....	135,775.29
Total.....	140,972.84

The statutes provide that all indebtedness be paid in the order of its creation. The Attorney General has ruled that this provision applies to all types of obligations, irrespective of their nature or purpose. During the biennium, salaries of Territorial employees were paid in preference to other indebtedness and vouchers were paid without regard to the date the indebtedness was incurred.

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

Unauthorized withdrawals and unrecorded deposits

During the course of our examination of this office, a number of transactions came to our attention which are commented upon below. A summary of such transactions for the biennium ended December 31, 1948, is as follows:

1. Checks drawn on Territorial bank accounts which were not in payment of warrants issued, deposited items returned by the banks or tax refunds, \$14,742.80.

2. Receipts of Territorial funds deposited in Territorial bank accounts but not recorded in the treasurer's accounts, \$23,237.65.

Warrants prepared by the auditor and countersigned by the treasurer are issued in payment for goods and services. The reduction of the appropriation or special fund accounts is recorded at the time the warrants are issued. On the other hand, the actual disbursement of funds in the custody of the treasurer is accomplished by checks signed only by the treasurer who also reconciles the Territorial bank accounts. Generally, checks are drawn to banks each day in payment for warrants accepted for collection by the banks. Checks are also drawn to banks in reimbursement for items deposited with but returned by the banks because of

noncollection. These latter items are carried by the treasurer as cash on hand until cleared by the redeposit or collection. No changes in appropriation or fund balances are made if the item is eventually cleared. It was also the practice of the treasurer to draw checks to individuals in anticipation of warrants being issued by the auditor. The warrants covered by these checks, when received from the auditor, were used to record the charges against the appropriation or fund accounts and then canceled. Certain refunds of taxes were made by check without the preparation of a warrant.

Warrants were not issued for any of the checks making up the amount of \$14,742.80 shown above, and therefore the appropriation and fund accounts were not charged with these disbursements. Consequently, the cash balances shown by the books would have exceeded the actual amount of cash on hand and in banks by the amount of the unauthorized disbursements. The shortage arising from these disbursements and from similar disbursements made in prior periods was concealed by the treasurer by depositing amounts received from the Federal Government in payment of railroad income taxes in the Territorial bank accounts without recording these amounts on the books. Such unrecorded deposits amounted to \$23,237.65 during the biennium under review.

Bank	Balance on deposit	Collateral		Deficiency if covered by deposit of U. S. Government obligations
		U. S. Government obligations at par	Other securities at quoted market value	
The B. M. Behrens Bank.....	\$482,179	\$416,350	-----	\$65,829
The First National Bank of Juneau.....	874,221	607,000	-----	267,221
The Seattle-First National Bank.....	114,540	100,000	-----	14,540
The First Bank of Valdez.....	223,273	-----	\$133,014	112,428
Total.....	-----	-----	-----	460,018

Allocation of cash balances among banks

The treasurer is required by law to allocate the funds of the Territory among all of the banks of Alaska in relation to the capitalization and financial condition of the banks. We were informed by the treasury that no attempt had been made to fulfill this requirement.

Interest on bank balances

Territorial law requires that banks holding deposits of Territorial funds shall pay interest thereon at the rate established by the Territorial banking board (one-half percent per annum). During the biennium under review, the following banks did not pay interest on balances deposited therein: The B. M. Behrens Bank, the First National Bank of Juneau, the Seattle-First National Bank.

We were informed that these banks did not pay such interest on the ground that the cost of handling the Territorial accounts offsets any interest earned by the balances in these accounts.

Special funds

As shown in schedule 1, at December 31, 1946, the cash balances of the Territory held by the treasurer totaled \$223,630.18. At that date unexpended balances of special funds under the jurisdiction of the treasurer totaled \$603,246.79, or \$379,616.61 in excess of the cash balances which indicated that special fund cash had been used for general purposes. This situation did not exist at December 31, 1948. We were informed by the Attorney General that cash receipts for or appropriations to special funds are available only for the specific purposes of such funds and should not be used for payment of general Territorial obligations.

As soon as these transactions came to our attention, we reported them to officials of the Territory. As a result of these disclosures, we were instructed to extend our examination of the treasurer's records to cover the period from October 1, 1944, to May 7, 1949. The results of this examination are being submitted in a separate report.

Collateral security for Territorial funds

The treasurer is required by Territorial law to obtain from banks in which Territorial funds are deposited collateral security having a market value of at least 120 percent of the amount of such funds held. The records of the treasurer were inadequate to permit us to determine whether this requirement had been complied with throughout the biennium under review. As shown on schedule 10, the treasurer had not secured sufficient collateral from all banks to cover balances on deposit with them at December 31, 1948. We understand that during the 1949 session of the legislature the requirements were amended, effective July 1, 1949, to permit banks to furnish United States Government obligations as collateral in principal amounts equal to 100 percent of the cash balances to be secured. The requirement with respect to securities other than United States Government obligations remained unchanged. The deficiency in collateral security at December 31, 1948, computed in accordance with the Revised Statutes, is summarized below:

Review of vouchers drawn by the auditor

Territorial statutes require the treasurer to examine and approve all vouchers chargeable to appropriations of the auditor or his office before warrants are prepared for payment thereof. We were informed that the treasurer had not examined these vouchers during the biennium under review.

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR

Support for vouchers passed for payment

Our examination of vouchers passed for payment indicated that, generally speaking, adequate supporting data were attached thereto to enable the auditor to pass upon the propriety of the claims. However, the following types of vouchers either did not contain adequate support or related information necessary to pass upon such claims had not been secured by the auditor:

Type of Voucher and Information Lacking

Department of education school maintenance refunds: Copies of budgets or estimates of costs submitted by school boards and approved by commissioner.

Rural school teachers' salaries: Statement of amount of refund for prior year and copies of contracts with teachers.

Department of health and public welfare expenditures chargeable against Federal funds: Regulations and restrictions applicable to Federal grants.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Expenditures of insurance proceeds

During 1944 the board of education received \$30,375.40, representing insurance proceeds resulting from a fire in the school building at Bethel. These funds were deposited in a bank account under the supervision of the commissioner of education. At the

instruction of the board of education these funds were used for the construction of a school at Teller and for plans and preliminary work on schools at Clark's Point and Aniak.

We were informed by the attorney general that the insurance proceeds should have been paid to the Territorial treasurer as unrestricted receipts and that the board of education had no authority to place these funds in a special bank account, to direct the use of such funds, or to expend these funds.

Teachers' certificate fees

During the biennium under review \$1,189.50 representing fees for teachers' certificates was collected by the commissioner of education. Of this amount \$688.50 was transferred to the territorial treasury and credited to the appropriation for administrative expenses of the department of education. The remaining \$500 was deposited in a special bank account maintained under the title of the "Territorial Office of Education." At January 1, 1947, this account had a balance of \$383.60. Expenditures totaling \$511.82 were made from this account during the biennium leaving a balance at December 31, 1948, of \$371.78. No data supporting these expenditures were available for our examination. Notations in the check book indicated the larger payments to be as follows:

Payee and particulars:	Amount
Cash, education film.....	\$50.00
Alaska airlines, office contingent....	50.00
Ada Winther:	
Travel.....	120.05
Salary for 12 days.....	91.77
National Council of School officers, membership.....	100.00

The attorney general informed us that the statutes require that all fees from teachers' certificates be deposited with the treasurer as unrestricted receipts and all expenses of the office of the commissioner of education be paid from appropriations for that purpose upon vouchers approved by the auditor.

School maintenance refunds

The commissioner of education has the authority to make advances each quarter of the school year against refunds due to incorporated cities and school districts for their allowable maintenance expenses. The statutes limit the amount of each of these quarterly advances to not more than 25 percent of the sum which such municipality or school district received as a refund for the previous school year. The commissioner has followed the practice, however, of advancing quarterly 25 percent of the approved budget of each municipality or school district for the current school year. This has resulted in advances being made in excess of the statutory limitation since the current budgets have been exceeding previous year's refunds.

School boards are required to furnish the commissioner with detailed statements of their maintenance expenses together with vouchers and supporting documents. At the time of our examination no such reports had been received from the City of Fairbanks School Board for the school year 1948-49.

The percentage of maintenance expenses which is allowable as a refund to incorporated cities and school districts is based upon resident school enrollment, varying from 75 to 85 percent as enrollment decreases. The percentage of refund used by the commissioner of education has been based upon the preceding year's enrollment. The attorney general advised us that the current year's enrollment should be used as the basis for determining the percentage of refund.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Temporary aid to indigents

During the biennium under review it was the policy of the department of public wel-

fare to consider that the statutory limitation of \$30 per month to any individual applied only to cash payments made directly to indigents and did not relate to the cost of goods and services furnished to indigents. It was the opinion of the attorney general that the law required that aid to indigents in all forms, exclusive of medical care, must not exceed \$30 per month. Payments made to individuals during the period in excess of the statutory maximum totaled \$13,263.40.

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION

Tax and license collections

As previously stated, since receipts of taxes and licenses cannot be measured or recorded prior to collection, it was possible for us to determine independently that all revenues from these sources had been recorded and covered into the Treasury. While prenumbered receipts are issued for certain taxes and licenses, the recorded collections could not be proved except by accounting for the entire issue of tax receipts printed. It was impractical for us to check the recorded tax collections in this manner, but the tax commissioner has undertaken to account for all tax and license receipts printed. This work had not been completed at the conclusion of our examination.

The major portion of tax revenues is evidenced by tax returns prepared and filed by the taxpayers. We were not able to determine that all persons liable for Territorial taxes had filed returns and paid the taxes due but our tests of the records of the department of taxation indicated that all taxes represented by returns on file had been recorded and transmitted to the Territorial treasurer. We made no attempt to verify the amounts of taxes reported in the returns filed.

Examination of offices of the deputy collectors

We examined the records maintained by the deputy tax collectors at Juneau, Ketchikan, Anchorage, and Fairbanks, counted cash on hand and confirmed cash in banks, counted unissued tax receipts and reconciled the accounts of each deputy collector with the control records maintained in the commissioner's office. Our examination of the office of the deputy collector at Anchorage on May 9, 1949, disclosed a shortage of \$555.29. On May 10, 1949, the deputy collector deposited the full amount of this shortage in the bank account of his office and transferred all collections made to that date to the office of the commissioner.

Liquor wholesalers' bonds

The statutes require every wholesaler of intoxicating liquors to furnish a surety bond of \$25,000 to the tax commissioner to guarantee payment of Territorial excise taxes on liquors. At the time of our examination the department's records were incomplete with respect to these bonds, but the commissioner is taking steps to put these records in order.

The following tabulation sets forth the number of wholesalers who currently pay liquor excise taxes and their status with respect to the bond requirement:

Particulars:	Number
Wholesalers whose bonds were on hand and examined by us.....	4
Wholesalers who claimed to have furnished bonds but which could not be located for our examination....	7
Wholesalers who have not furnished bonds.....	4
	<hr/> 15

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Indebtedness incurred by the university

During the biennium the university borrowed \$211,000 from various sources and used these funds to defray operating costs. At December 31, 1948, \$191,000 of these loans

were unpaid. The Attorney General has advised us that the university does not have authority to borrow funds.

Appropriation expenditures

The university records do not show a classification of all expenditures by source of funds. Expenditures of Federal grants and certain Territorial appropriations are classified in the accounts but expenditures for administration, maintenance of physical plant and faculty salaries not chargeable to Federal grants, are not charged against any specific appropriations. Consequently, the records do not reflect a breakdown of the unexpended balances by appropriations.

Student loan fund

Twelve loans receivable having unpaid balances of \$2,202.46 at December 31, 1948, were submitted to us for examination. We requested confirmation of these balances from the borrowers with the following results:

Particulars	Number	Unpaid balances
Balances confirmed.....	7	\$974.19
No reply received.....	3	578.27
Request returned for lack of proper address (no other address available).....	2	250.00
Total.....	12	2,202.46

Four loans having unpaid balances of \$780 are current and the remaining eight loans having unpaid balances of \$1,422.46 are past due.

Upon request, we shall be pleased to discuss with you any of the matters set forth above or to furnish you with any information contained in our working papers. We appreciate the courtesies and cooperation extended to our representatives during the course of the examination.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR ANDERSEN & CO.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner]

A SHABBY RECORD

For the information of its readers, the Daily News-Miner today publishes the text of the auditor's report on the state of Territorial finances during the 1947 and 1948 biennium.

The document tells a disgraceful story of inept and slipshod handling of the people's money by members of the Gruening administration in that period. And worse, it details the manner in which ex-treasurer Olson used Federal funds to conceal shortages in his accounts. Olson has been charged with embezzlement and is awaiting grand jury action.

A total of 20 other alleged irregularities in the handling of Alaska funds are cited by the auditing firm, Arthur Andersen & Co., of Seattle. Nine practices contrary to Territorial law, as interpreted by the attorney general, were found in the treasurer's office. Other such practices were found in the Territorial auditor's office, in the department of education, department of public welfare, and the department of taxation.

Some accounting methods of the University of Alaska in the period under scrutiny were criticized by the auditors, who also disclosed that the attorney general has ruled that the university is without legal authority to borrow funds from private sources to defray operating costs.

The auditors also noted cases in which the department of education had set up its own bank accounts without legal authority and arbitrarily disbursed funds from these accounts without regard to required procedures under Territorial law.

A further shocking example of the Juneau administration's disregard for the public interest is found in the disclosure that records

and other supporting data for grants totaling \$762,339 out of the Territorial treasury during the biennium were destroyed prior to the audit. These included "substantially all" the applications for unemployment benefits and earning records of claimants for 1947, as well as data supporting grants to independent school districts from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947.

A more brazen appearing attempt by some officials to evade an examination of their activities by the auditing firm is impossible to imagine. Destruction of records only two and three years old is not normal procedure, nor can it be dismissed as someone's oversight.

An immediate investigation into this and other matters cited in the report should be made by proper authorities and the officials involved required to explain their dealings publicly. If the responsible leaders of the administration remain derelict in this regard, it then should be the obligation of members of the legislature to undertake the inquiry in the public interest.

The audit was ordered by the legislature at the insistence of Senator John Butrovich, a Fairbanks Republican, and Representative James Nolan, a Wrangell Democrat. It is the same audit that was blocked for 2 years by the Territorial board of administration which refused to provide funds to finance it while continuing to finance such nonsense as the development board.

The report is the latest chapter in the story of Gov. Ernest Gruening's administration of Alaska affairs. As a result of the findings, the audit has been ordered extended to cover the period from October 1, 1944, to May 7, 1949.

We will await with interest the next chapters in this shabby record.

USE OF THE PUBLIC PURSE FOR PRIVATE GAIN

Surprised Alaskans learned a few years ago that members of the Territorial legislature had been given jobs on the payroll of the executive branch, under Governor Gruening, a practice which certainly strikes at the foundation of the usual concept of government in this country. Needless, to add, the lawmakers who thus benefited from the Territorial treasury were invariably supporters of the Gruening administration in carrying out their legislative "duties."

A noteworthy example of this practice was the case of Stanley J. McCutcheon, a member of the Alaska House from Anchorage, also, the Gruening administration's floor leader during the 1949 legislative session.

At that session, McCutcheon actively supported and voted for legislation creating the Alaska Aeronautics Commission, whose primary function was to oversee the building of civilian airports in Alaska, of course, with the aid of Federal matching funds. McCutcheon voted for the appropriation for support of that agency.

Thereafter he was hired as attorney for the same agency. He drew fees which totaled at least \$5,628 for legal services over an 8 months' period. The number of the Territorial voucher by which he was paid was 284803, dated April 19, 1950.

McCutcheon has benefited from his association with the Gruening administration in other ways. He is president of Alaska Airlines. For years the Alaska Airlines owed the Territory \$22,000 in back sales tax for which it had collected and then failed to turn over to the Territorial treasurer as required by law. A "token" payment of \$1,000 made in April, 1950, did not even cover the interest on the delinquency. Now, we come to the quid pro quo.

It was also Alaska Airlines that transported the pro-statehood clique to Washington for hearings before the Senate committee in April, 1950. The round-trip fare charged by the airline (which couldn't afford to pay a tax debt to the Territory) was \$125 per

person, a fraction of the commercial rate which statehood opponents were forced to pay to testify before the committee against the pending bill. The exchange of favors between Governor Gruening and McCutcheon is, or should be, obvious.

Another among the legislators who have profited from close association with the Gruening regime was Victor Rivers, a member of the Alaska senate, who also voted for the creation of the Territorial aeronautics agency and voted for the appropriation for that agency. Rivers, the record shows, was subsequently hired by the same agency as an engineer. He drew fees totalling several thousands of dollars, including \$4,320 paid to him on vouchers Nos. 274203 and 280552 in January and March of 1950.

Rivers has also received pay from numerous other agencies of the executive branch of the Territorial government, whose appropriations he supported as a member of the legislature. Some of the agencies and amounts paid him by each are as follows: Department of Education, \$18,760.50; Department of Public Health, \$12,151.58 and Highway Department, \$1,544.65.

But the members of the legislature are not the only ones who profit from the largess of the Gruening administration at the expense of the taxpaying public.

Mrs. Mildred Hermann, wartime OPA administrator in the Territory, is a devoted follower of the Alaska administration, as well as being a loud exponent of the statehood cause. She it was who suggested before the Senate committee that Alaskans ought to be willing to "eat beans" to support a state government.

Records of the General Accounting Office show that Mrs. Hermann received total pay from the Federal Government for her services as OPA Administrator amounting to \$27,146 between May 16, 1942, and May 3, 1947. Alaska's former Delegate, now a Federal district judge in Anchorage, is authority for the disclosure that Mrs. Hermann received her Federal appointment through the personal intervention of Governor Gruening. (See letter.)

Mrs. Hermann is currently serving as a paid secretary of the Alaska Statehood Committee, a promotion agency for the statehood cause supported entirely by tax funds. When the legislature is in session, she broadcasts over the radio in Juneau 3 nights a week, bitterly assailing in most personal language the activities of those lawmakers who are opposed to the Gruening regime, while blessing with glowing approbation those who have stood in favor of its various programs.

This is a pressure tactic, and there can be little doubt where it had its inception.

Mrs. Irene Ryan is another who has been similarly rewarded. Her testimony and that of her husband, strongly favoring passage of the statehood bill, will be found in the record of the hearings before the Senate committee. Both took advantage of the reduced \$125 fare to travel to Washington to state their views in favor of the legislation.

It therefore becomes pertinent to refer to the financial records of the Territorial government which show that Mrs. Ryan drew a total of more than \$30,000 in tax funds as an engineer on a number of Territorial airport projects. Her husband is also on the public payroll, serving as an engineer at Fort Richardson, near Anchorage.

This is the same couple to whom Senator Anderson referred on the floor of the Senate on February 4 (see Record, p. 764) when he referred to witnesses at the last statehood hearing 2 years ago in the following language:

"A fine group of people appeared and testified on the statehood issue. There were some who had lived in Alaska a long time; there were some who were newcomers to the area. I was surprised to find among the group who appeared from Alaska two young people, a man and his wife, who were mining

engineers. It had been only a few years before that I had been the speaker at the commencement exercises at the school of mines in my home State and had handed the diplomas to these young folks. The wife was the first mining engineer of her sex to be graduated from that school.

"These two young people were living in Alaska. They had been to Washington many times, because they believe statehood will accomplish wonderful things for the whole mining industry. They believe that as a result of statehood we can look for a tremendous development in the production of minerals which are now badly needed by this Nation, and their testimony stands uncontradicted in all the hearings we have held."

The foregoing is certainly all very lovely, but what are the Ryans doing toward development of the Territory? Where is their contribution? How does a female mining engineer qualify as a designer of airports? Under the circumstances, their enthusiasm for statehood, or anything else desired by the present Alaska administration, isn't hard to understand.

William Baker, editor of the Ketchikan Chronicle, is another follower of the present Alaska administration. The record shows that he has on occasions in the past received a total of more than \$5,000 in printing business from Territorial government agencies without competitive bids. He is the only Alaska publisher thus favored by the administration. A second paper published in Ketchikan and unfavorable to the Alaska administration has not been as fortunate in the securing of work financed from the Public Treasury, the record shows.

Another who has been handsomely rewarded at the expense of taxpayers for his loyalty to the Alaska administration is Herbert Hilscher of Fairbanks. Mr. Hilscher is a public-relations counsel and proved of invaluable aid to the Territorial administration 3 years ago during that administration's campaign to outlaw fish traps, a device vital to the economical and efficient operation of the salmon industry.

Hilscher handled the publicity for those seeking to destroy the traps, including leaders of the Gruening regime, as a means for dealing a crippling blow to the salmon industry. At the same time, as an editor of a weekly newspaper, he was able to support his campaign in its news columns.

Hilscher has now been honored by appointment to the Alaska Development Board, a post which enables him to travel about the Territory to meetings, conferences, and what not at public expense, free to promote at the same time his public-relations business. He has also been placed on the payroll of the University of Alaska at \$300 per month. He was hired by the Alaska Statehood Committee to produce that agency's biennial report and was paid \$1,237.36 out of the public purse. More lately, he has been placed on the payroll of the Federal Government by the Bureau of Reclamation to whip up sentiment in favor of a public power project near Fairbanks.

Another who found a place on the public payroll after acknowledging his support of the policies of the present governor was John Pegues, now deceased, who was an editor and columnist for various Alaska newspapers during his lifetime. Mr. Pegues was ODT administrator in the Territory during the war. Records of the General Accounting Office show he received a total of \$4,633.77 from the Federal Treasury between March 3, 1944, and August 31, 1945. Pegues' loyalty to the Gruening administration is no more difficult to comprehend than that of the other recipients of pay from tax funds who have been cited herein.

The penchant of Governor Gruening for bringing newspaper people into his administration is well known in Alaska. The influence of officials of the press in their home communities can hardly be overestimated.

Among those on whom the gubernatorial blessing has thus been bestowed are Paul Solka, placed on the Territorial veterans board at a time when he was also a newspaper editor; Robert Atwood, publisher of the Anchorage Times, presently the chairman of the statehood committee; his wife, Mrs. Evangeline Atwood, named by the Governor to the Territorial welfare board, and William Baker, the Ketchikan publisher previously mentioned, who is also on the statehood committee.

Least the report get about that the parceling out of favors by the Gruening administration was entirely altruistic, it is perhaps germane to remind the Senate of the private road, built at public expense, a few years ago for the sole purpose of serving property outside Juneau occupied by the Governor or members of his family. Construction of the road is a matter of record and cost taxpayers more than \$2,200. It was the subject of litigation in the district court in Juneau in 1949.

At the hearings on the Governor's confirmation before the Senate committee later that same year, members of the committee expressed interest in the project, an obvious convenience for the Governor and members of his family, and one which doubtless enhanced the value of the property. The Governor's explanation was that the road was built by the Territorial highway department on an occasion when he happened to be absent from the Territory and, therefore, he could not be held accountable for it.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1942.

WALTER P. SHARPE, Esq.,
Juneau, Alaska.

DEAR WALTER: Your letter of May 25, expressing doubt as to the wisdom of the appointment of Mrs. Mildred R. Hermann to the position of Price Administrator for the Territory of Alaska, was received this morning and I have read it with much interest.

The news of Mrs. Hermann's appointment came to me as a complete surprise for I had not been consulted on the subject. At the Office of Price Administration here I was told that she had been appointed upon the recommendation of Governor Gruening.

Thank you for having told me what you think of the appointment. The times appear to be troublous in more than one respect.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY J. DIMOND,
Delegate.

USE OF PUBLIC PURSE FOR POLITICAL GAIN

Charges that the public purse in Alaska has been used for the private gain of a select few individuals are clearly supported by the record of the present Territorial administration.

That public money has also been used for political gain by leaders of the same administration is also a matter of record.

By carefully timing the expenditure of funds to coincide with primary and general elections in the Territory, the officials in control of Alaska's purse strings have sought to influence the voting of the rank and file of Territorial inhabitants.

The administration was aided in this practice by the stringent financial condition in which the Territory found itself in 1949.

Because of the failure of anticipated revenues to meet the appropriations made by the 1947 and 1949 legislatures, the Alaskan board of administration froze more than \$5,000,000 of the appropriated funds soon after the legislature adjourned.

These frozen funds included money for the University of Alaska, welfare agencies, the veterans' revolving loan fund, the statehood committee, and others.

In the intervening period, tax collections have far exceeded the expectations of the most optimistic Territorial officials. Revenues to meet these projected expenditures have since been collected, thanks to the millions pumped into the Alaska economy by the Federal Government, and the frozen funds have now been entirely released.

The political implications in the handling of this public money became the most pronounced during 1950, an election year. The bulk of the appropriations had remained blocked throughout 1949, a nonelection year, by the board of administration, of which the Governor is chairman.

Governor Gruening and his followers will claim that the money could not be released until a number of the usual court tests of new tax laws had been brought to a successful conclusion.

To some extent, this cannot be denied. But no one can claim that the court tests continued up to within a few days of both the primary and the general elections of 1950, which is when a large proportion of the funds with the widest popular appeal were released.

Nor can the Governor's most enthusiastic followers support an argument that the court tests were of such a nature as to force the Territory to deny the appropriation of funds for the welfare agency adequate for the care of delinquent children, while releasing funds for such governmental activities as the board of dental examiners, the board of cosmetology, and the Alaska statehood committee, a surperlobbying agency created by the present Territorial administration.

That was what happened just prior to the 1950 primary election and the record will so show.

The frozen funds also included, among other items, \$1,200,000 earmarked for payment into the Alaska World War II veterans' revolving fund at the rate of \$50,000 a month. The law clearly provided that these payments were mandatory.

Because the entire appropriation had been frozen, no payments were made to the veterans' funds for nearly a year, in spite of constant requests by the veterans' board that such payments be made according to law.

Less than a month before the 1950 primary elections in April, the Territorial treasurer refused to make the payments to the veterans, saying, "The financial picture of the Territory at the present time is not clear."

Four days before, the treasurer had spoken in glowing terms of the Territory's improved financial condition which had permitted the board of administration to unfreeze \$25,000 for the statehood committee, \$5,000 for the Alaskan National Guard, and other amounts totaling \$261,564.

Then, 6 days before the primary election, the board of administration announced it had unfrozen \$100,000 of the money due the veterans. The treasurer said he had just discovered fine print in the law making payment mandatory.

No further payments were made on the delinquent balance until the following October when, 6 days before the general election, the board of administration announced it had unfrozen \$50,000 more of the veterans' money.

Funds for the tax-supported University of Alaska were withheld in a similar manner until just prior to election.

The frozen account included \$900,000 appropriated for new construction at the university.

Less than a month before the April primary election in 1950, the board of administration released \$85,450 to the university.

No further payments were made until 6 days before the general election in October, at which time the Governor announced the release of \$90,000 more of the money owed the university. This announcement carried

also the promise that the board of administration would release the balance in 1951 at the rate of \$100,000 a month.

The university is located near Fairbanks. Money spent by the university would normally flow into Fairbanks coffers. Fairbanks was also the scene at that time of a bitter political battle between the administration and its foes. The bold attempt of the administration to tamper with the views of the electorate through timely release of university funds is, or should be, obvious.

As it turned out, the administration's gesture in this respect was in vain. The Governor took the worst beating of the election in Fairbanks, where he lost all except one seat in the legislature to Republicans.

Other funds released by the board of administration within days of the 1950 primary election, after they had lain dormant in frozen accounts for many months, were \$50,000 for aid to hospitals and clinics, \$20,000 for the public employees' retirement fund, \$25,114 for the Alaska housing authority, \$75,000 for the department of fisheries, \$750 for the board of dental examiners, and \$250 for the board of cosmetology.

The record shows that these funds were released at a time when the Alaskan department of public welfare was closing its doors to all juveniles except those already under its care because there was not enough money in the department to operate it effectively.

This lack of money for the care of delinquent children was the direct result of action in the administration-controlled 1949 legislature, which chopped \$90,000 off the request made by the board of public welfare.

The same legislature appropriated \$30,000 for the statehood lobby. Part of this money was used to hire a professional lobbyist who previously had represented the satellite Government of Poland in Washington circles.

In the same month (April 1950) that the board of administration released \$25,000 for the statehood committee, the director of public welfare made the following report:

"With the serious shortage of juvenile code funds, the agency will only be able to provide assistance for a very limited number of these younger children. This action means that the adolescent boys and girls who are in trouble in the communities and are committed to the department of public welfare will suffer as there will be no funds available for their care. * * * As a result, the child welfare service program will be critically hampered by lack of adequate funds."

BUREAUCRATIC PRESSURE ON VOTERS

Early in 1950, Mr. Arvo Saario, president of the Northwest Alaska Chamber of Commerce in Nome, asked the Alaska Development Board to establish an office in Nome to aid in promoting a tourist business for the Territory.

He received a reply soon thereafter from George Sundborg, at that time a consultant for the development board, who wrote to Mr. Saario from Washington where he was staying at taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Sundborg's reply (see photostat marked "F") consisted of a refusal to accede to the request for a development board office in Nome. In the same communication, Mr. Sundborg attacked the records of certain Alaskans who represented Nome in the Territorial legislature in 1949 and concluded with this revealing statement:

"Whether we will be able to proceed toward these objectives next biennium will depend entirely on action taken by the 1951 legislature and, of course, upon the make-up of that body."

For many years, Alaskans have anticipated that soon a flourishing tourist trade will someday be a major source of income. But, when the Nome Chamber of Commerce wrote asking for help along this line, it received

back only a threatening letter attacking its legislators.

Thus, the citizens of Nome, who desire a portion of tax funds from the Territorial administration for the betterment of their community, now know how to go about getting those funds. In simple language, they must send to their legislature only those representatives acceptable to Mr. Sundborg and other administration leaders.

Sundborg's letter, significantly, was written about a month before the 1950 Alaska primary election.

Government by pressure is commonplace in Alaska.

It works both ways. Those individuals and those communities that are loyal to the administration are amply rewarded, as in the case of legislators who have been placed on the payroll of the executive branch. Those who offend the administration, as in the case of Nome, are penalized. The record shows that both Senator Munz and Senator Jones were subsequently defeated in their races to win reelection to the legislature.

Little pressure is required to control the outcome of the balloting in sparsely populated regions such as northern and western Alaska. There are only about 500 votes cast in Nome and only about 2,000 in the entire division, the majority of which are natives and subject to further pressure through the Interior Department and the Alaska Native Service.

Yet this division elects one-quarter of the membership of the Senate and one-eighth of the membership of the House.

As to Mr. Sundborg, his annual salary at the time he wrote the letter to Nome was \$8,000, paid out of Alaska tax funds. Records also show that he drew an additional sum for expenses amounting to \$6,800 between April 1, 1949, and April 1, 1950.

This was during a period when more than \$5,000,000 in appropriations for the Territorial government remained frozen for lack of funds to meet them, and there was insufficient money in the treasury to finance adequate care for delinquent children by the welfare department.

Mr. Sundborg's pay has since been increased to \$12,000 per year.

ALASKA DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1950.

Mr. ARVO SAARIO,

President, Northwest Alaska Chamber
of Commerce, Nome, Alaska.

DEAR MR. SAARIO: Your recent night letter has been forwarded here by my office at Juneau. The interest of your organization in building up a real tourist business in Alaska is greatly appreciated by us and we hope your attitude will be emulated by other chambers of commerce in the Territory.

Mr. Polet, our Alaska Development Board member for the second division, has long advocated our establishing an office at Nome. We have been unable to do this because of budgetary reasons. As you may know, all four of the senators from the second division voted in the 1947 legislative sessions to completely abolish the Alaska Development Board. These men were O. D. Cochran, Tolbert Scott, Charles Jones, and William Munz. They were also instrumental in that session in obtaining a vote by which our board was given no appropriation whatsoever for the entire biennium. In the 1949 session Senators Jones and Munz again voted to cripple the Alaska Development Board in every possible way but the two new senators who had been elected in the meantime, Howard Lyng and Ed Anderson, supported us strongly. The Alaska Development Board, as a result, received an appropriation of \$80,000 for the current biennium. This does not permit us to maintain an office in Nome or to spend any money on a tourist-promotion program.

