polemic or forensic or argumentative as in politics. Music can no more spell out the Einstein Theory of Relativity or the Darwin Origin of Species, than it can reflect Communist ideology.

All this shows to what extremes communism can bring a people. Montaigne said, "the fantasies of music are governed by art." I say, they can never be governed by politics.

FREEDOM TO TRAVEL

The Supreme Court has just issued a most momentous decision, indicating that there is uttermost freedom to travel, that everyone has the constitutional right to travel, and that the State Department cannot arbitrarily limit that right by denying a passport save for reasons that would be laid down by Congress and those reasons must be certain and definite. Congress has not done this in the case of political beliefs.

The Court held that the Secretary of State had no statutory power to deny a passport for refusal to answer questions on alleged Communist "beliefs or associations." The Secretary of State did not have the right to refuse a passport if one refused to answer a question as to whether he was a Republican or a Democrat—in the absence of some standard of instructions laid down by Congress. In other words, the Court refused to give the Secretary of State an "unbridled discretion to grant or withhold a passport for any substantive reason he may choose," such as, mere suspicion that the applicant is or was or might be a Communist sympathizer.

The Court held that the Secretary of State was not dealing with citizens who had been accused of any crime nor found guilty of a crime. The applicants were being denied their freedom of movement, their freedom to travel, solely because of their refusal to be subjected to inquiry into their beliefs and associations. There had been no proven charges of any danger to our security if they were to travel abroad.

Espionage or sabotage or any criminal activity would, of course, be a different matter. The Secretary of State has a right to deny a passport on these definite grounds. The Government has a right to protect itself and its security. But that protection does not run against mere radicals or political cranks or crackpots or unorthodox believers. I have always maintained that the political means test laid down by the State Department in recent years for issuing passports has not been helpful to the security of the country nor to the good name of the United States. If Congress now sees fit to enact a statute that would specify the Secretary of State's authority for refusal to grant a passport, that would be proper as far as I am concerned, provided reasonable and fair standards are set and due process is observed. Very likely Congress will do this, and then the Secretary of State will be unable to act arbitrarily. He would be compelled to follow reasonable restraints laid down by Congress.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1958

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

O Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting, let the light of Thine eternity now fall upon our sinful ways.

May the floodlight of Thy judgment fall not only upon a world in the turmoil of selfish strife, but also upon our own hearts, with all their deceit and pretense.

Save us from demanding of others a higher standard of conduct than we demand of ourselves.

May the sympathy we show to others who are in want and woe be commensurate with the pity we would expend on ourselves if we were in their misery and need. So may we love our neighbor as ourself.

We ask it in the name of the One who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 23, 1958, was dispensed with.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1958.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, a Senator from the State of Texas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. YARBOROUGH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Post Office Matters of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there wil be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Maj. Gen. Gerald E. Galloway, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission; and

Col. John S. Harnett, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

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

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3203. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (ch. 509, 67 Stat. 592; Public Law 284, Eighty-third Congress, first session), to revest title to the minerals in the Indian tribes, to require that oil and gas and other mineral leases of lands in the Riverton reclamation project within the Wind River Indian Reservation shall be issued on the basis of competitive bidding only, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1746).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 4002. A bill to authorize the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir as a part of the Glendo

unit of the Missouri River Basin project (Rept. No. 1748).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 4009. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California, in order to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for such project (Rept. No. 1749).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, without amendment:

S. 3786. A bill to further amend Public Law 85–162 and Public Law 84–141, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1747).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 4042. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to permit certain alien crewmen to remain in the United States in excess of the 29-day period provided for under the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 4043. A bill to amend the act providing aid for the States in wildlife-restoration projects with respect to the apportionment of such aid; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 4044. A bill to establish a board of directors to manage the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 4045. A bill for the relief of Henri Polak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 4046. A bill to authorize the appropriation to the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission of an amount equal to amounts, not in excess of $7,500,000, which may be received by the Secretary of the Navy from the sale of vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register, to be expended for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act of August 5, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution extending for 60 days the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on last Thursday the Senate unanimously agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 94, expressing deep indignation over Soviet barbarism and perfidy in the execution of Imre Nagy and other Hungarian leaders. I am pleased, Mr. President, that the State Department released its statement of June 19; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES STATEMENT ON NAGY

(WASHINGTON, June 19.—Following is the text of the State Department's statement today on the execution of former Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy, as read to reporters by Lincoln White, department press officer:)

The United States is gratified to learn that the United Nations Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary has decided to convene urgently in order to consider the secret "trial" and execution of Imre Nagy, Gen. Pal Maleter and two compatriots by the Soviet-installed Hungarian regime.

The brutal execution of these Hungarians is an affront to all members of the United Nations and to the conscience of the world. It contravenes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and ignores the will of the United Nations General Assembly expressed in Resolution 1133 of the 11th General Assembly. That specifically refers to this Hungarian situation.

The report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary was endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations. The report made crystal clear that the events which took place in Hungary in October and November of 1956 constituted a spontaneous national uprising and it found that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in violation of the charter of the United Nations, has deprived Hungary of its liberty and political independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental human rights. The report also states that the present Hungarian regime has been imposed on the Hungarian people by the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Imre Nagy was the victim of Soviet violation of safe-conduct pledged by the Hungarian regime. Furthermore, Pal Maleter was the victim of Soviet duplicity while negotiating in good faith with Soviet representatives for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary.

The United States Government has repeatedly asked those in power in Hungary for information concerning the whereabouts of Mr. Nagy and his colleagues. No information has ever been received.

It is hoped that the committee will develop the full facts surrounding this latest occurrence in the horrifying tragedy of Hungary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note that the State Department's statement says that these executions contravene the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted at the United Nations on December 10, 1948. I am particularly pleased that the Department has taken this occasion to remind us of the importance of that declaration.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was promulgated during a period when the United States was playing a forthright and leading role in the United Nations in an effort to promote and protect human rights. During this period, from 1946 to 1953, we also stressed the promulgation of the Genocide Convention to which 55 nations have now acceded. These were the years when our beloved former First Lady, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, was chairman of the Commission on Human Rights. This was the period when the United States of America was steadily associated with the cause of human rights at the United Nations.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, I know from my own experience as a delegate to the United Nations that our reputation for leadership in the field of human rights is no longer secure, either at the United Nations or elsewhere. There may be several reasons for this. One of them undoubtedly, however, is that since 1953 and the efforts of the so-called "Bricker amendment" advocates, there has been considerable pressure against official participation in international conventions and treaties affecting human rights.

In April 1953 Secretary of State Dulles came before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee and announced that the United States would no longer participate in a movement to promote rights by international agreement. He stated—in fact, he pledged—that the United States Government would not submit for ratification treaties on such subjects. Since Secretary Dulles' statement in 1953, no multilateral treaties for the promotion of human rights have been signed by our Government. We have even gone to the extreme of announcing in advance to the United Nations that we will not sign treaties on human rights—even before we have examined the provisions of these treaties.

The one convention, Mr. President, which was signed and submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee prior to 1953—the Genocide Convention—has languished in committee. The reasons for this are well known to every committee member. The State Department does not desire its ratification. Under these circumstances, the committee has given the Department every opportunity to withdraw this and other items on the agenda of the Foreign Relations Committee on which the State Department has changed its mind and on which action is no longer desired.

However, the State Department does not wish to take the responsibility for withdrawing the Genocide Convention. Instead, it wishes to maintain the present situation of inactivity, with responsibility for our failure to ratify thus placed on the shoulders of the members of the committee, rather on the Department. This is an unpardonable bit of buck passing, Mr. President, and I think it is high time it was publicly aired. I believe we have a right to have the State Department fish or cut bait on this issue. The Department has an obligation either to press for action in the Foreign Relations Committee on the Genocide Convention, or else be honest and withdraw it.

Many other issues are involved in this whole question of the depressive impact of our present State Department position on the question of international human rights. A brief survey of developments in this field will indicate what I have in mind.

For instance, the United States has not become a party to the following conventions in the field of human rights:

December 9, 1948: Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide;

April 6, 1950: Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons—in effect December 1951;

July 28, 1951: Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees—in effect December 1952;

December 20, 1952: Convention on the Political Rights of Women;

March 31, 1953: Convention on International Right of Correction—not in effect;

September 28, 1954: Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons—in effect December 1954;

June 1956: Convention on Maintenance of Obligations Abroad;

September 7, 1956; Supplementary Convention on Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similiar to Slavery;

January 29, 1957: Convention on the Nationality of Married Women.

Second. The following instruments are being considered by organs of the United Nations:

(a) The two Draft International Covenants on Human Rights;

(b) Recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination;

(c) Draft Convention on Freedom of Information.

Third. The following studies are under consideration:

(a) Study of discrimination in the field of employment and occupation—by the International Labor Office;

(b) Study of discrimination in the matter of religious rights and practices—by the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities;

(c) Study of discrimination in the matter of political rights—by the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities;

(d) Study of the matter of arbitrary arrest, detention or exile—by a special Committee of Four of the Commission on Human Rights.

In the face of this long record of inactivity, and the harm it undoubtedly has done to our national image before the world, I believe that Senate action would be appropriate to help correct the situation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution urging the President of the United States to resume participation by the United States in the United Nations and in other international bodies in the effort to draft and sign international instruments to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I urge speedy attention by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 97) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States has pledged itself by the Charter of the United Nations "to take joint and separate action in cooperation" with the United Nations to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distincion as to race, sex, language, or religion"; and

Whereas denials of human rights anywhere have a direct relationship to the preservation of world peace and stability; and

Whereas the United States from 1946 to 1953 played a leading role in the efforts of the United Nations to promote respect for and observance of human rights, during which period the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Genocide Convention were promulgated; and

Whereas the United States has failed to ratify the Genocide Convention and has informed the United Nations that it will not in the future sign any international agreement on human rights; and

Whereas the present refusal of the United States to participate in international efforts to protect human rights has diminished the prestige and influence of the United States and weakened such international efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to resume the participation by the United States in the United Nations and in other international bodies in the effort to draft and sign international instruments to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world.

FAIRER DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR WILDLIFE PROJECTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for fairer distribution of Federal funds for wildlife restoration and management programs. The proposed legislation, amending section 4 of the Pittman-Robertson Act, would require the apportionment of Federal funds to States for game projects on the basis of license issued, rather than on the basis of number of license holders.

Recently I received from L. P. Voigt, director of Wisconsin's Conservation Department, a resolution, adopted at a joint meeting of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission and the Illinois Advisory Board, endorsing the objective of this proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a supplemental statement, prepared by me, and the resolution from Director Voigt, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, supplemental statement, and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4043) to amend the act providing aid for the States in wildlife-restoration projects with respect to the apportionment of such aid, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 669c), is amended by striking out "one-half in the ratio which the number of paid hunting-license holders of each State in the preceding fiscal year, as certified to said Secretary by the State fish and game departments, bears to the total number of paid hunting-license holders of all the States," and inserting in lieu thereof "one-half in the ratio which the number of paid hunting licenses issued by each State in the preceding fiscal year, as certified to said Secretary by the State fish and game departments, bears to the total number of paid hunting licenses issued by all the States."

The statement and resolution presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Under the Pittman-Robertson Act, the States match Federal funds on a 25-percent basis to carry on acquisition, maintenance, and restoration of wildlife projects. The funds are obtained by collection of an excise tax on firearms and ammunition. After deducting administrative costs and certain statutory aids to Territories, the money is reapportioned to the States.

For over 20 years, funds under the act have been allocated to the States according to a formula generally based on records of number of licenses issued. Now—by a new interpretation of the original statute—the Department of the Interior proposes to change the formula to allocate funds on the basis of license holders, rather than on licenses issued. The result, I believe, would be an unfair and inequitable distribution of funds under the program.

For example, a hunter may be issued separate licenses for different kinds of game hunting. Under the proposed changes, however, the State, for purposes of qualifying for funds, would be allocated money only on the basis of a single license. However, the cost of management, maintenance, and restoration of the separate game programs would be the same as if several hunters had been issued licenses. Thus, it would result in an inequitable distribution of funds.

The task of determining the number of hunters in a State annually, too, would require a special statistical survey. This data would be used as a base on which to apportion funds for the next year. However, according to estimates, such a survey would cost Wisconsin from $15,000 to $30,000; the expense to other States would be proportionately high.

From time to time, also, the surveys would have to be repeated, so as to attempt to maintain accurate records. Instead of this costly, inequitable procedure, I believe the record of licenses issued can, and should, serve as a basis upon which to apportion the funds.

Thus, the proposed changes would not only disrupt the present policy and result in inequitable distribution of money under the programs; it would also require the outlay of large sums of money for surveys that could more appropriately be spent for wildlife management and restoration practices.

To forestall what I feel would be detrimental effects of the proposed changes, I am urging Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton to hold in abeyance any such action until the Congress has had an opportunity to take a new look at the situation and make necessary changes in the law.

Meanwhile, I respectfully urge the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to take action on this proposed legislation as soon as possible.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Public Law 415, better known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, was passed in 1937 and provided that the excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition be distributed to the various States by the Department of the Interior on the basis of a formula which included equal weight to land area of each State and to the number of paid hunting license holders as certified to the Secretary of the Interior by the State fish and game departments; and

Whereas for the past 20 years the number of paid license holders has been interpreted to mean the number of hunting licenses sold and apportionment of Pittman-Robertson funds has been based on this assumption with the full knowledge and approval of the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas many people hold both big game and small game, resident and nonresident hunting licenses, and it is a well-recognized fact that a certain number of people in every State in the Union hold more than one hunting license—such duplication can only be determined by a most comprehensive and costly statistical survey; and

Whereas the original Pittman-Robertson Act contains a number of unrealistic provisions; that is, the quality of the land areas for wildlife values is not differentiated, the valuable waterfowl areas of the Great Lakes are not included in the land areas considered, and hunting pressure is grossly undervalued in the formula; and

Whereas no consideration is proposed for the dual role played by the hunter who maintains two sets of arms, ammunition, and licenses for both big-game and small-game hunting; and

Whereas it is now determined by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife that the method of certification of hunters by the various State fish and game departments is no longer considered valid and, therefore, large sums of State fish and game management funds must be expended for statistical surveys to determine the actual number of hunters in each State, such surveys to cost somewhere between $4,000 and $350,000 per State annually, which money will be forever lost to game management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Conservation Commission and the Illinois Advisory Board, in joint meeting duly assembled on April 24, 1958, in the city of Elgin, Ill., respectfully request the Members of Congress and the United States Senators from the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to instigate legislation in the Congress of the United States to make desirable changes in the formula for the distribution of funds available under the Pittman-Robertson law and for the certification of the number of licenses sold so that the division of fish and game funds under the recent ruling of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife can be eliminated;

* * * * *

ILLINOIS ADVISORY BOARD,
By GLEN D. PALMER,
Conservation Director.
WISCONSIN CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
By L. P. VOIGT,
Conservation Director.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO MANAGE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Board of Directors to manage the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes.

This bill would formally remove the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation from the supervisory authority of the President and establish it as an independent agency.

I believe this action is especially necessary, following the Executive order of the President last weekend, to transfer control of the Seaway Corporation to the Commerce Department.

When the transfer from the Defense Department to Commerce was in the discussion stage last December, I wrote to the President to protest the transfer. I suggested that supervision and direction of the Corporation remain with the Defense Department "at least until such time as the Corporation can be made an independent agency."

Unfortunately, the President has ignored the many protests that have been raised over the matter and has transferred jurisdiction to the Commerce Department. He has taken an action which I believe will help no one in the long run except those who are against the aims and purposes of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

With the seaway now scheduled to begin operations within a year, it is important that control be vested in those who will make it a serious and full-time business to insure the seaway's success.

My bill would turn the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation into an independent agency governed by a three-man Board of Directors.

The Directors would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and they would serve 9-year terms.

Complete control of the seaway, negotiations with the appropriate Canadian agency, and the setting of measurements, rates, and tolls would be vested in the Corporation.

The precedent for this is the long-standing Federal policy of placing the practical responsibiilties of our transportation systems with independent agencies.

Examples, of course, are the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Maritime Commission.

While the Maritime Board technically is under the Commerce Department, the Board, with respect to its regulatory functions, is independent of the Secretary of Commerce.

I believe the interests of the seaway users, the surrounding area, and of the country will be best served by making the Corporation an independent agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4044) to establish a board of directors to manage the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under legislation which I sponsored several years ago, milk has been provided, not only to children in our schools, but also to children in summer camps, child-care centers, and similar institutions, under what is known as the special milk program.

Authority for this program will expire next Monday. Unless something is done about it this week, the Department of Agriculture must suspend its activities under the program.

The Senate previously voted a 3-year extension of the program, and a similar extension has been approved by the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but has been included in an omnibus farm bill that will take more time to clear through the Congress.

As a result, we face suspension of this program right at the start of the summer period. Unless emergency action is taken, for example, some 2,000 summer camps will be cut off from intended milk distribution.

No Member of either the Senate or the House wants this to happen. A parliamentary situation should not be allowed to cut off this program. For that reason, I have explored means of avoiding such a suspension with various Members of the other House who are interested both in this program and in the omnibus farm bill.

Mr. President, as an outgrowth of those discussions, I introduce a joint resolution extending the special milk program for 60 days, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for immediate consideration and action. We must approve it this week.

I have reason to believe the joint resolution is acceptable to the House committee. In fact, one of the House committee members plans to introduce a companion joint resolution today.

I am sure the House will either pass the joint resolution or will pass the Senate bill already pending before it, to extend this program.

In the interest of time, however, it would be advisable for the Senate itself to act on this temporary extension, even though we have already voted a 3-year extension.

This temporary continuation has been discussed with officials of the branches concerned in the Department of Agriculture, and they assure us that it will permit continuation of the program uninterrupted until August 31. By that time, the Congress will have opportunity to complete action on the 3-year extension, either in an omnibus bill or separately. I urge the cooperation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the leadership in getting this joint resolution enacted as quickly as possible.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 181) extending for 60 days the special milk program, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STABILIZATION OF PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN MINERALS FROM DOMESTIC MINES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 4036) to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines. These amendments would include pig aluminum on the same basis that copper is presently included in title III of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and myself, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 4036) to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines, and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred.

Senate bill 4036, which was introduced on June 20 by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and myself, establishes the so-called Seaton plan for copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines.

The amendment I submit would add to the bill for lead and zinc a provision similar to that already contained in it for copper. It would authorize the Government, for a period of 1 year only, to purchase for the supplemental stockpile, 100,000 tons of lead and 200,000 tons of zinc.

Mr. President, the crisis in the lead-zinc industry in my State, and other areas in the United States, is critical. The Interior Department, in cooperation with the State Department, has done a constructive job in proposing a stabilization plan to benefit the domestic producers, without at the same time creating a disruptive situation in the mineral-producing countries friendly to the United States. I am persuaded that if the objectives of the Seaton plan are to be achieved, the large stocks of lead and zinc in the hands of producers must be absorbed in the stockpile. Then the industry can adjust to the new program, and reopen the mines and smelters and call its unemployed miners back to work, in an economic climate not depressed by abnormal pressures.

This is precisely the situation which has been recognized in the administration's plan with respect to copper. I am sure it will be found that the considerations apply equally in the case of lead and zinc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MISBRANDING AND FALSE ADVERTISING OF FIBER CONTENT OF TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PURTELL (for himself and Mr. BUSH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 469, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7963) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

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

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

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Statement prepared by him regarding concerts recently given by Benny Goodman at the Brussels Fair.

RETIREMENT OF ADM. FELIX B. STUMP

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, on August 1, 1958, one of the Nation's highest ranking naval officers, Adm. Felix Budwell Stump, will end a lengthy period of service to his country that is in keeping with the highest tradition of the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Admiral Stump, who will go into retirement on the day when he steps down from his post of commander in chief, Pacific.

I am particularly honored to pay tribute to this famed fighting man, since he is a native of my hometown, Parkersburg, W. Va., and now lists Clarksburg, W. Va., as his official address. West Virginians are proud to be able to claim Admiral Stump as one of their own.