Whether we will be able to proceed toward these objectives next biennium will depend entirely on action taken by the 1951 legislature and, of course, upon the make-up of that body.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE SUNDBORG,
Consultant.

THE STATEHOOD REFERENDUM

Proponents of immediate statehood for Alaska have placed strong emphasis on the results of the statehood referendum held in the Territory in 1946.

The statehood group claims that the outcome of the referendum reflected the will of the majority of Alaskan voters for immediate admission to the Union.

The facts do not support this contention. The question on the referendum ballot was so worded that the voter had only a "Yes" or "No" choice on the general proposition, "Are you in favor of statehood for Alaska?"

There are many Alaskans who look forward to eventual statehood for the Territory, but who believe it is not yet economically prepared to carry the tremendous added financial burden of a State government.

These were faced with the choice of voting "Yes" on the general principle of statehood or registering their opposition to statehood for all time.

The affirmative votes in these cases expressed no desire, much less a demand, for immediate statehood.

But, even with the support of these Alaskans, the margin of victory for the statehood adherents in the referendum was a slender one, 9,630 to 6,822. Under the terms of the ballot, those who voted "No" went on record as being opposed to any kind of statehood at any time.

The figures also show that more than 500 Alaskans who cast ballots in the general election, held at the same time as the statehood referendum, did not bother to vote on statehood at all. This is about 3 percent of the electorate which thereby registered its complete disinterest in the question.

Alaska is divided into four political divisions. Each division voted separately on the referendum. Two of these divisions voted against the statehood proposition.

The other two divisions which voted for it are notorious strongholds of the Federal and Territorial administrations. They include the capital city, Juneau, with its large payroll of Territorial employees, and the city of Anchorage, largest in the Territory, filled with thousands of both Territorial and Federal employees.

The voting for and against the referendum, by division, was as follows:

Division	For	Against	Result
First (Juneau)....	3,872	1,953	Carried for statehood.
Second (Nome)....	742	933	Carried against statehood.
Third (Anchorage)....	3,427	2,257	Carried for statehood.
Fourth (Fairbanks)....	1,589	1,679	Carried against statehood.
Total.....	9,630	6,822	

Total number of persons voting on this question was 16,452.

That was 6 years ago. Today the population, swelled by new settlers attracted by high-paying Federal construction jobs, stands at about 108,000.

Thus the 9,630 persons voting for statehood represent less than 10 percent of today's total population. Yet the statehood group constantly refers to this referendum as the expression of the will of the majority.

Opponents of immediate statehood have repeatedly asked the administration to hold a new referendum, posing the question: Do you favor immediate statehood for Alaska?

This the Gruening administration has refused to do.

When the statehood referendum was held in 1946, those who opposed the measure on the grounds that Alaska is not able to carry the financial burden of statehood had little or no time to present the pertinent facts to the voting public.

Proponents of the move made public only the glowing reports of the benefits they said would result from statehood.

Consequently, the residents of Alaska had only a one-sided viewpoint of the issue.

Since then, however, the series of financial crises in which the Territory has found itself, plus the staggering number of disclosures of corruption within the Gruening administration, have awakened Alaskans to the true state of their fiscal and administrative affairs.

Thus enlightened, these residents have sought in vain the opportunity to restate their position on the "statehood now" question.

Instead the exponents of statehood are assiduously holding the Territory inhabitants to the results of a referendum that was held nearly 6 years ago.

THE STATEHOOD COMMITTEE

The Alaskan statehood committee was created by the Territorial legislature as a superpromotion agency for the statehood cause, supported entirely out of public funds.

To date its achievements have been limited to the hiring of a highly paid lobbyist who formerly represented Soviet Poland, and the publication of a pamphlet which consists largely of newspaper articles and lists of names and which was printed outside of the Territory.

The lobbyist cost Alaskan taxpayers \$8,000. The pamphlet cost \$1,237.36 plus printing costs. The latter is the only tangible evidence Alaskans have as to how thousands of their tax dollars have been and are being spent.

The lobbyist, Randolph Feltus, a former Treasury employee who left Government service to become a lobbying agent for foreign governments, received \$8,232.21 from Red Poland in 1948 for his activities on the behalf of that communistic government. The following year he received another \$8,198.56 from the Polish Government for publicity work. His total take from foreign governments in the years 1948 and 1949 amounted to \$68,000, according to a Look magazine article of November 20, 1951.

This is the man chosen by the Alaskan administration to represent the Territory in Washington on behalf of statehood.

No accounting as to how he was hired or what he did to earn \$8,000 has ever been given to the Alaskan taxpayers. Yet his salary amounts to more than 86 percent of the \$15,000 turned over by the statehood committee to Alaskan Delegate to Congress E. L. BARTLETT as a "Washington fund."

In fact, when the Territorial auditor, Mr. Neil Moore, demanded an accounting of the money from Mr. BARTLETT, the delegate flatly refused to give such accounting.

Territorial law requires that the Territorial auditor audit or cause to be audited each biennium the accounts of every officer, department head or individual handling Alaskan funds.

Following Mr. BARTLETT's refusal to submit an accounting voluntarily, Mr. Moore, in pursuance of his duty as auditor, commissioned an auditing firm to visit Delegate BARTLETT's Washington office and audit his accounts.

The auditor appeared in Mr. BARTLETT's office and presented his credentials, but was refused access to the necessary records.

And to date there has been no such audit made.

This is not the first instance in which Territorial officials of the present administration have, for one reason or another, blocked

the auditing of public books as required by law.

For 2 years, 1947-48, the Territorial board of administration, headed by Governor Gruening, blocked the audit of the Territorial treasury by "freezing" the funds appropriated for this purpose. The 1949 legislature overrode the board and appropriated other money for an audit, and the firm of Arthur Anderson & Co. of Seattle was hired for the audit.

This auditor's report disclosed a \$45,000 shortage in the office of the treasurer, and some 20 other irregularities in the handling of public funds. Among these was the "disappearance" of some \$20,000 in liquor stamps, the absence of which has never been explained.

The audit also disclosed that vouchers covering disbursements of \$762,339 had been destroyed.

As the result of that audit, the Territorial treasurer, Oscar Olson, is now serving a 5-year sentence in the Federal Penitentiary at McNeil Island.

Mr. BARTLETT's refusal to have his books audited as required by law must be attributed to one of two possible reasons: either he is frightened at the prospect of an audit or he holds himself to be "above the law" in respect to the accounting for public moneys placed under his management.

The statehood committee's pamphlet, labeled "A Report on 2 Years Achievement," was prepared by an administration favorite, Mr. Herbert Hilscher, a public relations counsel of Fairbanks.

The pamphlet, while purporting to show the taxpayers what the statehood committee has accomplished with the money it has spent, studiously avoids any mention of the Feltus episode.

Hilscher is a governor-appointed member of the Alaska Development Board and is on the payroll of the tax-supported University of Alaska as publicity agent at \$300 a month.

That he is a champion of the Gruening administration and spokesman for the Department of the Interior has been evident for years; one of the latest indications being his employment by the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation to promote a new power project near Fairbanks.

The pamphlet for which Hilscher was paid \$1,237.36, consists of a listing of the Members of Congress; listing of the members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; listing of the House Committee on Public Lands; listing of the members of the statehood committee; listing of State governors purported to be in favor of statehood, and a list of newspapers said to favor statehood.

Also in the pamphlet are quotations from newspapers and from prominent individuals. Of the latter, only two are Alaskans, and these are both members of the statehood committee.

Aside from the hiring of the lobbyist and publication of the pamphlet, the statehood committee has confined its efforts to sending its officials on junkets to Washington, with the trips financed, of course, by the taxpayers, many of whom voted against statehood in a referendum 6 years ago.

And it is on this referendum, which was approved by the narrow margin of 3 to 2, that the statehood committee bases its often-repeated contention that "Alaskans want statehood now."

The fact is that the 1946 referendum did not mention "statehood now." It merely posed the general proposition of statehood—yes or no.

No effort has been made by the committee to learn the true feelings of the majority of Alaskans on the question of the pending bill or on the question of immediate statehood.

Not content with the expenditures of tax money already recorded in the promotion of

immediate statehood, the Alaska committee has hired another lobbyist, Emil Hurja, and has begun paying him from the statehood fund. The Alaska Delegate has also announced his intention to hire as still another lobbyist a former Member of the Congress, Mr. Hardin Peterson. These would necessarily augment the Interior Department's unceasing lobby for statehood and the lobbying of Governor Gruening for passage of the pending legislation.

When before have taxpayers been called upon to support efforts of such magnitude in the consideration of legislation affecting only Federal agencies and wholly concerned with the functions of government?

IRRESPONSIBLE PROPAGANDA

Statehood advocates have repeatedly resorted to the use of irresponsible propaganda in their efforts to frighten, cajole, or threaten Congress into hurried passage of statehood legislation.

Most recent of these attempts was a charge that Russia is beaming 24-hour radio broadcasts to the Territory, claiming that Alaska was stolen from the Russians and the Reds "will come back."

Author of this statement was Robert Atwood, publisher of an Alaska newspaper and chairman of the Alaska statehood committee. As leader of that group, he must be regarded a member of the Territorial administration.

His statement was carried in a news story from Washington which was published January 24, 1952, in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

The story quoted Atwood as saying that the broadcasts "go on for 24 hours and it is next to impossible to drown them out."

The publisher was further quoted as saying:

"They tell all who listen that Alaska should never be permitted to the Union because it is just so much land which was illegally obtained from Russia and which should be returned."

These serious charges by one who is presumably a responsible spokesman for an agency of the Territorial government, have been fully investigated both by Alaskans and by the Federal Government.

A group of Alaskan radio technicians, comprised of both military and civilian personnel, who frequently and at different times monitor short wave broadcasts, declared there had been no such broadcasts made to their knowledge, and they challenged Mr. Atwood to supply the time and radio frequency of the alleged broadcasts.

But perhaps the most clinching refutation of Mr. Atwood's charge comes from Secretary Lovett of the Defense Department.

Mr. Lovett, when apprised of Atwood's claims, requested an investigation by the Government agencies dealing with such matters. On February 15, 1952, Mr. Lovett reported in a letter to a Member of the Senate:

"An inquiry addressed to the cognizant agencies has revealed no information to confirm extensive broadcasts of the kind reported in the newspaper article. The Russians are actively broadcasting to the area, but in most cases the subject of their broadcasts is of a different nature."

To date, neither Mr. Atwood nor any other member of the statehood committee has submitted further information to support his allegations.

These charges, if true, are certainly of a most serious nature. If untrue, they become even more serious.

The statehood committee has persistently contended that the granting of a statehood to Alaska would result in a rush of new settlers to the Territory. Yet, on the other hand, its chairman has spread apparently unfounded rumors of a planned Russian invasion of Alaska, which rumors would cer-

tainly be a deterrent to any prospective settler.

Mr. Atwood's statement was made, according to the published account, when he was en route to Washington to plead for the granting of immediate statehood by Congress. One of the arguments which has been advanced by Mr. Atwood and his compatriots in favor of passage of the pending bill is that it will strengthen the national defense.

Whatever differences of opinion may exist on this point, there can be only one view on the issuance of exaggerated and alarming statements at a time when international relations are being held in delicate balance.

Probably the kindest thing that can be said of Mr. Atwood's allegations is that they constituted merely an impudent reflection upon the intelligence of Members of the Senate and other national officials.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of January 24, 1952]

RED RADIO HITS AT STATEHOOD—ALASKANS ARE TARGET IN PROPAGANDA DRIVE

(By William P. Flythe)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Red Russia has launched a vicious propaganda drive to obstruct statehood for Alaska, Robert Atwood of Anchorage today warned Senate and House leaders.

As chairman of a special committee on statehood created by the Territorial legislature Atwood flew to the Nation's Capital to plead for quick admission to the Union as a necessary security measure. A bill for this purpose will be taken up in the Senate within a few days.

Atwood said:

"Just before I left Anchorage Russian radio stations in Siberia began beaming anti-statehood propaganda into Alaska. It goes on for 24 hours and it is next to impossible to drown it out.

"They keep on repeating that Alaska was illegally sold to the United States by an unscrupulous czar and that they intend to take it back.

"In English and in native dialects they say over and over again 'we will come back.'

"We are confident their agents are active all along the coast and on some of the islands in the waters between Alaska and Siberia.

"They tell all who listen that Alaska should never be permitted to the Union because it is just so much land which was illegally obtained from Russia and which should be returned."

Atwood conferred with Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming) and MAGNUSON (Democrat, Washington), was endorsing the legislation in the Senate, and E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate of Alaska to Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, February 15, 1952.

HON. HUGH BUTLER,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I refer to your recent letter inquiring about a January 24, 1952, news story in the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer concerning Russian propaganda broadcasts into Alaska.

An inquiry addressed to the cognizant agencies has revealed no information to confirm extension broadcasts of the kind reported in the newspaper article. The Russians are actively broadcasting to the area, but in most cases the subject of their broadcasts is of a different nature.

I hope this reply will be adequate for your purpose. I return herewith the copy of the newspaper clipping you inclosed with your letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

MANIPULATION OF THE NATIVE VOTE

The Bureau of the Census has reported officially that Alaska has a native population of 33,884 out of a total nonmilitary population of 108,236.

The natives include Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos.

It has been charged that the Interior Department and Governor Gruening have sought, not without success, to control and direct the voting of that portion of this population qualified to participate in Territorial elections.

Certain facts of record support these charges.

On August 31, 1945, an Alaska Native Service teacher, Mr. C. Hureline, was instructed by the Alaska superintendent of the office of Indian Affairs to proceed to a number of specified native villages and there to establish voting precincts. (See enclosure A.)

In September of the same year, the same teacher received further instructions from the same source, including detailed information on the manner of establishing the voting precincts. (See enclosures B, C, D, and E.)

This was an off year in Alaska for elections.

But the following spring, on April 9, 1946, Governor Gruening addressed a lengthy letter to the same native service teacher telling of his objections to a particular candidate for the legislature. The letter was written just prior to the Alaska primary election of that year. Only one sentence—the final one of the letter—mentioned the native service teacher's official duties; i. e., the teaching of the Eskimos to paint. The rest of the communication was a bold piece of electioneering, concluding with the all-revealing statement:

"I thought you should know this in case the question arises of whether Whaley is what he is alleged to be saying or not."

Where did the governor expect the question to arise in this case, except among the natives? And whom did the governor choose to make known to the natives his wishes regarding the election? A representative of the Interior Department. The same man, incidentally, who had been charged by the Department with responsibility for establishing polling places for Eskimo voters. Is this not a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Hatch Act?

It is interesting to note that the candidate whom the governor wanted to be defeated was defeated in that 1946 election.

This is not the only matter of record where Governor Gruening, a creature of the Interior Department, has attempted to interfere in an Alaska election through the native service.

Prior to the primary election of 1944, on March 22 of that year, he wrote a letter to Mrs. Grace Kohler, a native service teacher, which was addressed to her at Hope, Alaska, an Indian village. In this communication, the governor boldly asked this teacher, holding her appointment at the pleasure of the Interior Department, to cast her ballot for the candidate of the governor's choice.

The implication is plain. The teacher, known to the natives as a representative of the parent government and doubtless the most respected member of the community, had been fully informed of the political desires of her superiors. Doubtless she was expected to act accordingly.

These circumstances take on added significance against a background of ever-increasing Federal expenditures by the native service in Alaska. A total of \$2,894,225 was spent by this agency among Alaska natives in the 1945 fiscal year. The total in the last fiscal year was more than \$12,000,000, a 400-percent rise in 7 years. Plainly the native service holds enormous power over a small segment of the Alaska population, though one which could well hold the balance of power in the Territory's tiny elec-

torate. It is equally plain that the Department will continue to wield this power through its vast Federal expenditures. If Alaska is granted statehood, the Department thus would be in a position to influence strongly the elections of Members of Congress as well as the State officials.

There can be no question that a detailed analysis of the election returns from Alaska precincts will show a deadly pattern of managed and dishonest balloting among natives in the Territory. Certainly there is nothing in the pending statehood legislation to safeguard against a continuation of this practice should Alaska be admitted to the Union.

Generally speaking, the 1950 election and the primary in Alaska showed a marked Republican trend. Six Republican senators were elected to the legislature as against two by the Democrats. The Democrats elected 14 members to the Territorial house as against 10 by the Republicans. This was a rather sharp reversal for the Democrats who 2 years earlier elected 19 to the house as against 5 Republicans.

The Republicans showed their greatest strength throughout the Territory in the population centers—Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Ketchikan, and Nome. These are urban areas where the balloting is supervised and where the electorate is kept informed through newspapers and the radio of the doings of the Government.

In the scattered villages, there is little election supervision and virtually no way—without an enormous and totally disproportionate expenditure of campaign funds—that the candidates of one party or the other can station watchers at polls hundreds of miles into the wilderness to make sure that those in authority in the villages conduct the voting in a legal and honorable fashion.

In the city of Fairbanks, for example, the Republicans registered a sizable margin over their opponents. The total of all ballots cast for legislative candidates in the general election was 4,854 for the Republicans and 3,476 for the Democrats. In Slaterville, an adjoining community, the margin was 1,241 for the Republicans and 625 for the Democrats. In South Fairbanks, another adjoining community, the vote was 831 for the Republicans and 675 for the Democrats.

That was the trend in the center of population in the fourth division covering most of the interior of Alaska. It was not the trend in the isolated villages, particularly those in which native service employees are stationed.

In Kwigillingok (Kwee-heé-ling-gok), where there are two native service teachers, the vote was 236 Democrats and 17 Republicans.

In the village of Beaver, where there is a native-service nurse, the vote was 224 for the Democratic candidates and 7 for the Republicans. In the primary, the vote was 193 Democrats to 10 Republicans.

In Northway, where there is one native-service teacher, the vote was 140 Democratic to 22 Republican. In the primary it was 110 to 25 in favor of the Democratic candidates.

In the village of Sleitmute (Sleét-mute) the vote was 115 Democratic to 25 Republican.

In Rampart, where there are two native-service teachers, the vote was 135 Democratic and 72 Republican.

The vote in Káitag was 132 Democratic and 6 Republican; in Stevens Village, 253 Democratic and 16 Republican, in the primary.

In Nulato (New-la-to) it was 192 Democratic to 25 Republican; in Quinlagak (Kwin-lea'-gok) it was 224 Democratic and 29 Republican.

The Territorial Democratic Party did not predominate in all villages but it did predominate in most of them, records show, and by margins so contrary to the general trend as to be remarkable.

Nor did the Democratic Party derive its strength from only those villages with native service personnel stationed there. There are also the villages where the United States Commissioner is the leading citizen and the one who passes out the pension and welfare checks. He is not without his following among the villagers.

Not only are the figures on the party vote in these precincts an interesting subject for study, but also the results of the primary election in which there were certain candidates running on the Democratic ticket who did not enjoy the support of the Gruening administration.

One of these was Mr. Robert Hoopes, of Fairbanks, who was among those who came to Washington at his own expense to testify before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs against the confirmation of Governor Gruening for a third term as chief executive of Alaska. Mr. Hoopes was one of three candidates in the Democratic primary last April for two seats in the Territorial senate.

He had two opponents and led them both in the voting in and around Fairbanks. But when the votes from the villages were counted he ranked third and was therefore eliminated from the race. Another was Mr. Frank Angerman, who also testified here against Governor Gruening's confirmation. Mr. Angerman ran well in Fairbanks and its environs but was far down the list of house candidates after the returns from the villages came in.

Anyone experienced in the field of politics knows that such things do not just happen. They know that when votes are delivered in blocs for one party or another, from certain precincts, contrary to the election trend, the chances are very strong that the voting in those precincts is corrupt.

[Enclosure A]

ALASKA NATIVE SERVICE,
Juneau, Alaska, August 31, 1945.
Mr. C. HURELINE,
Barrow, Alaska.

DEAR MR. HURELINE: This letter is to authorize you at a later date to proceed to the following villages to establish your work in art classes: Wainwright, Point Lay, Point Hope, Kivalina, Noorvik, and Noatak. If we are unable to secure a teacher for Point Hope it is quite possible that we may request you to go to Point Hope at a later date and take charge of the school there this winter.

While you are in these villages we would appreciate having you assist the teachers in establishing voting precincts. The matter of establishing voting precincts is vitally important to the Eskimo people, and we will appreciate your active assistance in getting them established.

Very shortly I will mail to you full information as to the proper procedure to follow in getting precincts established. You can deliver this information to the teachers at the stations you visit. You will receive another letter from us very shortly.

Sincerely yours,

DON C. FOSTER,
General Superintendent.

[Enclosure B]

ALASKA NATIVE SERVICE,
Juneau, Alaska, September 19, 1945.
Mr. C. HURELINE,
Barrow, Alaska.

DEAR MR. HURELINE: I wrote you under date of August 31 about going to certain villages to establish your work in art classes. We also mentioned to you the fact that while you were in these villages, we would appreciate your assisting the teachers in establishing voting precincts. Enclosed herewith you will find information as to the proper procedure in getting voting precincts established.

You can assure the teachers, and have the same assurance yourself, that no one can legitimately and honestly accuse you of political activity in assisting the natives in the establishment of voting precincts in their respective communities. This is a definite responsibility we have as representatives of a minority group of people. There is no greater privilege of an American citizen than the right of franchise, and we should assist the Eskimo, the real and true American of the Arctic, in exercising this privilege and right.

We will appreciate being advised how you get along.

Sincerely yours,

DON C. FOSTER,
General Superintendent.

[Enclosure C]

PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF VOTING
PRECINCTS IN ALASKA

The procedure for the establishment of voting precincts outside of incorporated towns in Alaska is that prescribed by chapter 17, C. L. A. 1933. It requires the United States Commissioner to (1) define his election district (which is coextensive with the recording district) into as many voting precincts as may be necessary or convenient: provided that each precinct has not less than 30 qualified voters; (2) define the boundaries of each precinct by reference to natural objects and permanent monuments or landmarks so that such boundaries may be readily determined; (3) give each precinct a name, and (4) specify a polling place for each precinct.

The boundaries of a precinct may include one or more villages, but no territory should be included that for geographical or other reasons might better be included in another precinct. Any citizen of the United States 21 years of age or more, who has resided in the Territory for a year, and within the proposed precinct for 30 days immediately preceding the election, and who is able to read and write the English language, is qualified to vote. The literacy test does not apply, however, to anyone who voted at the general election of November 4, 1924. Tax liability is not affected in any way by voting.

Any village or area having the requisite number of qualified voters may petition the United States Commissioner for the establishment of a voting precinct in substantially the following form:

"United States Commissioner-----
"DEAR SIR: The undersigned qualified voters of the village of ----- (or residing in the area roughly bounded by -----) respectfully request that a voting precinct be established in said village (or the area referred to) and that the boundaries thereof be fixed as follows: Beginning at ----- and proceeding in a (northwesterly) direction to -----, thence to -----, thence to -----, etc., to the place of beginning.

"More than 30 qualified voters reside in the village (or within the boundary of the proposed precinct) and the most convenient place for use as a polling place is -----
"Respectfully."

This petition should be transmitted to the Commissioner not later than 60 days before the time fixed for the general election in October of even numbered years.

The failure of any United States Commissioner to take any action on a petition of this kind should be reported to the United States district judge for the division in which the precinct presided over by the Commissioner is situated.

GEORGE W. FOLTA,
Counsel at Large.

[Enclosure D]

VOTING PRECINCTS

Outside of each incorporated town the recording district constitutes an election

district but the Commissioner of such election district has the authority to divide the district into voting precincts provided that each voting precinct has not less than 30 qualified resident voters. Requests for establishing voting precincts should be made to the recording commissioner of the district. For example, in the second division if an outlying village with 30 qualified voters desires to become a voting precinct their request should be made to the United States Commissioner in the recording district of Nome. Election law gives complete authority to the Commissioner to act in such instances.

[Enclosure E]

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER,
-----, Alaska.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned qualified voters of the village of ----- respectfully request that a voting precinct be established in said village, and that the boundaries thereof be fixed as follows: Beginning at -----, proceeding thence in a general ----- direction to thence -----, thence -----, etc., to the place of beginning.

More than 30 qualified voters reside in ----- (or within the boundaries of the proposed precinct), and the most convenient place for use as a polling place is ----- in the village of -----
Respectfully.

[Enclosure G]

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, April 9, 1946.

Mr. C. HURELINE,
Barrow, Alaska.

DEAR RUSTY: Haven't heard from you in quite a while, except that John Paden told me he had seen you recently. I hope all goes well with you.

I do not know whether Frank Whaley has been in your parts recently, but I have word from various quarters that he is alleging that he and I are very close together and, in effect, are working along the same lines. I want to correct this impression if he has left it with you. The contrary is the case; Frank Whaley has fought bitterly just about everything I have tried to do for the Territory since he came to the legislature. That, of course, is his right and privilege if he wishes to do so, but he shouldn't allege that he is one of my supporters. He has repeatedly tried to injure the Territorial guard. In the 1943 session, although we were still at war, he fought for an appropriation to reduce it to \$15,000 for the biennium, the purpose of which was to wind it up. Although we managed to get the appropriation worked up to \$49,000, it was still much less than we needed, and Whaley voted for every reduction.

In the last session a bill, senate bill 13, introduced by Coffey, would have wound up the guard immediately. Whaley was the second division member of the committee on finance and corporations, to which the bill was referred. The committee unanimously recommended that the bill do pass, and Whaley, as chairman of the rules committee, had it put on the calendar. There was enough opposition from other members so that it was plain that the bill would be killed, and when the vote was taken, Whaley, being the last on the list to vote alphabetically and seeing that it would not pass, switched his vote and voted against it. But I know that he is opposed to the guard, largely, I suppose, because it helps build up the morale of the Eskimo people, although he may also be against it because he seems opposed to almost all measures taken for defense, which is particularly paradoxical in

an able-bodied young flyer of draft age who did not see fit to enlist as did other flyers much older in years.

What is worst about him, in my judgment, is that he is violently prejudiced against the Eskimo, among whom he lives.

In 1943, when an antidiscrimination bill was introduced which passed the senate 6 to 1, Whaley cast the deciding vote against it in the House, where it was defeated by the smallest possible margin of 8 to 8—a tie vote.

In the 1945 session the bill came up again, passed the house by a 19 to 5 vote, having been introduced by Edward Anderson of Nome and being strongly supported by Bess Cross. When this bill came over to the senate, Whaley spoke against it with the utmost bitterness. I was in the gallery and heard him make his speech. He said the Eskimo smelled, and he did not wish to sit near him in a theater or restaurant. He said the Eskimo was dirty and that he ought to be kept in his place, and much more along the same lines.

He has consistently voted against progressive measures—against the housing bill in 1943. We could have had the housing authority 2 years earlier than we did. Against the planning council in the same year—we could likewise have had that 2 years before the present development board. And when the development board came up in the regular session in 1945, he voted for a \$40,000 appropriation for the biennium, which would have made the board practically useless, instead of the \$120,000 which I had asked for and which finally passed.

Worst of all, in this extraordinary session, when the veterans' bill came up in the senate, Whaley voted for every amendment to diminish the benefits to veterans. The excellent bill which was finally passed, however, contained the provisions which Whaley voted against, except for the sales tax, which I personally think is an unwise and objectionable tax.

I thought you should know this in case the question arises of whether Whaley is what he is alleged to be saying or not. I hope to get up to your part of the country before too long, but I don't know just when I can make it. Hope you are teaching a lot of youngsters how to paint.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
Governor.

[Enclosure H]

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, March 22, 1944.

Mrs. GRACE KOHLER,
Hope, Alaska.

DEAR MRS. KOHLER: I am writing you this personal letter on what seems to me to be a matter of vital importance to the Territory. As you know, Tony Dimond has resigned—a great loss to the Territory. Alaskans have been so long accustomed to his invaluable service that they probably do not fully realize what a difference it will make unless an able, devoted, intelligent, and progressive man is chosen in his place. Fortunately, there is an opportunity to select such a one in E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, who served for 2 years as Tony Dimond's secretary in Washington and therefore knows the ropes, and who for 5 years has been secretary of the Territory, where he has been able both to maintain his Washington contacts and to keep in the closest touch with our Alaska problems. As secretary he is likewise the Acting Governor during the Governor's absence from the Territory.

The fight will be in the Democratic primary on April 25 in which there are two opposition candidates—Henry Roden, present attorney general, and A. H. Ziegler, a Ketchikan lawyer. Without going into the

relative merits I wish to say that BOB BARTLETT has all the qualifications needed, including the right kind of experience and also the proper vigor and youth (he is just 40) for this terrifically strenuous job, which has really worn Tony Dimond out in the service of the people of Alaska. Tony evidently believes as I do, since for the first time in his long public career he has gone out of his way to endorse a political candidate, having sent BOB BARTLETT a telegram of endorsement.

I am writing this to you not because of any personal friendship or affection I feel for Bob. No matter how close a friend he were, I would not urge anyone to vote for him unless I believed the public interest clearly demanded it. Isolated communities like yours get little or no assistance from the Territory; nearly everything they get depends on the Federal Government, and it is highly important that we have in Washington a man who can be effective, who will be well liked by his associates and therefore able without a vote to persuade his fellow Members in the House and in the Senate to give to Alaska what it is entitled.

As I have said, the fight is in the primary, April 25, and undoubtedly whoever is nominated then will be elected, so I would appreciate it should you share my views and Tony's, if you cast your vote for BOB BARTLETT on primary day. The election will be hard-fought and close and every vote will count.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
Governor of Alaska.

IMPERFECTIONS IN THE BILL

Land grants: It is historically customary to allot to new States grants of a large proportion of their unoccupied lands to help support public schools and defray other costs of operating a State government.

This has been a comparatively simple matter for most States where surveys of public lands have been completed, or nearly so, at the time of admission.

In the case of Alaska, it was impossible, although the usual provisions relating to grants from surveyed lands were written into earlier versions of the legislation.

Less than 1 percent of Alaska land has been surveyed. To limit, in effect, the granting of land from this tiny percentage was ridiculous and the bill has now been changed to authorize the transfer of land to the new State government in the following fashion:

Upon achieving statehood under the pending bill, Alaska would be entitled to 400,000 acres of land (the area of the Territory is 365,481,600 acres) for community development. A total of 200,000 acres would be selected by the State from "vacant, unappropriated and unreserved public lands" and 200,000 acres would be selected from the national forests.

The long arm of the Federal bureaucracy is evident even in the projected transfer of this small amount of land to the State. The bill provides that the selections shall be made with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. It is specific on this point.

There is no protection in the bill for the new State against abuses by the Secretaries and the bureaucrats under them. There is no guarantee that the Secretaries will not force the State to choose the least desirable land. As far as the language of the bill is concerned, the Federal bureaucracy could accomplish this simply by refusing to approve selections of the most desirable tracts, leaving the State officials no alternative except to take only the land which the Secretaries will yield; that or take no land at all.

And this land would be transferred purely for community development.

Not until 5 years after its admission to the Union would Alaska receive lands for support

of schools. The bill provides a grant of 20,000,000 acres for this purpose under certain important limitations.

The question immediately arises as to how it is expected to meet its school expenses, aside from direct taxation, during the intervening 5 years.

The problem is ignored by the bill.

This land must be selected from "vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved public land in the State."

Under the bill, the choices cannot affect any valid claim, location, or entry made under United States law prior to the granting of statehood.

Where selections are made in unsurveyed areas the bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested and shall issue a patent in terms of this survey.

The bill does not state when the Secretary shall make the survey. It falls also to place any time limit on when the patent shall issue upon completion of the survey.

But this section gives rise to more serious questions. Nowhere does the bill define a valid, existing claim. Nor does it spell out a solution to a problem that is most certain to arise when the new State selects tracts which embrace a scattering of unpatented mining claims, homesteads, or other claims.

It cannot be said that tracts which include any of these encumbrances are vacant or unappropriated, which they must be, according to the bill, to be available to the State.

Therefore the Secretary could simply refuse to make the survey. Or if he did make the survey and issue the patent, how would the existing rights of claimants within the tracts be protected? Suppose the Secretary or the officials of the new State considered such claims invalid?

Failure of the bill to include specific language on these points seems to open the door to endless litigation, while foreshadowing a protracted period of negotiation between the Secretary and the officials of the new State.

Lawsuits would certainly follow if the Secretary issued patents on land which included existing claims.

He, of course, might include a reservation in the patent, similar to that contained in the statehood bill, stating that all valid existing rights are unaffected by the transfer.

But no one would know what those valid existing rights were. The State's powers in relation to those rights are not defined. No one would know how many claims were involved, their area or location, or what other rights might be affected. The bill contains no provision for handling these questions.

The confusion implied in this section might well delay for years the acquisition by the State of clear title to vitally needed public lands.

The measure also provides for the transfer of 2,500,000 additional acres vacant, unoccupied and unreserved land for internal improvements such as the construction of public buildings, institutions, normal schools and the like.

But it specifies that these are to be taken only from surveyed lands. At the rate at which surveys have been made in the past, it is estimated that several thousand years will be required for the completion of them. The bill offers no explanation of what the new State would be expected to do in the meantime to secure these grants.

The 200,000 acres of forest land which the State would receive for community expansion (out of a total of 20,882,679 acres in national forests in Alaska) is the sum total of grants from these fertile areas which the new State would receive.

In lieu of further grants from national forests, the State would receive 12½ percent of the revenues derived from the forest by the Federal Government. The Federal Government thus would hold authority and could be expected to dominate any pulp industry that might come to Alaska.

The industry, when it materializes, will be a basic one in the Alaska economy. Retention of Federal control over it is an unreasonable provision.

Plainly the proposed new State would be left totally at the mercy of the Secretary of the Interior, as it has been in the past.

Fisheries: The pending bill contains no language guaranteeing the proposed new State control over its fisheries, long the basic Territorial industry, prior to the start of the current Federal spending for war.

This must be regarded as a significant departure from earlier drafts of the legislation, notably H. R. 331 which stated specifically:

"The State of Alaska shall possess and exercise the same jurisdiction and control over the fisheries and the fur and game of Alaska as are possessed and exercised by the several States within their respective territorial limits, including adjacent waters."

This seemed to transfer to the State the authority over the fisheries now held by the Secretary of the Interior and to repeal existing Federal laws regulating these resources. But the measure now before the Senate does none of these things.

Meanwhile, an official of the Interior Department, Mr. Mastin G. White, the Acting Assistant Secretary, has been widely quoted in Alaska newspapers as saying:

"This Department (Interior) has strongly urged the enactment of legislation providing for the statehood of Alaska and it has been my view that the responsibility for management of the fishery resources ultimately would be assumed by the State of Alaska."

Alaskans are asking, "What does 'ultimately' mean?" The bill does nothing to help answer this question.

Statehood proponents have attempted to answer the questions of their fellow Alaskans, when the matter of control of the fisheries arises, by quoting from the committee report on the measure. This states:

"The new State would have the same control over the invaluable fisheries and wildlife within its borders as do other States of the Union."

To this, one of the Territory's most renowned newspaper men recently observed in an article:

"It is not necessary, I think, to point out that when the Senate acts on statehood it will not be voting on the report of its Interior and Insular Affairs Committee or on any other report. It will be acting on the bill itself and the language contained therein."

Still unanswered is the question as to why the clear and unmistakable language of the earlier bill, the last on which public hearings were held 2 years ago, giving Alaska control of its fisheries, has been omitted from the present measure.

Tidelands. At the end of section 4 of the pending bill the following amendatory language has been inserted:

"The United States shall retain title to all property, real and personal, to which it has title, including public lands, and shall retain the right of ingress to and egress from its lands across adjoining lands which are subject to the ebb and flow of the daily tides."

Thus is raised the delicate, though vital, issue of future control of Alaska tidelands.

Legal experts insist there is no doubt that the insertion of this amendment is warning that the Interior Department intends to retain control of the tidelands in the Federal Government instead of granting them to the State as was done in all previous admissions.

Logically, the question is asked: "If Alaska is admitted as a State, and by the terms of the bill of admission, the tidelands do not pass to the State but are retained in the control of the Federal Government, what happens to the thousands of Alaskans who have developed homes, businesses, and industries on the tidelands under the previ-

ously existing policy laid down by Congress in section 2 of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 409)?

"If the trust policy established by that act is to be repudiated by the bill of admission, then will not occupants of tidelands in Alaska retain their occupancy after statehood at the whim of the Interior Department?"

Still another change affecting the tidelands has been written into the bill in the description of Alaska's boundaries.

The earlier version stated:

"Be it enacted, etc., That all that part of the United States now embraced within the Territory of Alaska, including a distance of one marine league from the line of the coast, shall become the State of Alaska."

The present bill states:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the inhabitants of all that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Alaska, as at present described, are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, which shall be admitted into the Union, and that the said State of Alaska shall consist of all the territory now included in the said Territory of Alaska."

Elimination of a State boundary "one marine league" or 3 miles from the coastline in favor of a boundary "as at present described" has never been explained.

There is little doubt that the wording would automatically deprive Alaska of its coastal fisheries.

Hence the intentions of the Federal bureaucracy toward the new State of Alaska becomes increasingly plain.

Indian claims: The claims of the Indian tribes to vast tracts of Alaska land have hung like a sword over the economic life of the Territory since the Interior Department gave them substance a decade ago.

They constitute a cloud over the title to the most valuable areas in Alaska.

Thus they have throttled hopes for development of a pulp industry in the Territory.

More recently the Indian claims have been used to discourage a projected oil development in southeastern Alaska.

Reason and logic demand that these claims be settled before admission of Alaska to statehood is considered.

Records show little progress in this direction. Indeed, language in the previous bill which would have prohibited creation of vast Indian reservations while the Territory was in the process of achieving statehood has been eliminated from the present version without explanation and presumably at the behest of the Interior Department.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, very soon we shall come to a vote on the motion to recommit the pending bill to admit Alaska as a State of the Union. By this vote we will in effect decide whether the Senate means to challenge the overwhelming sentiment of the American people or whether we are in fact, going to follow the will of the people.

The American people are overwhelmingly convinced that Alaska is ready for statehood, that Alaska deserves statehood, and that the Union of American States should be increased by the admission of Alaska and of Hawaii into that Union.

We were originally 13 States. Today we are 48. If we are going to be true to our history, to our traditions, and to the spirit animating our Constitution, we are going to vote against the pending motion to recommit.

There is no rhyme or reason for a recommitment of the Alaska statehood bill. Hearings have been held; the bill has been extensively debated. Every angle and aspect of it have been considered. All the facts are available. They are spread out in the record. Every question can be answered. Every question has been answered. A vote to recommit is a vote to delay, to put aside, to kill this bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New York to say that all the questions have been asked and all the questions have been answered. Does the Senator from New York mean to say that there have been public hearings held on the bill during this session of Congress?

Mr. LEHMAN. There were public hearings held on substantially similar bills in the House. In 1949 we held very extensive hearings in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In 1950 extensive hearings were held. The record of the hearing covers more than 350 pages. We have discussed the question in executive session and otherwise in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs time and time and time again.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would not the Senator from New York agree that there have been no public hearings held on S. 50 during this session of Congress, or last year?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think it makes any difference, in view of the fact that exhaustive and intensive hearings were held on the subject of the admission of Alaska. The subject has been before the Congress for a long time. It would be a complete waste of time to go over the same ground time and time again.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would not the Senator from New York agree that new members of a committee, who have been appointed to the committee for the first time and know nothing about a bill, should have the privilege of attending public hearings if they ask that public hearings be held on a subject? Should they not be recognized as Senators and entitled to a hearing on the question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I agree with the Senator that every Senator should be recognized in his own right, whether he be a new member of a committee or an old member of a committee, and to have full information available to him. I do not think it is fair to say, however, that every time there is a change in the membership of a committee the pending bill or resolution before the committee must be reopened through the holding of additional hearings. If I may add one more word to my answer to the distinguished Senator from Florida, I would say that he was not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs until this year. I have been a member of it ever since I came to the Senate. Certainly the record was available to the Senator from Florida in very great detail, and there was really nothing he could not have obtained through a careful study of the record.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he does not agree with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] when the Senator from New Mexico made this statement in response to an inquiry as to why the committee did not hurry along with the consideration of the bill:

Senator ANDERSON. You are certainly not outside of your rights in saying you want immediate statehood, and I think the delegation down here and the sentiment in Alaska indicates that immediate statehood is desired, and I think this committee, although I cannot speak for the other members, but as one member of it, I would like to see you have statehood immediately, but I do not see how you can have it without consideration being given to this bill line by line. There are questions in it that we may not understand.

I am sure the Senator from New York agrees with that statement. Would he not have to say also that that was not the treatment which was accorded to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the junior Senator from Florida, when they asked that public hearings be held on the bill and when no public hearings were held on it?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I do agree with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that a bill should be considered line by line. However, certainly nothing in the proceedings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has prevented that. We have had this bill under discussion time and time again, and the Senator from Florida could have discussed every line separately or every word separately if that had been his desire.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will not the Senator from New York agree that a Senator has a right to have witnesses appear before the committee and testify regarding the various provisions of the bill? I am sure the able Senator from New York will agree that Senate bill 50 has many provisions which are not at all like the provisions of House bill 331, on which the committee last held hearings.

Mr. LEHMAN. Again let me say that there have been many bills on which hearings have been held, and to which amendments were offered after the hearings were concluded and when the bills were being considered in the committee. We do not hold hearings on every amendment. If that were done, the work of the Senate would never be concluded in a million years.

Let me also say that at the time when we held the hearings, I believe 35 persons came from Alaska to testify.

Mr. SMATHERS. That was in 1950, was it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, I know there is pending an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on which hearings have not been held; but this amendment is, I must say, a delaying amendment. We cannot seriously contemplate an amendment to our Constitution which would change the whole system of Government of the United States, the whole philosophy underlying the American Union of States. We are not

an empire. We do not aspire to be an empire. The American people would overwhelmingly reject the concept of colonialism implicit in the Monroney amendment.

We are against colonialism in whatever form. The British commonwealth of nations is possible only because there is a king through whose person and powers the commonwealth is held together.

In America we believe in a free and equal Union of States. As soon as Territories are ready for statehood, if they desire statehood, they are to be admitted as States.

Mr. President, Alaska is ready. The people of Alaska desire statehood. The Territory is certainly large enough to support a State of the Union.

The addition of Alaska and Hawaii to the States of the Union can restore to us the sense of expansion that we sorely need in our thinking and in our outlook. All material evidence points to the fact that Alaska can become as great and thriving a State of our Union as Texas or Florida or California or Oregon.

When Louisiana was admitted into the Union, it certainly was not contiguous with the other States. When California was admitted into the Union, it was separated by hundreds and hundreds of miles from the nearest State. Today, Juneau, the capital of Alaska, is less than 24 hours away by air from Washington. It is only 5 hours by air from Seattle. Honolulu is only 24 hours by air from Washington and only 12 hours from San Francisco. Noncontiguity is no argument against statehood. There is no valid or substantial reason in the argument of distance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming whether I may have an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the question remains, is Alaska ready to be a State? Alaska has been preparing for statehood for almost a century. It has been a Territory of the United States for that long. It is time to free Alaska from the shackles of Territorial status. It is time to expand America, to expand the American Union of States. This will bring benefits to every State in the Union and to every citizen of the United States. The direct beneficiaries will be Alaska and Alaskans, but the indirect beneficiaries will be all of us.

Mr. President, we are now engaged in a struggle with those who wish to blot out democracy in the world—the rulers of the Soviet Union. We have preached democracy and equality. Yet here we deny equality to men and women living in Alaska and to men and women living in Hawaii, in a way which contradicts everything we have stood for and preached as many years as anyone in this Chamber can remember.

Here we have a chance to show to the people of Asia that we are not influenced

or bound or controlled by racial considerations. Here we have a chance to show that if a man has given evidence of continuing loyalty, patriotism, and devotion to his country, we are not going to allow the fact that he is an Indian or an aborigine of Alaska or a Chinese or a Filipino or a Negro to stand in the way of our recognizing his right to equal protection under the laws of the State to which he aspires.

The men and women of Alaska are citizens of the United States. They are not citizens of a State, but they aspire to citizenship in a State.

I tell you, Mr. President, we shall do more to give a weapon of propaganda to our enemies in the Soviet Union, the rulers of the Soviet Union, than almost anything else we could do, if after all these years of discussion, debate, and study, we now refuse to give statehood to these two Territories.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that Alaska is of the utmost importance to the United States in respect to matters of defense. Alaska is only a few miles from Siberia, one of the strong points of the Soviet Union. Certainly we should do everything within our power to strengthen our defenses in Alaska. The leading military men of our country have testified time and time again that our defenses will be greatly strengthened by giving statehood to Alaska.

Let us not delay deciding this question by voting to recommit this bill. We have reached the point where a decision must be made and made now. We have no right to continue to put off the decision, and, under the device of recommitment, under the device of a delaying motion, to make it impossible for the Senate to act on this bill at the present session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I would be glad to yield, but unfortunately I have no more time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was my understanding with the junior Senator from Florida that I would have the next 15 minutes. If there is no objection, I shall now avail myself of that time.

I now ask unanimous consent that I may yield for 1 minute to my senior colleague.

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

(At this point Mr. ELLENDER submitted two letters in regard to another matter, for printing in the Appendix, where they appear under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall vote for Hawaiian statehood, when that bill is before the Senate on the question of final passage. However, I will not vote for Alaskan statehood. As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I have not had an opportunity to make as much of a study of this question as I should like to have made, because no hearings were conducted.

However, I shall say that I am positive that hearings would not necessarily change my mind, but would make me only more firm in my convictions. I believe that further hearings would show only more clearly that statehood for Alaska is not justified at the present time, but that statehood for Hawaii is justified.

It seems to me to be completely fallacious for some to attempt to let the question of statehood for Alaska ride on the back of the question of statehood for Hawaii.

Hawaii has approximately half a million people, and it has civilization which in some respects exceeds that here in the United States. In Hawaii we have a Territory which is paying into the Federal Treasury more taxes than many States of the Union pay. It is a Territory with high educational standards; it is well able to contribute its share to the support of the National Government. It has a very thoroughly developed system of government.

On the other hand, a completely different question confronts us so far as Alaska is concerned. In that Territory there are only about 123,000 people as compared to the 500,000 people in the Territory of Hawaii—only about one-quarter as many people. The great Territory of Alaska is very sparsely settled, indeed in some areas a person could travel 1,000 miles without ever seeing a human being.

The Governor of that Territory, Mr. Gruening, in an article written by him sometime back, December 1951, for the *Scientific Monthly*, a very learned article on Alaska, makes the statement:

It is an area just outside the cities, where the municipal police force have no jurisdiction, that the no man's land of lawlessness lies.

That is not the same type of situation we have in Hawaii. Think of that—a no man's land of lawlessness, speaking of the inadequacy of Federal enforcement of laws.

The point has been made that Alaska is close to the Soviet land mass. True, Alaska is close to the Soviet orbit; but, on the other hand, that does not prove that it should be a State. One of the letters in the hearings which were conducted 2 years ago mentioned that point. Here was a man trying to get to one of the Diomed Islands, which are close to Russia. He spent a week trying to get there, but never did reach the island. Probably much less serious an incident would be created by a Russian landing at some place in the Territory of Alaska than would be created if Alaska were a State. I believe statehood would probably increase the possibility of some incidents occurring which would cause friction between the United States and Soviet Russia.

It is true in my opinion that the argument of congressional neglect of Alaska is very well founded, but we see from the writings of the Governor of that Territory that Hawaii has developed its government to a greater extent than has Alaska. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that before we undertake to say that Alaska should become a

State, we should attempt to provide for more adequate home rule for Alaska.

It is unfortunately true that some people would apparently like to stymie the proposal that the Alaskans elect their own Governor, on the theory, apparently, that the more inadequate the government of Alaska is, the better the possibility of getting a statehood bill through and relieving Alaska of Federal control. Of course, that is ridiculous. We ought to encourage the Alaskans to develop their Territorial government just as thoroughly as they possibly can, to make it as adequate as they possibly can for their needs, and that the better they can develop their government, the more they will have proved to us that Alaska is ready for statehood.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, only 123,000 people live in that Territory, although it has been argued that Alaska could support a population of several million. Well, it would seem to the junior Senator from Louisiana that we should do something about getting the population there. For my part, I should be glad to support legislation which would provide for the expenditure of additional Federal funds to encourage people to go to Alaska.

We are told that there are millions of displaced persons, Poles, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, and possibly many from other countries, who might be interested in settling in Alaska. So far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned I believe it would be a good investment if we would spend some money to induce some of those people to go to that Territory, to help settle and develop that great area, and prove what can be done with it. I am certain much good could be brought about by following such a course.

Furthermore, it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that before we grant statehood, something should be done to see whether the enormous resources of Alaska can be developed. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Insular Affairs, I have listened to testimony by some of the geologists, who tell us that, acre for acre, it is impossible to condemn any section of the earth's surface, so far as the prospect of oil and gas, coal and iron ore, lead and other mineral deposits are concerned. All the available evidence and testimony indicate that Alaska has abundant, indeed enormous, natural resources.

What is the attitude with respect to natural resources when they are found? Those who take the view of the present administration want every last cent of those resources, retained by the Government of the United States, but, until they are found, they are apparently, willing to let anyone have them. No one was particularly interested in the oysters, shrimp, and the other marine life along the shores of the coastal States of the Nation until they were developed. However, in California, for instance, it was found that not only was there oil in the uplands, but that oil could be produced from the adjacent area offshore. The Federal Government then took a great interest in it. Even the then head of the Department of the Interior had signed letters stating that that was State

property, but the Federal Government then reversed itself and claimed that area. It filed lawsuits, and notwithstanding the fact that there were 52 Supreme Court decisions saying that that was State property, or indicating that it was, the Federal Government today claims—at least the present administration claims—that that is entirely Federal property, and that the States have no interest whatever in it. We are even told today that if the States receive a small belt of the submerged lands along their shores—which, if we look at the map behind me, will be seen to be about the width of a pencil mark—it would be the greatest steal ever perpetrated in the history of the country. On the other hand, Mr. President, take a look at Alaska on the same map. What Alaska would receive would not be the width of a pencil mark. The area of Alaska appears to be that of the United States. It will be seen that in the proposed State of Alaska, there are 376,000,000 acres, if I recall correctly, more acres than there are in the State of Texas, multiplied by 2. The acreage of Alaska is enormous; and I am sure that it would be possible to block out an area of probably as much as 150,000,000 acres in which there are no more than 1,000 people living, at the outside.

We may dispose of all of this land, before anyone finds the resources it contains, but I know that some of those who are advocating statehood for Alaska, once the resources were found, would like to have those resources for the Federal Government. Would it not seem that we should develop those resources to some extent, to see what their magnitude is, before we make disposition of such a vast area?

Mr. President, the Territory of Alaska, on an acreage basis, would compare with the original Louisiana Purchase. When the Louisiana Purchase was consummated, the State of Louisiana, shortly thereafter, about 10 years later, was taken into the Union; but the State of Louisiana was not given all the territory, which now comprises Arkansas, Missouri, and all the other States in the Louisiana Purchase area—quite the contrary.

A certain section which was reasonably well populated was delimited and taken in as a State. The same argument could be applied to Alaska. Only on the southern rim of Alaska is there any substantial population, with the exception of the cities of Fairbanks and Nome. The only reason I could observe for taking in all the enormous acreage between those points is that someone might say, "Well, it is not big enough to be two States, and possibly will never have sufficient population to make two States, and, therefore, we should make all the whole great area into one State."

Mr. President, I believe if that is done, a very basic mistake will have been made, because I see no reason why a State which may never have a population of more than 200,000 or 300,000 people should include hundreds of millions of acres on countless thousands of which no one lives. Therefore, it seems to me that some effort should be made to develop the natural resources of this great

Territory before all of this property is disposed of.

To show how little consideration was given to the question of statehood, if Alaska becomes a State under Senate bill 50 the Mineral Leasing Act will apply to it. What would be the effect? It would mean that insofar as oil and gas were found in the other three-hundred-and-some-odd millions of acres, 37½ percent of the proceeds would go to the newly formed State of Alaska, 10 percent to the administrative fund of the Federal Treasury, and 52½ percent to the reclamation fund. Alaska would not be one of the reclamation States. That would mean that 17 other States would have the benefit of the fund, and unless and until Alaska became a reclamation State it would not share in those revenues.

On the other hand, if Alaska decided it wanted to become a reclamation State, it probably would be entirely different from the other 17 reclamation States, because, as we know, Alaska's difficulty would be more that of flood control and transportation than one of a shortage of water. There are very few places in Alaska where any reclamation project would be indicated.

Mr. President, I have pointed out these matters because I do not think they have been adequately considered.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator from Louisiana is overlooking the fact that there is such a project adjoining the Matanuska Valley project. Many people think of it as a great agricultural possibility. It possesses a climate which is not very different from the climate of the State of Illinois.

Mr. LONG. That is not saying it has a climate similar to that of some of the arid States of the Nation.

If it should happen to be the case that Alaska should become one of the reclamation States, I would say it would be entirely by accident, because no one thought of it ahead of time. When the Secretary of the Interior came before the committee, he told us Alaska would not be one of the reclamation States. Can anyone inform us as to the location of the arid areas of Alaska, unless it be the Matanuska Valley?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for one more minute.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator a minute of my time.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, all these questions have not been considered. There are many things we should know about all these problems before we attempt to make Alaska a State. I believe it would be a very foolhardy mistake for the Senate, merely because someone might make a good case for Hawaii, to grant statehood to Alaska at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote to recommit the bill, hoping we may be able to improve upon the Territorial

government in the future and to provide for the further orderly development of that great Territory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, 38 years have passed since New Mexico and Arizona were admitted to the Union as the forty-seventh and forty-eighth States. In the interval, Mr. President, we have seemingly become accustomed to thinking of the United States as now being rounded out, since it reaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans and all the space in between is now filled by States. For some reason there has been in our minds a mental barrier which must be surmounted before other States can be taken in under the flag.

Mr. President, I do not feel that the Union of States has yet been completed; I do not think it is yet fully rounded out. We have been asked repeatedly by American citizens in Alaska to admit them to full citizenship by granting statehood to that Territory. In my opinion Alaska is qualified for statehood. It has been the property of the United States for 82 years. Since 1912 it has been recognized as an organized, incorporated Territory, and it has been serving, since 1912, an apprenticeship, so to speak, for admission as a State. I believe it has a right to statehood, and that it is ready. We have today, in 1952, Mr. President, an historic opportunity to add the forty-ninth star to our flag.

There has never been a period before in our history when so long a time elapsed between the appearance of new stars in our flag. After the admission of the original 13 Colonies, it was only a year's time before the fourteenth State gained statehood. That was the State of Vermont. Then there followed in rapid succession Kentucky, which was the fifteenth, and Tennessee, Ohio, and Louisiana followed in rather prompt sequence. In every year from 1816 to 1821 a new State came into the Union. Four were admitted in 1889 and two in 1890, including my own State of Wyoming and the State of Utah. In 1912 the process seemingly came to a halt. The delay has been all too long. When an area such as Alaska meets all the qualifications, to my way of thinking, it deserves admission into the Union.

Mr. President, in 1946, in company with 11 other State Governors, I spent some time in Hawaii. I visited the various islands and met with various groups of persons in Hawaii. Let me say that those who really have the greatest interest in these matters and those whose wishes I think we should recognize were practically unanimous in their desire for statehood.

In November of last year, Mr. President, in company with two other Senators, I had the privilege of visiting Alaska. I visited Nome, Fairbanks, Seward, Ketchikan, Whittier and Anchorage. What kind of people did I find there? I found just as intelligent a citizenship as there is in any State of the Union. I am not sure of the degree of illiteracy that may prevail in Alaska, but I might suggest that possibly

some of our States have a higher degree of illiteracy than is to be found in Alaska.

I visited the very finest of country clubs at Fairbanks. I found in Alaska practically every type of business that we have in the United States. I can see absolutely no reason why those people are not just as fully qualified to be citizens of the United States as is the present Presiding Officer or as is the junior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, it seems to me that both these Territories have now served more than a proper probationary period. It does not appear to me that there are any justifiable reasons for denying to them the same privileges which we in the Senate are today enjoying. I think the Congress should either grant the privileges or that we should allow both Territories to seek freedom by any other method or procedure which they might wish to follow. I ask what situation we would find ourselves in after denying citizenship to those fine people year after year, should they suggest they would like to withdraw from any connection whatsoever with the great United States of America? I think we would be in a rather foolish situation. We would say, "No, we shall not take you in, and you cannot leave us." Such a situation has been recorded in history prior to this time, Mr. President.

Facts have been cited during this debate setting forth that a very small percentage of Alaska is privately owned and that a very great area is federally owned. That is precisely the one situation which statehood, to my way of thinking, would correct.

It is a well known fact that industry, investment capital, will not go into a Territory and develop the area with the thought in mind that eventually statehood will be granted, and at the same time not know what the tax structure of the new State may be. Alaska is not fully developed at this time. It will never be fully developed as a Territory. Practically ever State that has been admitted to the Union, except the original 13 Colonies, has argued that until private capital and industry knew what the tax structure of a new State would be, development would be negligible.

Mr. President, there are States which have existed for many years whose land area is primarily federally owned. That is true of my State, 53 percent of whose area is federally owned. I often hear people in my State complain about the Government in the distant city of Washington having more authority over their lives than do local authorities or the State government.

If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. President, there is one State in the Union that has been in existence for 88 years; yet 64 percent of its land area is still federally owned or federally controlled. I know of another State whose area is still 60 percent federally owned. That State has been a member of the Union for a great many years.

One county in my State is only 4 percent privately owned, and unfortunately that percentage is diminishing from time to time as the Federal Government finds

it necessary or wishes to withdraw additional area for a Federal project.

I find that people everywhere and anywhere like to be masters of their own destiny. I have always felt that that was one of the cardinal points in our American democratic way of life.

Most certainly the fact that two additional Senators from Alaska might be considered as northwestern Senators should have no bearing or effect upon the position of the Senate with reference to the question of statehood for Alaska. By the same token, when, and if, Hawaii is admitted to statehood, there will be two more western Senators. That might perhaps call for a change in our rules and regulations and our system of functioning in the Senate, but I do not think we should at all allow that to be an important or decisive factor in our consideration of this matter.

It seems to me that Members of the United States Senate should look upon the requests of these two great Territories as though we were citizens of those Territories, living under the absentee form of government which they have, and which they have endured so patiently for so many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the junior Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I extend to the Senator an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Certainly no selfish factional or sectional considerations should guide our thinking and actions in this most important matter.

Mr. President, the other evening there came to my home a compilation of writings by Theodore Williams Noyes, of the District of Columbia, who throughout a long period of years had worked for home rule for the District of Columbia. In the first two or three pages of his book I found a few lines from article III of the treaty signed by this country when Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867. I wish to read those three lines:

The inhabitants of the ceded Territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within 3 years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded Territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, to my way of thinking, that is a treaty which we of the Senate should live up to. That is a firm commitment to the people now living in Alaska which, in my opinion, we have no honorable right to disregard.

I wish to make one other point. Down through the years, when our Nation was being formed, States were admitted in pairs—one Northern State and one Southern State. That was true of Kentucky and Vermont, Tennessee and Ohio, Mississippi and Indiana, Alabama and Illinois, Missouri and Maine, Arkansas and Michigan, Florida and Iowa, and so on.

I realize, Mr. President, that there is no longer available territory that might be

admitted as Southern States to offset, possibly, the admission of Alaska and Hawaii. We of the United States Senate this afternoon have an obligation, under the treaty I have quoted, to do what the Secretary of State, with the approval of the Senate, at that time said we would do.

I am very hopeful that the Senate, when the vote comes, will reject the motion to recommit the bill.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has charge of the time. I did not realize he was in the Chamber when I looked for him a moment ago. I shall defer to him.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, and that the time taken for the quorum call be not charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the question has been raised recently by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] with respect to the agricultural development of the Matanuska Valley.

In the first place, the question upon which we are now passing does not involve individual liberty or individual justice with respect to anyone in Alaska or Hawaii, or in the United States. The question is not to be settled on the basis of individuals. The primary question involved, as I have said many times, is a question of policy. That policy is far-reaching, and the steps to be taken will be irrevocable if we grant statehood to any group or any area beyond the present confines of the 48 States.

I shall discuss some of the questions which pertain to the economy and to the prospective State government of Alaska. I wish to mention briefly the subject of agriculture. It is a myth and a dream so far as the Matanuska Valley project is concerned. I refer the Senate again to the facts and figures which show that in the 1930's the Federal Government spent \$4,681,856 in the attempt to settle 200 families in Matanuska Valley. That is an average of \$23,409.50 for each family, and an average of \$520.15 for each acre, for the 90,000 acres under cultivation in the valley.

I believe those figures would have been of some benefit to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] if he had been Secretary of Agriculture during that time. From a financial standpoint the figures reflect the utter futility of any great agricultural development in Alaska. I submit the idea of any significant agriculture being developed in Alaska is a joke and a dream.

For one reason it is due to the intolerable climate. In previous remarks on this subject I quoted from the report of the Governor of Alaska in which he states in effect that the trouble with agriculture in Alaska is the inferior quality of the products which are grown.

I put the report into the Record the other day. It has not been denied up to this time. It cannot be denied, of course, because it is the truth. It is the Governor's report, and again it shows that wild statements have been made about agriculture being developed in Alaska.

Mr. President, about a week ago I raised on the floor of the Senate a very serious point with reference to the military situation in Alaska. The argument is made over and over again that if we strengthened our defenses and the defenses of Alaska through statehood it would greatly aid our military position. I quoted a statement from a reputable newspaper reporter to the effect that the military had said that only one-fourth of Alaska would be defended in case of an attack and that three-fourths of it would be expendable and would have to be abandoned. That statement was a challenge to the proponents to refute it if they could.

To this very moment Mr. President, the only refutation which has come into the Record was suggested by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He said later in the debate that he had conferred with General Collins and the Department of Defense with respect to my statement. The Senator from Wyoming never quoted one word from what General Collins had said. Instead, he put into the Record a letter from Mr. William C. Foster, Acting Secretary of Defense, which says in effect that statehood would be a great aid to the military defense of the Nation. General Collins is as silent as an Egyptian tomb on that vital question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be very glad to yield, but only very briefly, because I am speaking under a limitation of time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish the Senator from Mississippi to be quite certain in his mind that the only reason I did not quote General Collins was because under the system of responses to the Senate the response had to come under the signature of the Secretary of Defense. The statement in the letter, to the effect that an occupation of Alaska by an enemy air force would open the industrial centers of America to attack, is the statement of General Collins, as well as of the Department of Defense.