It would be far beyond my capacities to render a worthy account of the admiral's outstanding services during a period that spans two world wars. I feel that Admiral Stump's official Navy biographical sketch, which merely contains the statistical and factual information needed for naval records, does a more competent job.

The facts speak for themselves in spelling out this great American's contribution to the defense of his Nation.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an outline of the career of this officer.

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

ADM. FELIX B. STUMP, UNITED STATES NAVY

A native of Parkersburg, W. Va., Felix Budwell Stump was appointed to the Naval Academy from that State in 1913. Graduated in March 1917, just prior to the United States entrance into World War I, he had war service in the gunboat *Yorktown* and as navigator of the cruiser *Cincinnati*, operating on escort duty in the Atlantic.

After the war he served in the battleship *Alabama*, had flight training at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, and postgraduate instruction in aeronautical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He subsequently served in Torpedo Squadron 2 of the experimental carrier *Langley*; as assembly and repair officer at the Naval Air Station, Hampton Roads, Va.; and in command of the cruiser scouting wing and on the staff of Commander Cruisers, Scouting Fleet. He then had two tours of duty in the Bureau of Aeronautics; and was commanding officer of the *Saratoga's* Scout-Bombing Squadron 2, and navigator and executive officer, respectively, of the carriers *Lexintgon* and *Enterprise*.

In command of the *Langley*, in Manila Bay, at the outbreak of World War II, he was transferred in January 1942 to the staff of the Commander in Chief, Asiatic Fleet. For exceptionally meritorious service as commander of the combined operation center of the Allied-American, British, Dutch, and Australian air command, he was awarded the United States Army's Distinguished Service Medal.

In 1942 he had 8 months' duty as air officer for Commander Western Sea Frontier, then commanded the new carrier *Lexington*, which was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation for heroism in Gilbert and Marshall Islands operations in 1943. He was awarded the Silver Star Medal for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against enemy Japanese-held islands * * * from September to December 1943. He later commanded Carrier Division 24, and was awarded the Navy Cross twice, the Legion of Merit (three awards), and has the ribbon for the Presidential Unit Citation to his flagship, the *Natoma Bay*.

He was chief of the Naval Air Technical Training Command from May 1945 to December 1948, after which he served successively as Commander Air Force, Atlantic Fleet, and Commander 2d Fleet. Since July 10, 1953, he has been commander in chief, Pacific and United States Pacific Fleet, with headquarters at Pearl Harbor, T. H.

PERSONAL DATA

Date and place of birth: Parkersburg, W. Va.; December 15, 1894.

Parents: John Sutton and Lily Ragwell (Budwell) Stump.

Wife's name and date of marriage: Frances Elizabeth Smith; August 11, 1937.

Children: Felix B., Jr., and Frances Stump.

Education: Werntz Preparatory School, Annapolis, Md.; United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., 1917; Flight Training, Pensacola, Fla., 1920; Post Graduate School and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M. S., aeronautical engineering, 1923).

PROMOTIONS

Midshipman, June 26, 1913.
Ensign, March 30, 1917.
Lieutenant (jg.), March 30, 1920.
Lieutenant, July 1, 1920.
Lieutenant commander, October 7, 1927.
Commander, June 30, 1937.
Captain, June 30, 1942.
Rear admiral (T), March 30, 1944.
Rear admiral, August 7, 1947, to rank from May 16, 1943.
Rear admiral, upper half, July 1, 1948.
Designated commander, Air Force, Atlantic Fleet, rank vice admiral, December 3, 1948.
Admiral, June 27, 1953.

DECORATIONS AND MEDALS

Navy Cross with one gold star.
Distinguished Service Medal (Army).
Silver Star Medal.
Legion of Merit Medal (Combat "V") with two gold stars.

Presidential Unit Citation (U. S. S. *Lexington*).

Presidential Unit Citation (U. S. S. *Natoma Bay*).

World War I Victory Medal, Escort Clasp.

American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp.

American Campaign Medal.

Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with four bronze stars.

World War II Victory Medal.

National Defense Service Medal.

Philippine Liberation Ribbon with two bronze stars.

CITATIONS

Navy Cross: "For extraordinary heroism as commander task unit 77.4.2, while those six escort carriers were engaged in furnishing aerial support to our amphibious attack groups landing troops on the shores of Leyte Gulf, Philippine Islands, from October 18 to 29, 1944. With his task unit under almost continuous attack by enemy aircraft and suicide dive bombers during the battle off Samar Island on October 25, he continued to direct repeated aerial strikes against the Japanese fleet approaching Leyte Gulf and * * * contributed in large measure to the sinking of several hostile ships and the infliction of extensive and costly damage on numerous others."

Gold Star in lieu of a second Navy Cross: "For extraordinary heroism during the assault and amphibious occupation of Mindoro, Philippine Islands, from December 12 to 17, 1944 * * * Rear Admiral Stump afforded excellent air cover for two widely separated convoys and a covering group of battleships, cruisers, and destroyers, and in addition, located and launched destructive attacks against nearby Japanese airfields. In the course of these operations 67 enemy planes were definitely destroyed and 11 probably destroyed with a loss of only 8 of our planes."

United States Army's Distinguished Service Medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in a position of great responsibility as commander of the combined operation center of the Allied-American, British, Dutch, and Australian Air Command and of the Joint American, British, Dutch, and Australian High Command. * * * His tactful liaison contributed greatly to the maintenance of the closest cooperation in the maximum operation efficiency of combined allied forces. Under his direct supervision the combined operation center of the Allied Command was rapidly organized in Java and efficiently operated despite the imminent danger and difficulties resulting from the ruthless and devastating attacks of the numerically superior enemy forces in their impending invasion."

Silver Star Medal: "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity * * * in action against enemy Japanese-held Tarawa, Apamama, Wake, Mille, and Kwajalein, from September 18 to December 5, 1943 * * * (he) engaged in sustained offensive operations against the enemy during the assault on these strategic Japanese bases in the central Pacific area, and when the *Lexington* was hit and damaged by an enemy torpedo bomber on the night of December 4–5, he boldly fought off persistent aerial attacks for more than 2 hours before he retired from the combat area."

Legion of Merit: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as commander of a carrier air support group, during operations against enemy Japanese forces in the Marianas Islands from June 14 to August 1, 1944. * * * (He) conducted well-coordinated bombing and strafing missions, antisubmarine and combat air patrols in support of the amphibious landings in this area. By his efficient organization and manipulation of escort carriers during their many aggressive missions, (he) contributed materially to the successful Marianas campaign."

Gold Star in lieu of a second Legion of Merit: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as escort carrier division commander and escort carrier task unit commander in action against enemy Japanese forces at Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, April and May 1945. (He) contributed immeasurably to the repeated success of his forces and to the consistent high standard of carrier-based operations. * * * He led his carrier task unit as air support for ground forces on Okinawa in a total of 3,999 daring neutralization strikes, thereby inflicting extensive damage on vital enemy airfields, small craft and installations and destroying 52 airborne and 39 grounded craft."

Gold Star in lieu of a third Legion of Merit: "For outstanding services during the invasion of Japanese-held Luzon, Philippine Islands, from January 1 to 17, 1945. Although only 4 of the 6 carriers under his command were available for flight commitments on January 4 and 5, (he) skillfully coordinated operations to meet a full schedule, directing his unit in inflicting exceedingly heavy damage upon the enemy in preparation for the invasion and after troops had landed."

CHRONOLOGICAL TRANSCRIPT OF SERVICE

April 1917–December 1917: U. S. S. *Yorktown.*

December 1917–May 1918: U. S. S. *Cincinnati.*

May 1918–April 1919: U. S. S. *Cincinnati* (navigator).

May 1919–August 1919: U. S. S. *Alabama.*

September 1919–July 1920: Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. (flight training).

July 1920–December 1920: U. S. S. *Harding.*

December 1920–April 1922: Naval Air Station, Hampton Roads, Va. (instruction).

June 1922–October 1924: Instruction, Pg School and MIT (aero engineer).

December 1924–June 1927: Aircraft Squadron, Battle Fleet.

June 1927–September 1930: Naval Air Station, Naval Operating Base, Hampton Roads, Va.

September 1930–July 1931: VS Squadron NINE-S Aircraft Squadrons, Scouting Fleet (commanding).

July 1931–June 1932: VS Squadron TEN-S, Cruisers, Scouting Force (commanding).

July 1932–June 1934: Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department.

June 1934–June 1936: VS Squadron TWO-B (commanding).

June 1936–August 1937: U. S. S. *Lexington* (navigator).

August 1937–May 1940: Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department.

June 1940–June 1941: U. S. S. *Enterprise* (executive officer).

September 1941–January 1942: U. S. S. *Langley* (commanding).

January 1942–March 1942: Asiatic Fleet (staff).

April 1942–November 1942: Western Sea Frontier (air officer).

December 1942–April 1944: U. S. S. *Lexington* (commanding).

May 1944–June 1945: Carrier Division 24 (commanding).

June 1945–November 1948: Chief, Naval Air Technical Training, Chicago, Ill.; Pensacola, Fla.; and Memphis, Tenn.

December 1948–March 1951: Air Force United States Atlantic Fleet (commanding).

April 11, 1951–June 30, 1953: Commander, Second Fleet.

July 10, 1953–present: Commander in chief, Pacific and United States Pacific Fleet.

IF CONGRESS SURRENDERS—FAILURE TO ACT ON SENATE BILL 2646

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the New York Daily News of Monday, June 16, carries a lead editorial entitled "If Congress Surrenders," which takes a very dim view of what it considers to be the sidetracking of Senate bill 2646.

Because I think all Senators will be interested in the reaction indicated by the editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

IF CONGRESS SURRENDERS

It begins to look as if Congress—the current 85th Congress, that is, which expires at the year's end—has decided to put up no further fight against the Earl Warren Supreme Court's numerous kindnesses to Communists, attacks on the powers of Congressional investigating committees, and invasions of States rights and the crime-combating powers of police.

The Butler-Jenner bill, frequently discussed in this space, was approved weeks ago by the Senate Judiciary Committee—meaning it is eligible for debate and vote in the full Senate at any time.

Yet the Senate's Democratic policy committee in its wisdom has kept the bill from being called up for action, on the plea that more important legislation is before Congress and a long Butler-Jenner debate would only gum things up. Unless the bill is called up by mid-June, which is right now, the chance that it will be discussed at this session of Congress is slim.

If you ask us, the Democratic policy committee has been guilty of an unpatriotic sidestepping of its duty, because the future of the Nation is endangered by the things the Warren court has been doing to United States rights and practices ever since Earl Warren became Chief Justice by appointment of President Eisenhower in 1953.

What these nine men (most of them poorly qualified to sit on the Nation's highest bench) have done for the criminal Communist conspiracy is well known.

COMMIES AIDED, RAPIST LIBERATED

They have knocked over 42 States antisedition laws, gutted the Smith Antisubversive Act of 1940, made what the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy called fifth amendment Communists eligible to practice law in any State, and sprung dozens of Reds from jail or the threat of jail.

The net result of the long string of pro-Communist decisions is that it is harder than ever before for the Government to combat the Red conspiracy to overthrow that same Government and make slaves of all Americans except Reds.

We doubt that any of the learned Justices are personally in favor of rape. But in the notorious Mallory decision, a confessed and convicted Washington, D. C., rapist was turned loose by the Warren Court because the police had held him for 7 hours' conversation with them prior to his arraignment before a magistrate.

By this decision, the Warren Court confused and bemused police and prosecutors all over the country, and enabled gangsters and other hardened criminals to thumb their noses frequently at the law. Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, by the way, referred to the above-mentioned convicted rapist as just "a 19-year-old lad." At last report, the lad was going around Washington free to rape again.

These are only a few samples of the things done to the American system by the collection of theorists, sociologists, and political hacks who make up a majority of today's Supreme Court Justices.

BUTLER-JENNER COURT CURBS

The Butler-Jenner bill aims to restrain this group in four ways. It would (1) put

the teeth back into the Smith Act, (2) forbid the Court to tell States whom they may and may not admit to the bar, (3) restore the 42 State anti-sedition laws which the Earl Warren Court rubbed out for all practical purposes, and (4) make the Court stop prescribing conditions under which Congressional investigating committees can investigate.

This, it seems to us, is the very least that Congress ought to do as regards clipping Warren's and his colleagues' claws.

Yet the Butler-Jenner bill's misfortunes to date indicate that Congress lacks the backbone to stand up and fight the Warren Court. Is it possible that Congress is overloaded with lawyers who suffer from a mixture of exaggerated respect for and plain fear of these nine men?

By failing to debate the Butler-Jenner bill at this session, Congress would simply encourage the Warren Court to continue and broaden its offensive against American rights, privileges, liberties, and customs. If the people's elected representatives have no courage, how can the people be saved from judges bent on making laws rather than interpreting existing laws?

And why should the people vote for any candidate for House or Senate who is known to be a coward in this respect?

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

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER FOR UNFINISHED BUSINESS TO BE LAID BEFORE THE SENATE AT CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the morning business is concluded the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

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

Is there further morning business?

COTTON ACREAGE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in the morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 7 minutes on the subject of cotton acreage.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, since the calendar year 1953, under acreage controls our cotton farmers have sustained a severe and drastic 40 percent reduction in cotton acreage. With a 28.3 million planted acreage in 1953, our national cotton allotment has now dropped to 17.4 million acres.

Under a provision of the 1956 farm bill, cotton acreage was frozen at the 1956 level for the calendar years 1957 and 1958. This was an effective stopgap measure. However, without new legislation at this session, cotton acreage will be cut an additional 20 percent for the calendar year 1959. Such a reduction can mean only disaster to large numbers of cotton farm families who cannot possibly survive further acreage cuts.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a table prepared by the Department of Agriculture which shows the size of allotments which were set for farms, the percentage of farms by size allotment, and the number of farms by size allotment. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TABLE A.—*Estimated farms in United States with cotton allotments according to size of allotments, 1956* [1]

Size of allotment	Percent farms by size allotment	Number of farms by size allotment
0 to 4.9 acres	37.4	354,576
5.0 to 14.9 acres	35.6	337,510
15.0 to 29.9 acres	13.4	127,040
30.0 to 49.9 acres	5.9	55,936
50.0 to 99.9 acres	5.0	47,403
100 and over acres	2.7	25,598
Total, United States	100.0	948,063

[1] Estimated by Cotton Division, CSS (Notice CN-108), USDA.

Mr. STENNIS. Thus we see that 73 percent of all cotton farms in the Nation are already cut to an allotment of less than 15 acres.

I desire to give a few further brief figures, Mr. President. The average 5-acre cotton farmer does well to produce five bales of cotton thereon. He will realize a profit of from $250 to $300 on this cotton which is his "cash crop." He will grow most of his food, and with some other source of income will manage to make a living. But if his cotton acreage is cut further, even though he may own the place, he is forced off the land and from his home.

PRODUCTION COSTS

For a better understanding of the cost of production of small farmers, I quote from the United States Department of Agriculture publication, Farm Costs and Returns, 1956. Here are the key costs and returns figures for a typical cotton farmer with 12 acres of cotton in the delta area of Mississippi for the 1956 crop year.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Cotton farm (small, delta)—Costs and returns, 1956

Land in farm (acreage)	57
Cropland harvested (acreage)	33
Crops harvested:	
Cotton acreage	12
Corn acreage	7
Soybeans acreage	11
Hay acreage	3
Total farm capital	$11,460.00
Cash receipts	3,169.00
Cash expenditures	−2,132.00
Net cash farm income	1,037.00
Additional income	500.00
Change in inventory	+123.00
Net farm income	1,666.00
Charge for capital	−647.00
Return to operator and family labor	$1,013.00
Purchasing power of family labor, 1937–41 dollars	447.00
Return per hour in current dollars	.41

(Source: Excerpts from Farm Costs and Returns, 1956).

(USDA Agricultural Information Bulletin No. 176, June 1957.)

Mr. STENNIS. It is mandatory that the Congress take notice of this threatened major disaster immediately, and that the necessary legislation be passed to avoid it. No relief program is required, and I do not call for any giveaway or handout. The situation can be met, at least partly, with simple legislation providing for freezing cotton acreage at least at the 1958 level.

This is not a political question. It is a serious, major national problem. The future of many of our people is at stake. It is not a sectional or a geographical problem, although the problem is far more serious in the Midsouth and the Southeastern States than elsewhere. The extreme hardships suffered there from drastic acreage cuts is greater than elsewhere. We cannot stand further acreage reductions.

The latest available figures indicate that in the 16 major cotton-producing States there are a total of 863,200 cotton farms and a total of 4,051,300 people who live on these farms, depending on cotton farming as a way of life. The actual survival and future of these families depend in a great measure upon what is done about cotton acreage allotments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks another table, showing the estimated number of farms growing cotton and the estimated cotton farm population by States.

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

TABLE B.—*Table showing estimated number farms growing cotton and estimated cotton farm population by States*

[In thousands]

State	Estimated farms growing cotton, 1954	Estimated population on farms growing cotton, 1954
Alabama	106.6	506.4
Arizona	2.7	21.9
Arkansas	67.8	311.9
California	9.8	48.0
Florida	5.6	25.2
Georgia	79.0	410.8
Louisiana	51.3	251.4
Mississippi	156.3	672.1
Missouri	13.7	54.8
New Mexico	3.4	20.4
North Carolina	77.3	394.2
Oklahoma	26.8	109.9
South Carolina	76.1	410.9
Tennessee	56.4	260.8
Texas	126.0	529.2
Virginia	4.4	23.3
Total, 16 States	863.2	4,051.4

NOTE.—The above table is calculated on basis of U. S. Census figures, 1954.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is evident from this table that 98.1 percent of the farm units are in the Midsouth and the southeastern part of the Nation.

In the same area we find 97.7 percent of the cotton-farm population.

I emphasize that fact, because it is in this area where the people live on the land and where the making of a cotton crop, even though it may be small, is the major source of their income—their cash income—and in many instances it is almost the sole source of their cash income.

Mr. President, I have in my hand another table which will give the Senate information as to the number of farms producing cotton, State by State, broken down as to size of cotton allotments. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE C.—*Upland cotton: Estimated percent of total farms with allotments according to size groups, 1956* [1]

State	Total number of farms	Percent of farms receiving allotments of—							
		0 to 4.9 acres	5 to 14.9 acres	15 to 29.9 acres	30 to 49.9 acres	50 to 99.9 acres	100 to 499.9 acres	500 to 999.9 acres [2]	1,000 acres and over [2]
Alabama	117,726	46.4	42.5	7.4	2.1	1.2	0.4	0	
Arizona	3,634	4.6	18.1	17.8	15.1	18.1	24.5	1.6	0.2
Arkansas	61,830	23.6	44.5	16.9	6.1	4.8	3.7	.4	
California	14,416	6.5	31.4	32.7	9.0	10.4	8.8	.9	.3
Florida	8,324	72.9	24.6	1.6	.8	.1			
Georgia	85,203	41.5	42.1	10.5	3.3	1.9	.7		
Illinois	457	63.0	30.4	4.4	2.2				
Kansas	4	50.0	50.0						
Kentucky	1,078	81.6	11.9	2.8	3.7				
Louisiana	46,626	39.2	44.4	9.7	3.0	2.0	1.6	.1	
Maryland	1			100.0					
Mississippi	112,128	47.8	36.8	8.5	2.6	2.0	2.2	.1	0
Missouri	16,222	24.4	36.1	21.5	8.2	6.7	2.9	.1	.1
Nevada	17			50.0				50.0	
New Mexico	5,617	14.6	32.3	21.8	12.9	13.6	4.8		
North Carolina	87,110	70.6	23.2	4.4	1.2	.5	.1		
Oklahoma	45,107	15.2	46.3	21.1	10.6	6.0	.8		
South Carolina	72,787	51.5	34.4	8.6	3.0	1.8	.7		
Tennessee	64,252	51.9	34.1	9.0	2.8	1.5	.7		
Texas	198,887	10.1	29.4	24.6	14.4	14.2	7.1	.2	0
Virginia	6,637	90.7	8.2	1.1					
United States total	948,063	37.4	35.6	13.4	5.9	5.0	2.6	.1	0

[1] Estimated number of farms in each size group based on a tabulation of a 10-percent sample of old cotton farms for which 1956 allotments were originally established prepared in accordance with specific instructions issued by the Cotton Division CSS (Notice CN-108). The sample does not take into account subsequent changes in farm allotments due to corrections, reconstitution of farms, etc.