Mr. STENNIS. The statement does not so state.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator from Mississippi to take it upon my assurance.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall not argue the point. The only statement we have before us, however, is in the letter. I am amazed to find that the major part of it or at least the gist of it is an exact reproduction, word for word, of a letter written on April 18, 1950, by the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson. That statement of Mr. Johnson appears at page 3 of the report which was filed with the pending bill. It is a statement which consists of 11 printed lines. The same 11 lines showed up in the letter, written in February 1952, by the Acting Secretary of Defense, in which he says:

By the same token it would seem to me—

And so forth. Exactly the same words were used by former Secretary of Defense Johnson.

I think it is a further illustration of the propaganda that is coming from the bureaus of the Government in attempting to bolster the pending bill. No military man has been put on the stand in any hearing before the committee and subjected to cross examination. Perhaps it is not correct protocol to do so.

Mr. President, I state on my own responsibility that under this system we are not getting the true facts. The newspaper article from which I quoted, stating that only one-fourth of Alaska would be defended at all, still stands uncontradicted directly. It cannot be successfully challenged, because it is the truth.

I submit to fair-minded Members of the Senate that there is before the Senate the statement that based on World War II experience, Alaska as a whole cannot be defended, and that it would not be defended in case of an attack, except to the extent of one-fourth of the area, and that there are no plans now contrary to the statement I have made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield, but very briefly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Mississippi will read the letter from Mr. Foster, he will find in it the specific statement that the plans of the Department of Defense for the defense of Alaska naturally cannot be made public.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. I am sure he would say that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I submit to the Senator from Mississippi that therefore he cannot cite the article of a newspaperman, who is not a military expert, as evidence that the Department of Defense plans to surrender three-fourths of Alaska in case of an attack. I think the statement is absurd on its face.

Mr. STENNIS. I stand on my original statement. I feel that the Senator from Wyoming has enough ingenuity to have brought in proof if he could have found such proof to offset my statement. It raises a very serious issue.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to put into the RECORD, with the consent of the Senator from Mississippi, the statement of Rear Adm. Ralph Wood, who was the commandant, during World War II, of the Seventeenth Naval District, which includes Alaska. He said:

In my opinion it makes no difference whether Alaska is a State or a Territory as far as national defense is concerned. Were Alaska to become a State tomorrow it would not alter, I am sure, the general over-all consideration of our defense problem.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution which has been made to the debate by the distinguished Senator from Florida. Admiral Wood was the commandant of the naval district of which Alaska was a part during World War II. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall proceed rather hurriedly, of necessity, on my charge that the proponents of the bill are attempting to rush the bill through the Senate without first holding hearings on it. The Senate is being asked to pass on this important bill without having had submitted to it any budget under which the proposed State of Alaska would operate. The only thing I have been able to find, after a great deal of research, is a proposed budget which was incorporated in the old hearings on H. R. 331. In connection with that bill the proponents of statehood proposed a budget and the opponents proposed a budget. The opponents said it would take \$17,000,000, and the proponents said it would take \$6,000,000.

I have before me a statement from the Legislative Reference Service, which is the only impartial evidence I have been able to find on the subject of a budget. The information is 2 or 3 years old. Therefore it does not reflect present conditions. However, the Director of the Legislative Reference Service said:

Due to these varying factors, therefore, one is forced to conclude that no accurate estimates can be made of the additional costs of statehood to Alaska.

The statement will be found at page 514 of the hearings. It is based, of course, on the facts which the Director of the Legislative Reference Service had before him at the time he made the statement, and when he had before him the two budgets to which I have referred.

He said:

Possibly, the figure might lie somewhere in between the two extremes of estimates. Much depends, however, upon the number of functions willed to Alaska by the Congress and upon the financial ability of Alaska itself.

There we have an impartial witness who says that it is not possible to tell much about the situation and that there is not enough before him to enable him to give an accurate estimate.

It is a sad fact that although more than 2 years have elapsed, today there is nothing before the Senate that is any more accurate or any more dependable than the estimate to which I have just referred. In fact, no budget at all has been presented for Alaska for the current year.

It has been claimed that Alaska is debt free. So far as the whole Territory is concerned, that statement is correct. However, that statement certainly does not tell the whole story, in view of of \$70,000,000 development program which is now in progress in Alaska, in connection with which some agencies of the Alaskan government are responsible for paying one-half of that amount back to the Federal Government. Under that program \$7,000,000 was spent from the 1952 appropriations. In 1953 it is proposed to spend \$20,000,000 under that program, which already is pledged to continue until a total of \$70,000,000 has been expended. So someone in Alaska will have a \$35,000,000 debt, which is a considerable amount of money, considering the sparsity of the population of Alaska. That is an accurate figure with reference to the debt.

Mr. President, during several weeks of inquiry and effort to bring to the Senate true facts, the full facts, and the up-to-date facts—because they are not available since there have been no hearings—I have been calling for a report by the government of Alaska to the Secretary of the Interior. That report covers the activities of the various agencies of the Territorial government and includes a general discussion of the Territory's finances, population, and so forth. Ordinarily that report is in Washington in November, following the close of the fiscal year for Alaska, which ends on the 30th of June of each calendar year. However, for some reason or other, the report has not been filed, according to the information given my office.

I also wish to refer to a report by the Secretary of the Interior in reference to Alaska. Ordinarily that report covers all the activities of the Department of the Interior, including the Territories. Normally, that report is filed each year, in November, and relates to the fiscal affairs of Alaska, including the receipts and the disbursements. I have checked many times with the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior. As late as February 5 of this year that report has not been filed; for some reason or other, the Senate is left entirely in the dark.

Instead of having an official, accurate, down-to-earth statement of the fiscal affairs of Alaska, we have only a statement in regard to cash balances. That statement was filed yesterday by the Senator from Oregon, in response to some remarks I made. I know he thought the figures he submitted were accurate. Doubtless they are accurate as far as they go, but that report does not reflect the true condition of fiscal affairs in Alaska; the report merely shows what was the cash balance on January 31, 1952. Although I do not know it to be a fact, it may be that that was a period of high taxes and high tax collections.

At any rate, anyone knows that the cash balance of the Treasury at any given time during the fiscal year does not reflect the true state of conditions; the only thing that counts is the fiscal condition when the fiscal year is over. Then there can be shown the true state of governmental affairs.

So we are without the benefit of those facts and figures. I do not know why they were withheld. I do not charge anyone with bad motives, but this situation is strikingly strange, and it fits in with the program of propaganda and the program of activities emanating from the various Government departments which would conceal the true facts regarding these matters. That is the situation today, and that is what prevents us from obtaining the true figures.

The statement submitted by the Senator from Oregon shows a cash balance of \$1,682,000 in the general fund at the end of January 1952.

In a newspaper article approximately one month before that, it is shown that the cash balance was approximately one-tenth of the amount set forth in the statement submitted by the Senator from Oregon. I do not have that newspaper article before me now, but when I find it I shall place it in the RECORD. At any rate, approximately 30 days before the time of the cash balance set forth in the statement submitted by the Senator from Oregon, the cash balance was approximately 10 percent of that figure.

I have before me a news item from the January 16, 1952, issue of the Daily Empire. The headline is "Treasurer reports general fund balance \$114,756 at year's end." That means at the end of 1951.

I submit that news article for printing at this point in the RECORD, just to show the contrast.

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

**TREASURER REPORTS GENERAL FUND BALANCE
\$114,756 AT YEAR'S END**

Quarterly report by the office of the Territorial treasurer showed a cash balance of \$114,756.42 in the general fund as of December 31.

Figures from which the balance was ascertained were: Bank balance of \$6,195,853.20, less outstanding warrants of \$2,182,266.22, and less special funds and funds incorporated in the general fund which are not available for the general operation of the Territory, of \$3,898,330.56.

Taxes collected were listed for the period January 1 to December 31, of 1951 at \$13,016,791.43, including \$1,649,569.36 excise on liquor and \$5,170,796.90 on net income taxes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly something further in regard to the sentiment of the people of Alaska themselves. It is strikingly strange to me that if this proposal were so sound from their standpoint, approximately 42 percent of the people of Alaska who participated in an official election 5 years ago on this question voted against statehood. That fact has not been explained to me or to the Senate, and it is all the more striking inasmuch as the Territorial administration of Alaska was moving heaven and earth to get out every vote they possibly could in favor of the statehood bill. Statehood is their theme song.

I do not criticize them for wanting statehood; it seems to me that every person in Alaska would want statehood in the United States of America, unless there was some overwhelming reason

against it, unless their common sense and good judgment told them plainly that Alaska was not ready for statehood. I believe that is the reason why most of them voted as they did. Nine thousand six hundred and thirty-four votes were cast in favor of statehood, and 6,822 votes were cast against statehood. That was the vote in Alaska; that is the official record of the Alaskan official election on that issue.

Mr. President, in further reference to the sentiment in Alaska, let me point out that following the failure of the Alaskan statehood bill to pass the Senate of the United States in December 1950, the Alaskan Territorial Legislature passed a resolution memorializing the Congress that they desired an additional measure of self-government, through provision for the election by the people of the Territory of their own Governor. The Territorial legislature is the most representative group to speak for Alaska, and it passed a resolution requesting the Congress to allow the people of Alaska to elect their own Governor.

However, in the face of that resolution, their delegate to the Congress opposes the movement to let the people of Alaska elect their own Governor.

I have before me various editorials from newspapers in that great Territory; and I also have before me other evidence coming from the Territory of Alaska.

After the Alaskan statehood bill had been before the Congress in 1950, and failed of passage by the Senate, the Territorial Legislature of Alaska memorialized the Congress of the United States to allow Alaska a 15-year exemption from all Federal taxation, in favor of corporations which would develop the territory of Alaska. The Territorial legislature was taking a very sound and practical approach to a practical matter, when it memorialized the Congress of the United States for that special tax provision for 15 years. However, such a provision could not stand if Alaska were a State, because throughout all the States of the Union taxation must be uniform, according to fixed schedules. Here is a constructive, down-to-earth proposal by the people of Alaska, not by us; but it is being opposed and played against by the Delegate from Alaska to the Congress of the United States.

I have before me two editorials which reflect the public sentiment in Alaska. I read these editorials, not on criticism of Delegate BARTLETT, who is a very fine gentleman, but because I wish to show the sentiment in Alaska on this question:

Delegate BARTLETT is only practicing heroics when he says in effect that nothing constructive for Alaska must be done until statehood is granted.

That was the stand he took recently when he was asked to support a bill calling for the election of a Governor of Alaska.

Such a move was recently proposed by Senator HUGH BUTLER, the Republican Senator who led the opposition fight against H. R. 331, the Alaska statehood bill.

It might have been expected that Delegate BARTLETT would not feel kindly toward any measure proposed by the Nebraska Senator, but in denouncing support of BUTLER's proposal, Delegate BARTLETT put himself squarely on record as opposing one basic principle of free democracy so far as Alaskans are concerned.

In connection with the proposal for statehood for Alaska, the freedom cry has gone up in the Senate. Some Senators cry "Freedom! We must extend the horizons of freedom in Alaska; otherwise we draw around Alaska an iron curtain."

Mr. President, I submit in all deference to those who raise that cry, that there never was a more false issue raised on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Wyoming had his freedom train moving west the day the debate opened. I asked him, "What about Puerto Rico?" "Ah," he said, "Puerto Rico involves a different legal situation, and certain technicalities." I said, "Waive the technicalities. What about freedom for the Puerto Ricans?" He said, "Puerto Rico cannot support a State government. Its economy is not strong enough." This is not merely a question of freedom. That is a false issue. The people of Hawaii, Alaska, and all the other Territories have freedom, and with a high standard of living, they come nearer to conducting their own affairs than any other people living on any land which has ever touched the Pacific Ocean, except our three Western States.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield very briefly to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. In the case of Puerto Rico, I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that the people of Alaska have \$76,000,000 worth of bank deposits, while the people of Puerto Rico have \$257,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad the Senator brought out that fact.

Mr. SMATHERS. So far as the Selective Service is concerned, in World War II Puerto Rico sent 50,235 men; in the Korean war, 17,000. Alaska, in the Korean war, sent 641.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's contribution very much. I have before me another editorial, from which I shall read but one sentence. It is an editorial from the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily News of December 26, 1950. I read:

Clear-thinking people fail to see how a measure to elect our own governor could possibly harm statehood. Statehood will come when the time is ripe and in the meantime a governor, elected by the people, a governor in whom the people of Alaska had faith and confidence, a governor who had Alaska at heart, could do more to aid the cause of statehood than any other form of strategy that could be adopted.

That reflects the sentiment of the people of Alaska, who feel that it is a reasonable suggestion that they should train themselves in government. They realize that one step in that direction is the selection of their governor, and getting some tax exemptions which will enable them to travel somewhere under their own power.

Mr. President, with all deference to those who, when they come to Washington, make the argument that the Senate must pass this bill in order to prevent being criticized by Russia or her satellites, or to avoid being condemned in the eyes of nations elsewhere in the world, in view of our fine record over the

decades, for almost two centuries, it seems to me that such an argument is merely an echo of Russian propaganda, and ought not to be made on this floor. I believe that if we submit and succumb to the arguments which come from the so-called international set, we are merely grabbing at straws. Such arguments amount to appeasement, they are arguments of fear, arguments of frustration. America will never grow strong by trimming its sails to catch the winds which blow from every area of the continent. That is a begging attitude, and I think we should repudiate such reasoning. It has no place in the arguments of the council chambers of a Nation which has spent more than \$71,000,000,000 toward civilian relief and construction in various areas of the world since the year 1940. It has no place in the council chambers of a Nation which is taking the lead in the United Nations with respect to problems of the world, and which is furnishing more than 90 percent of the manpower, the money, the matériel, and the casualties to fight the war which is now going on in Korea. It has no place in the council chambers of a Nation which has given freedom to the Philippines, to Cuba, and to a host of other states I could name.

If our attitude against imperialism has not been entirely demonstrated in the eyes of the impartial people of the world, then we shall never be able to prove our case. I submit, Mr. President, that to make such arguments in the Senate indicates a compromising attitude, and those who make them and try to inject such issues into this debate unwittingly become the cohorts, aiding and abetting an extension of the influence of the Kremlin itself. I say it is being done unwittingly and without realizing its import, because those who make the argument are quite as patriotic as am I or anyone else.

I wish now to refer briefly to the original statement I made, that there is involved a question of policy. That is what we are to decide today. It is a question of policy, and the question is, How far shall we go, once we open the door to the admittance to statehood of areas lying beyond the confines of continental United States? What are we to do with Guam?

Guam is far away in the Pacific Ocean. It cannot become more closely connected with us militarily than it is. Guam has a population of 59,000, almost as great a population now as Alaska has, if we exclude the military personnel and their families and the temporary construction workers who are in Alaska.

By the way, something has been said about taxation without representation. Alaska pays into the Treasury about \$18,000,000, according to the latest figure I have. In contrast to that, the Federal Government this year is spending approximately \$500,000,000 in that area. But, referring again to Guam, with her 59,493 people, we have already passed an organic act making Guam an unincorporated Territory. The next step logically would be to make Guam an incorporated Territory, and, according to the argument which is being made at

this time, the next step would be to admit Guam as a State of the Union. Would we want to do that?

Let us consider the Virgin Islands. They constitute an unincorporated Territory with a population of 26,665. The next step would be to make of the Virgin Islands an incorporated Territory; the next step, to make them a State within the United States. If we consider their strategic importance, we hear the same argument, we have a citation of the same facts, and we have people of the same type. The question is, Are we to go beyond the confines of our present 48 States, to launch out on a policy which will lead, God only knows where?

Mr. President, much has been said about the people of Alaska and Hawaii. Let me say one word for the people of the 48 States. They are being left out of consideration in this matter. They are the ones who are paying the taxes. If any one of those 152,000,000 people will look at the globe pin-pointed with markers to show every spot in the world where we have men and materials, and where we are spending money, where we have launched out on policies which we must defend with our blood, with our brawn, and with our finances and our reserves—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. May I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield four additional minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for four additional minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there are 152,000,000 people in the United States. Much has been said in the course of the debate about the 75,000 people in Alaska. I think we may well spend a part of the four minutes talking about the 152,000,000. If any one of them will look at a globe pin-pointed to show all the places in the world where we have a program, an agency, or a commitment that we are already bound to defend with our blood, with our brawn, and with our money—yes, with everything we have—I think he will take a long look, and, with a sigh, he will return to his work with a realization similar to the one that is gradually creeping into my mind, namely, that we had better take a little trend toward isolationism. Mr. President, I am not an isolationist, but this accumulation of world facts is awakening me to a realization that we are over-spending ourselves. I believe a realization of these things will awaken the American people.

We had better think about our strength at home and to our commitments already given, rather than to go out into some vague field to dream of a budget which can be balanced, when no budget has been presented. We should overcome the trend of making commitments farther and farther from home, particularly irrevocable commitments such as would be involved in making Alaska a part of the United States. There is no turning back when we do

that. We cannot repeal the law or change our minds; we cannot remove the error. I say, Mr. President, we ought to take a long last look at our own situation before we go chasing into vast areas of the world on a policy from which we cannot turn back.

I want to thank the Senator from Florida for granting me additional time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief reference to what the Senator from Mississippi has just said about national defense, and to the interpolation by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The Senator from Florida quoted Rear Adm. Ralph Wood, retired, as a military expert, to the effect that the national defense would not be aided, whether Alaska were a Territory or a State.

On page 369 of the hearings on Alaska statehood, Mr. W. C. Arnold, the head of the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., though a resident and a citizen of Seattle, Wash., asked permission for Rear Admiral Wood to be heard. He said:

First, I ask permission for Rear Adm. Ralph Wood, retired, who during the late war was the Commandant of the Seventeenth Naval District, which comprises Alaska, and who was the deputy commander of the Alaska Sea Frontier, and the deputy commander of the North Pacific Force and area, to make a statement, expressing his views on the relationship between statehood and national defense.

Rear Admiral Wood comes here at my request and at the expense of the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc.

The Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., is the industry, under the directorship of Mr. Arnold, which financed the campaign against statehood because it wants to impose absentee landlordship upon the people of the Territory of Alaska. It will be a happy day for Alaska and for the defense of Alaska and of the United States when industrial corporations cannot continue longer to impose their absentee control over the people and the industries of that area.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot yield now, because some time has to be allotted to other Members of the Senate.

I desire to add, Mr. President, that the Senator from Mississippi has spoken about the next step being the incorporation of Guam, the incorporation of Puerto Rico, and the incorporation of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. President, all those questions have been settled. The Senate has acted upon bills reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs providing a constitution for the people of Puerto Rico, and they are satisfied with it, because they chose it at a public election.

The committee recommended the same sort of local self-government for the people of Guam, because we knew that statehood could not and should not be granted to such areas.

To compare Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam with the incorporated Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, which were positively and affirmatively given the promise of statehood when they were incorporated is, to use the words of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], on

the floor this morning, merely an attempt to bludgeon the issue.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I decline to yield at the moment. I will give the Senator time later on.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Wyoming permit me to ask who paid the expenses of those who came from Alaska to testify?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, as I see it, the question is whether our country is to continue to be an expanding nation, a nation which retains the pioneering spirit that made the United States of America the greatest nation in the world, or whether we are going to limit our future expansion, and curtail our future expansion.

Every expansion and development of our country has had its opponents, the Louisiana Purchase, the Northwest Territory, the Panama Canal, among others. Even today there is opposition in the Senate to the St. Lawrence seaway although delay in its consideration allows millions of kilowatts of electric power to be bled away from our country out into the sea, and continues to landlock the heartland of industrial and agricultural America.

It has been a matter of great concern to me, in listening to the debate, that implicit in the opposition to this bill there seems to be an idea that Alaskan residents are somehow inferior to or different from the residents of the 48 States.

Three-fourths of the present residents of Alaska Territory went there from the United States. They are American-born. They know just as much about how our Government operates as do the citizens of Mississippi, Florida, California, New York, or any other State. They are just as well qualified to take part in the discussions of national policy as are the residents of any other area under the American flag. They are as well informed, as alert, as progressive, and as accomplished as are residents of the States. They read the same magazines and books, see the same movies, listen to the same radio programs, read the same news as reported by the press services, in exactly the same words as are printed in the newspapers in the 48 States.

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] a few minutes ago raised the question of taxation without representation. I think that issue is as good today as in the early days of our history. I do not believe many Americans question the fact that taxation without representation was discarded long ago as a principle on the North American Continent, so far as we are concerned. And I might point out that the taxes paid last year by every man, woman, and child in Alaska, were approximately \$300 each. That is a greater amount than the taxes paid in a number of the States of the Union. The

total paid into the Federal Treasury, despite the small population of the Territory of Alaska, was more than \$38,000,000.

It was also mentioned that perhaps it might be a good idea to cultivate a trend toward isolationism. I am sure the Senator who said that is, as he asserted, not an isolationist. But the idea of cultivating a trend toward isolationism, when the very survival of the Nation depends on a proper, broadly-developed organization of world teamwork against the threat of world Communist domination, would be a terrible mistake. The very suggestion seems to me to strike an off-key note when introduced into this particular issue.

Mr. President, not long ago the President of the United States welcomed a new Finnish Minister to the United States in the person of Johan Nykopp, and when he presented his credentials to the President, Mr. Truman suggested that we would like to welcome a couple of hundred thousand Finns from Finland to immigrate to Alaska.

What he meant, I believe, was that in many respects the development of the Territory of Alaska does have a similarity to the development of the Republic of Finland. I believe that if proper opportunity is given to Alaskan genius, to enable that Territory to produce, we shall have a Territory which will attract people of Scandinavian descent who have settled in our country—in Minnesota, northern Michigan, and other latitudes which are similar to those of their homelands—and people from other countries, who will help develop the Territory and bring their great industry to our country. In Michigan we have probably more native Finns and persons of Finnish ancestry than any other State of the Union. We are proud of them. We are proud of their industry; we are proud of their enterprise, and we are proud of their patriotism.

I think we ought to remove the shackles which now bind us on a Territorial basis, and give to Alaska the same freedom, we have to other Territories. If we do that, there is no limit to the enterprise and vigor which may be put into the development of this Territory.

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

Mr. MOODY. I am sorry, but I have only a few minutes left, and the time is in charge of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I believe he had better apportion the time.

Those of us who favor this statehood bill have seen in it the prospect of a future Alaska peopled by all races and from all States. We can discern such a pattern in the development of some of our own Northern States. Europeans have come to as nearly identical areas in the United States as they could find conforming to their homelands. Thus, Swedes and Norwegians have come to central Wisconsin and central Minnesota; Finns to central Michigan, northern Wisconsin, and northern Minnesota, and Danes to the more southern States. I believe the development of Alaska's resources will be a challenge to those people, and that those who go to that area

will help develop it as they have helped develop their own home areas.

There is one other note that I should like to inject into the debate before the roll is called. One of our great shortages in the last few years has been wood pulp, newsprint. The cost of our principal medium of communication, the newspaper, has been sharply increased because of the lack of a sufficient supply of newsprint and too high a price for the paper on which newspapers are printed.

I believe one of the greatest opportunities for the growth of the Alaskan Territory lies in its forests. A United States Government survey has shown that 15,400,000,000 feet of timber lie in two forest reserves in southwestern and southeastern Alaska alone.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MOODY. I have only a few minutes, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan would mind pointing out how the granting of statehood to Alaska will increase the growth of trees in that Territory, or how it will produce more pulp.

Mr. MOODY. I am sure that the granting of statehood will not result in the growth of any more trees, but I feel sure that the status of statehood, if I may say this to my good friend from Florida, will attract capital to Alaska, and will make it possible for the general development of the Territory to proceed at a faster pace.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator from Michigan recognizes, as even the proponents of the bill admit, that statehood will raise the cost of government to the citizens of Alaska anywhere from 60 to 100 percent, and that, rather than helping to attract people, it may result in the reverse.

I agree thoroughly with what the Senator has said, but it seems to me that the best way to accomplish what is sought is to break the hold of the Department of the Interior, which this bill does not do.

Mr. MOODY. It seems to me, and perhaps the Senator from Florida will agree, that the status of statehood would give an entirely different psychological aspect to the development of this Territory.

As a newspaper man, I hope that we shall get a great deal of newsprint out of Alaska. I feel that this will be stimulated by the admission of Alaska as a State. I am informed that Alaska can produce an estimated 1,000,000 tons of paper products a year. Looking ahead, that output could be greatly increased.

As the Senator from Florida probably knows, much of our present newsprint comes from the northern part of our continent, from Canada. It seems to me it would be a good thing, in order to keep the cost down of keeping the channels of communication open, to develop newsprint industries in Alaska. I think that would be stimulated by the admission of Alaska as a State.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the very able and distinguished Senator from Michigan, who is also my good friend, that I thoroughly agree with him about

the need of newsprint. On the other hand, there is no reason to believe that those who might desire to go to Alaska and develop newsprint or pulp could not do so now, even under Territorial status. The fact of the matter is that statehood would not change the hard facts. It takes about \$5,000 to move to Alaska. It is a long way from Chicago, and ordinarily the weather is not very good. Those conditions will continue, unfortunately, whether statehood is granted or not.

Mr. MOODY. I understand that, but I am sure that my esteemed colleague will agree with me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, may I have five additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield additional time to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator. I should like to point out to the Senator from Florida that certainly in travel time and in ease of access, Alaska is today much closer to Chicago than was California when California was opened up for development. Perhaps the weather in Alaska is not quite so good as it was in California.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator from Michigan will agree that it is not right to try to judge what is to be done in 1952 with the Territory of Alaska on the basis of 1860 standards, which is what seems to be what is proposed at the moment.

Mr. MOODY. Oh, no. I merely think that people are recognizing the fact that with modern means of transportation Alaska is not so remote a Territory as it was when it was first taken in with a promise of future statehood.

I think I had better conclude my statement, if I may. I should like to point out also that there are many products which can be developed in Alaska other than those already referred to. Newsprint is merely one facet of the problem. There are many other riches in Alaska which can be developed, and which I believe will be developed if Alaska achieves the status of statehood.

There are the salmon fisheries. Already 5,000,000 cases of salmon are packed annually in Alaska. There is also a great potential for the development of metals which are now scarce. There are many other rich resources in Alaska which, in my judgment, will be developed more speedily if Alaska is admitted to statehood.

Since my time is limited, I should like to conclude by reading into the Record once more the platform planks of the two major political parties in 1948 on Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. There are some who may think that political platforms are merely window dressing for election campaigns. I have never believed that should be the case, and I do not believe it now. Therefore, I should

like to read what both parties said about the matter of statehood.

The Democratic platform said:

We urge immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

That is about as categorical as any statement could be. I believe it can be interpreted as an implied pledge.

The Republican platform said:

We favor eventual statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

That is a little more equivocal. It says "eventual statehood." Nevertheless, it seems to me that if it means anything at all, it means that the Republican Party is in favor of admitting Alaska into the Union as a State. I certainly hope that when the roll is called this afternoon the members of both parties will live up to their party platforms and vote for the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an additional statement on this subject.

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

The treaty by which we acquired Alaska reserved a plot of land for the Finns—the site of the Finnish Lutheran Church in Sitka, the capital. Among the population at the time of the transfer were a hundred or so Finns, employed by the Russians as artisans and clerks, as navigators and explorers.

In the 1840's, the Governor of Alaska was Adolph Etholin, a Finnish officer. And again in 1853, the Governor was another Finn, an admiral—Humpus Furuhejm—whose daughter was born in Sitka. So the imprint of Finnish character is in evidence in our far Northern history. Let us have more of it. Let us give their love of independence and liberty a chance to develop on our northwest frontier—our last frontier.

Alaska and Finland lie in practically the same latitude. Anchorage is virtually in an identical latitude on this continent that Helsinki, Finland, occupies in Europe.

Recently I came upon a special report prepared by Mr. Reino Sarvola, a scientist from Finland, who made an 8-week survey of northern Alaska under the auspices of the United Nations. He reached most interesting and valuable conclusions.

Mr. Sarvola was financed by a United Nations public-health grant, and while his impartial survey covers much territory not particularly germane to our present fight for Alaskan statehood, I am sure the Senate will indulge me the few minutes necessary to summarize the report.

Here it is:

"ALASKA

"(By Reino Sarvola)

"In Alaska I traveled for 8 weeks and observed the Alaska Native Service, the Territorial Health Service and the Public Welfare Service. I will relate briefly the questions which have been most interesting to me.

"Alaska is a very big territory, of about 586,400 square miles in area, or about one-fifth the size of the United States. But the population is small. There are only 126,661 inhabitants. In Finland, which is as far north as Alaska, we have 130,661 square miles—which is about one-fourth the size of Alaska, but our population numbers 4,500,000 people. In the district where I live—which is like northern Alaska—there are 160,000 people in an area of about one-twelfth the size of all Alaska. They main-

tain themselves by forest and reindeer industries.

"The most important industries in Alaska are fishing, mining, and furs. Where the country is very rich the people live by taking only the best of the natural resources. But they should develop other industries, such as forestry, farming, and expansion of the reindeer industry.

"The purpose of social work is to help people help themselves. Thus the people of Alaska must begin to plan more clearly about what they need to develop—a better standard of living for themselves. First I have taken into consideration such general questions as housing, temperance and liquor trades, the labor market and unemployment situation, farming, forest and reindeer industries. These are all very important background factors for the above-mentioned services.

"Housing is the least developed among the native people. Their houses are too old, run down and overcrowded. It cannot but be very difficult to take care of the public health in such homes. Tuberculosis has free circulation. Homes are very small and thus it is difficult to consider an adequate foster-home program for children needing placement in boarding homes. Part of the buildings are only temporary. The inhabitants first have intended to stay in Alaska for a year or two and thus built for themselves only a temporary shelter, which, however, after remaining in the same place for decades has become their permanent residence.

"Building of new houses is very expensive when wages are so high and the forest industries are not developed by the Alaskans. I think that the Government must very strongly support the building of new individual houses. I have not noticed any difference in the method of building between the buildings here and in the States. So first it must be determined what is the best and cheapest type of building for this climate, taking into consideration also the long winters and snow and the difficult heating possibilities. The weight of snow is to be particularly noted when building roofs.

"In particular, it was amazing to discover that in regions where there was plenty of firewood available, expensive oil heating was being used for the reason that it was easier to use. The Eskimos no longer care to collect and use the driftwood, which is left to rot on the beaches. When planning and constructing new buildings and houses, in my opinion, the fireplace should be taken into consideration in order to make available the use of wood, at least partly, for heating purposes. And when you find different types of homes for the people here, you can build sawmills and factories and make building materials and precut parts for these buildings.

"In Finland we have prefabricated buildings, with the components made in factories, easy to transport and put together at the place where the house is to be built.

"As compensation for war debts we send such prefabricated houses in great numbers to Russia. They are cheap but they make good dwellings.

"From the economic point of view, if we are thinking only about costs I do not know which is the more expensive—to aid the natives obtain proper homes, or continually increase expenditures for their health and social services.

"When the forest industry will have been developed in Alaska, it will provide continuous and steady livelihood for the majority of the people of southern Alaska and at the same time will advance the rapid progress of all Alaska. After realizing the great wasteful use of various raw materials in Alaska, it should be noted that the same mistake made in many areas of the United States, where the forests were cut down

without the least consideration of forestry conservation or that posterity too would need wood, shall not be repeated.

"I further believe that greenhouses would have a great future in Alaska just as well as within the arctic circle in the Scandinavian countries, where greenhouse projects have brought excellent results. The produce thus grown is superior to that grown in the south, with the result that vegetables and greens are now brought from the north to the south. Vegetables as well as meat are products transported from the States to Alaska. However, before the greenhouse project could be developed, a glass factory should first be built in Alaska, to facilitate and make more advantageous the obtaining of the glass for the greenhouses.

"One big trouble in Alaska is the unstable, seasonal labor market and the moving of working people, this year about 50,000, who come from outside the Territory. These people are often not the best working people, but may be searching for adventure and escape and they give much trouble. We had the same trouble in Lapland after the war during the rebuilding program. But then we gave work to only completely professional and skilled workers and gave vocational training for workers in our own district in order to make them more efficient.

"Another factor in Alaskan life may well be a larger, rejuvenated reindeer industry. The first importation of reindeer from Siberia into Alaska was made in 1872. In the following 10 years a total of 1,280 head were brought to Alaska. In 1894 a total of 16 Lapps were brought to Alaska to train the natives in reindeer husbandry. Around 1932 there was estimated to be around 600,000 head of reindeer. At present there are 17 herds with a total of 27,245 head of reindeer.

"During my trip I observed the various reindeer areas of Alaska and these are my observations:

"1. Reindeer summer feeding areas are excellent.

"2. Winter feeding areas on the coast are not too good, but in the interior there is plenty of lichen.

"3. Reindeer herding could now be much larger than it is, as reindeer can live in the same areas that support caribou. For the future it would be well to examine all of the potentials of a reindeer industry.

"4. The present herds are in good condition and herds are growing rapidly.

"In Finland before the war there were 250,000 reindeer in one-tenth the feeding areas which exist in Alaska. At that time the industry brought a return of 250,000,000 Finnish marks. Eighty percent of the production was exported. Direct reindeer herding produced employment for 16,000 people. During the war the number of reindeer dropped by 180,000. In the last 6 years it has increased by 100,000.

"As the population increases in Alaska the reindeer industry would have a chance to expand, thus benefiting the native people and the whole Territory as well. As caribou decrease the opportunity in grazing for reindeer increases and also the need for reindeer can increase. The reindeer need not be a source of products for the natives only as it can afford a good return for all the people of the Territory. Later the industry could be developed into an export business if markets and circumstances permit.

"Transportation of reindeer to market is a problem in Alaska. Because of this problem the coastal areas of Alaska are the logical areas for herding. In the coastal areas 200,000 reindeer could be herded. This would comprise at least 100 herds of 2,000 each. This should take care of 6,000 people. Reindeer herding could be very suitable to the Eskimo.

"In the foregoing I have already briefly visualized to what direction, according to my understanding, the conditions of living, live-

hood, and education of the natives, retaining their special characteristics, should be developed. It should always be borne in mind that they have a long tradition behind them, and to attempt to alter their mode of life and thought from what they are accustomed to, must be very gradual. One of the greatest weaknesses in Alaska is the incoherence of the administration which makes it difficult to determine what activities or duties belong to each department of the government.

"Native crafts are changing. In their crafts, they are using strange and foreign ideas that are not their own. The crafts would be superior and more valuable if they adhered to their own original designs. There are some excellent Eskimo artists who could furnish the ideas for their basic designs.

"A trade-mark should be established for all crafts made by native artists and craftsmen. This would increase their value and protect the native crafts from exploitation.

"It is to the advantage of the native to maintain his customs, traditions, costumes, and dances. Morally it is good for these people to maintain their heritage of customs and traditions."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I allot 7 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will defeat the motion to recommit Senate bill 50, and will instead proceed to pass this measure for Alaskan statehood, and will then follow such action by passing the bill providing for Hawaiian statehood.

The substantial objection that seems to be working against the admission of Alaska and Hawaii is the feeling of Senators from certain regions of the country that the addition of four new Senators will so dilute existing voting strength as to threaten the interests of those sections in Congress. I can understand this feeling, but it should give way, in my opinion, to important national considerations.

Thus, it may well be against the apparent and immediate interest of the large tax-paying States, like my own State of Illinois, to have a new State admitted which is likely to join with the public works bloc and be a substantial recipient of Federal funds for development.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have only 7 minutes, and I should like to be permitted to conclude.

If I were considering this measure solely from the standpoint of the interests of my own State, I think I might have to vote against the admission of Alaska, because I think we can be quite certain that the Alaskan Senators, no matter what their good intentions may be at the time they enter the Senate, will later want large Federal grants for public works, which the taxpayers of the great industrial States will then be called upon to pay.

I should like to point out for the benefit of the Senate and the country the degree to which the large industrial States are underrepresented in this body. The five largest States in the Union are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I should like to be permitted to complete my statement.

I have only 7 minutes. I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion of my statement.

These States include more than one-third the population of the country. Their citizens and corporations pay nearly one-half the Federal taxes of the country—that is 47.5 percent—yet we have on the floor of the Senate only 10 out of 96 Senators, or approximately one-tenth of the voting strength of the Senate, and we possess much less than one-tenth of the political influence in the Senate. There is not a single Member of the Senate from any of the five largest States who is chairman of any committee of the Senate. Generally Senators from those States occupy a very inferior position on the committees. In fact, I am inclined to believe that politically our five States occupy the position of conquered provinces. We pay the bills, but we have very little voice in determining what is done. I do not complain about this—

Mr. GEORGE. Does not the Senator think that is a fortunate circumstance?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not think it is a fortunate circumstance. [Laughter.]

If I were considering this question solely from the standpoint of sectional or State interest, I would vote against the admission of Alaska, because it is not going to help my State at all, and it will mean bigger bills which Illinois taxpayers will have to pay. But in my judgment our narrow sectional interests should give way in this matter to the clear and overriding national interest in making this strategic Territory and the Territory of Hawaii sister States.

It is my earnest hope that the South, which with certain notable exceptions has been opposing admission for differing regional reasons, will likewise subordinate these sectional interests in this critical period.

The Southern States apparently fear that if Alaska and Hawaii are admitted there will be four more Senators who will vote for civil-rights legislation.

But let me point out to the South what its representatives are undoubtedly perfectly well aware of, namely, that already the South, with the help of hidden allies from other scattered areas, can now control more than one-third of the seats in the Senate. Hence it can filibuster to its own sweet will and prevent cloture from being enforced on a civil-rights measure.

In the old days the South insisted that for every free State admitted, there should also be a slave State admitted—a ratio of 1-to-1. This was before the filibuster was practiced. Now a filibuster can defeat action so long as one Member more than one-third by voting or staying away can prevent cloture from being enforced and hence can prevent a vote from being taken or affirmative action carried out in the matter of civil rights. So long as the anti-civil-rights group can get 33 of the 96 Members of the Senate either to vote against civil rights or to have a feigned illness and go to the hospital when the issue is before the Senate, it can prevent civil-rights legislation from being carried into effect. Moreover, by the terms of the

Wherry amendment, we cannot change that rule, because under rule XXII, as it now stands, cloture cannot be enforced in connection with any proposal to change the rules. We of the big industrial States who believe in civil rights are hog-tied, with the heavy chains loaded down upon us, ready to sink us to the bottom of the ocean.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I have only 7 minutes. When I shall have concluded my statement I shall be willing to answer questions.

Now the ratio which the South seeks is not 1-to-1, but many of our southern friends are apparently insisting that the ratio should be 2-to-1. Here is a case in which it is feared that four pro-civil-rights Senators from Alaska and Hawaii would be admitted without any corresponding anti-civil-rights Senators. I think that is true. There would be four civil-rights Senators from Alaska and Hawaii—I hope so, in any event. But since the South already has the filibuster available, and since it can defeat the will of a majority and prevent cloture by the joint action of only one more than one-third of the Senate, it certainly should not in my judgment seek additional protection at the expense of the national interest.

The South can now defeat any civil-rights bill by the open or concealed opposition or by the indifference of a total of 33 out of the 96 Senators.

Were Alaska and Hawaii to come in, only 34 Senators out of a total of 100 would be needed to block action. The issue really boils down to whether our southern friends will be willing to sacrifice the national interest for the sake of one vote. Believing in the high patriotism of the South, I cannot believe that upon mature reflection they will do this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield as much additional time as the Senator from Illinois needs to complete his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can state quite briefly the principal affirmative reasons why I favor the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as full-fledged States.

First. This action is required by our fundamental belief in local self-government. People should have not only the right but the obligation to govern themselves. They should not be governed from Washington by representatives and an executive they have no part in choosing. The people in these Territories want to assume these responsibilities, and the apparent will of a great majority of the American people is that the Alaskan and Hawaiian people be granted these rights.

Second. The judgment of our defense leaders, both civilian and military, is virtually unanimous that statehood for Alaska and Hawaii will strengthen the defense of our country against Communist aggression. These Territories are strategic points on the globe, and stable local governments add greatly to the strength of a defending force.

Third. By granting statehood to these Territories we can give to the world another clear demonstration that we are firmly committed against colonialism. We have assured the peoples of the world that this is our position on principle. Welcoming Alaska and Hawaii on an equal footing with other States will back up our declarations with affirmative action.

While some opposition has been expressed to their admission on the grounds of their population, their resources, and their distance from the main body of the country, these factors wash out when comparisons are made with the status of other Territories at the time of their admission.

Our principles of self-government argue for admission. Our country's defense and the maintenance of the co-operation and unity of the free world will be strengthened by Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood.

If we of the big States are willing to subordinate our regional interests on this issue, is it too much to ask of the South that it do likewise? I ask this without any regional self-righteousness but with the hope that we all will put first things first.

I hope, therefore, that the motion to recommit will not be approved and that the Senate will today take a favorable vote on Alaskan statehood and follow it with similar action with respect to Hawaii.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Mr. Senator," published in the Chicago Herald-American of February 26, 1952, and the text of a radio address which I made over 15 Illinois radio stations.

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

MR. SENATOR

The Alaskan statehood bill comes up Wednesday in the Senate.

The margin between victory and defeat hangs on the votes of a few wavering Senators.

We say to them: Put aside petty sectional interests and obey the public will.

We say: You cannot afford, either from self-interest or the immeasurably greater interests of the United States, to be on record as opposing a bill supported by all branches of the military and backed up, according to latest polls, by the 9-to-1 approval of the men and women of America.

We say: Every military leader of consequence, including General MacArthur and General Eisenhower, wants statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii to strengthen American unity and defense in this time of crisis.

We ask: Are you, at a time like this, going to run counter to the best military thinking we have? Are you going to disregard overwhelming public opinion?

DON'T KILL IT

The vote in the Senate tomorrow will be on a motion to recommit the Alaskan bill to committee "for further consideration." This is an evasive means of killing the bill with no blood on the knife, no smoke from the muzzle. But it would kill it just the same.

Alaskan statehood and Hawaiian statehood are separate technically, but they are interwoven psychologically and emotionally. So

to kill Alaskan statehood would kill Hawaiian statehood, too.

Since the number of Senators definitely favoring and opposing the bill are about equal, the issue will be decided by a wavering fringe group, which could be as small as four or five men.

It is to them that this is chiefly addressed.

To our own Senators—PAUL H. DOUGLAS and EVERETT M. DIRKSEN—we urge: Vote to keep Alaskan statehood alive.

TALKING IT OVER—THE ISSUE OF STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII, WITH SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, DEMOCRAT, OF ILLINOIS

ANNOUNCER. This is the program Talking It Over, with Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Recently the United States Senate has been debating the issue of whether or not to admit Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. What about this issue? Should these Territories be admitted as States? What about the danger of communism in Hawaii? Could it be helpful to this country's defenses to make these Territories into States? These are some of the questions we shall ask Senator DOUGLAS during this broadcast.

First of all, Senator DOUGLAS, how do you stand on the issue of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii?

Senator DOUGLAS. I support the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as full-fledged States. There are three main reasons why I believe that this should be done:

First is the belief which we all have in local self-government. The people should have the right to govern themselves and not be governed from Washington. And the people in both Hawaii and Alaska want self-government.

Secondly, and something which is extremely important now, is the fact that to admit them as full-fledged States would help our country to have a better defense against the possibility of Communist aggression in the Pacific.

A third reason is that by making these Territories into States we give the world a clear demonstration that we have no desire to practice colonialism. The United States has spoken out on many occasions in the United Nations against colonialism, and we, of course, freed the Philippines. By permitting Alaska and Hawaii to come into the United States on an equal footing with other States we would show that we are willing to back up our position.

ANNOUNCER. Senator DOUGLAS, how do you think the inclusion of Alaska and Hawaii into the United States would be helpful from a standpoint of national defense?

Senator DOUGLAS. The more stable a local government can be, the more successful can be that government in defending that area in the case of sudden attack. There's no substitute for State and local instrumentalities of law and order. The local police and civil defense units would be of great help in cases of sudden danger. We should realize that both of these areas are very likely to be strategic points where the initial attacks by Russia or its satellites might take place. Alaska, for example, is a mere 54 miles across the Bering Straits from Soviet territory. Hawaii is an extremely important outpost for our defenses in the Pacific.

ANNOUNCER. On what grounds has opposition been expressed to the inclusion of Alaska and Hawaii as States?

Senator DOUGLAS. Let us take up the objections to Alaska first, and then consider the objections to Hawaii later.

ANNOUNCER. All right.

Senator DOUGLAS. In the first place, I think it's very significant that no resident of the Territory of Alaska itself has appeared to testify before the Senate committee against this legislation. In other words, the objection is from people outside Alaska, not from people inside Alaska.

There have been three reasons, however, advanced by people outside Alaska against admitting it as a State. First, that it is too small from a population standpoint for representation in Congress and too small to support a State government. Second, that its natural resources are not sufficiently developed to permit it to support the financial burdens of statehood. Third, the fact that Alaska is noncontiguous (this is true of Hawaii, too, of course), namely, that it does not border on the United States proper.

ANNOUNCER. What about these objections, Senator DOUGLAS? Do you think Alaska is too small to become a State?

Senator DOUGLAS. The population is now 128,000 and the bulk of the people are native-born Americans. Thus, Alaska has a greater population than did Idaho, Nevada, or Wyoming when they were admitted as States—more even than Illinois when it was admitted as a State in 1818.

ANNOUNCER. But what about Alaska's resources? Would they be adequate to support a State government?

Senator DOUGLAS. I think so. Alaska produces about \$375,000,000 worth of goods and services annually—mainly, in mining and fisheries. And, furthermore, it collected about \$20,000,000 in taxes during the period 1949-51. It is estimated that these same tax rates will produce \$25,000,000 during the 2-year period 1951-53. Alaska has been able to balance its budget which is more than certain States have done and more than the Federal Government seems to be able to do.

ANNOUNCER. I guess in comparison with the other States which were small at the time they came into the Union, Alaska is not too small and probably has adequate resources to support a State government. But I suppose there's no denying the fact that Alaska does not actually border on the United States and is noncontiguous, as you call it.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is, of course, true. You only have to look at the map to see why. But, on the other hand, when California was admitted, that State was 1,500 miles away from the nearest border State, namely, Nebraska. The fastest possible travel by pony express required 9 days to get from Nebraska to California. Travel by stagecoach required 25 days. For those who wanted to get to California by clipper ship, the time required was 97 days. The same thing was true of Oregon in even greater measure. Yet California was admitted as a State and Oregon was admitted as a State. On the other hand, Alaska is but a few hours away from the United States by airplane and only 2 or 3 days by ship. The truth of the matter is that the world has shrunk because of the development of radio, telegraph, aviation, and fast ocean shipping.

ANNOUNCER. Yes. And I suppose nobody's really sorry that we admitted California and Oregon, even though they were noncontiguous at the time.

What are some of the positive reasons for admitting Alaska into the Union other than those you mentioned for defense purposes and for our reputation in the eyes of the rest of the world in denying colonialism?

Senator DOUGLAS. I pointed out that if we believed in self-government, we should allow people to govern themselves and not be governed from Washington. Alaska has had a popularly elected Territorial legislature since 1912. It's been a United States Territory for 84 years, longer than any other United States Territory which is not now a State. The bulk of the Alaskan population consists of native-born Americans, and the Territory is certainly mature enough to be admitted as a State on an equal footing with the other States in the Union. It should not be kept in the cellar indefinitely, or in cold storage indefinitely.

ANNOUNCER. Then what about Hawaii, Senator DOUGLAS? Do the same general rea-

sons hold, in your opinion, on the advisability for admitting Hawaii as a State?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; I would say the same three basic reasons: need for self-government, advantages in terms of national defense, letting the world know that we have no desire to hold a colonial empire. This last point is perhaps particularly important in the case of Hawaii.

ANNOUNCER. Then I suppose that much of the same type of objections have been raised to the admission of Hawaii as have been raised against the admission of Alaska.

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; but the objections are not as strong in the case of Hawaii as in the case of Alaska, because the population of Hawaii is about half a million, or almost four times the population of Alaska. The population of Hawaii is even now larger than the population of Vermont, or Delaware, or Wyoming, or Nevada.

The ethnic make-up of this population shows that the groups long loyal to the United States are in a majority. Besides Hawaiians and Filipinos, there are about 114,000 Caucasians. And I may say that Hawaii has been extraordinarily successful in getting harmony out of various groups and in getting these various groups to live together on terms of comparative friendship with each other—native Hawaiians, part Hawaiians, Caucasians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos—they live together in comparative harmony, and they are a great demonstration to the world that American institutions can be absorbed and lived by other groups rather than merely native whites.

ANNOUNCER. What about the financial resources of Hawaii?

Senator DOUGLAS. Hawaii has very great financial resources. It has a huge \$124,000,000-a-year sugar industry, and an \$80,000,000-a-year pineapple industry. They've exported 60,000,000 pounds of coffee, and of course they do an enormous tourist business.

ANNOUNCER. Hasn't it been contended that Hawaii is, if not controlled by the Communists, certainly in danger of falling into the control of the local Communists?

Senator DOUGLAS. That charge has been made by some. It's based on the left-wing control of one of the large longshoremen's unions—Harry Bridges' union, which has also organized some of the agricultural workers in Hawaii in addition to the dock workers.

But the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, has investigated these assertions with great care. The House Un-American Activities Committee during April 1950, went out to Hawaii and conducted an investigation. After the conclusion of these investigations, the two committees reported that, in their judgment, there was not sufficient communism to justify withholding statehood from the Territory.

ANNOUNCER. What about the politics of admitting Alaska and Hawaii into the Union as States, Senator DOUGLAS? Would it help the Republicans or the Democrats?

Senator DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact it probably wouldn't help either one very much. They would balance each other. At the present time Hawaii would probably send Republican Senators here; Alaska would send Democrats. The two would balance each other in the Senate. In the House, there would probably be one more Republican than Democrat, so that on the whole, it would slightly help the Republicans rather than the Democrats. But the Democratic Party in the North is very strongly supporting the admission of both.

ANNOUNCER. What seems to be holding up the admission of these two Territories as States? Haven't both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms advocated that they be admitted?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes. Now, the real difficulty is this: The Southern States know that

if Alaska and Hawaii are admitted there will be four more Senators who will vote for civil-rights legislation. As long as the South, with the help of allies from other scattered areas, can keep one more than one-third of the seats in the Senate under their control, it can filibuster and prevent cloture being enforced on a civil-rights measure.

In the old days the South insisted that for every free State admitted, there should also be a slave State admitted—a ratio of 1 to 1. Now they are insisting that the ratio should be 2 to 1. Here is the case of where four civil-rights Senators would be admitted without any anti-civil-rights Senators. Therefore the South, in general, is opposing the admission of these States with some honorable exceptions, such as Senator HOLLAND of Florida. I hope that the South will place the national interest above its prevailing regional concerns.

As a matter of fact, it's against the regional interest of the big States to admit these small States because they would probably join the public works bloc and obtain large grants of Federal money for which the big States would pay. But since we of the big States are subordinating our local interest to the national interest, I hope the South will do the same.

ANNOUNCER. Then the large States such as New York and Pennsylvania and your own State of Illinois, I would think, would be the ones who would suffer most by a dilution of their Senate strength.

Senator DOUGLAS. We're already more or less a conquered province. We're ruled by the combination of the South and the semi-arid Western States which run the United States Senate. But in the national interest we believe that Alaska and Hawaii should be admitted, and we're willing to subordinate our regional interest. In view of that fact I think it's not too much for us to ask the South to do likewise.

ANNOUNCER. Senator DOUGLAS, how would the legislation currently before the Senate provide for admitting Alaska and Hawaii into the Union?

Senator DOUGLAS. The legislation would permit the people of Alaska to elect a constitutional convention to formulate a State constitution. Then when this constitution is approved by Congress, Alaska would become a State.

Now Hawaii on the other hand has already had a constitutional convention. This convention was held in 1950. The legislation which we are considering would validate this constitutional convention so that the Hawaiian state constitution could then be submitted to Congress for approval. When this was done, Hawaii would be admitted.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard a discussion with Senator DOUGLAS on the issues surrounding the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the United States as States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the observation which was made by our esteemed colleague the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], that now is the time for us in the United States to take stock of our position in the world and the drain on our resources, and perhaps to curtail some of our commitments, instead of extending them.

It occurs to me that our commitments so far as Alaska are concerned are already in existence, and that any commitments which geography has made for us cannot be curtailed if the safety of America is to be a consideration,

which it must be in this and in all other matters.

I presume the words of General Mitchell have been quoted previously in this debate. He said:

Whoever controls Alaska, controls the world.

I think the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] will agree that in this atomic age, when Juneau, Alaska, is approximately 22 hours by air from Washington, D. C., we are confronted with a physical condition which demands that we strengthen Alaska by every appropriate measure we can devise.

The question therefore arises: Is the granting of statehood to Alaska designed to accomplish that objective? I believe history demonstrates that areas of our country have developed most rapidly when they came into the Union as States. Certainly the examples of Washington, Oregon, and California are before us, and they illustrate that with statehood came a development of their marvelous resources. I believe that the resources of Alaska are comparable to the natural resources of all the States west of the Rocky Mountains.

I believe that one of the things that militates unfavorably in a consideration of this proposal is the thought which was advanced by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], to the effect that perhaps Alaska is a land of snow and ice, and therefore unsuitable for any future development of a large population.

Of course, we know that the junior Senator from Florida comes from a very well advertised section of the country. However, Jacksonville can be rather cold. In fact, on one occasion when I arrived at the airport in Jacksonville I nearly froze, and when I arrived at Miami I had to turn on the electric heater.

Perhaps I should read into the RECORD the following statement:

The average annual temperature varies from 45° above zero at Ketchikan to a low of 9.9° above zero at Point Barrow.

That is a little lower than temperatures at Miami.

The January mean temperature of 20° above zero in Anchorage compares to that in Concord, N. H.

Perhaps we should call this fact to the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The January mean of 33.6° at Ketchikan is about the same as Denver and New York. Ketchikan's record low of 8° below zero approximates record low temperatures for—

For where, Mr. President?

for Washington, D. C., and is considerably warmer than the record cold in such cities as Chicago and Boston. Ketchikan's all-time high is 96; Juneau, 89; and Fairbanks, 99. The temperature at Fort Yukon, 20 miles above the Arctic Circle, has often reached heights of 100° above zero. The temperature has also been known to drop below minus 70° during the winter in that community.

So much for the climate of Alaska. It is fortunate that it is so, because the natural resources in that Territory are

very great indeed. I am told that some of them have not been very accurately assessed. Certainly so far as the supply of pulpwood is concerned and so far as the supply of some of our most precious minerals, including tin, are concerned, we do know that they are there in great quantity.

I do not share the sentiments expressed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut three additional minutes.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not share the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that the admission of Alaska as a State would militate against the interests of my State. True it is that my State is not one of the five largest States of the Union, but it is an industrial State located in the northeastern part of the country. I am also aware of the fact that I have one ninety-sixth of the voting power of the Senate. If Alaska and Hawaii were admitted into the Union, I would have one one-hundredth of the voting power of the Senate.

But advert to the argument made by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that his regional interests would be prejudiced by the admission of Alaska—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Connecticut is aware of the fact, is he not, that I said even though it did conflict with regional interests, in my judgment such interest should give way to the national interest?

Mr. McMAHON. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Illinois. Permit me to congratulate him on his statement. I wish to make the point that every time the boundaries of the United States have been enlarged in our history, and every time new States have been brought into the Union, the Union as a whole has become richer, better, and stronger.

Mr. President, I feel that the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States, with the speedy development and exploitation of their resources, which would come through the protection that statehood would give to new settlers, would constitute a source of productive wealth which would flow both ways. Of the wealth that flows into the continental United States some finds its way into my State of Connecticut, which I have the honor to serve in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, some people in Connecticut make the argument that we collect more in income taxes in Connecticut than is appropriated out of the Federal Treasury to be

spent in Connecticut. They refer, of course, to the direct appropriations which are made for river and harbor development in Connecticut and other Federal expenditures.

I say that is a fallacious way of looking at it, because if we bring about the creation of great wealth by the development of natural resources, such as the Bonneville Dam, for example, which is 3,000 miles from Connecticut, people in that area will have money with which to buy insurance policies which are issued by insurance companies in Hartford, Conn. They will have money to purchase some of the 10,000 articles we make so well in Connecticut.

In my opinion nothing could constitute a more fallacious argument. If that argument were any good, then at any time in the past when we have extended the boundaries of the United States, the States which were in existence before that extension occurred would have become poorer, instead of richer. However, the fact of the matter is that we have become richer.

Alaska is the richest Territory now undeveloped, and contains the largest amount of natural resources to be found in any place we know of on the face of the globe. The quicker we integrate Alaska into our own system and admit it as a State, with Members of Congress to represent it, the quicker we shall become a greater, more productive, and stronger Nation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, since the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who describes himself as one of the hog-tied representatives of the conquered provinces of Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Ohio, has replied very frankly, sincerely, and, I think, straightforwardly to an argument I have been making as to why I intend to vote to recommit this measure, I wish to explain my position, in the hope that the explanation will not be worse than the offense.

As the Senator from Illinois has said, the vote of the southern States will be diluted. However, Mr. President, Kentucky did not secede from the Union in the Civil War; and Kentucky did not secede from the Union in 1948, when President Truman ran for the Presidency of the United States.

In Kentucky, we are now in the unfortunate position that our legislature, which now is in session, is trying to redistrict the State, with great turmoil and distress, with the likelihood that we shall lose one of two of the ablest men who have represented our State in years, either Representative JOE B. BATES, of Greenup, Ky., or Representative BRENT SPENCE, of Fort Thomas, Ky., both of whom are well known and are highly esteemed by so many of the Members of Congress. This year our State is to lose one of its Representatives in the Congress of the United States, due to

the reapportionment. Yet we are asked to give Alaska one Representative and two United States Senators.

This fall I must campaign for election to the United States Senate, and at that time I must try to make to the people of my State the plea, which I believe is an honest one, that the fate of this Nation hangs in the balance, depending upon whether the control goes one way or the other, now being determined, as it is, by only four votes, or before that by only three votes, until the time when our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOONY] was appointed to the Senate.

If there is any validity to that argument, there is no way on earth by which I could explain why I voted to give two votes in the Senate to Alaska, which has a population only as large as that of the county in which I live, which is but one of the 120 counties in the State of Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Does either the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Wyoming desire to be heard at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of discussion as to whether by admitting Alaska we shall be admitting a Territory which has too small a population.

Before the Senate votes today, I think we should examine the record. According to the report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as of 1950 Alaska had a population of 128,643.

Let us examine the record of the population of some of the present States at the time when they were admitted into the Union.

At that time their populations were as follows:

Idaho, 88,548; Florida, 87,445; Wyoming, 62,555; Mississippi, 75,448; Arkansas, 97,574; Missouri, 66,586; Ohio, 45,365; Oregon, 52,465; Illinois, 55,211; Louisiana, 76,556; Tennessee, 105,602; Nevada, 6,857; North Dakota, 109,983; Alabama, 127,901; Kansas, 107,206.

Mr. President, Alaska alone has at this time a population greater than 15 of the States now represented in this Chamber had at the time when they were admitted from territorial status into the status of statehood.

Sometimes it is argued by some of my friends on this side of the aisle that there is some doubt about how the Republicans of Alaska feel regarding the admission of Alaska to statehood. I am sorry that more Members of the Senate were not present when my distinguished colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] spoke yesterday. However, for the benefit of those who may be interested, let me say that he placed in the RECORD a number of telegrams, which appear on pages 1386 and 1387 of the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD. At this time I shall read to the Senate only one of those telegrams, as follows:

JUNEAU, ALASKA, February 19, 1952.
HON. GUY C. CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please be advised that the Republican Party in Alaska at its last convention held at Sitka made the following statement of its principles and convictions by including in its platform: "We advocate immediate statehood for Alaska." The position taken by that convention was affirmed by the National Republican Convention and on every occasion has been reaffirmed by Republican organizations both within and without Alaska.

HENRY A. BENSON,
Secretary, Republican Central Com-
mittee for Alaska.

Mr. President, who is authorized to speak for the Republicans of Alaska, if not their official central committee? So at least the argument about alleged opposition by Republicans should not carry any weight with Members on this side of the aisle.

At this time I wish to read to the Senate the following information which I received just yesterday:

In the discussion of statehood for California, the prime factor involved was the reluctance of the Senators from the South in admitting another free State. At that time, there were 14 slave and 15 free States in the Union; and California, it was felt, would swing the balance, especially since she had written into her constitution a provision against slavery.

In the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE Appendix for the Thirty-first Congress, page 1537, are contained the following remarks by Senator Houston, during this debate. His speech was made on August 13, 1850, as follows:

"I am for admitting them (California) as a State. I contend that it is an inherent right in the American people, wherever they are thrown together in sufficient numbers, that they shall establish some government for themselves. You cannot plant upon a spot of the earth a thousand Americans that will not establish for themselves free institutions. Sir, I contend that, upon the principle of self-government, California is entitled to come into this Union as a State."

This statement is all the more surprising in the light of the strong opposition and road blocks put up by the other southern Senators. D. L. Yulee, of Florida, filibustered for 3 days. Others tried every means at their disposal to block the vote. Even after the Senate had voted and approved the statehood bill, feeling ran so strongly that 10 Members of that body signed a protest over the admittance. This was put into the record some 2 days later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield 3 additional minutes to me?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California the additional time he requests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes more.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So, Mr. President, the present opposition to the admission of a new State is not new. If men had not had sufficient vision at the time when the present States were admitted into the Union, we would have had a

much smaller and a much weaker Union than we have today.

Mr. President, nations and individuals cannot stand still; for them there is no such thing as a status quo; they either grow or they die.

I believe this great Union of ours must have some of the same faith that was had by those who were responsible for bringing into the Union the States which are represented in this Chamber today. We must renew the faith they had, without which we would not have the great assembly that we have here today.

Certainly I am sure that the future will prove that Alaska and Hawaii are destined to be two of the great States of the United States.

This is no time for us to adopt a defeatist attitude. This is no time for us to say that America has had her greatest growth, and that now she must wither away. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I think we are just on the threshold of important new developments.

So I hope that by an overwhelming vote the Senate will reject the motion to recommit. I hope that even Senators who, for reasons best known to themselves, may be opposed to the granting of statehood to either Alaska or Hawaii, will at least permit us to vote on the definite, clear-cut issue of granting statehood, and not by indirection deny the Senate of the United States an opportunity to vote either up or down this important issue.

Mr. President, this is the time and the place for the Senate of the United States and the two great parties represented in it to stand up and be counted and to carry out the pledges in their platforms.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield me a few minutes?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I am glad to yield a few minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last week I told the Senator from Mississippi I would place in the RECORD statistics showing the exact vote of the people of Alaska in the referendum which was conducted on the statehood question. I have those exact figures before me at this time. In a direct referendum the vote of the people of Alaska, on the question of statehood, was 9,630 for, 6,822 against.

Those figures show, of course, what the people of Alaska, regardless of political affiliations, think about this matter.