[2] Because of the small number of farms in these size groups, a 10-percent sample of farms may not provide a basis for determining a reliable estimate for the State of the number of farms in these 2 groups.

Mr. STENNIS. These charts show that we are not dealing with theories, but with human beings. They are our people. This large group are directly concerned. They actually live on their farms and make their living growing cotton. Their fate depends directly on what we, the Congress, do in meeting this national problem. We must not ignore their plight.

This is the one group in our Nation's history who have been truly independent and self-sustaining. They do not expect, nor are they asking for any handout. To the contrary, they ask only for a chance to remain on their land and to make a living. They must have this chance.

This group, Mr. President, has no unemployment compensation. It has no program which reaches out and sustains them. These people ask for the American privilege of living on and working on their land and making their own living.

Some of the proposals for new legislation now pending provide for the scheduled 1959 cotton acreage cuts to go into effect, but with the additional proviso that each producer who would agree to a lower level of price support would then receive a bonus in acreage.

If acreage above the 1958 allotments is needed for a sound cotton economy, then all producers should share alike in this additional acreage. If we are to present a choice plan to the farmer, then it must be a real choice.

This is fair, just, and right.

Any plan that takes acres away from one farmer and gives them to another is not a real choice. We must start with the basic premise that no farmer will be forced to take a cut in his present acreage allotment.

Any plan for a generous increase in acres for some producers will only run up our cotton surplus within a year or two, and thus depress the price, and reduce the acreage allotments in future years. Thus, under such a plan, all cotton producers—both large and small—will lose in the long run.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who feel it is impossible to enact a law preserving our present cotton acreage because some individuals or groups may be opposed.

Differences of opinion among farm groups must not deter us from an all-out effort to pass legislation which will avoid scheduled acreage reductions in 1959, at the same time provide a plan which is fair to all producers.

Nor should we be deterred because the Department of Agriculture does not agree to this proposed legislation at this point.

First, we must determine what is fair and right, and work to that end.

I am fully satisfied that the only fair and just way to meet this situation is to let all producers share equally in any acreage increase, as well as share equally in any decrease in price support. Specifically, I propose that the 1958 acreage allotments be continued, with the guarantee that all producers will receive the same allotments as in 1958. To get this provision enacted, if necessary, I would agree to a reasonable lowering of the price support.

If it is proven that acreage over and above the 1958 allotment is necessary for a sound cotton economy, then let this additional acreage be shared by all producers on the basis of their present allotments. Any decrease in price-support levels, if necessary, should also be shared equally by all producers.

Certainly the views of all groups are invited and must be fully considered.

But after all, Mr. President, the only ones who have the power to do anything about our cotton acreage problem for 1959 and the years thereafter are the Members of the House, the Members of the Senate and the President of the United States. It is our direct responsibility. Our people are looking to us to find a solution. They expect of us our very best efforts, and rightfully so, because they have entrusted us with the power to act for them.

We have the facts. It is our responsibility to use these facts in our efforts to obtain results.

I make these proposals:

First. That we continue our efforts and personally confer with every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate who is not fully familiar with the seriousness of our problem. Let them know the tremendous burden which will be inflicted on our people, as well as on the economy of the entire Nation, unless something is done to relieve the problem.

Once our colleagues know the facts and know of the personal hardships that will be endured by such a large group of our people, I believe the great majority will respond and cooperate in the passage of needed legislation.

Second. That a small committee of Members of the Congress from the affected area, who are thoroughly familiar with the plight of our cotton farmers, present this problem directly to the President of the United States in a personal conference. They should sit down with him and discuss the entire situation frankly and fully, so that he may understand, as we do, that no real alternative exists.

This is not a matter of going over Mr. Benson's head. It is a question of presenting the distressing situation of our people to the one man in the executive branch of the Government who must give the final "yes" or "no." It is a matter of having the problem explained to him by those who know it best, the ones who live with it.

I am thinking in terms of a quiet discussion of this serious problem with the President by a very few leaders in the Congress in responsible positions who know the problem fully. Naturally, I would think of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and Representative COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairmen, respectively, of the Senate and House committees which deal with agriculture.

I also have in mind the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The Senator from Georgia was a Member of the Senate in the days before there was a farm program. He has taken an active part

in the enactment of every single phase of the present farm program. The mention of these names does not exclude others. We have many men who are eminently qualified to present this special problem to the President.

An error we have made in the past has been our failure to bring to the personal attention of the President the full facts on special major problems affecting millions of people. The President has evidenced his concern in such major problems by his personal visits to the flooded areas of the West and his visits to the drought-stricken areas in years past.

Certainly, there is impending for 1959 a severe "drought" of cotton acres which will directly affect 4 million people with distressing results.

I believe such a mission will be successful and that it should be undertaken. Once he has the facts, I believe the President will sweep aside fancy theories and extend this urgently needed relief.

One further word:

We are dealing with the problems and the livelihood of millions of our farm people. But this does not begin to tell the full story. If our cotton farmers are forced to take further acreage cuts, in any amount, then the entire economy of the Nation will suffer.

Any further acreage reduction, causing reduced farm activity as well as reduced farm income, will drive many of our farmers from the land. Not only will the farmer himself be destroyed, but we will destroy the trade and traffic in all farm supplies, including seed, fertilizer, machinery, fuel, labor, ginning and other processing operations.

Many more of our small communities will disappear completely.

Further acreage cuts will be the mortal blow.

If any more of our people are forced to leave their land and drift away to towns and cities, there to join the swelling ranks of the unemployed, only disastrous results can follow.

My remarks have been directed solely to the acute and distressing situation as to cotton acreage, and the even greater distress and disaster that will come in 1959 unless we pass favorable legislation at this session. I am not unmindful, however, of the problems which face other basic commodities, and stand ready to take up the cudgel in behalf of needed legislation.

And now a brief summary:

First. Cotton-acreage allotments have already been reduced to the minimum from the standpoint of the individual as well as the economy of the community.

Second. Unless legislation is passed at this session present acreage allotments will be automatically reduced by approximately an additional 20 percent for 1959.

Third. We must avoid any further acreage cuts. All producers must be assured of at least their present acreage allotments. If a moderately lower price-support level is necessary to avoid this acreage loss, we could yield some on this point.

Fourth. If additional acreage is to be added for 1959, all producers should share alike in the increase and on any price-support reductions necessary.

Fifth. I recommend that a small committee, composed of a very few Members of Congress from the affected area, confer informally with the President and advise him fully as to the problem and the consequences if something is not done immediately to solve this problem. Such a mission has much chance to bring fruit and it should be undertaken.

I make this personal appeal to every Member of the Senate:

This question of cotton-acreage allotments is not solely an economic question. It is both an economic and a social question. It directly affects almost a million families, over four million people. I ask every Member of Congress to withhold final judgment on this matter until all the relevant facts are made clear. These farmers represent a large segment of our remaining independent self-supporting, nonregimented American citizens. Our family farmers should not be liquidated by Congressional act. This is happening now, and we must adopt new cotton legislation during this session to turn the tide. We must preserve the future of these millions of people who live on the farm, and at the same time preserve a sound economy for the Nation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate in such a forceful manner. Representing, in part, as I do, a State which produces more cotton than any other State—cotton being the second largest producer of income to my State—a State with more farm families and more families engaged in cotton farming than any other State, I am appreciative of the great leadership offered by the Senator from Mississippi. I hope the Senate will listen carefully to the words of this outstanding agricultural authority in the Senate and that we shall move, with him, to try to preserve the agricultural production of the Nation, particularly the cotton production.

In the history of the United States for given periods of time cotton was the item which brought in the most income for the whole United States of America. Our historic position as a great producer of cotton should not, in my opinion, be frittered away by unwise regulations made by those wholly unfamiliar with the problems of the cotton growing segment of our population.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his extremely generous words and for his interest in this subject. I know the Senator from Texas has worked diligently on the matter and is making a very fine contribution in the seeking of a solution to the problem.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as this tense and eventful session of Congress nears an end, the majority leader of the Senate encounters innumerable difficulties in trying to ameliorate and adjust all the points of view under his command. A thoughtful and understanding article about the Senate's able majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, was published in the Washington Evening Star of June 13, 1958, by the distinguished syndicated columnist William S. White, a winner of the Pulitzer prize for biography. I ask unanimous consent that this column by William S. White, entitled "JOHNSON, the Ablest Leader," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

JOHNSON, THE ABLEST LEADER—TEXAS DEMOCRAT VIEWED AS HAVING STRIKES AGAINST HIM ON PRESIDENCY

(By William S. White)

On the plain test of getting things done, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, is the ablest Senate majority leader in many decades. This is the reluctant estimate even of those who do not like him, his ideas or policies.

As a man, Senator JOHNSON is at times a hard-as-nails handful. Like most brilliant people, he suffers fools only in excessively frank, eye-rolling pain and impatience. He has great practicality, and again great sentimentality; a very demanding approach, and again a very considerate approach.

He is, in short, a genius in politics, or at least in parliamentary politics. His conduct is unpredictable in its details, and often brusquely so. But his achievements in general are so extraordinary as to make him, if this one measure be used, almost unarguably the outstanding Democrat in the country today.

In his forum and in his field—that is, in the Senate and in legislation—he could master any half dozen of his rivals all at once without raising any great sweat.

He could never do this by speaking; he is an indifferent orator—but a good listener when he wants to be. He could do it—and many times has—through his peculiar talent of personal negotiation and persuasion.

It is an almost indescribable kind of persuasion in which Senator JOHNSON is perfectly capable of having his way, either by cajoling the person with whom he is dealing or by simply ordering him, in a way both pointblank and kindly, to do as he is told.

To have a face-to-face go-round with him at the top of his form is to undergo a dizzying series of personal experiences. Miss Mary McGrory of the Washington Star has coined for this process the term "the Lyndon Johnson A treatment." It must be experienced to be appreciated; it is no good trying to illustrate it.

But it is possible to say with some confidence that if Senator JOHNSON ever should meet Nikita Khrushchev, say, ordinary charity would require a small sigh of half-compassion for a hapless Russian.

Through the "A treatment," or lesser variations of it, Senator JOHNSON has solidified the Democratic party in the Senate into an organism of massive power where it used to be a collection of competing blocs.

Most any leader can sell his plans and purposes if, like a door-to-door salesman, he cuts his prices on demand. But the Senator never cuts his prices. More likely, he coolly raises them—and the other fellow somehow feels, all the same, that he is getting the better of it.

Thus, Senator JOHNSON has Democratic isolationists voting for foreign aid, and deep southern Senators accepting civil rights bills.

It is this very success, however, that brings to him most of the criticism that comes from advanced Democratic liberals. They put him down as a crass "operator"—and then call for his help on their own designs. They suggest that he lacks political conviction.

He was an early protege of Franklin D. Roosevelt and some of his intimate friends are old Roosevelt New Deal liberals—men like Tom Corcoran, Ben Cohen, Abe Fortas, and James Rowe, Jr.

Most of the newer Democratic liberals are far from the Johnson camp. But many of the older liberals—the Rowes, Corcorans, and so on—entirely understand his operating premise. This is that attitudes of fight, fight, fight don't carry you very far unless you have the troops—and that you can't keep enough troops without compromise sometimes.

Deeply sensitive to every form of criticism, Senator JOHNSON is excessively sensitive to it from any liberal source. It is a state of mind that is not helped by his awareness of the fact that he has been of more practical service to some liberal causes—public power and public housing among them—than have most of his detractors put together.

And as a pro he has none of the emotional approach of most of the advanced liberals. They think in visions of crusades; Senator JOHNSON thinks in terms of votes. They see him as a straddler. He sees them as shrilly insisting upon the impossible rather than sensibly settling for the possible.

Senator JOHNSON, a tall, rangy man with a ranch background, is far more western than southern. Nevertheless, Texas is historically a Confederate State. This fact powerfully works against the possibility that the Democratic Convention of 1960 would ever give him what he insists—sometimes with loud, unprintable Texanisms—he does not want anyhow: The Presidential nomination.

Too, he is popularly identified—though to an exaggerated degree, as it happens—with the Texas oil and gas millionaires. And in 1955 he suffered a heart attack. Finally, there is no guaranty, of course, that his legislative skill could be translated into the administrative skill needed in the White House.

ARE WE SWATTING FLIES OR DRAINING THE SWAMP IN THE SHERMAN ADAMS CASE?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe it is time to place in perspective the episode involving Sherman Adams.

I believe that, in the context of modern American politics, Sherman Adams is only the latest scapegoat—like Col. Harry Vaughn before him—for a national course of conduct which has become commonplace and accepted in this country.

Sherman Adams is the victim of a system under which the spending of large sums of money on politics and politicians is virtually taken for granted among substantial segments of our society. He may not have been an innocent victim. I do not condone his conduct. But I think we should be honest and realistic in appraising it.

After all, it is not so long ago that the acceptance by a prominent politician of an $18,000 expense fund from real-estate and oil operators was turned into a personal triumph over a nationally broadcast television program. Do the gifts to Sherman Adams, about which we have heard so much, add up to a fraction of $18,000?

What is our premise about the obligations that are attached to gifts? Do we criticize Mr. Adams because he sought information from regulatory agencies in cases involving his friend, Mr. Goldfine, or do we criticize him because he accepted gifts and hotel suites from Mr. Goldfine?

When Sherman Adams committed his errors of judgment in doing favors for his friend, the public is being left to infer that he did this because of Mr. Goldfine's vicuna coats and hotel suites. Yet is Sherman Adams any more indebted to Mr. Goldfine for gifts than a man who sits in the Senate or in a governor's chair is indebted to those who collected $100,000 from big-business men or from trade-union political-education funds to pay for his campaign expenses?

Is Sherman Adams, with his $2,400 rug and $700 vicuna cloth coat more obligated to render unethical favors than is a Member of Congress who is dependent every few years on 20 times that amount from bankers, natural-gas and private-utility owners, and distillery executives to finance his billboards and radio and TV shows? What is the difference between one gift and another?

What is morality in government? Was it virtue for utility stockholders to contribute enormous sums to the Eisenhower campaigns, and then for the President's assistant, Sherman Adams, to call the SEC to postpone a crucial hearing in the Dixon-Yates case—but immorality for the same Sherman Adams to inquire from the SEC about the case of Mr. Goldfine, from whom he had received a $2,400 rug?

When Sherman Adams exercises the influence of the White House on the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the FPC to dispose of the Hells Canyon power site to the private-utility interests who did so much for the Republican campaigns, is that merely the honest execution of national policy—but corruption if Sherman Adams phones the FTC for his old friend Mr. Goldfine, who had given him a vicuna coat? Does this not prove the wisdom of the old verse which goes:

> The law locks up both man and woman
> Who steals the goose from off the common
> But lets the greater felon loose
> Who steals the common from the goose.

PRESIDENT RECOGNIZES SAME FACTS

At his press conference last Wednesday, President Eisenhower himself was perfectly right in drawing attention to the contrast between really minor personal gifts and the vast funds which are customarily collected to further the political careers of almost everyone in American politics. I spoke last Thursday about my letter to the President, in which I expressed my agreement with him on this subject. Is this not the only realistic context in which to discuss the problems of money and morality in American politics? And is this not a context which should steer us away from too much smugness in these repeated pursuits of gifts and favors among executive leaders?

Is it morality for a Senator to collect $500 or $1,000 speaking fees from many labor unions or liberal groups and then to oppose a Federal right-to-work law—but immorality for Col. Harry Vaughan at the White House to be given a deep freeze?

Is it morality for oil and gas tycoons to stage great benefit dinners to collect hundreds of thousands of dollars for the campaigns of Members of Congress in distant States who will vote to lift Federal control from offshore-oil deposits or from natural-gas prices—but immorality for Sherman Adams to sign a hotel bill to the account of his friend Mr. Goldfine?

Could it be, Mr. President, that the taint of corruption attaches to the specific form of the benefaction, and not to its value?

Why is it that great and unctuous breast-beating rises in Congress when there are tangible gifts involved, such as rugs or hotel bills or deep freezes or coats—mink or vicuna—but strange silence about a $30-million campaign exchequer to elect a President or a one-half million dollar fund to put a Senator in office?

Is there a feeling that the public will understand coats and vacation trips and household furnishings, but is indifferent to colossal sums of money?

Surely some great historians of the future will be perplexed by the fact that some persons in Government during our era encountered grave embarrassment over the acceptance of kitchenware and hotel accommodations, while their brethren in high places were acclaimed as heroes for successfully employing campaign exchequers and personal-expense funds that dwarfed the other gifts in value. Could it be because a piece of furniture is more tangible than a bag of currency?

Again I say, Mr. President, let us scrutinize the assumptions and the major premise behind all this righteous indignation. I repeat, I am not speaking in defense of Sherman Adams—for, whatever may have been his other sins, he has certainly been among the most self-righteous of all with respect to the question of ethics in government. But Sherman Adams' many accusers proceed on the premise that, having accepted a rug and numerous hotel-bill payments, he inevitably was in moral bondage to Mr. Goldfine and had to do Mr. Goldfine's bidding. Do any of these accusers confront the question whether, having accepted campaign funds from, for instance, the automobile industry, they must do that industry's bidding on legislative matters? Or, having accepted campaign funds from labor, must they do labor's bidding when the roll is called in Senate or House?

In none of the questions I have raised in this brief speech am I referring to any individual Member of Congress. This is not an individual matter. Every person in American public life is trapped

by a system which has encouraged the dominance of money in elections, which has permitted or even required public office to be placed on the auction block like a jewelry bauble—to be carried off by the highest bidder.

Congress has traditionally taken unto itself the vital role of watchdog over executive officers. Yet is morality divisible? The author of the Sermon on the Mount thought that it was not. He laid down a principle of universality of conduct which has stirred mankind ever since. He said:

Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me (Matthew 25, v. 40).

WHAT MOTIVES ARE MORE IMPORTANT

Mr. President, public officials may act honestly or meanly, in the best public interest or on behalf of special privilege. Does it make sense to assume that in their actions they will be motivated by insignificant personal gifts, but not by the past or future campaign treasuries upon which their power depends? To assume this is to place the collection of a few gadgets and luxuries as a motive of human conduct above the ambition for success in a public career, for national stature, for power to affect public policy in a measure that no coat or rug or deep freeze can equal.

In our political system today, Mr. President, the cost of such power and such ambition comes high. It is hardly to be compared with Mr. Goldfine's occasional largess toward his old friends. For example, it has been estimated by responsible scholars, and by journals of information and public opinion, that some $200 million was spent in 1956 to elect public officials to high offices throughout our Nation. Until we do something about this, we shall be swatting flies instead of draining the swamp.

REFORMS PROPOSED

I have long advocated two proposals which I believe will ultimately be the tests of the sincerity of Congressional critics of Sherman Adams and such of his predecessors as Colonel Vaughn—be they on this or the other side of the aisle.

First, there are the proposals which I presented to the McClellan committee on lobbying and campaign expenditures, at the time of the studies which grew out of the attempted $2,500 campaign contribution from natural-gas interests to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. These proposals would eliminate the present unhealthy and undesirable reliance on huge privately collected campaign funds by having major essential expenditures for all Federal candidates underwritten by the Federal Government, as President Theodore Roosevelt recommended to Congress as early as 1907.

Second, there are the proposals of my bill, S. 3979, to apply equal conflicts-of-interest principles to Members of Congress and to executive officials and to provide for disclosure of gifts and outside income.

Until Congress is willing to come to grips with proposals such as these—which go to the crux of the relationship of money to politics in America, not only for the executive but for Congress itself—and until some reforms such as these are enacted into law, rather than languishing unheard and unnoticed in committees, the recurring shrill denunciations in cases such as that of Harry Vaughn or Sherman Adams will, I fear, seem insincere and hypocritical to many thoughtful students of our public affairs.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a thoughtful and informative article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 22, entitled "Some Gifts Always Cost More Than Their Price." The author of the article, Mr. J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington Post, has tried to place in perspective the gifts and presents which are often showered on personages in public authority and power. I commend his cogent analysis to those who regard this problem as something to be decided by partisan speeches or political invective.