I also told the Senator from Mississippi I would place in the RECORD the exact figures of the Gallup poll, February 2, 1952, showing what the people of the United States think of this proposal. On the question of statehood for Hawaii, the vote was 69 percent for, 11 percent against; 20 percent, no opinion. That shows conclusively what the American people think of statehood for Hawaii. On the question of statehood for Alaska, 76 percent were for, 8 percent were

against, and 16 percent were of no opinion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion concerning Alaska's strategic position and air mileages from Alaska to other points in the world. I think those mileages should be placed in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the absence of the Senator from Wyoming, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

In order that the RECORD may be clear, I desire to state the distances from Fairbanks, Alaska, to various other places in the world. From Fairbanks, Alaska, to Rome, Italy, it is 5,050 miles; from Fairbanks to Prague, Czechoslovakia, 4,480 miles; from Fairbanks to Paris, 4,450 miles; from Fairbanks to Warsaw, Poland, 4,350 miles; from Fairbanks to Berlin, Germany, 4,320 miles; from Fairbanks to London, England, 4,230 miles; and from Fairbanks to Moscow, 4,150 miles. This demonstrates that, speaking in global terms, the farther one goes from Fairbanks into Russian territory, the closer he gets to Fairbanks.

From Fairbanks to Stockholm, Sweden, it is 3,870 miles; from Fairbanks to Oslo, Norway, 3,800 miles; from Fairbanks to Tokyo, it is 3,500 miles due west. It is almost as far from Fairbanks to Japan as it is from Alaska to many of the strategic points in Europe. From Fairbanks to Washington, D. C., is 3,270 miles; from Fairbanks to New York, 3,255 miles; from Fairbanks to Chicago, by way of the inland route, it is 2,790 miles, and from Fairbanks to Seattle, down the coast, it is 1,525 miles.

I know of no more graphic illustration of what the late Gen. Billy Mitchell meant, when he said, "He who controls Alaska controls the world," than a statement of these air distances as I have read them into the RECORD.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at the outset, once again I should like to express my admiration and respect for the very able chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. O'MAHOONEY]. Certainly in the 13 months I have been a member of that committee, with the exception of Senate bill 50 and Senate bill 49, he has conducted hearings fairly, impartially, and always very pleasantly. I regardless of what I may say hereafter, I want that to be well understood by him.

I should also like to say to the Senator from Illinois, when he suggests that the reason for many southern Senators being against this bill is because they are worried about the diminution in the power of their votes, that I know that is not true insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned. I know, too, that it is not true insofar as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned; I know

it is not true insofar as the junior Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, and I doubt whether it is true of hardly any of the Senators from the South. It is unfortunate that every time somebody wants to whip somebody else into line it is necessary to bring forth the old argument that those attempted to be whipped into line are against civil rights or that the question at issue has something to do with civil rights. Such is not the case here. It is unfortunate that every time somebody stands up to express a conscientious belief against a certain program, he is immediately branded as an obstructionist, or un-American, or something of that nature. In this morning's newspaper there appears an advertisement inserted by citizens who want statehood for Alaska, in which they say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to the motion to recommit, which amendment requests hearings on the plausibility of a commonwealth status, is a specious, un-American suggestion. It seems to me the time has come when Senators should be able to discuss these matters without attributing base motives to those who may choose to disagree with them.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending proposal to admit the Territory of Alaska into the Union at this time, for very basic reasons. It has generally been admitted today that it is a most important subject, and every Senator who has spoken has said that the world is looking at us; that Russia might decide what course she will follow by reason of what we do with 108,000 civilians. There can be no doubt that the move contemplated is an important one, and one of my reasons for being opposed to this bill being brought up as it has been is that, important as it is, there has never been one single day of hearing held on it in this Congress. There has never been one witness permitted to come before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to say that he was for the bill or against it, and to have an opportunity of expressing his reasons for his position.

As a matter of fact, during the Eighty-second Congress there has never been any public hearing whatever as to whether Alaska should even be admitted as a State; and on the bill, Senate bill 50, so far as I know, there has never been any hearings whatever, in all the history of the Congress.

Earlier today the very able Senator from Nebraska said there have never been any hearings held in Alaska, where the people most concerned would like to have an opportunity of stating how they feel about the bill. There has never been such a Senate hearing in that Territory for the poor people who might realize that statehood would mean greater burdens to them and who would like to have had an opportunity to testify. They had no opportunity if they did not have about \$600 with which to pay their way from Anchorage to Washington. If they did have it they could then come to Washington to make their voices heard.

No, Mr. President, when this bill came up before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee the junior Senator from

Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the junior Senator from Florida asked that hearings be held, because we felt that it was of great importance.

Finally, after we insisted that hearings be held, the question was put to a vote, a very unusual procedure, and by a vote of 7 to 6 we were denied hearings. Six members of the committee asked that hearings be held, but this was not permitted.

Mr. President, I feel that this very important departure from ordinary good legislative procedure is almost as important as is the whole question of statehood. It has been my understanding that the reason why we have committees in the United States Senate is because the Senate as a body is too large to consider in detail the great volume of complicated matters which come before it. So the various bills must be referred to committees, where the committee members can have an opportunity to go into the questions involved very thoroughly.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it is also my understanding that each Senator who sits on a committee has a responsibility to his fellow Senators to examine very closely into the facts, the arguments both for and against, and then, when a measure comes to the floor, to give the arguments pro and con so that other Senators who have not had an opportunity to study it may be advised as to the merits of the proposed legislation.

Opportunity to fulfill that function was denied the junior Senator from Louisiana and the junior Senator from Florida. It is significant, Mr. President, I submit, that since the last hearings were held on this very important matter 17 new Senators have come into this body for the first time, and there have not been any hearings.

Mr. President, at the risk of being repetitious, it seems to me we should emphasize once again that Congress is not a continuing body, that every time it ends a 2-year period, it legally comes to an end. At the beginning of the next Congress any proposed legislation which was not acted upon during the previous Congress has to be reintroduced. Committees have to be reconstituted. Hearings are once again held; and that is the reason why we see hearings being held on subjects on which countless pages of hearings have previously been held.

The able Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], a member of the Armed Services Committee, has been present at hearings on universal military training and the very able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is holding hearings of that committee today. Hearings are being held on the St. Lawrence waterway project. Hearings have been held in the past on Alaska and Hawaii, but that is no reason why we should upset orderly procedure and not give six Senators the right to have further hearings.

It is interesting to observe, Mr. President, that another matter—the so-called tidelands bill—came up a few weeks later, and a tidelands bill was reported. Before that happened, however, the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] offered an amendment to the

tidelands bill which was disposed of by a vote of 7 to 4. After the amendment had been disposed of, and after the major part of the bill had been disposed of, the very able chairman of the committee [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said he was going to hold hearings on that particular amendment, even though the amendment and the bill had already been disposed of and the bill reported. He made a most meritorious and praiseworthy statement, when he said there had been a substantial request for hearings and, therefore, he was going to grant hearings even though the matter had already been disposed of.

I am sure the Senator did not mean to imply that the six Senators who asked for hearings on the Alaskan statehood question were not substantial Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator will recall that before the committee had acted upon the submerged lands bill the committee, by unanimous consent, called the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] before the committee to explain his amendment. He took about 10 minutes to do that, and he said he had come unprepared and had hoped that he would have additional time.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was for that reason and only for that reason that the action was taken.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator somehow considered that it was a substantial request from one Senator, but when two members of his own committee asked him to hold hearings, and six voted to hold hearings, he did not consider it a substantial request in connection with one of the most important issues now pending before this body.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida knows that the chairman of the committee did not control the votes of the Senators who voted.

Mr. SMATHERS. There was a one-vote margin. The Senator could have voted with us.

There were a number of questions which I should naturally have liked to propound to certain witnesses, both for and against the proposition of statehood for Alaska. I was not permitted to do that.

Mr. President, I think it is important for us to keep in mind the size of Alaska. If we lay a map of Alaska over a map of the United States we will find it reaches from Charleston, S. C., to San Francisco, Calif. Alaska has a coast line as long as that of the coast line of the States of the Union put together. It has 375,000,000 acres of land, and yet we find in that vast Territory only 108,000 civilians, 35,000 of them natives, Aleuts, and Eskimos.

From the arguments we have heard today it seems to be suggested that because Alaska has a population of 108,000 and other Territories previously admitted had no more, therefore Alaska is entitled to be admitted into the Union.

It seems to me it is unfair to base the case of a 1952 Territory on 1845 standards.

The very able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] referred to the admission of the Territory of Florida into the Union. In 1845—when Florida was admitted—there were only 20,000,000 people in the entire United States. There was 1 person in Florida for every 285 persons in the United States at that time. If we look at Alaska today, we find there is only 1 person to every 1,388 people in the United States. Alaska, to be equal to Florida percentagewise, would have to increase its population five times.

Let us not forget that if we admit Alaska, we are, in the matter of population, lowering the standard percentagewise to a point to which it has never been lowered before. Certainly it is undisputed that there are fewer people in Alaska per square mile than there have ever been in any other Territory at the time it was admitted to the Union. This can be an important question, insofar as admitting Territories into the Union is concerned, depending upon how we look at it. It seems to me it is important because of the fact that there are so few people in Alaska, and because it is such a vast Territory and its present government is burdensome. Even the proponents of Alaskan statehood admit that statehood will raise the cost of government anywhere from 50 to 100 percent. If we care to examine the figures, I think we will come to the conclusion that the cost will be raised 100 percent rather than 50 percent.

I think a perusal of the figures will show that if, under statehood the cost of government is raised 100 percent, taxes in the proposed State of Alaska will be 216 percent higher than in any State in the Union. I should like to have those who desire to help Alaska think about that. Is that the way to develop a Territory? Is that the course to follow to encourage new people to come in, to put in front of them a mounting tax burden? Ordinarily, people go where they can get away from high taxes, not to places where they will have a higher tax load placed upon them.

Mr. President, we did not have the opportunity to hear the testimony of the proponents of statehood. We had to dig it up ourselves in the Library of Congress, as was suggested to us. But we went there and dug it up, and we learned something about Alaska. In any event, if anyone desires to read the hearings held 2 years ago, he will find that even the proponents of the bill admitted that for a person to go to Alaska, it was necessary for him to have \$5,000 in his pocket, and extremely good credit. I feel, Mr. President, that if a person has \$5,000 in his pocket, plus the cost of transporting himself and his family to Alaska, he would probably find no reason for going to that frontier area. Furthermore, he can understand that if he has \$5,000, plus the cost of transportation, and gets to Alaska he is then necessarily going to have his taxes increased 100 percent if statehood is granted at this time.

Perhaps this is not the way to develop Alaska. Perhaps we should not grant statehood at this time. Perhaps there

are better ways by which we can help Alaskans. Certainly, Mr. President, Senate bill 50 does not in any way remedy any of the problems which Alaska has today. We can pass S. 50, but it will still not change the fact that the distance from Chicago to Anchorage is 4,016 miles. It will still not change the fact, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] may be interested to know, that Juneau, the capital city of Alaska, has less sunshine annually than has any city in continental United States. It will not change the fact that there is a large glacier around the capital, Juneau. There is no road at present, and apparently there will never be one, because it would have to be built over a moving glacier, and no one as yet has been able to devise a way to construct it.

Mr. President, if we are desirous of helping the Territory of Alaska, it may be that we should not consider admitting it as a State at the moment, but should consider breaking the hold of the Department of the Interior, which now seems to have Alaska by the neck.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Figures have been presented here to show how mild the weather is and how warm the temperature is in the southeastern section of Alaska. I believe it should be pointed out to Members of the Senate that the reason why the temperature is so mild is that the Japanese current runs so close and the rainfall is so great that that section does not have a chance to get cold.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. We can help Alaskans by breaking the stranglehold of the Department of the Interior on 99.4 percent of the land in Alaska. Senate bill 50 does not do that. Even if the bill should be passed in its present form, it would still leave the Department of the Interior in charge of more than 90 percent of all the land in Alaska.

As a matter of fact, what Alaskans want is to break this stranglehold. They do not want statehood at the moment. The most recent vote on the question of what they really want was held at the last session of the legislature, when two resolutions were considered. One was No. 36, the other was No. 26. Resolution No. 26 asked Congress to give Alaskans the right to elect their own judges and governor. Resolution No. 36 urged Congress to grant statehood, but that resolution was not adopted. I submit that that was the most recent vote indicating what the people of Alaska really want.

It seems to me there are many questions which should have been asked about the pending bill. I wanted to ask some of the witnesses about section 1 of Senate bill 50. When House bill 331 passed the House of Representatives, and hearings were held upon it in the Senate committee, the bill described the boundary of Alaska as being one marine league from the coast line. But Senate bill 50 does not provide for the boundary being one marine league from the coast

line. As a matter of fact, by legislative action that provision has been deleted. Yet, Mr. President, when the great States of California, Oregon, and Washington were admitted to the Union, either the enabling acts or their constitutions provided that the boundary line should be one marine league from the coast.

Mr. President, I submit that what is being attempted here is to settle the tidelands issue in the bill for Alaskan statehood. Proponents of the bill would like to have the United States Senate go on record as not favoring for the proposed new State extending beyond its immediate coastline, which would affirm the decision of the Supreme Court, in the California case. If this is done, then in 2 or 3 weeks, when we have before us the tidelands issue, we will find ourselves in the very embarrassing situation of having voted 2 weeks previously to limit the coast line of the States to the area right along the shore, and we shall be estopped from voting for a quit claim bill.

This is rather a subtle way to have the Senate affirm the California case without having the matter brought up in public hearings, as should be done.

I have noted, Mr. President, that many Senators have said they favor statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, or one of them, but nothing more.

I should like to say that we are setting a pattern. It is not going to be very easy for some Senators, who may today vote for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, to stand upon the Senate floor and say that they cannot vote statehood for Puerto Rico. They will try to excuse their stand on the ground that Puerto Rico is an unincorporated Territory, while Alaska and Hawaii are incorporated Territories.

Mr. President, I am sure the average citizen who walks the streets of Puerto Rico, or the average citizen who walks the streets of Alaska, has no more idea of what it means for a Territory to be incorporated or unincorporated than has my 8-year-old son, and he has no idea whatsoever.

I think it would be unbecoming for this great deliberative body to give statehood to 108,000 civilians in Alaska, but opposed giving it to two and one-half million in Puerto Rico, merely because Alaska is incorporated, while Puerto Rico is unincorporated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself two additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. We are setting a pattern for taking into the Union non-contiguous areas. The only two States to come into the Union which were non-contiguous to other States were California and Louisiana. All States which have come into the Union have been contiguous either to another State or to another United States Territory which it could logically be assumed would itself some day become a State.

I am sure that even the able Senator from Wyoming, who is chairman of the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, cannot explain how Alaska will ever be contiguous to the United States.

I feel certain he does not for a moment profess that we are going to take in the great Commonwealth of Canada. It may be that if we could take in Canada, we could also take in Ireland. I do not know.

If we take in Alaska and Hawaii, then obviously we shall sooner or later have the same argument made for statehood for Puerto Rico, Guam, and our other possessions. It may be that that is what we should do. I do not know. But I will say that a question of such tremendous importance as this should have come before the committee, where public hearings could have been held, where 17 new Senators who had never had the benefit of hearings could have been present to listen if they cared to do so, where a new record could have been made, and where up-to-date facts could have been brought out.

Mr. President, I submit that what has been done in this instance is not in accord with good parliamentary procedure and is not fair to new Senators. If it is, then everyone is going to say, "Do not elect new Senators in the future. Keep the old ones."

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think it would be a pretty good idea to keep the older Senators? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMATHERS. All of us must agree that proper legislative procedure calls for hearings. There have never been any hearings in the Eighty-second Congress on this bill. The provisions of the bill have not been examined with the minuteness and care becoming a deliberative body such as the United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, by agreement with the Senator from Florida, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time will be taken from neither side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chief Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Dworshak	Ives
Anderson	Ecton	Jenner
Bennett	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Benton	Ferguson	Johnson, Tex.
Brewster	Flanders	Johnston, S. C.
Bricker	Frear	Kefauver
Bridges	Fulbright	Kem
Butler, Md.	George	Kerr
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Kilgore
Byrd	Green	Knowland
Cain	Hayden	Langer
Capehart	Hendrickson	Lehman
Case	Hennings	Long
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Clements	Hill	Malone
Connally	Hoey	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Douglas	Humphrey	McCarran
Duff	Hunt	McCarthy

McClellan	Nixon	Smith, N. C.
McFarland	O'Connor	Sparkman
McKellar	O'Mahoney	Stennis
McMahon	Pastore	Taft
Millikin	Robertson	Thye
Monroney	Russell	Tobey
Moody	Saltonstall	Underwood
Morse	Schoeppel	Watkins
Mundt	Seaton	Wiley
Murray	Smathers	Williams
Neely	Smith, Maine	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I hope to be able to return a part of the 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming for use by someone more able than I am to present this case. However, I wish the RECORD again to show that I rise in favor of the bill for statehood for Alaska and in opposition to the motion to recommit the bill with instructions.

This question has been debated pro and con for days. There has been no argument made for the proposal or against it that has not been heard in the United States Senate on at least 35 previous occasions. Such arguments are heard every time there is a bill before this body to grant statehood to a Territory of the United States. Many of those debates, or excerpts from them, have been made a part of the RECORD. It would be idle to refer to them again. They are there for all who desire to inform themselves on the subject.

There has been nothing presented here in opposition to statehood for Alaska which has not been heard time and time again, and, no doubt, it will be heard on this floor if, as, and when the bill for statehood for Hawaii shall come before us. I hope it may seasonably follow the bill now under consideration.

Mr. President, this subject has received consideration before the committee. Hearings have been held. If it be a sound basis for recommitment of the bill that the subject has not been reopened for hearings every time a request has been made for hearings, or every time the committee finds it necessary to change some portion of the language, to insert a comma or semicolon, or delete a word, we shall never have anything in the Senate but committee hearings, and we shall pass nothing but the time.

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

Mr. CORDON. I have only 5 minutes allotted to me. I am sorry I cannot yield. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida, as I have already stated to him, that he did request hearings time and time again. I opposed his position, and I opposed it for the reason that I am setting forth today, namely, that in my opinion we had all the hearings that were necessary to be held to present all the facts. Hearings would have been superfluous from that time on. If we had opened the subject it could have dragged on until we would never have had an opportunity to act on the question in this session of Congress, time and conditions being what they are. For that reason I opposed any additional hearing. I believe that my position was the correct one to take.

Mr. President, I shall not go into the merits of the question again. I shall take the liberty, if I may, of reading into the RECORD what I said on the same subject at another time:

My position with reference to statehood for Alaska and statehood for Hawaii can be summed up thus: If taxation without representation was tyranny in 1776, it is tyranny today. If the right of people to govern themselves, to participate in their Government, was so dear to those giants of old who gathered and promulgated and signed the Declaration of Independence, that they were willing to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, in support of that proposition, it is just as dear today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we Democrats throughout the country during this season are observing Jefferson-Jackson Day and are having many dinners in honor of these two great Americans.

Andrew Jackson is the shining light in vindicating the democratic principles enumerated by the founder of our Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson.

Andrew Jackson, I believe all of us will concede, had a pretty good idea of what was in the interest of this Nation and of the kind of expansion we should consider in the years to come.

In the 1830's, he saw the importance of Alaska.

Andrew Jackson was the first Member of Congress from the State of Tennessee. There was doubt about him among his neighbors in those early days of our Republic, just as there is often doubt today about persons as well as measures.

I recall a letter that was written to Jackson about that time. It was from a neighbor, Mark Mitchell. He wrote:

DEAR ANDREW: So you're going to offer for Congress. Your size is against you. I don't know anyone weighing a hundred and forty in Congress.

But get yourself a pair of cotton overalls and wear your great coat. You've got a loud speech and you might make it.

MARK MITCHELL.

History pretty well takes care of Andrew Jackson—as a Member of Congress, as a governor, as a Senator, as a general, and as President.

It is not generally known, however, that President Jackson took the very first American steps to "brush up" on what are now Alaska and Hawaii.

We generally think of the first interest manifested by us in what is Alaska today as stemming from the negotiations that opened in the Polk administration around 1845 to 1847. Two offers of \$5,000,000 for the territory of the Russians on this continent are reported. But what history does not mention is that Andrew Jackson had his eyes on the west as early as 1836. He wanted to know more about Russian America, and a forgotten chapter of our interest in the Pacific comes to light in a letter written from Mexico in 1836 by William A. Slocum, an agent of our State Department, operating under the supervision of Secretary of State John A. Forsyth.

Slocum met Baron Wrangell, ex-governor of the Russian settlements, in Cali-

ifornia, then a part of Mexico, and reported:

I feel perfectly satisfied that the Hudson Bay Co. is making encroachments within our line, even as far as 45° north latitude, destroying the beaver dams where there is any doubt as to jurisdiction. * * * The Russians' principal establishment is at Sitka-New Archange. * * * I think it will be worth the attention of our Government to allow me to go to Sitka after visiting the Oregon * * * from the Sandwich Islands. I can get a small vessel to take me thither * * * then go from Sitka to Okatsh, and then overland to St. Petersburg * * * the cost will be about \$500.

If the President thinks favorably of my views, I doubt not I could get much useful information for our Government, and I am willing to endure any privations and hardships for the good of my country.

Andrew Jackson read the letter from Slocum, and in his own handwriting told the Secretary of State that—

The information suggested by Mr. Slocum's tour is well worthy of the expense. I will have no hesitation in approving it as required.

I am happy to say that my State, Tennessee, has always had the vision of western development. When the treaty for the cession of Russian America came before the United States Senate in early April of the year 1867, 37 votes were cast in favor of it. Two were cast against it. Senators David T. Patterson and Joseph S. Fowler from the Volunteer State were among the 37 affirmative votes. Later, the next year, when the bill came up for paying the sum of \$7,200,000 for Alaska, Tennessee had eight Congressmen, and when the final vote was taken, Tennessee registered her opinion, seven votes for, with but one against.

It is not necessary to remind you that Alaska was added to the United States domain under the administration of another Tennessean—President Andrew Johnson. To William H. Seward, of New York, his Secretary of State, was entrusted the task of the negotiations that gave us a Territory one-fifth the size of the whole United States, 584,600 square miles.

The vision of Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson was for a great America. Events have fully justified them.

Today, let our vision for America in 1952 be no less than that of 1836.

Let us vote for Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the vote on the pending motion will constitute a very clear and direct test of how much a political-party platform means and to what extent it is respected. It is a test of whether campaign pledges made to the electorate are to be kept or broken.

The platforms of both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party pledge statehood for Alaska. I consider a vote for this motion to be a vote to pigeon-hole the bill and thus to defeat it under a parliamentary smoke screen. If the motion carries and the bill is thus defeated, then both parties might as well junk their platforms and not make any more, for they then become fraudulent farces upon the American people.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII IS THE ROAD
TO PEACE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it has been stated that all the arguments against statehood for Alaska are old arguments which have been raised against the admission of almost every State into the Union. That is the fact. The timid warnings of Daniel Webster against the admission of California have been repeated by those who have far more reason than he to know their opportunities for growth presented by distant Territories. "What can we do with the western coast?" he asked in an eloquent but worried voice, "a coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, treeless, uninviting, and not a harbor in it. I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean one inch nearer Boston than it is now."

How tragically wrong was the great orator. But not more so than those who today see in Alaska nothing but a wilderness. These old arguments are as worthless today as when they were uttered over and over again against the admission of almost every Western and Southern State.

However, if Senators were to think that there are no other issues involved than these threadbare fears of early days, they would be making a great mistake.

I am reminded of the fact that when Napoleon was taken to St. Helena after Waterloo and the period of war which his ambition had brought upon Europe was brought to an end, 55 years elapsed before Bismarck again bathed Europe in blood by his invasion of France. When the Franco-Prussian War was over many people thought that perhaps there would be an end to war, or at least a century of peace. They were mistaken, for only 47 years elapsed before the Kaiser again forced Europe into war, a conflict which eventually involved the United States and became the First World War.

The Kaiser was defeated and banished from Germany as Napoleon had been banished from France.

The victors sought to make peace. World War I was ended, but only 11 years elapsed between the fall of the Kaiser and the rise of Hitler and Hirohito in the beginning of World War II.

There we have the history of modern times, a constantly and steadily diminishing period of peace and the recurrence of more bloody and widespread wars. Members of the Senate who have the opportunity of sitting upon the Appropriations Committee and, indeed, all Members who have the opportunity of reading the reports, know that the cost of war is mounting with even greater rapidity than that which marks the outbreak of international war.

We are now drifting into a third world war, Mr. President. The cost of that war in blood and money will be beyond imagination. Our preparedness program is more costly than previous wars.

Mr. President, I say the time has come to try the way of peace. I assert with all the earnestness at my command that the way of statehood is the way of peace.

I have before me in the Chamber a chart of the Territory of Alaska, which I trust will soon be a State. The chart

shows the distribution of the unmeasured natural resources of this vast Territory.

Let us bear in mind that in war we have been spending the mineral resources of continental United States. In World War II we shot away one-fifth of all the iron ore that had been dug in 100 years from the Mesabi Range. One-half of all the aluminum and the copper we are producing will be used in the preparedness program. Not for industry and the building of a world at peace, but for the weapons of war are we using our resources.

Let us look at this map of Alaska. In Alaska are found not only gold, but also coal, oil, tungsten, power, bismuth, zinc, antimony, tin, platinum, lead, more tungsten, manganese, more bismuth, copper, more coal, more oil, more power, more antimony, wood pulp, and fishing of all kinds up and down the peninsula are the resources that can help us to build for peace, the resources that will help to make us independent of foreign sources of supply, the mineral resources we need for defense.

On the map of the world, the Territory of Alaska lies in exactly the same parallels of latitude as those in which the Scandinavian peninsula lies. We can look forward to a steady expansion of population and industry when statehood is granted.

Mr. President, that is not all. Not only does Alaska have resources which we need, but let me now show the Senate on the map of the world how statehood for Alaska and Hawaii will be a long step toward peace. The Bering Strait is 50 miles across. The one hundred and fifty-sixth meridian of longitude passes directly through both Territories. I say without hesitation or reservation of any kind that these two incorporated Territories when admitted into the Federal Union as States will be worth 10 divisions to the free nations, for this action by the Congress will not only raise the morale of the Americans in both Territories but will prove to the people of Asia and of the whole world that we are not colonial imperialists.

The testimony before the Appropriations Committee shows how the cost of defense is rising. The B-17 bombers, for example, which destroyed the German military power in World War II cost approximately \$17,000 each. The modern bomber we are building now flies so much higher and so much faster than the B-17 that each unit costs \$3,500,000—approximately eight times as much. This is the monetary measure of war.

Mr. President, there is no inflation in statehood. There is no unbalanced budget. There is no mounting cost, for statehood will uncover new resources for the United States. There is no added national debt in making it possible to recover these minerals. We shall only be showing the world how to help itself. We shall be promoting peace.

Furthermore, there is the argument on the spiritual side that by admitting Alaska and Hawaii to statehood we shall be winning the minds of mankind for we shall be practicing what we preach. Let it be known throughout the Asiatic world that we are admitting to statehood these

two great incorporated Territories—Alaska, the property of the United States for 85 years, promised statehood over and over again by the Congress; Hawaii, an independent republic which came into the United States by treaty of its own volition, and was promised statehood—the propaganda of Russia will then fall fruitlessly on the ears of those who seek release from imperialism.

O Mr. President, the vote today will tell us whether we are going to take a step along the road to peace or whether, by sacrificing our solemn promises to these people, we are to tell the world that reliance cannot be placed upon the promises we make to our own people. The latter is the message which will go out from this Chamber today if the Senate votes to recommit.

O Mr. President, an effort is made by our friends who oppose statehood for these territories to divide and conquer; they say now in the face of the instructions in the motion to recommit that Alaska and Hawaii are separate issues. Beware. They would defeat Alaska today, and at some time in the future defeat Hawaii. If the recommittal vote is carried they will change ground and say that Hawaii was defeated when Alaska fell.

Mr. President, these two Territories stand together in reason, in logic, in philosophy, and in good sense. Let us keep them together.

Mr. President, I urge upon the Senate the rejection of the motion to recommit, with all its instructions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized at this time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly the reasons why I shall vote in favor of the motion to recommit.

Although I do not agree with all the reasons included in the minority views, which were signed by five Senators, among them three Republican members of the committee, I think the basic conclusion of those views is correct. That is why I shall vote for the motion to recommit.

Under the provisions of this bill, I think Alaska would remain an economic dependency of the Federal Government. Under those conditions, Alaska would not be a free State. I think the Senators and Representatives who would come from Alaska would be controlled, regardless of whether they were Democratic or Republican, by the administration in power.

Mr. President, it seems to me that at the present time, at least, Alaska is not an economic unit. I do not think Alaska can fulfill the financial responsibilities and obligations of statehood. In that respect, Alaska is in great contrast to the Territory of Hawaii.

I am strongly in favor of voting for statehood for Hawaii. Not only does Hawaii have 5 times the population of Alaska, but Hawaii has economic resources which make her entirely self-

supporting and will make her a full member of the congregation of States which make up the United States.

I do not mean to suggest that we cannot hope to have statehood for Alaska; but I think this particular bill could have been improved and should be improved by the committee, when the bill is re-committed, so that Alaska may be more self-supporting. As one instance, let me point out that the bill grants to Alaska certain lands—the Federal Government now owning most of the lands—for her use, and the bill provides for the selection of such lands from public lands which remain vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved. The lands available for such selection would be of doubtful value, because all the desirable public lands in Alaska have heretofore either been reserved or withdrawn. That is one respect in which Alaska might be made more self-supporting by the liberal grant of Federal lands.

Referring to the Republican Party's platform of 1948, it says:

We favor eventual statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

That platform pledge particularly looks in the same direction in which I am suggesting that the committee may look, by saying:

We urge development of Alaskan land communications and natural resources.

I should say that could be brought about by their assignment to the public or to the new State, in such a way that Alaska could finally become a completely self-supporting community. If that objective could be attained, I would be very much in favor of statehood for Alaska. It seems to me, therefore, that the committee, by further consideration of this bill, can endeavor to set Alaska up as an economic, self-supporting unit, and it can bring back to the Senate, certainly in time, a bill which will provide for such an establishment and enable us to grant statehood to a Territory, which will, in fact, become an independent State, not a dependency of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. The Senator from Ohio makes a very amazing argument. He says that the Department of the Interior controls too much of the area of Alaska and, therefore, asks the Senate to condemn Alaska to the continued control of the Department of the Interior. The bill before us grants 23,000,000 acres of Alaska to the people of that State, under a State government, and the experience of other States in the West has been that after admission grants have on occasion been increased, after Congress has found that the need for more land had arisen.

The Senator from Ohio says he disagrees in the main with the minority report but favors some of its basic conclusions. Therefore the Senator is on both sides of this issue of statehood.

I want the friends of Hawaiian statehood to realize where the Senator is standing upon this issue.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. What I said was that, while I did not agree with all the statements in the minority report, I did agree with the basic conclusion that Alaska would not be a self-supporting economic community, under the bill as here presented.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator correctly, and that is what I tried to say. The minority report says, "Alaska cannot afford statehood at this time." The truth is, Alaska will have a surplus of several million dollars.

The minority report says, "There are no industries for Alaska in prospect now." The truth is that a \$40,000,000 pulp-mill development has been started in Ketchikan.

The minority report says that Alaska suffers from "grave economic ills" which are an effective bar to statehood now. This is the ground upon which the Senator from Ohio stands. The truth is that statehood itself is the remedy for the economic ills which the report has discussed. The way to release Alaska from bureaucratic control is to make a State of it. The way to condemn it to continued control by the Department of the Interior is to vote to recommit the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to me under date of January 10, 1952, by the secretary of the Alaska Statehood Committee, Miss Mildred R. Hermann.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

ALASKA STATEHOOD COMMITTEE,
Juneau, Alaska, January 10, 1952.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The 1951 report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on the Alaska statehood bill, has been studied with great interest. It is heartening indeed to know that Alaska has the support of such staunch friends as you and your colleagues who signed the majority report, and also to note the report's masterly summation of the case for statehood.