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

There is no gift a grateful constituent can give a public man that will be worth as much to him as the ability to say truthfully that no gift was ever given him.

Sherman Adams today no doubt would be the first to subscribe to this view. This admonition ought to head any manual describing the ethics of gift giving to those in public life.

Views on the subject, however, have been almost as many as the men who have held public office. Most official views lie somewhere between those of Thomas Jefferson and those of Ulysses S. Grant.

Thomas Jefferson paid for gift of Cheshire cheese by the pound, and turned over to the Government the stud fees obtained from an Arabian stallion given him by a foreign government. General Grant accepted almost anything offered him, without a qualm.

Political safety clearly lies in turning down all gifts. It is hard to find a safe and clear line anywhere short of that drastic and clearly discernible prohibition.

President Eisenhower's statement of the differences between bribes and friendly gifts may be a fair definition legally, but, unfortunately, gifts can be dangerous to public policy in whatever friendly instincts and selfless purposes they originate. And even gifts can have other purposes and objects.

GRATEFUL GRANT

Gifts and not bribes, as such, fouled up General Grant who was, by his own lights and by many other standards, an honest man. Of him, Parrington has said:

"He was a materialistic hero of a materialistic generation. He was dazzled by wealth and power, and after years of bitter poverty he sat down in the lap of luxury with huge content. He took what the gods sent, and if houses and fast horses and wines and cigars were showered upon him he accepted them as a child would accept gifts from a fairy godmother. He had had enough of skimping meanness; with his generation he wanted to slough off the drabness of the frontier; he wanted the good things of life that had so long been denied him, and he was not scrupulous about looking a gift horse in the mouth.

"He sought out the company of rich men. He was never happier than when enjoying the luxury of Jay Cooke's mansion in Philadelphia or riding with A. T. Stewart in Central Park. * * * He accepted gifts with both hands, and he seems never to have suspected the price that would be exacted of the President for the presents to the general.

"He never realized how great a bill was sent to the American people for the wine he drank or the cigars he smoked with his wealthy hosts; yet if the wine had been molten gold and the cigars platinum they would have been far cheaper.

THE PRICE OF FREE CIGARS

"In return for a few boxes of choice Havanas, Jay Cooke laid his hands on millions of acres of western lands for the Northern Pacific Railroad. It was the way of the gilded age, and Grant was only doing what all his friends and associates were doing. If he accepted a $50,000 house in Philadelphia, his comrade, General Sherman, accepted a $100,000 house in Washington. Such gifts were not bribes; they were open and aboveboard; it was a free and easy way of the times. What the age was careless about is the fact that it is hard to refuse a reasonable request from one's fairy godmother, and what the general never understood is that if one is President, such a godmother is certain to be a very dangerous member of the family."

No, the distinction between gifts and bribes, so far as the public risks are involved, is not so easily made. Both can menace the public welfare and the reputation of recipients—different as they may be legally and morally.

HARD CHOICE

What is the public man to do? Citizens of all descriptions, old friends of younger days and utter strangers alike, press about him, gifts in hand. They wish to honor the office he graces. They desire to show their good will. They seek to draw notice to themselves. They hope to advertise a product. They are anxious to publicize a good cause. Perhaps some of them wish to buy influence * * * but which ones? What is a public man to do?

Turning down all gifts is not easy. The rejection of a gift carries with it an implied reproach to the would-be donor; it is as much as to say that the sought-for object is influence or bribery. Or the rejection of a modest gift may chill the warmth which ought to prevail between the people and elected servants. Or a stiff and stuffy declination of an accustomed exchange between friends may make public life a dreary affair indeed. Worse yet, the hospitality that would not be questioned in other circumstances may become as dangerous as gifts of greater value.

Perhaps it could be safely said, however, that the danger varies in direct proportion as the gift's value varies; and in the same degree that the donor's opportunity to profit by favor varies. The safest gift is the gift of no intrinsic value given by the citizen who has nothing to gain from governmental favor; the most dangerous, the gift of great value from a citizen who has a greal deal to gain as a litigant or as a supplicant for governmental favor.

The danger differs, in addition, in accordance with the publicity and the secrecy attending the gift. Gifts by groups of citizens and associations of firms probably are less objectionable than gifts by individuals and individual companies.

The White House is plagued by thousands of gifts, more calculated to reward the donor by publicity than to gratify the recipient, and these are hardly open to the objections that lie against gifts of other kinds. Where they are not of great value, however, they often are of such a commercial nature that the dignity of the Government would be better served if they were banned. Where they are of substantial value they may be inappropriate on that ground alone.

The Presidency has another sort of gift with which to cope—that conferred by one

head of state upon another. Most of the time, embarrassment on this count can be escaped by making the gift the property of the Nation—as many of the Presidents have done.

There is one kind of gift which surely is not at all objectionable, the gift to be used in public institutions: furniture and chandeliers for public buildings, rugs for public places. The White House has many such gifts and they reflect no discredit either on the Presidents who have received them or the private persons who have donated them. Here is one way of showing respect for the office and its temporary tenant that is without reproach.

Can troublesome gifts be stopped by law or by Executive order? The idea has been entertained. The statutes, of course, cover outright corruption and bribery as well as gifts which Congress has deemed inappropriate (originating with foreign governments). Perhaps, but not all gifts to public men are as simple and straightforward as those Sherman Adams received.

What about the gift of social standing and prestige? How could it be outlawed? What about the gift that may consist of lucrative private jobs for relatives or for friends? What about the gift which is no more tangible than the expectation of a soft berth after Government service—in case of political misfortune?

Congress has at least been worrying about its own special type of gift—the campaign contribution—and about the favors that Congressmen do to reward past contributions and recommend future ones.

Whatever laws are made or rules adopted, in future as in the past, much no doubt must be left to the conscience of the public man. Appropriate standards, in fact, may not always be exactly the same. Each public man helps build his public legend. His public has a right to insist that his public acts be in conformity with it. And he will feel the reproaches of national opinion as his acts are at variance with the legend, the image that he has helped construct.

Favors extended and received by a Jimmy Walker will not excite quite the same furor as those extended or received by a Sherman Adams.

Fundamentally, in a free and democratic society, the philosophical objection to exchanges of gifts between citizens and public servants arises in the favoritism and discrimination that such a relationship implies. Each citizen, in relation to officials, ought to stand on equal footing; but when one applicant for the attention of a public official is a citizen who has showered him with gifts and the other is a citizen who has given him nothing, there is a plain danger of discrimination.

Gifts, of course, are not the only things that endanger this equality. Long acquaintance, friendship, intimate association, old school ties, blood relation, and a hundred other aspects of life impair the ideal equality of all citizens before the laws and the men who administer the laws.

Gifts, however, are one conspicuous and avoidable menace to impartial administration of Government. They always will be looked upon with suspicion and uneasiness that rises as they increase in value to the recipient and in proportion as the donor is in a position to profit by favor.

There may be other public issues and concerns of great importance from which attention is momentarily diverted by such excursions as those into which the Harris committee has led the country.

This is not an unimportant matter, however. Citizens are properly concerned with the behavior of public men in those areas of everyday life where the common citizen is as good a judge of motives and purposes as the most favored citizen.

The people know, instinctively, that Jefferson was right when he said: "The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest." They are rightly anxious that the practice of the art marks their public affairs.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In addition, the leader of at least one major interest group in our country has indorsed the proposal made by Theodore Roosevelt half a century ago and which I have embodied in legislation. This man is Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO. In an editorial written for the April 1956 issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist, Mr. Meany asked:

Might it not therefore, be a good idea for Congress to provide by law for Government financing of campaigns for Federal office, as proposed in S. 3242, a bill introduced by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER and cosponsored by Senators MORSE, MURRAY, DOUGLAS, SPARKMAN, MANSFIELD, LANGER and HUMPHREY?

If Congress refused to adopt such a law, might it not then consider limiting all campaign contributions to a maximum of $1?

Mr. Meany's attitude is heartening to me, and I ask unanimous consent that his editorial from the American Federationist be printed in the RECORD, along with my letter to him commenting on the editorial, which is dated March 29, 1956.

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

MARCH 29, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL–CIO,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEANY: I was very pleased to see your kind reference to my bill for Federal assistance in campaign financing in your editorial in the American Federationist for April. As you recognize in your editorial, such a step will, in the long run, prove to be the only effective means of freeing our political parties and their candidates for public office from their present unhealthy reliance on vast private campaign funds.

In spite of efforts which are continually made to shift attention to the relatively modest campaign contributions collected by organized working people, your editorial position shows that labor itself recognizes that average men and women can never compete in this respect with the wealth of owners and managers of business enterprises, whose candidates for public office are invariably far better financed.

While I believe that President Theodore Roosevelt's proposal, as embodied in my bill, is the ultimate solution to the financing of modern election campaigns, I have introduced two more modest proposals which could be enacted in connection with clean-elections legislation this year. One of these would make federally paid radio and television broadcast time, worth up to $1 million, available equally to both major parties. The other would permit individual campaign contributions up to $10 a person to be taken as a tax credit (not a deduction from income) against Federal income taxes.

I hope that these two proposals, which are designed to bring more democratic means of financing and more equality to our electoral processes, will also win the support of your great organization.

Again, I appreciate the public-spirited and forward-looking interest which you have taken in the grave problem of election financing.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

THE LOBBY PROBE

(By George Meany)

A special Senate committee has been authorized to undertake a full-scale investigation of political contributions by big business. This investigation was touched off by sensational disclosures regarding the lobbying activities of gas and oil interests. President Eisenhower found these activities so reprehensible that he vetoed the bill freeing natural gas producers from Federal price regulation on that very account.

The AFL–CIO heartily supports this Senate investigation. Despite the law forbidding political contributions by corporations, it is common knowledge in Washington that big business interests have financed political campaigns of individual candidates and political organizations through various legal loopholes.

Frequently these contributions have been made in the name of corporation executives and members of their families. It was not until Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, told the Senate he had been offered a $2,500 campaign contribution by a lawyer representing a gas producer, in the expectation that the Senator would vote for the bill desired by the gas lobby, that the scandalous nature of big business influence upon the legislative process was brought forcibly to public attention.

Since the Senate investigation was authorized, it has been stated in the press that the committee would inquire into political contributions by labor organizations as well as big business. One of the committee members, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, has publicly announced that he will insist that the investigation be broadened to include unions.

Labor welcomes such an investigation. The AFL–CIO, in accordance with the law, files with Congress a complete record of all funds it receives in $1 voluntary political contributions from its members and all expenditures from those funds. There is nothing secret in these activities, which are completely open and aboveboard.

Before the merger both the AFL and CIO maintained separate political committees which collected campaign contributions from members and made expenditures in behalf of candidates from both parties who received labor endorsements. Since the merger the AFL–CIO has established the committee on political education to carry on the same work.

We are proud of the records of these committees. With the help of State organizations, they have endorsed candidates for public office with outstanding records of public service.

Perhaps an attempt will be made to indicate that labor's campaign contributions to candidates, in the aggregate, matched those of business contributors. Such efforts will be doomed to failure, because the fact is that labor has never succeeded in raising by voluntary contributions more than a small fraction of the total amounts expended in any campaign.

It is to the best interests of democracy that the cost of campaigns be financed by as many voters as possible, because this helps to arouse the political consciousness and responsibility of the great masses of the American electorate. It is also obviously in the national interest to prevent a few large campaign contributors from dominating the selection and election of candidates for public office.

Might it not, therefore, be a good idea for Congress to provide by law for Government financing of campaigns for Federal office, as proposed in S. 3242, a bill introduced by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER and cosponsored by Senators MORSE, MURRAY, DOUGLAS, SPARKMAN, MANSFIELD, LANGER, and HUMPHREY? If Congress refuses to adopt such a law, might it not then consider

limiting all campaign contributions to a maximum of $1?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I also ask unanimous consent that a report by the distinguished newsman, Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Oregon Journal of Portland, of June 11, 1958, be printed in the RECORD, along with an editorial from the New York Daily News of June 13, 1958, entitled "Gander Wants No Sauce." In addition, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the news broadcast of Mr. Eric Sevareid, the well-known news analyst on June 11, 1958. I further ask to include, from the Oregon Journal of June 16, 1958, an editorial entitled "Legislation Not the Answer."

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

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of June 11, 1958]

BILL WOULD HAVE CONGRESS TAKE DOSE OF OWN MEDICINE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, may not be adding to his popularity with his colleagues, but he is taking a step which can help the whole Federal Government.

In a bill he is introducing in the Senate this afternoon, Senator NEUBERGER is putting this simple and reasonable proposition to the Members of Congress: Take your own medicine—or else.

This all has to do with conflict of interest and that complex of laws designed to keep public officials from having private interests which could conflict with their public duty.

You will recall with what zest, virtue, even smugness Senate committees cross-examine executive appointees to see if their ownership holdings might at some time under some circumstances unduly influence a decision this official might be called upon to make. And if the mood of the Senate committee is that he better sell his stock, he better sell it whatever the effect on his company or on himself—or he will be off to a bad start.

But, somehow, during all these years of eagerly applying the conflict of interest law to others, members of Congress have never applied it to themselves.

Senator NEUBERGER rightly asks: Why not?

The case for applying the conflict of interest statutes to Congress is unexceptionable.

If a Defense Department official shouldn't make contracts with a company in which he has stock, should a Senator be free to make laws for a business in which he has an interest?

But he is free to do so—and he does.

Recently a Defense official was raked over the coals because, having something to do with ordering military uniforms, it was found that his wife was engaged in manufacturing uniforms. There are wives of Members of Congress who are engaged in business on which their husbands legislate.

Nothing is done about that.

A member of the Federal Communications Commission must not own radio or TV stock because he regulates the industry, but members of the Senate and House Committees on Interstate Commerce, in charge of legislation for the industry, can own radio and TV stock.

The Congressional conflict of interest is almost unending.

Members of Congress are engaged in the oil business and they vote legislation giving special tax provisions to the oil industry.

The are engaged in farming and they vote on farm subsidies.

They take legal fees from the railroads and legislate on railroads.

They are publishers and they vote on second-class postal rates for their publications.

They are lecturers and they take lecture fees from groups who are affected by their legislation.

They are lawyers and they make money from a wide range of clients who have a stake in legislation.

There is plenty of conflict of interest among Members of Congress. If conflict of interest can be guarded against by law—as Congress evidently thinks it can in the executive branch of Government—ought it not to be similarly guarded against in the legislative branch?

That's what Senator NEUBERGER is asking. It will be revealing to see how the Senate and House respond.

"I hold no brief for these existing conflict of interest statutes, which have been subjected to much criticism," Mr. NEUBERGER points out. "My immediate purpose is only to present the principle of equal treatment for elected and appointed officers of our Government and I do not wish to complicate this by simultaneously rewriting the existing rules."

In this area of conflict of interest it seems elemental that all ought to take the same medicine. If, for any reason, Congress is not prepared to take its own medicine, it ought to change the prescription.

[From the New York Daily News of June 13, 1958]

GANDER WANTS NO SAUCE

To the surprise of few, if any, Washington dopesters give Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER's conflict-of-interest bill little chance of passing Congress.

The Oregon Democrat points out that officials in the Government's executive branch have to get rid of any business connections which might influence their official acts—remember former Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson's General Motors stocks that he had to unload?

NEUBERGER'S RIGHT, BUT—

So, NEUBERGER, on the theory that what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, has introduced a bill requiring Members of Congress to part company with stocks, properties, businesses, law clients, and so on, that might influence their votes.

He's right, of course; but if this gander consents to be garnished with this sauce, a near-miracle will have come to pass.

CBS RADIO NEWS ANALYSIS FOR JUNE 11, 1958

(By Eric Sevareid)

Good evening. Henry Adams once wrote that people are always being deceived by the illusion that power in the hands of friends is an advantage to them. Mr. Sherman Adams, of the White House, has power in his hands, probably as much practical political power as anybody in the Capital. And he is the friend of Mr. Bernard Goldfine, of Boston, a man with various business irons in various fires. Question: Has Mr. Goldfine's friendship with Mr. Adams been an advantage to Mr. Goldfine, beyond the natural joys of friendship for its own sweet sake? Mr. Goldfine's lawyers say "No." Mr. Adams will say "No." Mr. Hagerty says Mr. Adams enjoys the President's confidence. The House subcommittee counsel implies that the hotel suites occupied by Mr. Adams, at, it says, Mr. Goldfine's expense, indicate that the answer to the question is, "Yes." The Capital awaits proof, whether or not Henry Adams' maxim pertains in this case.

Right in the middle of all this, just as everybody is bracing himself for another Congressional "orgy of morality," as Swinburne put it—(very handy thing, Bartlett's Quotations)—right in the middle of it all, Oregon's Senator NEUBERGER has committed something akin to booing the preacher. Mr. NEUBERGER seems to have a simple, logical mind, which will get him nowhere in politics.

He has raised a simple, logical point as shattering as that of the child who pointed out that the emperor had no clothes. How, he is saying, can Congressmen tear the liver and lights out of administration officials for mixing up their private business and their public duties, when Congressmen themselves do this all the time—dozens of them? The Senator is introducing a bill to apply the conflict-of-interest laws to Senators and Members of the House.

For, as Mr. Roscoe Drummond recalls for us, Congressmen who own oil and gas wells are always voting on oil and gas legislation; Congressmen who own newspapers vote on the postal-rate laws; Congressmen with farms devise and vote on farm subsidies, and so it goes. It's the old question—who's watching the watchmen? Congressmen, when pressed, usually answer this by declaring that the voters, the good people of the great State of, have passed upon their moral character, and there is no higher earthly judge. But somehow this sounds a bit weak.

Well, maybe Mr. NEUBERGER should go further and submit another bill (it will have about as much chance of passage as his present one), a bill based on the recommendation of the New York publisher, Mr. Alfred Knopf. For some weeks, Mr. Knopf has been proposing a permanent standing committee of leading citizens to investigate Congress; they wouldn't have the power of subpena, of course, unless Mr. NEUBERGER could fix that, but if they do things the way Congressional committees often do things, they could have great fun leaking accusations to the press and great fun watching the accusee trying to make his denial catch up with the accusation.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of June 16, 1958]

LEGISLATION NOT THE ANSWER

We're not sure just what Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER had in mind when he introduced a bill which would apply the conflict-of-interest principle to Members of Congress.

It is doubtful Senator NEUBERGER believes his bill will become law—at least not at this session. If, however, his idea was to call to attention the double standard which Congress maintains on this issue and to spotlight some of the incongruities in the matter, then his mission already is accomplished.

Conflict-of-interest laws are those designed to prevent private interests of public officials from conflicting with the public duty which they are sworn to perform.

Roscoe Drummond, Journal columnist, recently noted "with what zest, virtue even smugness Senate committees cross-examine Executive appointees to see if thier ownership holdings might at some time under some circumstances unduly influence a decision this official might be called upon to make."

At the same time he also noted that Congressional conflict of interest is almost unending—Members who are engaged in the oil business who vote legislation giving special tax provisions to the oil industry, Members engaged in farming who vote on farm subsidies, Members who take legal fees from railroads and legislate on railroads and so on.

Then he asks why, if conflict of interest can be controlled by law, as Congress apparently thinks it can in the executive branch, it should not also be guarded in the legislative branch.

The question is perfectly legitimate. Conflict of interest has no more justification in Congress than it does on the Federal Communications Commission, the Defense Department, or other executive office.

But we doubt whether the answer to the problem lies in the field of legislation. If a Congressman or an executive-department appointee has it within him to use his position to further his personal interests, or those of his friends or clients in contravention of his sworn duty, then he will be a poor appointee or Congressman whether or not there is a conflict-of-interest law on the statute books.