I should like, however, to comment briefly on the arguments set up in the minority report, if I may be permitted to do so.

I would not go so far as to say that this section of the report was written by the non-resident canned salmon industry, but certainly I do not hesitate to say that point for point, it bears a striking similarity, to the arguments presented by the industry before your committee in April of 1950, and that it presents no argument that has not been used by the industry, its satellites and camp-followers, throughout the 85 years in which they have opposed every step toward greater autonomy for Alaska and every piece of progressive legislation affecting Alaska introduced either in Congress or the Territorial legislature.

I shall not bother to answer all the inaccuracies that characterize the minority report. Most of them have been answered in minute detail before they were offered as the minority view. To answer them again would be merely to duplicate the arguments in hearings on the bill and in the majority report which summarizes them.

I do, however, wish to point out a few statements in the minority report which

represent glaring inaccuracies, in view of the present status of Territorial affairs.

1. The minority report says "Alaska cannot afford statehood at this time," and attempts to prove the assertion by a categorical charge that the Territory will have a deficit of \$2,000,000 at the end of the current biennium.

The truth is that Alaska will have a surplus of several million dollars at the end of the present biennium. Tax revenues paid into the Territorial treasury during the calendar year 1951 totaled \$13,932,799.72. Appropriations were made by the last legislature on the basis of an estimated biennial income of \$19,000,000. It should therefore be noted that the chairmen of the legislative tax committees whom the minority report has quoted so fulsomely, either guessed wrong to the extent of approximately \$7,000,000 for the biennium, were simply talking for the record, or were trying to keep appropriations at a minimum. It is worth noting, I think, that every time these chairmen predicated a deficit for the current biennium, they were challenged by the tax commissioner, the treasurer, the governor, or some other official or citizen who knew the financial picture. These challenges are not mentioned in the report.

Incidentally, to nail another misstatement to the masthead, there is no frozen appropriation of \$2,000,000 or any other amount in the Alaska financial picture at the present time.

All the appropriations of the preceding sessions which were frozen because of litigation instituted by the opponents of statehood, and because of the ghastly failure of the 1947 legislature to discharge its responsibility by making revenues match appropriations, have been defrozen and the money made available for the purpose for which appropriated.

So the facts are that not only will Alaska have a substantial surplus for the present biennium, she will also have met the service deficit of \$2,000,000 created through the necessity for freezing appropriations during the four preceding years. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance has recently authorized a very inspiring story about the present financial outlook of the Territory. A copy of this has been sent to the members of your committee.

Therefore, our \$64 question to the signers of the minority report is: "How many States in the Union can boast a similar sound financial condition and an equally high level of government services?" Can any of their own States?

2. The minority report further says, "There are no industries for Alaska in prospect now."

The truth is a \$40,000,000 pulp-mill development has been started in Ketchikan, a plywood factory in Juneau, a tin-mining industry in the second division and numerous new small businesses throughout the Territory have been added to the territorial economy during 1951.

As for those industries still in contemplation, the Alaska Visitors Association, created by Territorial statute at the session of 1951 and financed jointly by private subscriptions, has already made notable progress in setting up the machinery to capitalize on Alaska's unparalleled tourist attractions.

Alaskans believe, and are backing that belief with good, hard cash, that in this field also Alaska has potential resources of untold value.

And two additional pulp mills now being projected can certainly be considered among new industries in prospect—industries that will create new pay rolls and add substantially to the soundness of the economic structure of the Territory. Others, of course, may be anticipated when Alaska is freed, by statehood, from the crippling restrictions that are part and parcel of territoriality.

3. The minority report says that Alaska suffers from "grave economic ills" which are an effective bar to statehood now.

The truth is statehood itself is the remedy for the economic ills which the report has discussed at length.

Alaska is not the first or the only segment of these United States to so suffer. The South has for years suffered from grave economic ills, including those of absentee ownership and high transportation costs such as Alaska is burdened by today.

The West also has suffered from grave economic ills, including the handicap of vast areas of public lands in Federal ownership, a shortage of processing plants for its raw materials, and high transportation costs, even as Alaska.

Nevertheless, in each of these regions, a dozen States comparable, in the aggregate, to the area of Alaska have been carved out, and all of them, it must be assumed, are financing adequate State governments and providing satisfactory service to their citizens, as well as discharging their obligations to the Federal Government.

4. The minority report further asserts that, not statehood, but an elective governor is the answer to Alaska's needs at this time. Here again we see the unmistakable technique of the canned salmon industry—a diversionary appeasement.

The truth is that the right of Alaskans to elect their own governor would not by itself, correct the manifest evils engendered through remote control by Federal agencies. What Alaska needs is voting representation in both Houses of Congress, the kind of representation that all sovereign States have. No governor, elective or appointive, however able or popular, is in a position to work, with full effectiveness, for Alaska without that supporting representation. All the privileges of first-class citizenship, of which the right to elect their governor is only one, is what Alaskans are fighting for and should have.

5. The minority report says that more hearings in Alaska are necessary, to enable the opponents of statehood who cannot afford to go to Washington to be heard.

The truth is that in hearings held in Alaska, on Alaska's statehood, only a handful of Alaskan residents stood up to be counted as opposed to statehood. They were outnumbered almost 20 to 1 by those who urged passage of the enabling legislation.

And surely it must be apparent to anyone that the industry which has spent such stupendous sums to defeat statehood could have chartered half a dozen planes to bring anti-statehood witnesses to Washington, if they could have found the witnesses to fill them. The fact is that the industry failed to produce a single resident of the Territory who was willing to stand up before your committee and be counted as against statehood for Alaska.

So it is with deep regret that the proponents of statehood for Alaska view the conversion of five members of your committee to the minority position on this bill. As a lifelong Republican expressing the sentiment of a large number of Alaskan Republicans, who are working for statehood, I especially regret that the opposition seems to be led by members of my own political party. It is good to note, however, the Republican sentiment or statehood is strongly represented in the majority report, though actually, of course, the issue is in no way partisan.

Someone has said, "No power on earth is strong enough to withstand the force of an idea whose time has come." It is the humble opinion of this Alaskan that a majority of the Members of the United States Senate will recognize that statehood for Alaska is an idea whose time has come. I am sustained in that faith by the splendid support given the statehood bill by those members

of your committee who are responsible for the majority report.

With deep appreciation of their tireless work, I am,

Respectfully yours,
MILDRED R. HERMANN,
Secretary, Alaska Statehood Committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has 15 minutes, the Senator from Wyoming, 7 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as the mover of the motion to recommit, I believe I have the right to close the debate. If that is the case, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has no rule on that subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had hoped to have a few minutes. I think it is unquestionable, under any rule of law in any court of which I have ever heard, that the mover has the closing time, and I would ask that that rule be applied here.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very anxious indeed to accommodate my friends of the opposition, but the Senator from Georgia this morning refused to guarantee that no Senator on his side, after recommitment, would assert the claim that statehood for Hawaii had been defeated by the recommitment of the Alaska statehood bill; and I want to reserve 3 or 4 minutes of my time to deal, very imperfectly I grant, with the incisive logic and the great skill in debate of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the flattery of the Senator from Wyoming, I suggest that we permit him to maintain his straw man until the time to vote on the motion, and that the Senator from Florida yield the remainder of the time to whomever he may desire.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield the remaining 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with the limited time at my disposal it is manifestly impossible for me to do other than make a few general observations on this matter. I wish first to say that I regret very much that the distinguished Senator from Illinois saw fit to label this as purely a sectional issue. I have observed, Mr. President, in times past, that when we of the South vote with our Democratic brethren from other sections who delight in the label of "liberals," we are very fine and purified Senators; no objection whatever is found to us. But when a majority of us should happen to be opposed to the views of those who delight in the label of "liberals," the red flag is raised, "Contagion here—Southern Democrat—Beware—You will be condemned if you are found anywhere in this vicinity."

I regret very much that that red hering, or red shirt rather, should have

been dragged through this debate. I wonder how it makes the southern Democrats who happen to be voting against the motion to recommit feel, to find that they have been labeled in effect, at least by inference, as traitors to the South, because they are found cleansed and purified and in full stature of statesmanship because they are voting with the "great liberal" element in the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say it was impossible for me to have completely analyzed this bill, in the light of the fact that there were no hearings explaining it. It is quite clear to me, however, that this bill grants to the proposed State of Alaska powers in the Department of the Interior which no bureau should have over any sovereign State. Alaska should either come in as a State or it should retain its present status, or some other status, as a Territory, until the time when the Department of the Interior is willing to relinquish the complete powers which they hold over that Territory and permit it to become in fact a State.

The Senator from Wyoming, in his discussion with the Senator from Ohio, talked about all of this land which was going to be given. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that under the terms of this bill it will be 5 years before the proposed State will get an acre. In the 5 years' time then, the Secretary of the Interior grants to the sovereign State, which will have been in existence for 5 years, 20,000,000 acres.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The Senator is not quite accurate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not have the benefit of hearings on the bill to completely elucidate it, but that is the construction I place upon this bill, that it is a step-up job, that the Secretary of the Interior has these vast powers over this proposed State, and, as it limps along, trying to become a full-fledged State, the bill grants additional lands. I am sure I am correct in that part of the statement.

Mr. President, if Alaska is to have statehood it should be a State; it should not be a principality of the Department of the Interior. I make that statement as an American, without regard to the section of the country from whence I come.

We have heard a variety of arguments regarding this bill. Some Senators, in advocating the measure, have said that the new devices and means of transportation which are available have brought Alaska closer; and, of course, that is true. But another one argued with equal seriousness that the people of Alaska should not be compelled to come to Washington to testify on this bill, because it was so far away and such great expense would be incurred.

Mr. President, I want to say that if the officials of Alaska had been as diligent in appearing before the committee as they have been in buttonholing Senators with respect to the pending bill, there could have been hearings. They are all here.

We have before us a case in which a great many legislative agents, I might call them, have been brought in to bring pressure to bear upon Senators to vote against the motion to recommit and to

vote to admit Alaska without hearings and without having a complete understanding of the bill.

I want to say, Mr. President, that this is one of the dangers which confront the American people in legislative matters. There is great pressure brought to bear upon Senators by organizations, and there is no countervailing force to resist it, and when a man does undertake to resist it on grounds that might not be in anywise connected with that which has been charged, he is accused of making a purely sectional appeal.

Reference has been made to party platforms. Perhaps I am not as regular as are some Democrats, and I cheerfully admit that I am not, but I want to say that we have a very sad picture in this country of both political parties in writing platforms yielding to almost any group that promises them a few votes. Indeed, 6 or 12 delegates from territories can have a great deal of influence in writing platforms if they commit themselves to the candidate for the nomination who controls the platform committee.

I do not consider it as being any reason for the Senate to abandon its wise policy of careful scrutiny of legislation merely because it might appear in both party platforms.

Mr. President, I want to say only a word or two to those who have raised the cry that this bill should be enacted forthwith because of certain Communist propaganda being spread over the world. We are told, in all seriousness, by eminent men, that because of Communist propaganda that we are holding the people of Alaska in a colonial status, we should immediately grant statehood to Alaska. That argument could be applied to Puerto Rico, to Guam, or to other islands. It is brought to bear only on this piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I was never more serious in my life than when I say that this constant repeating of the statement that we must legislate to combat Russian propaganda is making us a fear satellite of the Soviet Union. If we ever see the day when Senators will be influenced by that argument, we are fast approaching the destruction of this Republic. We do not have to combat Soviet propaganda by doing unusual and undesirable things against our better judgment.

Let Russia compare the economy of Alaska with that of any spot behind the iron curtain. Tell them to look at the wages paid in Alaska. Even the Federal Government pays 25 percent more to every Federal employee in Alaska than it pays to those in continental United States. Let them see the housing which has been constructed in Alaska. Let them see the highest wage scales known under the American flag, and refute Russian propaganda with the truth, not with a state of confusion. May God forbid that we should ever rely on specious claims and pleas, or we shall surely be slaves of the Russians even as are those unfortunates who are behind the iron curtain and subject to Russian bayonets.

Mr. President, the question of hearings has been very ably discussed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. For my part, I wish to compliment him for

the courage he has shown in coming into this body, a relatively new Member, and insisting upon being recognized as a Senator of the United States from a sovereign State.

Mr. President, we should not abandon our system of hearings because hearings have been held at some time in the past. I was intrigued with the argument of the Senator from Oregon that hearings had been held. Mr. President, we have hearings upon tax bills for this Nation each and every year. We have exhaustive hearings each and every year upon appropriation bills. But when the very serious question was raised by the Senator from Florida as to whether the economy of the Territory of Alaska would support statehood, no hearings were allowed to determine the true status of the tax system in Alaska, the true relationship of income to expenditures, the nature of the expenditures now being borne by the Federal Government which the proposed State would be compelled to bear.

I submit that hearings 3 years ago could not possibly reflect any light on the subject, in view of the changing conditions which exist today. If there ever was a case where hearings should have been held, it is this particular measure and on those specific questions.

Mr. President, I announce it as a general proposition that when there are members of a committee who have not been in a previous Congress, as has been disclosed to be the case in connection with the present issue, who earnestly and zealously have sought to have hearings upon a measure, they are entitled to have such hearings, even though hearings were held during the last Congress. I submit that as a proposition which is essential to the orderly conduct of legislation and the life of a parliamentary system.

I do not wish to labor that question. I have served as chairman of committees. I would vote to recommit any bill which I support, if any members of the committee requested hearings and were not allowed them. I know how onerous it is to conduct long hearings. I suppose I sit through as many hours of committee hearings as do any other Members of the Senate, but a subcommittee can always be appointed, of which the Senator who desires the hearing is a member. We do not have to have the entire committee sitting around in every instance to conduct the hearings. The matter can be left to a subcommittee to deal with, and let that particular Member of the Senate who desires hearings have that right which, in my judgment, is inherent in each Member of this body, to produce the facts by his own questions, instead of having a 2-year-old dish of hearings served up to him.

I want to make just one more mention of the importance of hearings, Mr. President. The motion provides for recommitting the bill with instructions to have hearings. There has been an effort to drag in the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], who did not make the motion, said "Territories" instead of "Territory." It is claimed that that affects the Hawaiian

statehood bill, but, of course, that claim is completely untenable.

Mr. President, I have never been one who could exactly define who is a liberal and who is a conservative. It never disturbed me deeply. I have been called a reactionary in my time. I have also been called a radical, both charges having been pressed with equal vigor. Neither charge has greatly disturbed me. But this I do assert. A true liberal will give his colleagues and the American people hearings on important issues.

I have been amazed at the so-called liberal newspapers, those who boast of their liberalism, and at some of my colleagues who do not shy from the appellation of "liberal," who talk about their being great liberals and who have been so insistent on pushing this bill through without granting hearings. Not one of these great metropolitan newspapers that boast of their liberalism has even mentioned in their editorials the very solid and substantial fact that no hearings have been held on the pending question in this Congress.

Mr. President, if it be contended that one is a reactionary who insists upon the full right of speech for the American people, and to the right of examination and investigation by Senators, then I will accept the title, because I know in my own heart that a true liberal is one who upholds the right of all Members of the Senate to make an investigation. That is truer than ever when six members of a committee vote for hearings, and two or three of them insist vigorously upon having them.

Mr. President, the bill should be re-committed for hearings.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise now merely to say for the RECORD that after prolonged association with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], over 18 years of service in this body, I can testify that he is a liberal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia has demonstrated it to me on a dozen or more occasions. One of the occasions which is clearest in my mind is that which took place during the last Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, when a motion was made to take up the Alaska statehood bill. The problem before the Senate at that time was whether Senators who favored Alaskan statehood would have an opportunity to vote by taking up the bill, or whether there would be a filibuster to prevent a vote. There was a filibuster, but I am happy to say that the Senator from Georgia did not participate in it. The Senator from Georgia was liberal enough to permit the matter to come up, because he is willing to have Senators vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike interrupting the Senator from Wyoming in the limited time we have, but he does me more credit than I deserve when he absolves me from participation in all the extended educational discussions which have taken place in the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia deserves all the commendation and all the applause that I or anyone else can give him, but a filibuster by any other name is still a filibuster.

If Members of this body wish to know the reason why the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs voted against holding further hearings, it is that the committee knew, with all the hearings at hand, that if another hearing were granted the report of the bills would be delayed and we would be face to face with a filibuster to prevent the bills from being taken up, just as we were in the last Congress. I cannot weep with my friend because we did not hold a dilatory hearing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit Senate bill 50.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McMahon
Anderson	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Benton	Hill	Moody
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Nixon
Byrd	Jenner	O'Connor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnson, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Seaton
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Duff	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Ferguson	Malone	Taft
Flanders	Martin	Thye
Frear	Maybank	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Underwood
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hayden	McKellar	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with certain instructions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If he were present and voting, I am informed that he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is absent because of illness, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business, and his pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has been announced previously.

On this vote the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—45

Bennett	Hayden	McKellar
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Connally	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Taft
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarran	Wiley
George	McClellan	Young

NAYS—44

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Anderson	Holland	Murray
Benton	Humphrey	Neely
Cain	Hunt	Nixon
Case	Ives	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kefauver	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Seaton
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman
Eaton	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey
Gillette	McFarland	Watkins
Green	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Moody	

NOT VOTING—7

Carlson	Lodge	Welker
Dirksen	McCarthy	
Eastland	Smith, N. J.	

So Mr. SMATHERS' motion to recommit was agreed to.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What is the joint resolution to which the Senator refers?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is the so-called submerged lands measure.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator have any intention of taking up the Hawaiian statehood bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no intention of making such a motion at this time. The statehood bills have, in effect, been considered together. The Alaskan statehood bill was recommitted for the purpose of holding hearings. No more hearings were held on the Hawaiian statehood bill than on the Alaskan statehood bill.

We have had the Alaskan statehood bill under consideration for approximately 4 weeks. Even deducting the time taken for the purpose of Lincoln's

birthday addresses, we have devoted 3 weeks to the consideration of the bill.

The joint resolution relating to the submerged lands is very important, and I feel that we should take it up and consider it at this time. We need development of the submerged lands for the benefit of the national defense, and we should not proceed to consider legislation granting statehood to Hawaii after such a vote as we have just had, and after having consumed all this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—
Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from California. He was first on his feet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would a substitute motion to take up Senate bill 49, Calendar No. 296, which is the statehood bill for Hawaii, be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that an amendment of that kind would not be in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the motion of the Senator from Arizona is subject to a yeas-and-nays vote, and if that motion is rejected, will a motion then be in order to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 49, Calendar No. 296, the bill granting statehood to Hawaii?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any Senator who can obtain the floor will have the right to make a motion to take up any other bill, if the pending motion is rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I still have the floor. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is debatable. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the joint resolution which the Senator from Arizona moves to take up also comes from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I should like to say, as chairman of the committee, having been on the floor throughout the 4 weeks, which the Senator from Arizona has mentioned as having been consumed in the discussion of the Alaska statehood bill, that it would be overworking the chairman of the committee just a little bit if the Senate were to proceed now to the consideration of the very debatable and controversial joint resolution on submerged lands. I feel that the record before us indicates that we should proceed to the consideration of the Hawaii statehood bill. I hope that the Senator from Arizona will agree to proceed to the consideration of S. 49, which is on the calendar and which stands in equal strength with the Alaska bill.

We have heard a great deal of argument today to the effect that Senators should be accorded the privilege of having their expressed desires carried out.

When the Democratic Policy Committee met last year, near the close of the last session of Congress, it was stated that the statehood bills would have priority at this session of Congress. The Senator from Arizona, who has worked and voted in favor of the Alaska statehood bill, spoke about the legislative program for this session. I shall read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 10, page 13681. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], on the previous page of the RECORD, made reference to the Hawaii statehood bill. I took the floor and I said:

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad that the Senator from California has referred to the statehood bills. I believe the RECORD is clear that the policy committee of the majority party in the Senate, at one of its meetings during this session, decided that the statehood bills would have priority of consideration at the beginning of the new session.

The Governor of Hawaii has been in the city during the past week or 10 days. I have had numerous conferences with him. I know from him and others that the people of the Territory of Hawaii are waiting anxiously upon the action of this Congress with respect to the statehood legislation.

I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that it will be my purpose, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to take the earliest practicable step in the new session to bring up for consideration the statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii. The people of those two Territories are entitled to have a decision made by Congress, and nothing will be left undone at the beginning of the next session to bring that about.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

In those words I believe I made my position perfectly clear. After I had taken my seat the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] went on to say:

Mr. McFARLAND. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been very diligent in moving the statehood bills forward not only in his own committee but before the policy committee. The bills were not taken up for floor action, as he well knows, because we were working almost entirely on important national defense matters and appropriation bills. Of course, they will be given early priority in the next session.

The District of Columbia home rule bill is in the same category but should not take as long to consider. I feel it should be disposed of promptly and I have agreed that we would make the fats and oils bill the second order of business. That bill, also, will not take very long to consider, in my judgment. Thereafter we will decide on the order of succeeding bills but the statehood bills and the measure referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are both on the calendar and will receive our early attention.

I wish to invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that the RECORD is thus perfectly clear that the plan which was laid down by the policy committee has been carried out, with one exception. Alaska was given priority. The fats and oil bill was taken up. Home rule for the District of Columbia was taken up. There remains only the Hawaii statehood bill. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I shall vote, if a yeas-and-nays vote is had, against taking up the submerged lands bill until we have had a vote on the Hawaii statehood bill.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understood the Senator from Wyoming to say that the agreement had been carried out with one exception, namely, the Hawaii statehood bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the exception also of the bill offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] providing for the establishment of a joint committee on fiscal policy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Arkansas has been very patient.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I voted my sentiments on the Alaska bill. I understood that following consideration of the Alaska statehood bill either the tidelands bill or the bill to create a joint committee on the budget would next be called up. I am ready to proceed with the bill to create a joint committee on the budget. It is a bill which has for its purpose bringing into our Government in this time of crisis some measure of economy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill of the Senator from Arkansas is very important. However, the record is that the statehood bills had priority. I am very firmly of the opinion that the Hawaii statehood bill can be disposed of very quickly if we can get a vote on it. I am ready to vote on the Hawaii statehood bill this afternoon.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!
Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much hope that the motion of the Senator from Arizona, the majority

leader, will prevail. The tidelands measure has been pending before Congress for a long period of time. It is of the highest importance that the bill be voted upon and some production had. There is no production from these lands now. There cannot be any production until some kind of tidelands bill is passed. I very much hope that Senators, regardless of their opinion on the measure—whether they intend to vote for or against it—will follow the leadership of the majority leader and bring the bill before the Senate for action. No doubt a number of amendments will be submitted by certain Senators.

I plead with the Senate not to reject the motion which has been made by the Senator from Arizona, but to proceed to consider the so-called tidelands joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 20.

I am very strongly in favor of having the Senate take action on that measure. The Senate, the highest authority in this land, should not permit the tidelands to remain endlessly without development, without exploration, without having any activity in regard to oil and gas take place.

I plead with Senators not to reject the motion the Senator from Arizona has made, but to support the motion and let us have an opportunity to obtain an enactment of some kind in regard to this pressing matter.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I seek recognition in my own right.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator from Missouri will pardon me for just a moment, he may have the floor.

Mr. President, in regard to the program, I wish to say that I think the majority has given a great deal of consideration and a great deal of thought to bills similar to Senate bill 50.

First we considered the bill providing home rule for the District of Columbia. We took a great deal of time in considering that bill.

Now we have been considering the bill proposing statehood for Alaska. Of this session 2 months have elapsed. I do not know how much time we shall have to spend in consideration of measures such as the Hawaiian statehood bill.

However, let me say to the Senate that the Government needs the oil which lies under the submerged lands. Senators can talk about being ready to vote for statehood for Hawaii, but they know there will not be a vote on that measure this evening; there can be no question about that.

If the majority had not pushed hard to have the Alaskan statehood bill considered by the Senate, do Senators think that bill would have been brought up at this session? Perhaps I am wrong, but I doubt that it would have been considered. Now we have had a vote and that measure has been recommitted.

Both of these two Territories stand in the same position, and they should be treated alike. I say to my good friend the Senator from Wyoming that it is not right to give statehood to Hawaii and to reject Alaska's application for statehood.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that the two statehood bills stand in the same position and should be treated in the same way. Why is not the Senator willing to have both bills treated in the same way and to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on the second statehood bill? Is there any reason why that should not be done?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senate already has recommitted the Alaskan statehood bill because hearings were not held upon the two statehood bills. Personally, I voted for hearings; I thought we could have saved time by having hearings. However, a majority of the committee voted against holding hearings on these bills.

But, Mr. President, the Senate has decided that hearings should be held on the Alaskan statehood bill. If those who wish to have hearings held on the Alaskan statehood bill are entitled to have them held, they are also entitled to have hearings held on the Hawaiian statehood bill.

Mr. President, we need the time which now is available. Two months of the present session have already elapsed. Important proposed legislation is ready and waiting to be considered. If we do not move on, we may find that we will not have time to consider much vital legislation. If we have any extra time, we can consider bringing up the Hawaiian statehood bill at such time.

Mr. President, last year the tidelands bill, one of the bills relating to the submerged lands, was passed by the House of Representatives, but the Senate did not take action on that bill. Long hearings on that subject have been held.

I say to my good friend the Senator from Wyoming that he does not need to have any fear that he will be overworked in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 20. There are many other Senators who will talk about the joint resolution. There are a good many Senators who are more interested in it than is the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. If we do not take up that measure now, we may not take it up at this session.

Those who wish to dictate to the Senate and to say that the Senate must do this or do that, in this way or that way, and who talk about what was decided by the majority policy committee, should bear in mind that I told that committee what I was given permission to do, and everyone of the members of the committee, except the Senator from Wyoming, was in favor of having the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution relating to the submerged lands. I mention that only because it was brought up by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the able majority leader whether it is true that in the amendment which was made a part of the motion which was just agreed to, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was directed to make a study covering both Territories, pro-

vided the bill was recommitted; I refer to the Monroney amendment or modification of the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. McFARLAND. I assume that that amendment is sufficiently broad to cover all Territories, including Hawaii; the language is "other Territories," and the Senate voted for that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the Senate voted to the committee instructions to make a study covering both Territories; is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to say to the able majority leader that all along I have taken the attitude of favoring statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. However, I have firmly believed that we should treat them together and should bring up both the statehood bills and pass them at the same time. For that reason, if a motion is made to have the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of the bill proposing statehood for Hawaii, I shall certainly vote against taking up the Hawaiian statehood bill at this particular time.

If the Senator from Arizona will yield to me for a further moment, in order to permit me to ask just one question, I should like to ask the question, because it relates to a matter with which I am greatly concerned, and is one with which all other Members of the Senate should be concerned, namely, when are we going to reach the question of the Japanese peace treaty? Last year we indicated that we would take up that treaty at an early date, and the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] urged us to take up the Japanese peace treaty, even if it was necessary to have a special session called in the winter, in order to do so. By means of various statements which were issued, we said that treaty would be taken up very soon after this session of Congress began. However, 2 months of the session have now elapsed.

So I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona whether he can tell me where that matter stands in the legislative schedule.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me answer my good friend from Alabama by saying that I am in favor of having the Senate consider the Japanese peace treaty at an early date. We have not brought up other matters thus far because we did not wish to interrupt consideration of the Alaska statehood bill. However, merely because we have had consideration of one statehood bill does not mean that we have to stymie the whole session by having statehood debate for another month. Where shall we be unless we can work out some understanding regarding the statehood bills? It may be possible to do so; I do not know.

However, while we are talking about them, we can pass the joint resolution relating to submerged lands; and it is important that we do so.

In view of the situation in which the Senate finds itself today, we can proceed with some other measure until we can make a check and can determine what is best to be done.

COMPENSATION OF LOBBYISTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on the desk of each Senator is a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26. Beginning at page 1451, and for the next 45 pages, Senators will find quarterly reports submitted by registered lobbyists.

I have taken the trouble to have compiled some figures based upon the earnings of the various lobbyists for the quarter, and have multiplied those earnings by four, because we may assume that they earned something for the previous three quarters, although there may be an error in such assumption.

Senators may be interested to know that the following result was obtained: The number of lobbyists receiving under \$5,000 a year was 170; the number receiving between \$5,000 and \$10,000 a year, 144; the number receiving between \$10,000 and \$15,000, 73; the number receiving between \$15,000 and \$20,000, 37; those receiving from \$20,000 to \$25,000, 21; from \$25,000 to \$35,000, 22; from \$35,000 to \$50,000, 18. Those who received as compensation for their lobbying more than \$50,000 during the past year numbered 40.

There may be errors as to the number of lobbyists in each category, because the actual earnings may not have been the same during the previous three quarters as for the fourth quarter of 1951. It is also possible that some of the fourth-quarter reports were not correctly made. Nevertheless, the figures clearly indicate that, so far as private industry is concerned, it is willing, in more than 100 instances, to pay more for its legislative representation in Washington than are the people of the United States.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to know what investigation of this subject, if any, is being conducted by any committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. All that has been done has been to carry out the provision of law which provides that any person engaged in lobbying shall file a report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has any committee of Congress investigated this subject, or is it now under investigation by any committee of Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not that I know of at the moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator believe that a committee of Congress should investigate the subject? Everyone else is being investigated except the people who harass us to earn their living.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are so many investigations now under way that I do not know whether we ought to add any more expense for that purpose.

I wish to point out that what appears in the RECORD is merely a brief statement of the name of the lobbyist, by whom he is employed, and the compensation he receives. Anyone interested in obtaining further information can obtain it in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate or the Office of the Clerk of the House, where the complete reports are filed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, lobbyists are paid huge salaries because of their influence, or supposed influence.

Mr. HAYDEN. I assume that must be true. Otherwise they would not be receiving such large incomes.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator give the figures as to the total amount reported by lobbyists as being their compensation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not totaled up the amounts received. I have merely divided the lobbyists into categories. In a case in which a lobbyist might have received compensation from more than one source, I have added up what he receives during the quarter from all sources, and have multiplied it by four, on the assumption that he received the same amount in each of the previous three quarters. In that way I arrived at the conclusion that there were 40 lobbyists in Washington who were receiving more than \$50,000; 18 receiving between \$35,000 and \$50,000; 22 receiving between \$25,000 and \$35,000; 21 receiving between \$20,000 and \$25,000, and so forth.

PEACE, OR MORE WAR?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, America faces dangerous days. The years just ahead will be years of thoughtful re-examination. They may be years of fateful decision. We are at the crossroads in our national life. It will be tragic if we take the wrong road.

WE HAVE BLUNDERED INTO WAR

Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson have blundered into one war. They may be steering us into more war. Congress did not declare war in Korea. Mr. Truman made war. Mr. Truman talks peace while he makes war.

In 1945, when Mr. Truman became President, the United States was the greatest potential instrument for peace the world had ever known. The first thing Mr. Truman did was to go to Potsdam and there resort to a habitual breeder of wars—the secret treaty.

Instead of repudiating the disastrous, behind-the-back agreement made by his predecessor at Yalta, Mr. Truman chose to go along with the State Department "pinks." He confirmed the deals that gave much of Eastern Europe to Russia, that cost us the friendship of the Republic of China, and that now threaten our position in Japan.

The folly of Mr. Truman's course is now evident. By every test the Truman-Acheson policy has failed. Let us take one yardstick as an example: In April of 1945, there were approximately 200,000,000 people behind the iron curtain under the Communist regimes. Today there are 800,000,000 behind the iron curtain under Communist regimes.

WAR—CAUSE AND REMEDY

The founding fathers, who set up on the North American Continent the experiment in free government that we call the Republic of the United States of America, knew a great deal about war.

They and their immediate ancestors had had many opportunities to observe it in the countries beyond the seas. The soil of Europe has been drenched with human blood every few years since the dawn of history.