The vigilant Senators required Charles E. Wilson, former Secretary of Defense, to dispose of his General Motors stock because that corporation had and was eligible for additional defense contracts. Yet the same Senators did not require Neil McElroy, former president of Procter & Gamble, to dispose of his stock in that corporation. Are the good Senators suggesting that members of our Armed Forces no longer take baths?

The problem is not unlike that involved in the picking of a jury. In the eyes of some attorneys, an unprejudiced juror is one who has never read anything, who has no friends or relatives, who has never done anything—in fact one whose mind is a total blank at the time the trial starts. We pray that our fate never rests in the hands of such a juror.

There are some rather obvious examples of what should not be done. We would not, for example, have appointed the late Al Capone to head up the FBI. Probably a broker of television stations would be better left off the Federal Communications Commission, and we would think it poor policy to appoint an avowed enemy of public power to a power agency.

But leaving aside the extremes, the conflict-of-interest laws fall into the category of attempts to achieve morality and ethical conduct through legislation. It can't be done.

Appoint and elect the best men available and then watch them like a hawk. No law will ever take the place of public vigilance.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator for the thought-provoking address he has just delivered, and I wish to associate myself with the sentiments he has expressed—and particularly to view with some alarms the failure of Members of Congress to understand the very difficult position in which they place themselves when they carry on, before governmental bureaus, many of the same activities which cause them to complain about Mr. Adams. I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me that the biblical injunction about the mote in our brother's eye and the beam in our own would be a good text for our colleagues, both in the other body and in the Senate, to consider in connection with this subject.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I could not agree more fully with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who, I may add, is my only present cosponsor in connection with Senate bill 3979, to apply equal conflict-of-interest principles to Members of Congress and to executive officials generally. I particularly welcome the Senator's comments.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand, there is a rule of the Senate which calls upon a Member to reveal a conflict-of-interest, and therefore disqualify himself from voting, or, in the alternative, at least to reveal such interest before he casts his vote. Is the Senator aware of such a rule?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am aware that there is such a rule; but it is my understanding that, with respect to most, if not all, of us, it is honored much more in the breach than in the observance thereof.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I recall my astonishment, as a new Senator, at hearing the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], when the postal rate bill was under discussion, state to the Senate that because he owned a newspaper in Virginia he was disqualifying himself from voting on that measure, which affected the postal rates paid by newspapers. I thought that was a fine thing for Senator BYRD to do. I had not appreciated until then that there was such a rule in the Senate; but I do not recall any other instance in the past 2 years in which it has been applied.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I, too, share the admiration of the Senator from Pennsylvania for what the senior Senator from Virginia did. I should like to add a further thought. We seem to have set up a double standard of morality in American politics. Let me explain what I mean. It is regarded as sinful, for example, for Sherman Adams to have accepted a rug from Mr. Goldfine. I do not support that action. I do not defend it. I believe that Mr. Adams showed great indiscretion, and certainly very poor judgment, when he accepted such gifts. Apparently it would have been perfectly legal if Mr. Goldfine had given $50,000 to the campaign fund of Sherman Adams' master, President Eisenhower, when he ran for President of the United States.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon has pending a bill which would remedy the situation with respect to campaign contributions and put them on a better basis, by allowing a tax credit for small campaign contributions. The Senator feels—and I share his views—that that would make it unnecessary, as a practical matter, to raise very large sums for campaign expenditures from wealthy individuals.

Mr. NEUBERGER. There can be no question about that. The bill referred to is pending in committee. I am also the author of a proposal under which the Federal Government would underwrite campaign expenditures, as President Theodore Roosevelt requested in a message to Congress in 1907.

I wish to conclude by emphasizing one particular inconsistency, which seems to me to be the root of much of the corruption in American politics. It is possible for Congress to become terribly exercised about a deepfreeze to Colonel Vaughan, under the Truman administration, and about a rug and hotel suites for Sherman Adams under the Eisenhower administration. Yet William S. White, the author of a definitive book on the United States Senate, has written that it takes approximately $200,000 in a campaign fund to elect a Senator in an average State, and a million dollars in a populous State.

So long as we permit these huge campaign funds in American politics, to which big business and big industry and trade-union educational funds can contribute, it seems to me that when we become excited over trivial things, we are, to repeat, swatting at flies instead of draining the swamp.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. I agree thoroughly with the Senator. I believe he knows that there is pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on which we both serve, a bill which has passed the House of Representatives, and which proposes to establish a code of ethics for Government employees. I do not know at the moment whether the code mentions elected public officials. I wonder whether the Senator would give some thought to whether we might interest our colleagues on that committee to report a bill, with suitable amendments, on that subject, before Congress adjourns at this session.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe we should work toward that end. One reason the bill has not moved thus far in committee is that it does not contain any enforcement provisions. In other words, it is toothless, as only a mere statement of principles. As I understand, it applies to the lesser bureaucrats, rather than persons in higher positions. It should contain some enforcement clauses.

Mr. CLARK. I suspect that the Senator agrees with me that that kind of long range governmental reform takes several sessions of Congress to bring about. I hope that my good friend from Oregon will still be here when the reforms which he espouses with such logic and persuasion, become law. I commend him for his interest in this subject, and I point out again that, although it may take a long time to accomplish such reforms, we should nevertheless start somewhere.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. I believe he has made a chronological underestimate with respect to the time element involved. It was in 1907, over a half century ago, that Theodore Roosevelt, one of our most vigorous and illustrious Presidents, became concerned about the dominance of campaign funds in American political life. That was before the days of radio and television and the other mass media of communications.

Mr. CLARK. That was before Cadillacs, too.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know if it was before Cadillacs or vicuna coats, but certainly it was before the day of multi-million-dollar campaign funds. That was 51 years ago. Nevertheless, this proposal, which originated with a great President, whose centennial we are celebrating, still languishes in committee and still has not come to life. The recent episode concerning Sherman Adams should give Congress the impetus, once and for all, to banish the importance and the dominance of large political campaign contributions in American public life.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the Senate still proceeding with the transaction of morning business? We have had 2 speeches now, which have lasted for 45 minutes,

when we are supposed to be operating under the 3-minute rule. Are we still operating under the heading of morning business?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Pennsylvania had no intention of violating the 3-minute rule.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have addressed a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. The junior Senator from Virginia must attend in another place and his opportunity to speak to the Senate is limited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The previous speaker was speaking for a longer period under unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the Senator who is about to speak will limit himself to the 3-minute rule, I have no objection. I call attention to the fact that the previous speakers took 45 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Virginia that the junior Senator from Oregon, who was the preceding speaker, obtained unanimous consent to speak for an additional 10 minutes. I believe he did not exceed the additional time limit.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] also obtained unanimous consent to speak for a longer time.

PROPOSED HOUSING ACT OF 1958

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the proposed Housing Act of 1958 will be before the Senate within a few days. This bill has been painstakingly put together under the leadership of the eminent junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], whose position as a housing expert is unparalleled in this body. It has been one of my greatest pleasures as a new Senator to explore this complicated field under his leadership and guidance.

The bill is a complex one. It is, perhaps, most complex in the fundamental changes made in the public housing program in an effort to revive a program which is needed more than ever, but which has been gradually dying in the past few years. Testimony before our subcommittee indicated very strongly that public housing was dying from strangulation with redtape and from suffocation under the tight controls of a Washington bureaucracy.

Perhaps the best brief guide to an understanding of this bill is an address delivered last night by the able Senator from Alabama before the National Housing Conference here in Washington. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the text of the Senator's address and commend it for the study of my colleagues.

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

I am again honored by your invitation to address the annual convention of the National Housing Conference.

It has been my privilege to address you many times. Usually, your annual meeting takes place at a critical stage of the legislative year. This year is no exception. Only last Thursday, I reported a Banking and Currency Committee bill to the Senate. It is now on the Senate Calendar and will be debated in the near future. If enacted, it will become the Housing Act of 1958. If its major provisions are retained—and I am hopeful they will be—this year's housing act will be one of the most fundamental, and far reaching, enactments in many years.

The committee bill is, in my judgment, sound in its basic policy direction, and eminently practical in its approach. Its general purpose is to take another step forward toward achieving the policy, set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, of decent housing for all of our people.

The bill is practical in its approach, for it depends primarily on local initiative and responsibility.

Another way of describing the theme of this year's bill is that it attempts to cut redtape, and decentralize Federal housing programs, wherever feasible.

The present status of housing has both its encouraging and discouraging aspects.

The Census Bureau reported over 1 million new nonfarm households formed in 1957. This compares with the production of less than 1 million new homes for the same period. This means that we are still losing ground in trying to meet the needs of a growing Nation.

Moreover, on the qualitative side, the Census Bureau reported the continuing existence of 13 million substandard dwelling units in the United States—roughly one-fourth of the total inventory. A generation ago, one-third of the Nation was ill-housed. Today, one-fourth of the Nation is ill-housed. This slight improvement should give little comfort to the wealthiest and most powerful Nation on earth.

Faced with these realities, it is imperative that more and more people at the grassroots become aware of the basic need for good housing programs, that they speak out in loud and clear voices. Dedicated organizations like yours offer a medium for this important task. It is to the great credit of your own National Housing Conference that it has contributed so much to better housing for America's less fortunate families.

When all is said and done, the realization of the need, coupled with a spirit of dedication to do something about it, constitute the ingredients of success in influencing national policy.

The committee bill now on the calendar is not the first housing bill this year. Earlier this year, you will recall, the Congress enacted, with bipartisan support—in fact, with only one lonely dissenting voice—an antirecession housing measure.

The results have been very encouraging. FHA applications for insurance and VA requests for appraisal have increased rapidly. Even the building industry itself seems a little surprised at the success of the program. The main reason why it went through Congress, in record time, and has since done such a good job, is that it is based upon what I believe is sound policy. The entire bill was directed at the great unmet market for low- and medium-priced homes. As you know, this is an old and familiar tune I have been playing for some time.

I still do not understand, however, why the President is so troubled by Congressional action in the field of housing. Despite the speed and unanimity with which the Congress adopted the emergency housing bill, the President waited until the 11th hour before he signed it; and in signing it, he voiced extensive objections to its main features. Now that the beneficial results of the Emergency Housing Act are becoming evident, I hope the White House will concede that the Congress has some understanding of the Nation's housing needs.

I have been somewhat amused by that part of the press which originally attacked the emergency housing bill, but now that it has worked so well, call it a statesmanlike administration act.

The bill now on the Senate Calendar is also a good bill, and it deserves the same kind of bipartisan support accorded the Emergency Housing Act.

The Subcommittee on Housing, after long and serious discussion, assembled an omnibus bill. In general terms, the bill has these objectives:

It would make a long-term commitment toward the support of urban renewal.

It would expand and strengthen programs such as low-rent public housing, relocation housing, and rental housing generally, which are indispensable to the ultimate success of urban renewal.

It would create a new FHA title for elderly persons.

It would broaden the scope of college housing.

It would extend and strengthen many other activities such as title I home improvement, military housing, and farm housing research.

Now, for a few minutes, let us examine some of the highlights of the bill, and see if it deserves—as I think it does—the same bipartisan support given to the emergency housing legislation.

In the urban renewal title of the bill, the committee recommends that the Federal Government make a 6-year commitment to the urban-renewal program, at an annual rate of $350 million in grant authorization, which could be increased to $500 million a year if necessary. The volume of current applications proves that the urban-renewal program could have used up to $500 million this year. Thus, the committee recommendation is based on a reasonable forecast of future needs. Anything less would be a betrayal of our promise in the Housing Act of 1949 to rid the American cities of slums and blight.

The administration also requests a 6-year program but at an annual rate of $250 million for 3 years, which would be reduced to $200 million for the last 3 years. Moreover, the administration would increase the local share of the cost from one-third to one-half. The overwhelming majority of witnesses testifying before our subcommittee, in the field in the autumn and recently here in Washington, state categorically that a reduction in the Federal share would virtually choke off the Federal program.

In fact, in view of the upsurge of interest in urban renewal in all parts of the country, I am confident that the committee bill will win broad support in the Congress.

More money, however, is not all that is needed to make urban renewal work. A provision in this year's bill would speed up the whole renewal process by cutting red-tape and simplifying the requirements of the urban renewal plan. Another provision permits a slight expansion in the use of urban renewal funds for commercial and industrial redevelopment.

At long last, the need for community-wide planning is recognized. Planning grants for community renewal programs would become available for the first time. Following adoption of this new type of programing, as well as the existing planning for general neighborhood renewal, credit for noncash grants-in-aid would be available over a 5-year period prior to the signing of the loan and grant contract.

These urban renewal amendments are, I believe, fundamentally sound and defensible. They could stimulate a great deal of activity in all parts of the country, especially in small- and medium-sized communities. But they depend in great measure on our finding an effective solution to a growing problem; namely, the problem of providing decent relocation housing for displaced families.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my conviction that urban renewal will succeed only to the extent that a successful solution is found for the relocation problem.

To meet this problem, the committee bill would:

1. Provide relocation payments to any family displaced by governmental action in an urban renewal area, by code enforcement activities, or by a program of voluntary rehabilitation.

2. Require a local public agency to give displaced business concerns a priority of opportunity to relocate in the renewal area.

3. Permit FHA section 221 housing for displaced families to be built anywhere within the environs of a community with an approved workable program.

One of the most pressing needs in the housing field today is recognized by title II of the bill which would create a new and separate program for elderly persons housing. You may recall that 3 years ago the subcommittee prepared an extensive analysis of the problem, and in the following legislative year, I submitted a bill based upon this analysis. It was a recommendation that a new FHA section 229 be created especially for elderly persons. It lost in conference, in large measure because the administration felt that a special program for the elderly was not justified.

This year, however, the administration has stated that such a new program is needed. If it does not change its mind again, I believe that we will now make great strides toward a realistic housing program for our elderly citizens.

The differences between the administration's recommendation for housing for the elderly and mine are relatively minor. The administration thinks that all units in an elderly persons' project should be designed exclusively for the elderly. I have come around to the view that it is undesirable to colonize the elderly, and I am therefore recommending that a project qualify for FHA insurance if at least 50 percent of the units are designed for the elderly.

Another point on which we disagree is that the administration would confine the benefits of insurance to nonprofit organizations. As a long-time advocate of getting private enterprise into the housing field as much as possible, I am recommending that profitmaking organizations be given an opportunity to participate in the program.

Another relatively minor difference is that I believe the valuation basis for insurance should be changed from value to replacement cost, in keeping with similar changes we have made for other programs.

Perhaps no other housing program has stimulated such wide interest. Certainly this title of the bill should warrant wide support.

Another major change proposed in this year's bill concerns the college housing loan program. An amendment is included in the bill to add a new section to authorize Federal loans to colleges for construction or rehabilitation of classrooms and other college buildings. The authorization for this purpose would be $250 million. This amount would be in addition to the new authorization of $400 million proposed for the regular college housing loan program.

You may recall last year when I spoke to you I promised that the committee would take a long look at the public housing program and come up with some new ideas for 1958.

I believe that we have found some new ideas, and I think they will work.

Public housing has been in the doldrums for several years. Of the 70,000 low-rent units authorized in 1956, it is disappointing to find 2 years later that only 9,000 are under contract, and only 200 are under construction. Obviously, something has been wrong, and I think we have found what it is.

Witnesses before our subcommittee during hearings last fall testified about the excessive redtape and harmful effects of excessive centralization. We were told that local executive directors were unable to make any important decisions without clearing them with PHA.

Now you and I know this was not the intent of the original Housing Act of 1937. The program was established as a local program, with local boards of directors, and locally appointed staffs. The Federal Government's part was to assist in financing the program by committing itself to paying off the initial construction and development cost. Everything else was to be the responsibility of the local authority with overall direction from the Federal Government through the PHA.

This year, after many hours of testimony and volumes of written material submitted for the attention of the Subcommittee on Housing, I prepared a committee print which included a new policy for public housing. The objectives added to the old policy statement are the following:

1. To build smaller projects better related to local neighborhoods.

2. To give local public agencies more responsibility for the operation of their projects.

3. To permit the sale of units to overincome tenants or to permit such tenants to remain at an unsubsidized rent if suitable private housing is not available.

The key to this entire policy statement, in my opinion, is that to a much greater degree it gives full management responsibility to the local authority. The local authority would be responsible for establishing rents and eligibility requirements, preparation of budgets, the control of expenditures, and the provision of such social and recreational guidance as is necessary to make good citizens of the tenants.

Second, the bill would permit a local authority to establish rent schedules and income limits. This feature would be an implementation of the policy objective of more local autonomy, and with the new incentive feature written into law, I believe the PHA would be wasting its time by insisting on a tight control of rents and income. I feel that opposition to this feature will disappear when it is better understood.

Third, the bill would extend the present authorization for another year and authorize an additional 35,000 units for 1961 and 1962. This is a small number of new units to be proposed, but does assure continuity on which plans can be made for the future.

Fourth, the bill would make a new allocation of residual receipts, which are now being returned to the Federal Government to reduce the annual contributions. The proposed bill would use two-thirds for reduction of capital debt and thereby speed up the amortization of the debt. One-third would be retained by the local authority for low-rent housing use.

Let me give you an example of how the provision would work. Suppose a housing authority had $10,000 residual receipts and an annual contributions contract for $100,000. Under present law, the Federal Government would use the $10,000 to reduce the contribution from $100,000 to $90,000. Under the proposed law, $6,700 of the $10,000 would be used for advanced amortization; the other $3,300 would go to the local authority.

Now, let us see how the Federal Government comes out on this new plan.

On the loss side, annual contributions would be increased by $10,000 a year for 40 years, or $400,000.

On the credit side, the payment of $6,700 a year toward advance amortization would result in paying off the loan in 35 years rather than 40 years. The savings here would be 5 times $100,000 or $500,000.

You can see that the Federal Government loses $400,000 on the one hand and gains $500,000 on the other, or a net savings of $100,000.

There is every reason to believe that with a built-in local incentive to improve efficiency, operating costs will be reduced further and even more savings can be expected by the Federal Government. Certainly, there can be no objection to the Federal Government's saving money.

The bill would also permit the sale of units to overincome tenants. A local authority would use this at its discretion when found practical and feasible. If not feasible, such tenants could be left in occupancy if no reasonably-priced private housing is available to them.

There is another feature of the bill which deserves bipartisan support. It establishes a plan for low-income families to pull themselves up by the bootstraps. It gives the family a home, encouraging it to work harder and to improve its financial position. Under present law, a hard-working and industrious family winds up either losing its incentive, or being evicted from its home. The new law would award industry and hard work by holding out the goal of home ownership.

I am hopeful that the real-estate people will come to like this new provision because it is a plan for returning public-housing units to the private-housing field.

These new public-housing features of the bill are good, it seems to me. If properly administered, they should result in a revival of interest in this vital part of our Federal housing program. All the legislation in the world will go for naught if we do not have good administration. This is particularly true at the local level. I am hopeful that the public-housing title of the committee bill will inspire a resurgence of strength in local authorities.

Public housing was initially a crusade for decency in American family life; it must not lose that crusading spirit. New legislation will help, but it will succeed only if you make it succeed.

In closing, I want to join all of you in expressing profound and sincere regret over the departure of Lee Johnson. So many good things have already been said about him that there is little I can add. Even so, I know we all share the feeling that his contributions toward helping to make it possible for all Americans to have decent homes have been exceedingly great.

Lee has been the Washington workhorse in the field of housing. With one of the smallest staffs on the Washington scene, the volume of useful information made available has been truly remarkable.

One need not agree with everything he has proposed—and I am sure we all know opponents of the National Housing Conference's views—to appreciate his untiring efforts and his complete and unselfish devotion to the cause of better housing.

Lee is truly one of the most effective housing champions of all time.

I am delighted to join with you to wish him well in his new grassroots assignment. If the committee bill is enacted into law, Lee Johnson and people like him in other parts of the country will hold the key to its success. In fact, the Lee Johnsons of our Nation, operating with dedication at the local level, will, I am confident, make the program work.