Even before we have any authentic record, there were wars over there like the Trojan War, in which we are told, the face of a woman, Helen of Troy, "launched a thousand ships and burnt the topless towers of Ilium." We read that the shape of a woman's nose—Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt—changed the map of Europe. Then, one day a British sailor came into port and told a harrowing tale of how he was seized by the Spaniards, who cut off his ear. So the King of England went to war with the King of Spain, and before they got through thousands of their subjects on both sides had been killed.

The founding fathers gave thoughtful consideration to the cause of this incessant bloodletting. They put their finger on the cause. They said, "The cause is too much power—too much authority in the hands of one man or a small group of men." Then they set about to devise a remedy. The remedy they wrote into the Constitution of the United States. It is so plain and simple that any man or woman, boy or girl who came after them could understand it. It was as simple as this: "Congress shall declare war." No more, no less. But Mr. Truman ignored the injunction of the founding fathers. The first the Congress knew of the Korean war was from a press release that was read in the Senate by the then majority leader, former Senator Lucas, of Illinois. This press release said that 24 hours before, the President had ordered our troops into action in Korea. As soon as this press release was read, as some of the Senators who are present will remember, I immediately rose in the Senate and made the point that the President and those about him had arrogated to themselves the right to declare war, which was the duty and responsibility of the Congress.

In Korea, Mr. Truman made war upon the recommendation of his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. For the first time in our history, the United States is involved in a major war by the direction of the President alone. The consent of the Congress was not asked, and it has never been given. As Mrs. Jesse Hollar, of Camden Point, Mo., wrote me the other day: "If we can get along without a Congress, we could save a lot of money." Certainly no one wishes for America a military dictatorship.

MR. TRUMAN REVERSED HIMSELF

Truman administration apologists, weeping crocodile tears, say plaintively, "What could we do? We had to stop the Communist aggression." Mr. President, they purposely omit the important fact that the administration had, less than a year before our troops were ordered into Korea by the President, withdrawn our troops from South Korea, because they were told by military advisers that the peninsula was militarily indefensible. Then Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State, was sent to the National

Press Club in Washington, where correspondents from all over the world gathered, to make an important pronouncement. He said that our line was drawn through Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines, and that that was the line we would defend. He made no reference to Korea. It is generally conceded now that, had not this assurance been given by the State Department itself, the men in the Kremlin would not have ordered their troops to move into South Korea. When Mr. Truman suddenly, without warning, reversed our policy and ordered our troops into the Korean war, Mr. Stalin was probably the most surprised man in the world.

KOREA IS A UNITED STATES WAR

The Trumanites have come up with another choice piece of propaganda. They say that this is not a United States war at all—this is a United Nations war. There are three reasons why this contention is unsound.

First, we were engaged in the war in Korea for 24 hours before any deliberative Assembly of the United Nations requested the member states to furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea. Mr. Truman made war, then went to the United Nations and asked help in a war in which the United States was already engaged.

Second, the United States has furnished 90 percent of the troops and has sustained 95 percent of the casualties, not including the South Koreans. When Mr. Truman sent out an S O S to the members of the United Nations—many, incidentally, had been the beneficiaries of our largess under the Marshall plan—and asked them to send troops to Korea, he got regrets to his invitation. One by one these nations said, "We are sorry, we are just as sorry as we can be. We will send token forces, but American boys will have to do most of the fighting, and American taxpayers will have to foot the bill."

Third, the act of Congress which permitted the United States to join the United Nations contemplates that under no circumstances will the Armed Forces of the United States, the young men of America, be ordered into battle without the consent of the American Congress. To call this a United Nations war is what the late Al Smith would have denominated a "phonus bolognus."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator from Missouri familiar with the fact that when the United Nations Charter was adopted, the specific question was asked of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, "Can the United Nations involve the United States in a war, without a vote on the part of Congress?"

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. And before the Congress ratified the United Nations Charter, it relied, did it not, upon that promise on the part of Democratic administration—a promise they have broken?

Mr. KEM. The Senator from North Dakota is entirely correct, and that in-

tion appears clearly in the Enabling Act which was passed by the Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri referring to the Participation Act of 1945 in which Congress authorized the President to proceed to make agreements, with the understanding and the requirement that they would be submitted to Congress before any police troops were established?

Mr. KEM. I am referring to the act under which the United States became a member of the United Nations organization.

Mr. WATKINS. We became a member by the ratification of the treaty, but I am calling the Senator's attention to the Participation Act.

Mr. KEM. There was an enabling act passed at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. It is sometimes referred to as the Participation Act.

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. In that act it was provided that agreements which were to be negotiated would be submitted to the Congress for approval. It also set forth that no Armed Forces of the United States would be furnished except those covered by agreements.

Mr. KEM. Exactly. So I say that act clearly contemplates that the young men of America will not be ordered into action without the consent of the American Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. So the President circumvented the conditions of the United Nations Charter and of the participation act.

Mr. KEM. He violated the spirit of the charter and the actual letter of the charter, as well as the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the United Nations was never able to negotiate any agreements for police forces to enforce the peace or to engage in action such as we are now engaged in in Korea?

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. No machinery whatsoever had been established for a police force, and nothing had been done in this country other than to pass the enabling act or participation act of 1945. No agreements had ever been submitted to the Congress for ratification; no request had ever been made to the Congress for the right to send troops.

Mr. KEM. I think that is quite correct; and there is no more reason to call it a United Nations war than to call it a San Salvador war or a Honduras war or an Iraq war, or any other words that might come to one's mind. It is a United States war, a Truman-Acheson war, an unconstitutional war. It is an undeclared war, and we cannot make anything else out of it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. It has been said many times by apologists for the President for taking us into this war that the Congress itself probably would have declared the war and authorized him to take the action he did take if the question ever had been submitted to the Con-

gress. Does the Senator from Missouri agree with that statement?

Mr. KEM. The grace of prophecy was one of many that were not present at my birth. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet. I do not know what Congress would have done if the matter had been fully and carefully debated. If the fact that we were not prepared to go into Korea, that we had been told by military authorities that it was militarily undefensible—if those facts had been brought to the attention of the Congress, I do not know what the Congress would have done.

Mr. President, I have no illusions or delusions about the superior wisdom of individual Members of Congress, but I do have a profound respect for and a profound confidence in the constitutional procedures of the Republic.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, all the matters which the Senator has mentioned, the matter of separation, the matter of whether we were ready to enter into a war of that kind, whether we had the approval of our military leaders, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others who would be responsible for conducting a war of that kind—all that could have been inquired into if it had been brought to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. KEM. Exactly.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that the representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff previously testified before Senate committees and in their testimony had advised Congress and the people of the United States that staying in Korea was not desirable because the position was untenable if the Russians were in control of Siberia, Manchuria, and China.

Mr. KEM. I think the Senator from Utah is quite correct. I appreciate the point he has made. But, Mr. President, I think it is idle and futile for us to undertake to predict what might have been done if the Constitution had been followed. Mr. Truman said he went into Korea to establish constitutional government there. Korea is now a barren waste, and we find that constitutional government may be slipping away from us at home.

The Truman-Acheson war in Korea has been under way longer than the American participation in World War I, World War I, which lasted 585 days, ended in total victory for America. The Truman war in Korea is about 600 days old, and victory is not yet in sight. Who knows how many newly-dug graves, marked with white wooden crosses, lie ahead? Who among us can say that if the present peace negotiations in Korea are successful—which we hope and pray they will be—that it will be a victory for America?

A few days after he made war in Korea Mr. Truman said: "We are not at war." Korea will work out all right, he said. But it has not worked out all right. We in Missouri know that Mr. Truman's projects often have not worked out all

right. "The nurses know," says Lt. Helen Ely, of the United States Air Force Nurses Corps, "as most Americans do not, that this war is the worst in all history—not in scale but in its almost unbelievable primitive intensity. Our men are having to unlearn the rules of ordinary warfare. They are becoming experienced at hand-to-hand fighting, learning how to break bones with their bare hands, how to kill with knives, clubs, and stones."

ASKED TO DIE, BUT DENIED THE RIGHT TO WIN

No, Korea has not "worked out all right." It has not worked out at all. For the first time in our history our boys are asked to fight and die, and at the same time denied the right to win.

Someone had blundered.
Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die.

Our bumbling administration, responsible for the tragedy of China, for the unnecessary war in Korea, is trying to sell itself to the people as the peace party. I will leave it to the mothers and fathers of the 106,000 American dead and wounded in battle in Korea to expose this untruth. I will leave it to them to label such propaganda for what it is. The Truman-Acheson war now ranks among the longest, the most bitter, and the most costly of wars in our history.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator aware that in the past 50 years, under three Democratic administrations, the American people have suffered more than 1,400,000 casualties in Democratic wars, and no casualties whatever under Republican administrations?

Mr. KEM. The Senator is quite right. Mr. President, in one generation, the American people have been plunged into three major wars—the worst wars in the history of our Nation. Can the same party and some of the same men who have led us three times into war, be trusted to lead us into a just and lasting peace? Can we continue to entrust America's future to leadership that removes a great general because he dares advocate victory and retains a Secretary of State, who will not turn his back on a convicted traitor? MacArthur and Acheson—what a contrast.

A POLICY FOR PEACE

There are those who have again raised the cry of "isolationist." I am not authorized to speak for anyone else, but, for my part, I am neither an isolationist nor am I an interferist. I do not believe in isolating ourselves from other nations, nor do I believe in interfering in the internal affairs of other nations.

I believe in peace. I believe we should study how to live at peace with our neighbors as one of the most important and useful of the arts and sciences. I believe that peace can best be had by frank, above-board foreign policy based on sound constitutional procedure.

I shall continue to oppose permitting the President to make war on his own—war that must be fought by millions of

voiceless people. No one should be given a blank check on the blood of the young men of America.

We cannot remind ourselves too often of the words of Washington's Farewell Address, which is so fittingly read every year in the Senate of the United States—on February 22, the birthday of the Father of our Country. Washington said:

If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Korea must be an unforgettable lesson to us. Never again must we permit one man or a small group of men to arrogate to themselves the power to plunge this Nation into a state of war. Never again must Congress stand idly by while the President of the United States usurps its power to declare war.

In the past 19 years there has been entirely too much evasion of the fundamental law of the land. We have witnessed instance after instance of attempts to circumvent the Constitution. To the detriment of America, many of these attempts have been successful. The tragedy of Korea is only the inevitable consequence of having in public office men of limited vision and with a great thirst for power, who, though sworn to uphold the Constitution, consider it an outmoded instrument and treat it with a measure of contempt.

It is not too late for Congress to reassert itself. If America is to remain free—if America is to have peace in the days to come—the Congress must serve unmistakable notice on the President of the United States that it will tolerate no more of his war making; that henceforth before American boys are sent to die in distant foreign lands the elected representatives of the people in the Congress must by majority action approve an act of war.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Let it be said to the everlasting credit of the senior Senator from Missouri that he is one Senator who raised his voice at the time the action was taken by the President to send troops to Korea, and to the best of my recollection he opposed it. However, if I may say so, many Senators at that time did not care to assert that responsibility. In the argument the Senator is making, I believe he should also propose a remedy, for Senators seem not to have been too anxious to go on record as to whether troops should have been sent into Korea.

So far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, he was engaged in a political campaign for his own reelection, and took the position that the President probably had no choice in the matter as it developed at that time. I sometimes wonder whether Members of the Senate actually want to go on record in

the matter of our troops going into Korea.

Mr. KEM. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that I am not here to judge my colleagues. I recall that my seat mate, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Warkins], also raised his voice to assert the authority of the Senate, on that fateful day, June 27, 1950, when the press release had already been issued by the White House and read in the Senate. Well do I remember that press release, Mr. President. It contained more than 400 words, but nowhere did the word "Congress" appear. "I—I—I," said the President, "am sending our forces into action in Korea."

Mr. LONG. I will say that, to his eternal credit, the senior Senator from Missouri did affirmatively state his position. He said he thought it was a mistake, and that such action should not have been taken. I recall having raised the issue before, and he reminded me that that had been his position.

However, it has been the impression of the junior Senator from Louisiana that Congress could have spoken on this matter if a majority of Senators had agreed to join in a declaration, one way or the other, as to whether they felt the President was right or wrong at the time the decision was made. Some Senators who may have been under the impression at the time that it was the correct thing to do may have changed their minds since the action was taken, but they have not actually gone on record as saying so.

Mr. KEM. It may well have been as the Senator from Louisiana has indicated, that some Senators were at first of one opinion, and it may also be that they would have changed that opinion when the question was tried out here in the crucible of debate, when the constitutional implications of it were brought to their attention.

Regardless of what the ultimate action may be, I should like to say to the junior Senator from Louisiana that it is a different thing for us to engage in a constitutional war on the one hand and to engage in an unconstitutional war on the other hand. It may be that after full and careful consideration, the two Houses of Congress, acting within their constitutional orbit, would have approved the sending of our Armed Forces into Korea. I do not pretend to say that that might not have been done.

The matter of war psychology is a very difficult thing to predict, but I do say that we would have been better off then, and we shall be better off now and in the future, if we steadfastly adhere to the constitutional procedures of the Republic.

Mr. LONG. The Senator realizes, does he not, that if this Nation had paused long enough for the Congress to have deliberated on whether troops should have been sent into Korea, the Communists probably would have taken all the territory in Korea?

Mr. KEM. I do not agree that there was any justification for violating the Constitution. I recall the dramatic action at the time President Wilson appeared before a joint session of Congress, which resulted in prompt action on the part of the Congress. I recall,

too, and only a few years ago, the dramatic appearance of President Franklin D. Roosevelt before a joint session of Congress. Many Senators now present doubtless were sitting here at that time. That procedure resulted in prompt action on the part of Congress.

Mr. LONG. I certainly agree that there is some merit to the argument made by the Senator from Missouri, that if Congress had passed on the action it certainly would have tended toward unity. There is more likelihood of unity and less likelihood of disagreement in such a situation as that in which we found ourselves if the legislative body has an opportunity to pass upon it.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the observations made by the junior Senator from Louisiana. I think he is quite right from the standpoint of national unity. It is of vastly more importance to maintain the freedoms and liberties of the people as guaranteed to us in the Constitution of the United States.

I believe the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] asked me to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. No. I will seek the floor when the Senator from Missouri has finished.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as I was saying, henceforth American boys should not be sent to die in distant, foreign lands except when authorized by the elected representatives of the people. The elected representatives of the people in the Congress must by majority action approve an act of war.

Let us say to Mr. Truman that he must not enter into secret commitments with foreign nations which may produce other Koreas in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, this is not Stalin's Russia or Hitler's Germany or Mussolini's Italy. This is the United States of America, where one man cannot legally wage war. Let us be warned that it has happened here; let us make certain that it will not happen again.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is not my intention to read into the RECORD the debate which was carried on in this Chamber on June 27, 1950. I should like to refer to the fact that our esteemed colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] seemed to reflect the majority sentiment of the Senate when he stated:

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say, if the able majority leader will permit me, that I think this statement of the President of the United States today has drawn a line in the Far East which was essential to be drawn at some time. Certainly the free world could not protect itself if the line were to be drawn in Europe, with no similar line in Asia. I believe that in this very important step which the President of the United States has taken in order to uphold the hands of the United Nations and the free peoples of the world, he should have the overwhelming support of all Americans, regardless of their partisan affiliation.

I should like to read also some remarks which were made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. He said:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is in line with the action of the Security Council in asking for the war to stop, and for the invaders to withdraw. The invaders have shown no intention to comply with the request of the United Nations Security Council. Therefore the Security Council was put in the position

where their order needed implementation with some force. I refer to chapter VII, article 39 and following, of the United Nations Charter. In line with the fact that there is no United Nations force in existence which can be called upon, we, along with other nations were asked to implement the order of the Security Council. The President's statement is in line with our responsibility under the United Nations Charter to meet this crisis.

I understand that negotiations have been begun with other members of the United Nations. I am advised that at 3 o'clock this afternoon the Security Council of the United Nations is meeting to determine what further action should be taken. However, the action which has been taken is distinctly in line with our responsibility, as agreed to in the United Nations Charter.

I wish to join with the Senator from California in the statement that this is a clean-cut and direct stand by the United States to carry out our obligation to the United Nations to make the United Nations exist as an organization which can function in an emergency. That is our responsibility, and that is what we have done.

As the Senator from California has stated, I feel that all of us should back up the action of the President in what I believe to be a real stand in the Far East, comparable to the stand we have taken in the Atlantic area.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] subsequently stated:

I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois, as I indicated earlier, that I applaud the firm leadership of the President of the United States. I wish merely to add the hope that he will not shrink from using the Army, if the best military judgment indicates that that is the effective course to take.

There has been some discussion about the lack of consultation with the Congress, and it might be interesting to place in the RECORD at this point the statement by former Senator Lucas, in answer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who asked the then majority leader the following question:

I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if we may expect the President to consult with the Senate as the situation develops?

Senator Lucas replied:

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was there and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was there. Most of the Members of the Senate and the House who attended the conference are members of the Committees on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I should think that they would be the appropriate committees from which members for such a conference should be selected.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to say to the able majority leader that present at the conference were members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and members of the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services. Both Democrats and Republicans were present. As I observed the conference I felt that an attempt had been made to have both sides of the aisle in the House and in the Senate present when this important decision was made. Military and naval representatives were also there.

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

Mr. McMAHON. In a moment I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

I should like to invite attention to the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] then made a statement which went on for some length, and in which he stated:

Mr. President, I intend to support the hand of the President in carrying out what I think are the clear implications of the President's statement.

Mr. President, I have not attempted to make exhaustive research with respect to the debate, but I believe it to be highly appropriate that at this point in the RECORD, after the moderate speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], in which he reviewed the situation, that this illuminating bit of history should be adduced.

I have seen other statements made in this Chamber go unchallenged. From the fact that they went unchallenged there came about what I believe to be—shall I say—some untrue characterizations of recent history. It is in the interest of attempting to recreate some of the atmosphere which existed on that fateful Monday that I have now suggested that our recollections be refreshed.

I have not yet been able to find in the RECORD the remarks by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who I believe is chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, in which he stated that if it had been put before Congress he would have approved the action of the President.

I dare say there is not a Senator in the Chamber who will challenge the statement I now make: If a vote had been taken on a resolution supporting the stand that was taken in Korea, there would not have been 15 votes cast in opposition.

Other Members are entitled to make their own estimates as to what the vote would have been. I think it was unfortunate that there was not offered a resolution which would have endorsed the action of the President. However, as to what the result of a vote would have been I believe there can be little question, in view of the almost entire unanimity with which the Members of the Senate greeted the announcement of the action which had been taken in Korea.

I recognize the fact that the Senator from Missouri gave some plain indications at that time—as did also the Senator from Utah—that he was not entirely in sympathy with the action then taken; but it is significant that neither the Senator from Utah nor the Senator from Missouri offered a resolution which would have repudiated the President's stand on that occasion.

As for it being a Truman-Acheson war in Korea, or an unconstitutional war, the Senator from Missouri is entitled to his own opinion. There are millions of Americans who believe that this war is perhaps one of the most glorious blows that have ever been struck in the cause of collective security and freedom.

We should not overlook a consideration of what the alternative would have

been. To suggest that the alternative would have been anything other than an entire repudiation of the United States position in the Pacific is, in my opinion, very naive.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, inasmuch as he has read from the RECORD what took place on that fateful June 27, 1950, whether he has read my statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 7, page 9228. For the purpose of refreshing the recollection of the Senator from Connecticut, I should like to read it:

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I realize fully that the distinguished Senator from Texas regards it as an act of supererogation for any other Member of the Senate to express an opinion on the foreign affairs of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. KEM. I heard him say that to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on an occasion not long ago. I am sure that if the Senator from Texas believes that to be so in the case of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, a fortiori he believes it in the case of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I think there are several matters in connection with the pending measure which have not received adequate consideration on the floor of the Senate.

Yesterday the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], discussing the crisis in Korea, said:

"This is a matter of tremendous importance. We want to solve the problem presented, but we want to solve it after we know all the facts; we want to solve it in the light of our obligations and duties; we want to solve it in the light of our own safety and national integrity and national security."

Mr. President, those are eloquent words, and I should like to associate myself with them.

Mr. President, I need not remind the Senate that the pending measure and the crisis in Korea are very closely related. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] tells us that of the \$1,222,500,000 authorized by the bill, \$16,000,000 is allocated to Korea and the Philippines, and \$75,000,000 to countries in the general area of China.

I submit that this, too, is "a matter of tremendous importance." We want to solve the problem presented, but we want to solve it after we know all the facts. We do not have all the facts.

It occurs to me that before we vote to send additional millions of dollars to Korea, we should know just what the President and his Secretary of State are going to do about the situation in Korea. What is to be our policy there? What is to be our policy in regard to other countries in the general area of China? It would seem foolish indeed to continue pouring arms into Asia if our policy there is to continue to be, as has been said, "waiting for the dust to settle."

How about Formosa? How about southeast Asia? Just where do we stand? What is our policy?

Mr. President, we are now reaping the harvest for the tragic transactions at Yalta in 1945. It was at Yalta that the deal was made to divide Germany. It was at Yalta that a still-secret agreement is believed to have been made to split Korea in half along the thirty-eighth parallel.

As the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] said yesterday, after considerable investigation it appears not to be possible to find out just where the agreement to divide Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel was made.

It was also pointed out yesterday by the Senator from Nevada, and I should like to say that I do not think it can be referred to too often, that one of the leading State Department advisers for the President at Yalta was Alger Hiss.

The far-reaching decisions at Yalta were made in secret, without the consent of the Senate of the United States, as required by the Constitution.

Yalta should serve as a warning to the American people to stand by the principles of the Constitution. Yalta is a warning not to turn over to the President and the bureaucrats surrounding him the duty and responsibility of making decisions that may affect the peace of the world for generations to come. Such matters should be debated here and should be debated on the floor of the other body of the Congress. There is no reason to believe that when we put a pair of striped pants on a man and give him a high-sounding title and an elaborate office in the State Department he acquires any of the characteristics of a demigod or gains a capacity for unerring judgment.

I may say in passing, Mr. President, so that credit may be given where credit is due, that the quotation which I am about to read was referred to by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]:

I am among those who believe, as did the British statesman who was referred to the other day, there is no such thing as an inevitable war, and that if war comes it will be from a failure of human wisdom.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not wish to curtail the Senator from Missouri, but I should like to ask whether he has about concluded his question.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut, with his sense of fairness, would not want unduly to curtail me.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I may say that I yielded to the Senator from Missouri for a question. I permitted the Senator from Missouri to read at length from the RECORD. If he is going to read a speech I wish he would do so in his own time.

The Senator from Missouri has read the speech he previously made.

I stated that the RECORD made it plain that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Utah took more or less the same position.

I am quite willing to have the Senator from Missouri introduce 25 pages of the former RECORD, if he wishes to do so; but I cannot remain here and have that done in my time and listen to it being done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield for 30 seconds more, I shall be able to finish this portion, and then I shall refer later to other portions.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. I do not wish to encroach unduly on the Senator's time.

I continue, Mr. President, to read from my speech on June 27, 1950:

We want peace. Our people hope and pray for peace. So far as the American policy is concerned, it should be decided by all the people, acting through the President and their duly elected representatives in Con-

gress. I do not favor shifting these important decisions to the bureaucrats of the State Department. I believe these questions should be threshed out on the floors of the two Houses of Congress. The arguments should be weighed in the balance of public opinion.

In a time of crisis such as this, the decisions of the Government should be the product of the joint thinking of all of us.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield further for one or two questions, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to do so. However, I have another excerpt from the RECORD which I desire to place in this RECORD. I shall quote now from a statement made to the Senate by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on June 28, 1950. I shall not read the statement in extenso, but I shall read only a very brief paragraph from it. At that time the Senator from Ohio said:

I hope at a later time to put into the RECORD a historical statement of the position of various Republican leaders on the general question of China policy, showing that it is very different, indeed, from what the President has heretofore advocated, and that, in general, it is more in accord with what he is now proposing.

The Senator from Ohio then went on to say:

I shall discuss later the question of whether the President is usurping his powers as Commander in Chief. My own opinion is that he is doing so—

Incidentally, Mr. President, an opinion which was not shared by the two Senators from Massachusetts or the Senator from New Jersey or the Senator from Oregon.

Then the Senator from Ohio said:

But I may say that if a joint resolution were introduced asking for approval of the use of our Armed Forces already sent to Korea and full support of them in their present venture, I would vote in favor of it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Connecticut referred to the fact that certain Members of the Senate who happened to be members of the Foreign Relations Committee were consulted by the President in regard to this matter. Will the Senator permit me to call his attention to the fact that only 12 States are represented on the Foreign Relations Committee, and the other 75 percent of the States are not represented on that committee. Would the Senator from Connecticut contend that those States, constituting 75 percent of the States of the Union, are not entitled to participate in the discussion of such a momentous question as the question of whether the young men of American should be sent to war?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, of course, I regret that we cannot have the distinguished presence of the Senator from Missouri on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the generous solicitude of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I am sure that his advice and counsel would be most helpful.

Mr. KEM. I think the RECORD—
Mr. McMAHON. I ask the Senator to pardon me.

However, the rules of the Senate, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, provide for the selection of the membership of the committee. Either the Senator from Missouri has not had the good fortune to be appointed to that committee, or else he has not sought assignment to that committee.

Suffice it to say that the Senator from Missouri did have an opportunity to introduce a joint resolution of disapproval of the action which had been taken, as did any other Member of the Senate on that day. Either the Senator from Missouri thought it was a fruitless thing to do or he thought such a measure would be overwhelmed or he thought it was not worth while to do so. I cannot judge his motives. It is unfortunate that he did not take that course of action.

I did not rise to engage in debate with the Senator from Missouri, so much as I did to try to put a little bit of recent history in a context where it would do the most good, so that, when people read the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, they might be reminded of some other things which happened so recently in this Chamber.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President—
Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to have an opportunity to reply to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President I understand my motion to recess will be resisted. There are present some Senators who are ill and are here against doctor's orders. They are anxious to know the pleasure of the Senate. I am willing to yield for 5 minutes or any reasonable time to the Senator but I would like to get a vote.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Arizona to yield to me for any particular length of time; I am seeking recognition in my own right, under the well-established principles and rules of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair—

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Arizona, who has made a motion.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I desire to debate the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving my right to object—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Was not the Senator from Missouri on his feet for half an hour or more before the Senator from Arizona was recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to take a recess has been made, and on this question the yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I desire to reply to the Senator from Connecticut, and to make some observations on his gentle sarcasm.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to take a recess has been made, and it is not debatable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the motion of the Senator from Arizona is not debatable.

On that motion the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: What is the motion on which the yeas and nays are to be taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a motion that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. TOBEY. Until when?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until 12 noon, tomorrow.

Mr. TOBEY. What becomes of the motion of the Senator from Arizona to have the Senate consider Senate Joint Resolution 20 and to take it up as the next order of business? Does not that motion take precedence over the motion to have the Senate take a recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not take precedence over a motion to take a recess, which motion is not debatable.

A motion that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon has been made, and on this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New

Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—43

Anderson	Holland	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Ellender	Kerr	Russell
Frear	Kilgore	Smathers
Fulbright	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
George	Long	Sparkman
Green	Malone	Stennis
Hayden	Maybank	Tobey
Hennings	McClellan	Underwood
Hill	McFarland	
Hoey	McMahon	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Hendrickson	Nixon
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltionstall
Brewster	Ives	Schoeppel
Bricker	Jenner	Seaton
Bridges	Kem	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Langer	Thye
Capehart	Magnuson	Watkins
Case	Martin	Wiley
Cordon	McCarthy	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Young
Ecton	Morse	
Ferguson	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—16

Benton	Flanders	Monroney
Carlson	Gillette	Murray
Chavez	Hunt	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Lodge	Welker
Duff	McCarran	
Eastland	McKellar	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Leland S. Finney, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1952.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

To be major generals of the line

Maj. Gen. George Francis Ferry, ~~XXXXXX~~ Illinois National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Alsop Redding, ~~XXXXXX~~ Louisiana National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

To be major general, Adjutant General's Corps

Maj. Gen. Earle Marian Jones, ~~XXXXXX~~ California National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

To be brigadier general of the line

Brig. Gen. Calvin Edward Barry, [REDACTED]
Kansas National Guard, to date from November 20, 1951.

To be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Corps

Brig. Gen. John Burriss Morris, Jr., [REDACTED]
Arkansas National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal and ever-blessed God, grant that this Lenten season, upon which we are entering today, may inspire us with a greater concern and interest in the culture of our souls.

We penitently confess that our daily life so frequently becomes sodden with materialism and we yield ourselves to a quest for that which dwarfs and deadens our capacities for the loftiest instincts and aspirations.

May this period of inner discipline and self-examination, of cleansing of heart and consecration of purpose, challenge us to the higher and nobler ways of character and conduct.

We pray that the day may be hastened when all men everywhere shall be brought into right relationship with Thee and their fellow men.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 382 to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether this is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BRYSON. It is, sir.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President shall set aside and proclaim a suitable day each year, other than a Sunday, as a National Day of

Prayer, on which the people of the United States may turn to God in prayer and meditation at churches, in groups, and as individuals.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Friday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Abbutt	Dorn	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Mason
Aspinall	Fulton	Miller, Calif.
Barrett	Gamble	Miller, Md.
Bates, Ky.	Garmatz	Morrison
Battle	Hall,	Moulder
Beall	Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.
Betts	Hall,	O'Neill
Elatnik	Leonard W.	O'Toole
Eolton	Hart	Potter
Buchanan	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Buckley	Herter	Ramsay
Camp	Hess	Rooney
Case	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Celler	Kennedy	Secrest
Chatham	King, Calif.	Sheehan
Cole, Kans.	King, Pa.	Thompson,
Combs	Lanham	Mich.
Corbett	Larcade	Tollefson
Coudert	Latham	Wheeler
Crawford	McConnell	Wickersham
Dawson	McGrath	Wier
Dingell	McIntire	Wood, Ga.
Dollinger	Marshall	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes.

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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, during the debate yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] in emphasizing his opposition to the bill, and the fact that the action which the Congress took last year did not indicate approval of the principle of UMT, undertook to cite as his authority General MacArthur. He quoted General MacArthur as saying, referring to UMT:

While intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, it carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. It etches the pattern to a military state—

Knowing the great respect which all Members of the House have toward General MacArthur and the great weight which they put upon his recommendations, I felt it might be of interest that you should have the full quotation from which this excerpt used by the gentleman from Illinois was taken. The source of the quotation was an article in the American Legion Magazine of January 1952, by General MacArthur entitled "The Citizen Soldier and His Role in Our National Military Policy." In that article General MacArthur says:

Now our military policy again requires revision. Under Selective Service and other statutes, we have called up large increments of our citizen soldiery with which to prosecute the Korean war and to bolster our own defense and the defense of many other lands. We have adopted the principle of universal military training and the outlook is toward maintaining for many years—even in peace—an armed readiness for war.

All this, while intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. For it etches the pattern to a military state which, historically under the control of professional military thinking in constant search for means toward efficiency, has found in freedom possibly its greatest single impediment, to brush it aside as inimicable to established military policy. To avoid this historic pitfall, it is essential that civilian control over the citizen army be extended and intensified. Particularly is this true in the administration of the program of universal military training. If the youth of our land is to avoid being corrupted into a legion of subserviency to the so-called military mind.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the Nation's defense must always be the prime concern of every patriotic American. To dismiss our responsibility to protect our homes and loved ones from the aggressor is to deny our responsibility to preserve the God-given privileges which are our rightful inheritance from the founders of the Republic.

There are those today who sincerely argue that plans for war are not the way to lasting peace. There must always be the differentiation, however, be-