SEVEN DAYS UNTIL JULY 1—PROSPECTIVE INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF STEEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on yesterday I put in the RECORD letters written by Mr. W. L. Litle, chairman of the board and president of the Bucyrus-Erie Co., to President Eisenhower and Secretary Mitchell, together with a reply from Secretary Mitchell. In his letter to

the President, Mr. Litle, whose firm is the world's foremost manufacturer of power cranes and excavators, stated that unless the inflationary spiral is stopped, American manufacturers will have priced themselves out of the world markets. This would mean that firms such as his could compete in world markets only by building branch plants abroad, which of course would deprive American workers of employment.

They may, in addition, be pricing themselves out of the domestic market as well. The Wall Street Journal of June 23 quotes an official of one automobile company as stating:

Our prices are too high now. We know it, and we are determined to hold the line if at all possible.

If one can judge from recent surveys which were made by the Wall Street Journal and the magazine Steel, the prospect of having to face another increase in the price of their basic raw material fills many American manufacturers with gloom. The reason for their apprehension is not difficult to determine. In a number of industries, there still exists a considerable degree of true price competition. As a result of the current recession, there also exists a buyers market. Under these circumstances, no single producer in such an industry can be sure—as United States Steel appears to be sure—that any price increase which it makes would be paralleled by a comparable increase on the part of its competitors. It is this lack of certainty as to what the reactions of their competitors will probably be that sharply distinguishes competitive industries from the steel industry.

In its survey which covered 40 midwestern steel-using firms, the Wall Street Journal found that they are reluctant to raise prices even if they have to pay more for steel—June 23, 1958. The survey cited particular firms, of which the following appear to be typical:

Mr. John E. Carroll, president of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., of St. Paul, Minn., said:

We cannot pass along any price increases on our products. Even if we were in the red, which we are not, we couldn't raise prices because we'd lose too much business by doing so.

Mr. Francis J. Trecker, president of Kearney & Trecker Corp., Milwaukee, Wis., is quoted as saying:

There is no possible chance of increasing prices on machine tools at this time. Any added cost of steel would have to come from our profit—if there is a profit.

Mr. Ben F. Lease, president of Athey Products Corp., a Chicago heavy-duty trailer manufacturer, said:

Price cutting now is widespread in our industry. I don't know how you can pass along any steel price increase in those circumstances.

In its survey of manufacturers of metal-working equipment—in which steel is an important cost element—the trade magazine Steel found that because of competition it would be difficult, if not impossible, for many equipment manufacturers to pass on any increase in steel prices. The magazine cites a manufacturer of belt conveyors as stating:

There is definite price weakness in this field. Even the most ethical blue-chip producers are cutting quotations.

A producer of hydraulic presses is quoted as saying:

Some manufacturers want to fill their shop so badly they'll not only operate at smaller per unit profit but sometimes quote under cost.

A manufacturer of presses reports:

Some companies are accepting business at a loss to keep their plants operating.

This is not to say that none of the increase in the price of steel will be passed on to the consumer. But it is to say that if the recession continues, companies in competitive industries will find it much more difficult than last year to pass along the cost of a steel price rise, which in some cases will spell hardship, if not insolvency. No such difficulty is to be expected, of course, in industries where price competition no longer exists. There, the full increase will undoubtedly be passed on—with probably something more, to boot.

Mr. President, if the steel companies do raise their prices, their gain in unit profits will be at the expense of the American consumer in cases in which the increase can be passed on, and at the expense of steel-using firms in competitive industries when in which it cannot be passed on. In either event, the steel companies' gain would be the Nation's loss.

There remain only 7 more days for President Eisenhower to act to prevent the expected price increase.

FEDERAL AID FOR WILDLIFE PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of a resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Conservation Commission at its 23d annual meeting in Madison, Wis. The resolution stresses the need for a change in the formula for distributing funds for wildlife projects under the Pittman-Robertson Act. Under this act, funds are collected through an excise tax on guns and ammunition. After administrative costs and certain statutory outlays to territories are deducted, the money is reapportioned to the States on a 25 percent matching basis by the States.

However, there are now serious inequities in the program.

For example, under present methods of distribution, Wisconsin last year received only 83 cents per license issued. By contrast, other States received up to $8.50 per license. This is definitely unfair.

Currently, there are two approaches being considered for improving this law: First, the resolution proposes to change the formula so as to give greater consideration to the number of licenses issued, to license holders, rather than to land area. This is on a 50–50 basis.

Incidentally, such a proposal is contained in S. 3920, now pending before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This measure would change the formula from a 50–50 basis, to allocating 60 percent of the funds on the basis of licenses issued to holders, and 40 percent on land area.

Second, the bill I introduced today would, if enacted, help to assure that the formula would not be further distorted, as now being considered by the Department of the Interior.

As Senators know, a change is being considered which would require that funds now be allocated on the basis of the number of license holders—rather than on the traditional basis of the number of licenses issued.

To avoid prolonging or increasing the inequities in the law, I respectfully urge that the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee consider these two bills as soon as possible.

To indicate the deep concern with which the Wisconsin Conservation Congress views the need for improving this program, I request unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Whereas the national wildlife conservation program has been benefited tremendously through the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, better known as the Pittman-Robertson program;

Whereas the Wisconsin Conservation Department Game Management Division's program has been strengthened and increased through the receipt of Federal aid to wildlife restoration funds;

Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior now plans to change the method of apportionment of the Federal aid to wildlife restoration funds to the States;

Whereas such change in computing the apportionment will have a damaging effect on the Wisconsin wildlife conservation program by reducing funds available to Wisconsin;

Whereas the change in the apportionment procedure is apparently the result of political pressure on the part of certain States;

Whereas the change in the apportionment procedure will result in each State having to institute costly sampling procedures to determine the number of paid license holders; and

Whereas the change in the apportionment procedure fails to recognize the need of the States for funds to conduct a wildlife management program: Therefore be it

Resolved by this 23d meeting of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress, That the apportionment procedure which has been in effect for almost 20 years and which has proven to be highly acceptable be continued, that if the United States Fish and Wildlife Service insists on a change in the procedure along with a required expensive sampling procedure that the representatives of the State of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States introduce suitable legislation to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act to give in the apportionment formula more consideration to numbers of license holders and less consideration to land area of the States. * * *

Resolutions committee: Glen L. Garlock, chairman (Forest County); Donald L. Hollman (Adams County); Edward F. Keip (Manitowoc County).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3057) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1850) to adjust conditions of employment in departments or agencies in the Canal Zone, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HEMPHILL, Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina, Mr. REES of Kansas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska, and Mr. DENNISON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11246. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1902, to exempt certain common carriers of passengers from the mileage tax imposed by that act and from certain other taxes;

H. R. 12643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia,' to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia,' and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the Middle Atlantic Shrine Association meeting of A. A. O. N. M. S. in September 1958, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Almas Temple Shrine Activities, Inc., on the occasions of such meetings, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2548. An act to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of the construction area of the New Cumberland Dam project by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of New Cumberland Dam project;

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Lake Greeson Reservoir, Narrows Dam;

H. R. 5033. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.;

H. R. 6641. An act to fix the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land therein, and to provide for the transfer of certain land not included within said boundary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7081. An act to provide for the removal of a cloud on the title to certain real property located in the State of Illinois;

H. R. 7917. An act for the relief of Ernst Haeusserman;

H. R. 9381. An act to designate the lake above the diversion dam of the Solano project in California as Lake Solano;

H. R. 9382. An act to designate the main dam of the Solano project in California as Monticello Dam;

H. R. 10009. An act to provide for the reconveyance of certain surplus real property to Newaygo, Mich.;

H. R. 10035. An act for the relief of Federico Luss;

H. R. 10349. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 10969. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended;

H. R. 11058. An act to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments;

H. R. 11399. An act relating to price support for the 1958 and subsequent crops of extra long staple cotton;

H. R. 12052. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed at Stewarts Ferry, Tenn., as the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir;

H. R. 12164. An act to permit use of Federal surplus foods in nonprofit summer camps for children;

H. R. 12521. An act to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to withhold certain amounts due employees of the House of Representatives;

H. R. 12586. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury;

H. R. 12613. An act to designate the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River, Ill., as the Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam; and

H. J. Res. 577. A joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 11246. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1902, to exempt certain common carriers of passengers from the mileage tax imposed by that act and from certain other taxes;

H. R. 12643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia,' to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia,' and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the Middle Atlantic Shrine Association meeting of A. A. O. N. M. S. in September 1958, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Almas Temple Shrine Activities, Inc., on the occasions of such meetings, and for other purposes.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Pursuant to the unanimous consent order previously entered, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 7999.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] may, during the consideration on the Alaska statehood bill, have present with him on the floor of the Senate, to assist him, a member of his staff, Mr. Jack Howard.

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

TIME FOR STATEHOOD PAST DUE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the time is past due for the admission of Alaska to the Union. The issue has been defined in each of the last seven Congresses, and now has come before the Senate in this 85th Congress. All possible arguments in support of and in opposition to Alaska statehood have been raised and discussed. Both parties have time and again pledged support to statehood. The issue is not new, it is not partisan. There is no need for an exhaustive review of the facts and arguments, nor for partisan attacks on one another.

From the beginning, the emphasis of the Territories Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been on getting at the basic provisions that would achieve statehood. As a result of this approach, the subcommittee recommended unanimously a statehood bill, and the full committee voted with but one dissent to report a statehood bill. Members on both sides of the aisle worked hard on this issue, and it is only proper that the presentation of the bill be a bipartisan effort. Certainly one of the hardest-working members of the Territories Subcommittee, and its ranking minority member, was the distinguished junior Senator from California. I am grateful to him and all the members of my committee for their generous support.

First let me make perfectly clear the legislative situation in which we find ourselves. We face the almost unbelievable situation in which Alaska statehood could be voted by both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and still not go to the President for signature. It is possible and probable that the Senate's will thus could be frustrated by the parliamentary rules of the House of Representatives. It is for this reason that we are taking up H. R. 7999, which has already been passed by the other body. These are the legislative facts of life: if, as the result of any action taken by the Senate, the statehood bill must return to the other body, Alaska statehood could die in the House of Representatives.

Now, I am not demanding that the Senate accept without question the action of the House of Representatives. Certainly there are several approaches to the goal of statehood for Alaska.

Nevertheless, in all candor and honesty, it must be made clear to the Senate and to the Nation that if the bill now before us is sent back to the other body for conference or for concurrence in

Senate amendments, there is the possibility that the bill will end up in the Rules Committee and will die there. Every Senator should recognize this fact, and should reflect on the situation as we proceed to consideration of the bill. If the Senate truly wants statehood for Alaska, we must make certain that the will of the Senate—shared by a strong majority of the other body—shall not be overturned by a small committee of the other body.

DIFFERENCES NOT GREAT

So let us first examine the differences between the House and Senate bills. They are not great. Both bills originally were identical. Many amendments added by the Senate subcommittee also were adopted in toto by the House committee. But there were additional amendments added on the House floor, and these now provide the main distinguishing features of H. R. 7999.

Let me review briefly the outstanding differences between the bill now under consideration, and the bill previously reported by the Senate committee. It should be quickly obvious that the differences are of wording and language rather than policy.

At the outset, the House bill requires the voters of Alaska to answer the question, "Shall Alaska immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?" No one could object to such a plebiscite, and there is certainly no policy issue interjected by this question.

Another difference between the bills is to be found in the provision for land surveys. S. 49 authorizes an appropriation of $15 million to survey lands in the new State. The House bill does not. Since our bill was reported by the committee, Alaska has found new sources of revenue to finance her development—sources that will far exceed the $15 million we originally proposed to authorize. If our bill were being reported now instead of a year ago, we, too, would have made this change.

There is a difference in approach between the two bills with reference to management and administration of Alaska's fish and wildlife resources. S. 49 would permit the new State to assume immediate jurisdiction over such resources. The House bill would delay the transfer of jurisdiction until the Secretary of the Interior determines that adequate provision has been made by Alaska to assume its responsibilities. In both bills the end result would be achieved; the only difference is one of timing, because the intent of both bills is clearly that Alaska is ultimately to manage her own resources.

LEGAL AND TECHNICAL DIFFERENCES

Many of the remaining differences are purely legal or technical. They are designed to define more clearly some of the jurisdictional problems involved between Alaska and the huge areas of the State that may be reserved by the Federal Government. The objective of both bills is identical. There is strong evidence that the end product of both bills would be identical.

Among the other differences is a provision in the Senate bill restating the existing constitutional law forbidding discrimination by one State against citizens of another State. Another difference relates to providing the use of water areas to aid in the performance of national forest logging operations. So that all Members of the Senate may have a clear understanding of the exact differences between the two bills, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a section-by-section comparison of the two bills.

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

SECTION BY SECTION COMPARISON OF S. 49 AND H. R. 7999

S. 49	H. R. 7999
Section 1: Admission of Alaska to the Union.	Identical.
Section 2: Defines boundaries.	Identical.
Section 3: State constitution shall be republican in form.	Identical.
Section 4: Compact between the United States and the people and State of Alaska.	Identical except as below:
Page 3, lines 11–12: "[Federal lands and Indian lands] shall be and remain under the absolute control of the United States."	Page 3, lines 6 and 7: "shall be and remain under the absolute *jurisdiction and* control of the United States."
Page 4, lines 8–14: The State may not unreasonably discriminate against nonresidents.	No provision.
Section 5: Title to Territorial United States lands confirmed in present owners.	Identical.
Section 6: (a) Land selection for community development.	Identical except as below:
No time limit.	Twenty-five-year limit for selection of 800,000 acres of public land.
Page 5, lines 12–13: Selection not to "affect *the validity of any existing contract or* any valid."	Page 5, lines 2–3: Selection not to "affect any valid."
(b) Land selection for other purposes.	Identical.
(c) Grant of land in Juneau.	Identical.
(d) Additional grant in Juneau.	Identical.
(e) Administration fish and wildlife resources.	Identical except as below:
Administration turned over to State since no provision made for Federal Government to retain control.	Administration retained by Federal Government until the Secretary of the Interior certifies that the State has made "adequate provision." Pages 6–7, lines 19–25, 1–2, respectively.

SECTION BY SECTION COMPARISON OF S. 49

Page 7, lines 8–9: "*or such lands and personal property utilized* in connection with" fish and wildlife research retained by the United States.

(f) Support of public schools.

(g) 12½ percent of timber sales to go to State in addition to the 25 percent as paid to other States.

(h) Method of selecting land.

Page 9, lines 6–7: "Except as provided *for national-forest lands* in subsection (a), all lands granted" in conformity with regulations of the Secretary.

(i) Leases under Mineral Leasing Act and Alaska Coal Leasing Act.

(j) Grants include mineral deposits.

(k) Notice of intent to select land prevents Federal withdrawal for 5 years except for military or naval purposes or by Act of Congress.

(l) Schools provided for shall remain public and no proceeds from land grants to be used for sectarian or denominational schools.

(m) Previous grants confirmed.

Page 14, lines 16–18: "all lands * * * *including the interests, powers and rights of the United States under any contract, lease, permit or license outstanding with relation to any of such lands,* shall * * *."

Page 14, lines 21–23: "but such repeal *and grant* shall not affect *the terms or validity of* any outstanding lease, permit, license, or contract issued under said section 1, as amended, *or otherwise,* or any * * *."

Page 15, lines 2–4: "as amended."

Page 15, line 1: "such repeal *and grant* from * * *."

(n) Grants in lieu of internal improvement grants.

(o) Applicability of Submerged Lands Act.

Pages 15–16, lines 20–25 and 1–8, respectively: Alaska must provide access over tidelands and necessary water areas to aid performance of national forest logging contracts.

Section 7: Proclamation for elections.

Section 8: (a) Procedure for calling election.

Page 17, line 10: "said elections, *as so ascertained,* to the President * * *."

(b) Ballot to be submitted.

Page 17, line 17: "or rejection, the following propositions:"

No provision.

Page 18, line 6: "In the event the foregoing propositions are adopted * * *."

Page 18, lines 10–11: "In the event the foregoing propositions are not * * *."

(c) Presidential proclamation.

(d) Territorial laws continue in effect.

Section 9: State entitled to one Representative.

Section 10: (a) Defense withdrawals authorized.

(b) Area for such withdrawals defined.

(c) State jurisdiction within withdrawals.

Pages 23–24, lines 16–24, and 1–5, respectively: State may enact new tax laws affecting persons and corporations within withdrawals.

(d) State authority within withdrawals.

(1) General laws of Congress.

(2) Military enactments.

(3) Existing laws in withdrawals.

(4) United States Commissioners.

(5) Municipal corporations.

Pages 25–26, 19–25 and 1–5, respectively: "All functions vested in any municipal corporation, school district, or other local political subdivision by the laws described in this subsection, *including the function of enacting and enforcing new or amendatory laws, rules or regulations,* shall continue to be performed within the withdrawals by

S. 49 AND H. R. 7999—Continued

H. R. 7999	S. 49	H. R. 7999
Page 7, line 5: "or in connection with * * *."	such corporations, district or other subdivision, and the *existing and future* laws and ordinances of such municipalities or local political subdivisions, shall *be* in full force and effect notwithstanding any withdrawals made under this section:"	ordinances of such municipalities or local political subdivision shall remain in full force and effect notwithstanding any withdrawals made under this section.
Identical.	Page 26, lines 5–13: Inconsistent ordinances and State laws designed for the purpose of defeating Federal jurisdiction inoperative.	
No provision.	(6) Performance of functions otherwise performed by State officers or agencies.	No specific provision.
(g) Identical except as below:	Page 26, line 19: "by such persons or agencies * * * [to be appointed by the President]."	Identical except as below:
Page 8, lines 18–19: "Except as provided in subsection (a), all lands granted * * *."	(7) United States District Court jurisdiction.	Page 23, line 8: "by such *civilian individuals or civilian* agencies * * *."
(h) Identical.	(e) United States jurisdiction not limited by the description of laws to be in effect.	Identical.
(i) Identical.	(f) Specific protection of rights under eminent domain.	Identical.
No provision.	Section 11: (a) Mount McKinley National Park.	No provision.
(j) Identical.	(b) Military reservations.	Identical.
(k) Identical except as below.	Page 28, lines 24–25: "[owned by the] * * * United States and *used and* held for Defense or Coast * * *."	Identical except as below:
Pages 12–13, lines 25 and 1, respectively: "all lands * * * shall * * *."	Section 12: Technical changes in existing laws.	Page 25, lines 6–7: "United States and held for military, naval, Air Force or Coast * * *."
Page 13, lines 3–5: "but such repeal shall not affect any outstanding lease, permit, license or contract issued under said section 1, as amended, or any * * *."	Page 30, lines 6–7: "Effective upon the admission of *the State of* Alaska into * * *."	Identical except as below:
Page 13, lines 8–11: "as amended, *or derived thereafter from any disposition of the reserved lands or an interest therein made prior to such repeal.*"	Section 13: Pending litigation shall not abate.	Page 26, line 14: "Effective upon the admission of Alaska into * * *."
Page 13, lines 7–8: "such repeal from * * *."	Section 14: Appeals from District Court of Alaska.	Identical.
(l) Identical.	Section 15: Pending litigation transferred.	Identical.
(m) Identical except as below:	Section 16: Jurisdiction of State courts.	Identical.
No provision.	Section 17: Appeals from State courts to United States Supreme Court.	Identical.
Identical.	Section 18: Termination of Territorial district court.	Identical except as below.
Identical except as below:	Page 36, line 19: "The provisions of this act relating to the * * *".	Page 33, lines 3–4: "The provisions of *the preceding sections with respect* to the * * *."
Page 15, line 4: "said elections to the President * * *."	Page 37, lines 6–13: Territorial court to handle cases in State jurisdiction until State asserts readiness to assume.	No provision.
Identical except as below:	Section 19: Federal Reserve Act amended.	Identical except as below:
Page 15, line 11: "or rejection, *by separate ballot on each*, the following propositions:"	Page 37, line 21: "When the State of Alaska or any State is hereafter * * *."	Page 33, line 24: "When the State of Alaska is hereafter * * *."
Page 15, lines 13–14: "(1) Shall Alaska immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?"	Section 20: Repeal coal withdrawal act of 1914.	Identical.
Page 16, line 1: "In the event *each of* the foregoing propositions *is* adopted * * *."	Section 21: Authorizes appropriation of $15 million for land surveys.	No provision.
Page 16, lines 5–6: "In the event *any one of* the foregoing propositions *is* not * * *."	Section 22: (a) Distribution of coal profits.	Section 28: (a) Identical.
Identical.	(b) Distribution of mineral profits.	Section 28: (b) Identical.
Identical.	Section 23: Federal Maritime Board jurisdiction.	Section 27: (b) Identical.
Identical.	No provision.	Section 27: (a) Applies to Alaska an exemption from the coastwise sabotage law now applicable to all other States.
Identical.	Section 24: Nationality.	Section 21: Identical.
Identical.	Section 25: Immigration Act.	Section 22: Identical.
Identical except as below:	Section 26: Immigration Act.	Section 23: Identical.
No provision.	Section 27: Immigration Act.	Section 24: Identical.
Identical except as below:	Section 28: Immigration Act.	Section 25: Identical.
Identical.	Section 29: Immigration Act.	Section 26: Identical.
Identical.	Section 30: Separability clause.	Section 29: Identical.
Identical.	Section 31: All acts in conflict repealed.	Section 30: Identical.
Identical except as below:		
Pages 22–23, lines 20–25 and 1–2, respectively: "All functions vested in any municipal corporation, school district, or other local political subdivision by the laws described in this subsection shall continue to be performed within the withdrawals by such corporation, district, or other subdivision, and the laws of the State or the laws or		

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, what are the provisions of the statehood bill?

To begin with, the usual provisions are included relating to a republican form of State government, definition of boundaries, transfer of court jurisdiction, and a popular referendum on the act of statehood itself. These are provisions that were included in the last 10 statehood bills passed by Congress since 1889.

Sections 1 through 5 of H. R. 7999 deal with all of these subjects—except the referendum—plus the subject of land rights and titles. Section 6 relates to public lands in the Territory—a subject which, I might add, has formed an important part of every statehood bill enacted by Congress since 1889. This section can correctly be described as an important key to statehood.

LAND-GRANT PROVISIONS

Basically, the new State of Alaska would be granted the right to select 103,550,000 acres of land now owned by the Federal Government. There are restrictions, of course, so that defense installations and other land needed by the Federal Government will not be affected. Part of this grant—800,000 acres—will be for the express purpose of community

development and the expansion of recreational areas. The remainder will be for the purpose of getting the land out of Federal ownership and onto the tax rolls to help expand the existing base for self-government.

These grants should be considered in light of the fact that 99.9 percent of the entire land area in Alaska is owned by the Federal Government. State ownership of some of these lands will provide the necessary encouragement for the complete and efficient development of the natural resources they contain. Just as previous States received lands for railroads and schools and other purposes, Alaska would be given land with which to encourage the internal improvements necessary to her future growth and development.

This is not to suggest that the land selection is needed to keep the new State from going into deficit spending. Alaska is a going concern. As a matter of fact, Alaska is currently financing, by means of its own revenues, all functions and services it is permitted to carry on. The Territorial government has no debt, and actually has a cash surplus. The additional activities Alaska would engage in after statehood is granted can normally be expected to be financed through the additional revenues which also would become available to Alaska as a State.

ALASKA'S FAIR SHARE

The need for land grants is instead related to the right of the people of Alaska to enjoy a fair share of their own resources. All that is being proposed in the statehood bill is to transfer to the people of Alaska a part of the resources of the Territory so that the people of the new State may use and develop their land for the general good and welfare. Today the people of Alaska find themselves in a sort of Federal trusteeship—without the right to vote, without the right to develop their resources, without the right to the fullest enjoyment of economic and political democracy. Statehood would change all that for Alaska, just as it has done for the people in other Territories when they became full and equal members of the Union.

It should be noted that the grants provided for by the statehood bill are in lieu of internal improvement grants given other States under existing statutes. In the historical context, the grants to Alaska are a smaller proportion of available public land than were the grants made to many States admitted to the Union during the past 100 years. In previous cases of statehood, private land ownership had developed to the point were substantial holdings had been recorded, thereby reducing the proportion of Federal land in the State. Thus, grants of public lands in those States—ranging as high as 31 percent of the State's total area, in the case of North Dakota—actually represented significantly higher proportions of available Federal land than the land Alaska will receive under the provisions of House bill 7999.

CHARGES OF GIVEAWAY

While we are looking at this question in the historical context, it may be interesting to examine the charge of giveaway that has been made against the land selection provision of House bill 7999. As each Territory came to be admitted to the Union, large areas of federally-held land were transferred to the new State for support of schools, for development of communities and community facilities, and for encouragement of industries such as railroads. For example, in North Dakota, 24 percent of her entire land area was given by the Federal Government directly to railroad companies. Another 7 percent of the State's total land area was given directly to the State government. In the case of California, 12 percent of the State's total land area was given to the railroads, and another 9 percent was given directly to the new State. All these figures refer to transfers of Federal land holdings. To cite another example, my own State of Washington received in Federal grants about 7 percent of its total land area, while another 22 percent was given directly to the railroads by the Federal Government.

In the case of Alaska, the total land grant amounts to about 28 percent, a figure that is not out of line with the Federal Government's previous grants of public lands in North Dakota, Washington, Arizona, and Kansas, to name only a few.

There is another aspect to this giveaway charge. Let us look not only at what the Federal Government is giving away, but also at what the Federal Government will keep. In many States, the Federal Government has kept less land than it gave away. Examples which might be cited include South Dakota. There, the Federal Government granted 7 percent of the total land area to the State, and now retains only 6.2 percent. In Oklahoma, the Federal Government today holds 2.3 percent of the State area, but its grants to the State government totaled approximately 7 percent. In my own State of Washington, where 29 percent of the State's area was given away in grants, the Federal Government retains about 30 percent of the area of the State.

FEDERAL HOLDINGS NOT DESIRABLE

The point is not that Federal landholdings are to be desired; as a matter of fact, excessive holdings of Federal land in the West are a continuing problem to our expanding industries and cities. The point, instead, is to put the giveaway charge in its proper perspective. When all the grants in Alaska will have been exercised by the new State, the Federal Government will still retain nearly 72 percent of the total area of the new State. Only in the case of the State of Nevada will Federal holdings be a greater proportion. Certainly this cannot be characterized as a giveaway. Any attempt to do so ignores the fact that the Federal Government has given greater proportions of its holdings to other States and private companies than it proposes to give to Alaska. These earlier grants were not called giveaways; they were hailed as a necessary encouragement for the future development of the new States.

For the information of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a table indicating the various grants of public land made in a number of States.

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

State	Total acres	Present Federal land	Present Federal reserves	Grants to railroad corporations	Federal grants to States	Federal grants (State)	Total Federal grants
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Acres*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Arizona	72,688,000	44.5	40.6	11	10,543,753	14	25
California	100,313,600	47.0	29.6	12	8,832,893	9	21
Colorado	66,510,080	36.3	20.9	3	4,471,604	7	10
Idaho	52,972,160	65.2	42.7	2	4,267,866	8	10
Kansas	52,549,120	.6	----------	8	7,794,668	15	23
Montana	93,361,920	29.9	22.8	16	5,963,338	6	22
Nebraska	49,064,320	1.4	----------	15	3,458,711	7	22
Nevada	70,264,960	87.1	19.3	7	2,725,826	3	10
New Mexico	77,767,040	33.7	15.0	4	12,803,113	14	18
North Dakota	44,836,480	4.2	3.8	24	3,163,552	7	31
Oklahoma	44,179,840	2.3	2.2	----------	3,095,760	7	7
Oregon	61,641,600	51.3	26.2	6	7,032,847	11	17
South Dakota	48,983,040	6.2	5.5	----------	3,435,373	7	7
Texas	168,648,320	1.5	----------	----------	180,000	.001	.001
Utah	52,701,440	70.2	47.9	4	7,523,942	14	18
Washington	42,743,040	29.9	28.6	22	3,045,751	7	29
Wyoming	62,403,840	47.8	20.5	9	4,342,520	7	16
Alaska	365,481,600	[1] 99.9	[2] 25.0	----------	(103,350,000)	28	28

[1] This would be reduced to 71.7 percent under H. R. 7999.
[2] Plus defense withdrawal area of 176,588,800 acres. Unduplicated reserves and withdrawals could constitute as much as 70 percent.

Mr. JACKSON. Other parts of section 6 of the bill before us deal with the method of selecting the land grants, protection of existing contracts for use of public lands, and application of existing laws to land usage and rights in Alaska.

Next in sequence are sections outlining Alaska's representation in Congress and the method of holding a vote to confirm that the people want statehood and are willing to assume the obligations of statehood. These are found in sections 7, 8, and 9.

One of the most important sections of the bill, one which erased the opposition of the administration, is section 10, which provides for the national defense withdrawal areas. Because of Alaska's strategic position in today's polar-oriented age, provision has been made for the President to establish national defense withdrawals in the area that can be roughly described as the northern and western half of the Territory. At any time after passage of the statehood bill, the President can, by proclamation,

withdraw as much land in this area as he feels necessary for the national defense. Immediately upon such a proclamation, the Federal Government will assume complete jurisdiction and sole legislative, judicial, and executive power within the area. There are specific exceptions, of course, in making allowance for cities and other political subdivisions. But the overriding concern is for the national defense, a concern fully shared and accepted by the people of Alaska. This section of the statehood bill was written by the Department of Interior, in consultation with the Department of Defense, and bears the specific approval of the administration.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTS DEFENSE WITHDRAWALS

To make perfectly clear the position of the administration with regard to Federal control of the defense-withdrawal area, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement entitled "Governmental Powers in Established National Defense Areas," together with a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior to me transmitting the statement.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1957.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: During the hearings on S. 49, you asked that we prepare for the record a statement pertaining to the civil rights of residents of Alaska in the event the President exercised the authority to establish special national defense areas in accordance with the provisions of our proposed section 10 of S. 49.

It is, of course, difficult to catalog civil rights as such, and we would not like to appear to foreclose the existence of any civil right to any resident of Alaska merely because of an inadvertence on our part. In addition, the discussion which took place at the hearing when the request was made, indicated that there was a need to clarify the relationship of Federal, State, and local authorities to one another upon the establishment of such a national defense withdrawal. Therefore, we trust you will agree that the enclosed statement setting forth not what civil rights exist, but the authority and the source thereof, the exercise of which might affect the rights of Alaskans, will clarify the position taken by the administration and provide a further record to indicate our intent in regard to the amendments we proposed.

Sincerely yours,

HATFIELD CHILSON,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

GOVERNMENTAL POWERS IN ESTABLISHED NATIONAL DEFENSE AREAS

Subject to certain specified exceptions, the basic concept on which the proposed section 10 is founded may be stated to be designed, in general, to specify that in such areas that are established, the administration of Government shall be exercised by Federal authority exclusively. Such administration of Government shall be based upon the Federal Constitution, Congressional enactments, and State laws, to the extent that they are not inconsistent with Federal laws applicable to the area.

Prior to the exercise of the authority by the President, the State will have concurrent jurisdiction with the Federal Government over all public lands, not otherwise areas of exclusive jurisdiction, such as military reservations established prior to statehood. This State jurisdiction would extend to police power, exercised by the State through legislative and executive action. The courts of the State would have jurisdiction over criminal and civil actions throughout Alaska. Municipalities, of course, would be the creation of and subject to State law.

If the President should exercise the authority to establish a special national defense area, the Executive order or proclamation would specify the area and could delineate exceptions from the requirement of exclusive Federal jurisdiction. In this statement, for the purpose of an example only, we assume that the President will issue an order which will acquire for the Federal Government complete Federal jurisdiction, subject to the specific exceptions set forth in our proposed section 10.

Upon the issuance of such an order, all State laws applicable in the area covered by the order become Federal laws for the purposes of administration and enforcement, except those of, or pertaining to, municipalities and voting privileges. All such laws would be enforced by the person or persons designated by the President. The Congress could, after the issuance of an order establishing a national defense area, amend, revise, or suspend such State laws during the period of exclusive Federal jurisdiction. In the event any State law, as adopted pursuant to proposed section 10, is in conflict with Federal law, such State law will not be adopted as Federal law for it is our intent to incorporate into these amendments a rule which is similar to the rule of international law which operates to continue in effect those laws of the former sovereign applicable in the area at the time jurisdiction is ceded to another sovereign to the extent that such laws are not in conflict with the laws or policies of the new sovereign, until such laws are modified or changed by the new sovereign.

However, our amendments specifically except from the State laws which would be adopted as Federal laws, those laws of, or pertaining to, municipalities, and State laws relating to elections. Also, the municipalities and other local subdivisions will continue to function under State law within the special national defense areas. One particular reason for this exception is the desire to preserve the right of such entities to carry out their school and local welfare programs. Outside of local political subdivisions, most of the burden of these programs is now on the Federal Government and will continue to be a Federal responsibility, regardless of statehood, so long as the native population continues under Federal supervision.

Jurisdiction over all causes of actions occurring or arising within established national defense areas, whether based on Federal law or State law adopted as Federal law, will be vested in the Federal District Court for the District of Alaska. The civil rights of any civilian within an established special national defense area would be determined by the Federal Constitution, laws passed by the Congress, and, to the extent that they are not in conflict with Federal law, the laws of Alaska as adopted by this act.

These amendments are designed to give the President authority to act, without the existence of a national emergency, to establish special areas which the President determines necessary for the defense of the United States. This proposal is not intended to authorize the creation of an area in which martial law would govern and it is not related to those conditions which would give rise to the exercise of martial law. If private property must be utilized for the defense effort within an established national defense area, it will be acquired through normal purchase or condemnation processes. Since 99 percent of the land north and west of the line is federally owned at this time, the problem of land acquisition should not be too acute. We believe that all private and personal rights of residents of any area, established under the terms of the proposed section 10 for special national defense purposes, will be adequately protected under the Constitution of the United States, the laws passed by the Congress, and the laws of the State not inconsistent with Federal law. The establishment of special national defense areas would in no way affect the continued applicability of the Bill of Rights and other constitutional safeguards to persons and property located within the area.

In summary, it might be stated that the only substantial change which would result from the establishment of such areas, insofar as persons or property would be affected, is that their rights would be enforceable only in the Federal court, whereas prior to the establishment of the special national defense area, rights of persons or in property would be litigated in a Federal or a State court, depending upon the established rules of court jurisdiction.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, section 11 of the bill provides for continuing Federal jurisdiction over Mount McKinley National Park and existing military reservations. Sections 12 through 18 deal with the changeover from Territorial courts to State courts and a Federal district court. All of the remaining sections of the statehood bill provide the necessary amendments to existing laws, so that Alaska will have equal treatment with the other States with reference to immigration, Federal Reserve bank requirements, and other laws. There is also a provision to retain the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board over waterborne commerce.

These, then, are the terms under which Alaska would be admitted to the Union of States as a full and equal partner. These are the terms that have been worked over and refined through years of study and thousands of pages of hearings. The first bill for Alaska statehood was introduced 42 years ago, and additional bills have been introduced in every Congress since 1943. Eleven hearings have been held—2 of them in Alaska, the others here in Washington. More than 4,000 pages of testimony have been published.

A TIME FOR DECISION

There can be no doubt that the record is complete. The facts are before us. All that remains is the decision. Certainly, no bill is perfect, whether it comes from the Senate or from the House. As an attorney, I might look at the bill before us and might point to language that—if no other considerations were present—I might want to change. But, as an attorney and as a Senator, I can look at the bill before us and can say with all honesty that it is a better statehood bill than has ever before been voted on by the Senate.

Our objective is statehood. It can be achieved now. Subsequent legislation may become necessary, as indeed has been the case following the admission of other States. But as we consider this bill, let us address ourselves to the one, single question: Are we for statehood

for Alaska, or are we not? Let history record our answer.

During the delivery of Mr. JACKSON's speech,

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Washington for pointing up at this early stage in the debate the dangers which confront statehood in the event the Senate should choose to amend the bill. In that connection, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], circulated a letter to the Members of the Senate stating the reasons why, owing to the peculiar parliamentary situation in the House, any amendment to the bill before the Senate might place statehood itself in fatal jeopardy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the junior Senator from Washington, to have printed in the RECORD the text of the letter signed by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the committee, and circulated to all Members of the Senate, so that it may become a part of the RECORD in the remarks of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, further, that this colloquy, together with the letter of the senior Senator from Montana, appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The letter ordered to be printed in the RECORD is, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 17, 1958.

HON. FRANK CHURCH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Alaska statehood bill, H. R. 7999, passed by the House on May 28, has been scheduled for action on the floor of the Senate in the very near future.

This bill does not differ in any important respect from S. 49, reported last spring by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Thus, on the face of it, the situation is favorable.

However, if the Senate injects any amendments, a serious parliamentary entanglement would ensue. So far as I can now determine, there are only two methods whereby the House could send the bill to a conference. One would be by securing unanimous consent, and the other would be by way of clearance from the Rules Committee. It is apparent that unanimous consent could not be obtained, and previous experience with the bill before the Rules Committee indicates that affirmative action would not be forthcoming.

I therefore earnestly hope that all supporters of Alaska statehood, in the interest of the overall objective, will oppose any amendments and pass the bill as is. It is sufficiently satisfactory to E. L. Bartlett, Delegate from Alaska, and Alaska's Ernest Gruening and William A. Egan, both Senators-elect, and Ralph J. Rivers, Representative-elect, under the Alaska-Tennessee plan, so they feel it would be better to pass it in this form than to risk its being lost in a procedural snarl.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to commend the Senator from Washington, who, as chairman of the Territories Subcommittee, on which I am privileged to serve, is our floor leader in the historic effort to add a 49th star to the flag of our country. I think the Senator from Washington deserves a great deal of credit for the statesmanlike way he has presided over the hearings and the deliberations in our subcommittee, which have resulted in bringing this crucial issue for consideration to the floor of the Senate today.

He, like myself, has a geographic interest in this measure, because I think our two States of Washington and Oregon are the closest to Alaska and have the greatest ties and bonds with Alaska.

I should like to ask the able Senator from Washington a question, which has come to my desk a number of times, in regard to one of the provisions of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. I shall do so because he has very correctly emphasized the importance of the passage, without amendment, of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, so it can then go directly to the desk of the President for his signature.

In the bill as passed by the House we find a provision which deals with the great fisheries and wildlife resources of the present Territory of Alaska. It provides that the new State itself cannot take over the management of these wildlife resources—and by "wildlife" I mean big game, fisheries, and waterfowl and other bird life—until the management plan drafted by the new State government has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Of course, that means the Fish and Wildlife Service, which technically advises the Secretary of the Interior in regard to these matters.

It has been my impression that this provision is reasonable, that there is no reason for our even considering deleting it from the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, and that the Senate should approve it.

I particularly ask this question because, as the Senator from Washington knows, I have taken an especial interest in wildlife, in general; and in wildlife conservation, in particular.

So I should like to have him comment on that provision of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. It is my understanding that this language was included after having been offered as an amendment on the floor of the House. I also understand that it was accepted by the chairman of the Territories Subcommittee of the House, and was accepted by the House unanimously.

I see nothing in the provision that will injure the new State or will be unworkable.

PROPER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

As I understand, the philosophy behind this provision is that, inasmuch as fish and wildlife resources are a tremendous part of the overall resources of Alaska, it is the intent of the Congress to make sure that those resources are properly managed in the interests of the people of the new State. That being the case, it is the intent of the Congress to make sure that adequate provision has been made by the new State before its resources are turned over to it.

As the Senator from Oregon knows, the Fish and Wildlife Service now administers both fish and wildlife resources in the Territory. It has a very large number of personnel engaged in that effort. I understand the Department has no objection to this provision in the bill, because its ultimate objective is to provide for more effective management during the period of transition from Federal control to State control.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am very pleased to have that explanation of this particular wildlife and fisheries provision from the Senator from Washington. I felt it was necessary to have the explanation in the RECORD because a number of Senators have asked about it. I join the Senator from Washington in believing, and stating very clearly, this provision should stay in the bill. I think it is reasonable. I know that the representatives of the Territory have no objection to it, and, we trust, those of the new State of Alaska will have no objection to it. I know outstanding conservation and wildlife and outdoor groups in our country support it. I feel our Fish and Wildlife Service, which has had such long experience in Alaska, will be reasonable and fair and equitable with respect to administering this particular section of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the fact that it was adopted unanimously by the House of Representatives speaks eloquently for it so far as the other side of the Capitol is concerned. To my knowledge, the members of the subcommittee are in agreement that it shall be our objective to pass the House bill without amendment, in order to avoid the possibility of the failure of the House and the Senate to enact this bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I quite agree with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to take this opportunity once again to express my appreciation, first to the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and then our colleagues, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], for the invaluable help given to our subcommittee, ably supported by the chairman of our full committee, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like the RECORD very clearly to indicate my own pride in my membership on the sub-

committee which drafted the bill. The subcommittee has been ably presided over by my friend from Washington, the distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. JACKSON], and he and I had the pleasure—and it was a pleasure—to listen, as members of the subcommittee, to the testimony which was adduced before us in support of statehood for Alaska. After hearing once again the evidence, we of the Territories Subcommittee painstakingly prepared a bill which subsequently was approved by the full committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and was reported to the Senate without one dissenting vote.

The patience and the ability, legal and otherwise, of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington have put their indelible stamp on the work of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs preparing and reporting the bill to the Senate. We now have before us the statehood for Alaska bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

I should like to ask my able friend whether, in his opinion, if the Senate approves the pending House bill, H. R. 7999, in its present form, the measure will substantially reflect the spirit and legislative intent of the bill so carefully and painstakingly worked out by his subcommittee providing for statehood for Alaska.

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad the distinguished junior Senator from California has asked that question, because it should be made clear that the Senate committee believes that most of the amendments were clarifying in nature and do not constitute a change in the policy of the bill. I have already described some of the major differences and their effect, and I shall mention two others in order to make clear what I mean.

LOGGING CONTRACTS

The Senate committee inserted some specific language to indicate that existing logging contracts, for instance, relating to timber in national forests, will remain in effect and that suitable water areas will be provided to allow the performance of those contracts as it was contemplated by all parties when they were executed several years ago. The Senate committee does not believe that the State of Alaska would, under any circumstances, attempt to interfere with the proper performance of such contracts, and, of course, the contracts are protected by the Constitution of the United States.

I refer specifically to contracts between private companies—pulp and paper companies—with the Forest Service.

Moreover, the committee believes the contracts themselves, which contemplate long periods of time for performance, carry the implied, if not the specific, provision that the operators will be entitled to use necessary means of access and water areas to fulfill the terms of the contract. Since we believe these conditions are required and will not in any event be interfered with, we do not consider it necessary to make specific mention of it in the act.

RIGHTS OF NONRESIDENTS

Another example is the provision the Senate committee included in section 4 of the bill, by which the future State was admonished not to discriminate against nonresidents—referring to individuals, partnerships, corporations, business entities of all kinds as well as to individual persons. This provision is, of course, a restatement of the constitutional law on this point, and we do not believe that it is necessary to restate it specifically in the bill. Obviously the lack of specific mention is not intended as meaning, and certainly will not be construed to indicate, that we favor any relaxation of the Constitution as it applies to other States.

In other words, the situation in which we find ourselves in connection with the discussion of the statehood bill on the floor of the Senate is that, in order to get a bill passed, we must pass the House bill without amendment. By taking up the House bill and not taking up the Senate committee bill, we do not want to create the legislative impression that we have dropped provisions in the Senate committee bill which were intended to clarify what might be construed as certain ambiguities in the House bill. In other words, it is our purpose to make it clear, and to make it a part of the legislative history and the record of this debate, that the action taken to get the House bill passed is purely a procedural one, and we do not intend to minimize the action previously taken by the committee.

I take it my colleague, who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, is of the same impression.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am, indeed, and I think it is extremely important that the RECORD demonstrate that the answer which the able junior Senator from Washington has just given represents the unanimous feeling of the Members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as it finally reported the bill to the Senate; and, beyond that, the legislative history as the junior Senator from Washington has made it in answer to my question represents, I feel sure, the intention by which the Senate will stand up to be counted on the House approved bill.

Mr. JACKSON. We believe the provisions referred to in the bill reported by the Senate committee are covered in the House bill. Our only point was that we thought our language was a little more clear, shall we say, on the specific points which were contained in the amendments as approved by the committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, with all due deference to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee [Mr. MURRAY], who devoted most of his remarks yesterday to the defense of the proposition that the bill to be acted on is pretty much like the bill the Senate committee previously reported, and therefore we should not be too critical of the differences; and with all due deference to my able and esteemed colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who has worked for years on this subject, who knows it as possibly no other man does, and who is as sincere in believing Alaska should have statehood now as I am in believing Alaska should not; let me say I can understand the uneasiness expressed by our colleague from California when he asks, "Can you assure the Senate that the House bill, which contains so many things different from the Senate committee bill, is to all intents and purposes the same as the Senate committee bill, and therefore Members of the Senate should stand up and be counted?"

Mr. President, let me remind my distinguished colleagues from the west coast that in April 1865, General Grant told us in the South substantially this: "There was a provision in the Constitution for you to come into the Union, but there is no provision for you to leave it." That settled that issue.

We are asked to vote on something which is irrevocable. It is as irrevocable as the laws of the Medes and the Persians. Whatever we do now for about 100,000 Americans in Alaska, who are fine citizens, is going to stand permanently. Whatever advantages we give them over the public domain, which now belongs to all the people of the United States, will stand as long as the Union endures.

The Senator says there is not much difference between the two bills. There is one little difference about how many acres are to be given to Alaska. I think there is a difference of about 80 million acres between what the House proposes to give and what the Senate committee is willing to give.

The House bill would provide that for 25 years Alaska can select the choicest areas which may subsequently be developed for oil and strategic minerals, and claim that land in tracts of a little over 5,000 acres. That provision was not in the Senate committee bill.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have an illustration in the civil rights bill.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will yield in a moment.

Last year the Senate would not let the House civil rights bill go to the committee, as the rules provide, where it could have been analyzed before it came before the Senate for consideration and Senators could have been put on notice that the bill carried some provisions regarding the use of force, for instance, in the enforcement of civil rights decrees. That provision was in the House bill, but nobody knew it was there until the bill came on the floor and was subjected to debate.

It is now asked that we again bypass a committee. We have the hearings of last year with respect to Alaska statehood. There have been no hearings this year. We have no analysis of the House bill. We are asked to forget about what is in the Senate committee bill and accept an assurance that the differences are not too material.

Even though we know we could get a better bill, and even though we know

when we vote, assuming the bill passes—and all the proponents say it is bound to pass—that we cannot later change it, we are asked to take this action. The proponents say, "You cannot stop this bill. Everybody is for it except a few, perhaps, from the South, and they are probably misguided."

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. No chance is afforded to do what we could do. We are asked to forget about the limitation on territorial waters. We are asked to give Alaska something no State has ever had. We are asked to give them natural resources, of the Territory which no State has ever gotten before. We are asked to give them twice or three times as much of the public domain as all the last 10 Territories granted statehood have gotten together. Why? Because quick action is desired.

I will yield to the Senator from Washington in a moment.

There is a point I take exception to in the statement of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. The Senator says the bill would be bottled up in the Rules Committee of the House, and that that matter is covered by the rules of the House. When a House bill comes back from the Senate with amendments, there are two ways by which the bill can be sent to conference. One is by asking unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's desk and send it to conference. The other is by a motion to send the bill to the Rules Committee and get a rule to send it to conference.

My distinguished friend assumes that the bill would have to be acted on in one of those ways; that it would not be possible to get unanimous consent, and that if the bill went to the Rules Committee the bill might not come out again.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that a motion to recede and concur in Senate amendments would take precedence over the rule governing sending bills to conference.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Under the House rules, in order to move to recede and concur in a Senate amendment, the Member of the House must first ask unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table and then move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

If the course were followed in the House of adopting the Senate amendment, or if it were desired to send the bill to conference, as a condition precedent to either course it would be necessary to obtain unanimous consent.

I will admit to the Senator that I was a little "rusty" on this point, and I checked it with the House Parliamentarian.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia admits he has not been a Member of the House for 12 years, and he also is more familiar with the Senate rules. The Senate Parliamentarian informed me what the ruling in the Senate would be; that a motion to recede and concur would take precedence over a motion to send the bill to conference, and I assumed the ruling in the House would be the same.

Mr. JACKSON. The House Parliamentarian was my adviser on this subject, as the question would arise in the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I cannot argue with the House Parliamentarian about the interpretation of the House rules. Even if the House Parliamentarian be right, the Senator from Virginia still contends that, since this is our last chance to do what should be done, not only for Alaska but for the 172 million people of the United States who will be affected if around 100,000 people in Alaska are to be represented by 2 Senators, a representation equal to that of the 15 million people of New York, who are represented by only 2 Senators, we ought to be sure we are doing the right thing, because we cannot change it later.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two points of clarification?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. First, as to the amount of land to be granted, the amount in the House bill is identical with that in the Senate committee bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe I saw a report giving the figure as about 180 million acres.

Mr. JACKSON. It is 103,550,000 acres. That is the amount in the House bill, and that is the amount in the Senate committee bill.

On another point, with reference to a breakdown as to the differences between the House bill and the Senate committee bill, I included in my remarks and had printed in the RECORD earlier today a detailed analysis of the differences, which analysis is available.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That will be interesting information. As I said, we normally permit a House bill to go to the proper Senate committee. Then if the bill is reported by the committee, or if a Senate committee bill has already been reported, the committee states the differences and indicates to the Senate whether it wants to recede from its previous position.

In any event, those of us who do not serve on the committee should know what the differences are. I am sure that there are some material differences, although the objective, of course, is statehood.

I do not believe that the House bill properly settles the ownership and control of the offshore islands. I think there is vague language as to the jurisdiction over the land.

As I recall, there was no provision in the Senate bill that for 25 years the new State could select certain areas of its promised land and say, "This will be ours from now on."

I invite attention to another provision in the House bill. The Constitution provides that Senators shall be elected for 6 years. I think the House bill authorizes the election of one Senator for a long term and the other for a short term. That has never been done in connection with any other State. Senators were elected for the full 6 years. They then came before the Senate and were assigned to certain classes. One Senator was assigned to a class to hold office for a certain period, and another Senator to another. There was no attempt to run a bulldozer through the Constitution, as is proposed here.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. It is my understanding that in all the States Senators come up for election at different times, for their 6-year term. That being the case, it would seem, in order to have a logical base, that there must have been a short term and a long term in the beginning. How does the Senator account for the difference?

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not the question of the class to which a Senator is assigned a matter for the determination of the Senate itself?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is beyond the power of a State to assign Senators to classes. Such a provision in the State constitution of Alaska would make it unconstitutional; and we would be called upon to ratify an unconstitutional instrument.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. That is one more objection to the bill. We took an oath to uphold and support the Constitution of the United States. As the Senator from Mississippi says, if the proposed State constitution is clearly unconstitutional, to vote for it would be to violate our oath. We ought not to vote for it.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure the Senator will agree that it is rather difficult to predict how the Supreme Court would interpret the State constitution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is getting into a subject with respect to which I am at a disadvantage.

Mr. JACKSON. The only guaranty we can give to the new State is that its government will be republican in form. That word has no partisan significance. I am speaking of "republican" in the sense in which a political scientist uses the term.

That is our constitutional responsibility. In enacting the bill we make a finding that the government is republican in form. This requirement dates back to the Ordinance of 1787, in which the philosophy was first expounded. It was later confirmed by the Constitution, in Article IV, section 3, and Article IV, section 4.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia points out that in all previous instances, so far as he can recall, there was a simple motion to admit a State. The proposal then went to the Judiciary Committee for the arrangement of the terms, and to see that the State Constitution provided what was intended

to be provided. With all due deference, the bill should be reduced to a motion to admit, and then sent to the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Washington is very able. I have read the record of the hearings. He asked some very intelligent questions. Later in the debate I shall comment on some of the statements he made.

In the present instance we would have a State which was neither in the Union nor out. My distinguished friend from Idaho stated that statehood could be suspended for a while. The Senator realizes that that is something utterly unknown to the law.

Is not the distinguished Senator from Virginia amazed that the able and distinguished Senator from Washington should say that we should vote for something which is patently unconstitutional, in the hope that the Supreme Court would declare it to be constitutional?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not know that my friend went quite that far. He pointed to the decision in Brown versus Board of Education, in 1954, which greatly surprised the Senator from Virginia. On the basis of that decision, he asked, "Why should we be surprised at anything the Supreme Court does?" I think that was a general argument.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Virginia stated that the Senator from Washington said that we need not be surprised at anything the Supreme Court might hold. If that is what my friend from Washington said, I am in agreement. I do not believe he said it.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington merely made the observation that it would be rather difficult, perhaps, for the junior Senator from Virginia and the senior Senator from Mississippi to predict whether the Supreme Court would or would not hold the provisions in the Alaskan constitution to be constitutional. Am I to understand——

Mr. ROBERTSON. The reply of the Senator from Virginia was that the Senator from Washington had him at a disadvantage, because, if the Senator from Virginia were to proceed to make answer, he would have to admit that he could not predict anything the Supreme Court might be expected to say.

Mr. JACKSON. Therefore, I ask my distinguished and able colleagues, who are brilliant in the field of constitutional law, whether they do not feel that it would be almost impossible for this body to attempt to predict whether the Supreme Court would hold any provision in the State constitution to be unconstitutional.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When President Franklin Roosevelt was trying to push through the Guffey coal bill, and it was sent to the House Committee on Ways and Means, the President said, "If you have any doubts about constitutionality, resolve them in favor of those who want the legislation, and let the case go to the Supreme Court."

I did not take that viewpoint. I thought I was elected and took an oath to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States to as great a degree as members of the Supreme Court or anyone else, and that if a particular bill was unconstitutional, I should vote accordingly. I voted against the Guffey coal bill. The case went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court declared the Guffey Coal Act to be unconstitutional.

If we think the pending bill is unconstitutional, we have as great an obligation to uphold and support the Constitution as has any member of the Supreme Court. We do not need to speculate as to whether the Supreme Court would or would not interpret the Constitution as it was written, or whether it would go far afield, on another Myrdal expedition, and say, "We cannot turn the clock back; statehood for Alaska has been long deferred and the action must go forward"—forgetting all the technicalities and the provisions of the Constitution. The Supreme Court might hold that statehood should be granted in the interest of sociology or for whatever other reason one might wish to assign.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file three points of order against the pending bill. I ask that they lie on the table and be printed, to be called up at the discretion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the points of order will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia a question.

Of course, the Senator realizes that the United States Supreme Court has held time and again that a State must come into the Union on a basis of absolute equality with other States. We must assume that the Supreme Court of the United States will adhere to its decisions since the founding of the Republic. That being true, does not the Senator realize that, with the withdrawal provisions in the bill, the State of Alaska could not come into the Union on a basis of equality with the other States, and that therefore the bill flies in the face of the Constitution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia is opposed to the bill from every standpoint, including the constitutional standpoint.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator knows very well that, according to the testimony at the hearings, there would not be a uniform system of State taxation in the new State of Alaska. If the President should withdraw a certain area, that action would supersede the laws of the State; and the testimony was that the State of Alaska could not even enact a sales tax.

In addition, the public officials in vast areas would be out of office. They would be superseded by Federal employees appointed by the President of the United States.

The Senator realizes that that would be flying in the face of the Constitution of the United States, does he not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly so. As the Senator recalls, in the very fine speech of the junior Senator from Washington he made reference to the fact that the national interest was protected because the Federal Government could go back into Alaska and withdraw anything that was absolutely needed for the national defense, or in the national interest. I assume that is the point mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to read a statement by Mr. Stevens, of the Department of the Interior. He said: "Of course the Federal Government could not adopt such law, for instance taxing laws, which are inconsistent with the Federal Constitution."

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall yield as soon as I have finished yielding to my colleague.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the Senator yield so that I may answer the Senator from Mississippi on that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to invite attention to the fact that in the withdrawal area, for purposes of national security, which area is roughly north of the Brooks Range and west of Fairbanks, the Federal Government retains the authority to withdraw a little over half of all the land in Alaska. Therefore ample authority is provided to do it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the Constitution of the United States it is not possible to do it. Even without declaration of martial law, under the provisions of the bill it would be possible to move 24,000 people who now inhabit that area.

Mr. JACKSON. "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away."

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly it. It is a State and it is not a State. Membership in the Union would not be as firm, even, as the membership of a college student in a college fraternity. "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away." We can give statehood to Alaska and the President can take it away. That is in violation of our system of government, that States are admitted to the Union only on the basis of absolute equality. That equality would be denied to the State of Alaska.

Mr. JACKSON. The land is granted to the new State. It is subject to certain conditions, of course, and there are ample precedents to support such procedure.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know the Senator is referring to what happened in New Mexico and Arizona. That involved an entirely different situation, and I shall discuss it at length later. It is impossible under the Constitution to give statehood with a limitation.

I should like to read what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is a very able Senator, has had to say:

So far I have not heard any testimony to indicate what handicap there would be to defense of either Alaska or the country if we granted statehood without limitation to the entire Alaska area.

The point is that statehood must be granted without limitation; otherwise, it is of no effect.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Washington quoted from Job, but he did not quite finish the quotation. He said:

The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

I wish to quote from what Benjamin Franklin said when he was helping to frame the Constitution, which the Senator from Mississippi and I are trying to defend and preserve. Franklin said:

In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding?

The junior Senator from Virginia is speaking in opposition to statehood, and he hopes that what he has to say will set off real debate on the whole matter.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Virginia knows that any sovereign State has the power to pass laws which are effective within the State in fields in which the State is empowered to act. That is fundamental.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. We believe that there is a definite separation of powers between the Federal Government and the States, and that when the 13 States formed the central government, they were sovereign States, and they retained that portion of their sovereignty which was not, either through express provision or necessary implication, conferred upon the central government; and that the powers of the central government, especially under the provisions of the 10th amendment to the Constitution, were specifically limited.

Mr. EASTLAND. And that would apply to the entire area of a new State, of course.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to read from the testimony of the Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chilson, which I submit is directly opposite to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Chilson said:

Now, whether or not under our wording here Alaska could pass new laws to take effect within the withdrawal area—as the thing is written I have some doubts.

We are talking about a State which cannot even enforce sovereignty in half of its area. It is neither in the Union nor out of the Union. I am sure the Senator from West Virginia will agree that the bill flies in the face of the Constitution. If we were to admit Alaska, we would be committing an act which would violate the Constitution, and therefore would be void.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe that the proper thing to do with the bill would be to send it to the Committee on the Judiciary, to clear up the legal provisions, and either have a bill brought before us which would confer statehood upon Alaska in a constitutional way, or not confer statehood at all.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to read from what Mr. Stevens, the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior had to say:

The President, of course, could turn right around and appoint the Territorial or the State chief of police, and he could continue to enforce his own laws.

The Senator realizes that Alaska could not be admitted on the basis of equality when the President of the United States could supersede State officials and discharge them and appoint Federal officers and enforce laws of the State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. Not one of the original States would have stood for anything like that.

Mr. EASTLAND. The fact that the new State would not have the power of other States is conclusive proof, is it not, that Alaska would not be admitted on the basis of equality with the other 48 States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The conclusion is inevitable. This is a different procedure from that heretofore followed. The Senator from Virginia had already pointed it out. It is proposed to admit Alaska on terms different from those under which any other State has been admitted since the Union was formed. The Senator from Virginia does not see the necessity for all the rush now, when very serious problems have not been adequately considered and not resolved, and which cannot hereafter, as the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, be changed no matter how wrong the decision may be.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Virginia realizes that the testimony shows that if the State of Alaska, after withdrawal of half of its area, should enact a sales tax, which every other State in the Union has power to do and to make it effective within the confines of the State, such a sales tax would not be effective and enforceable in half of the land area of the proposed new State of Alaska. Is that a basis of equality?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia had not thought about that phase of it, but that certainly would raise additional serious objection to the plan here proposed.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have offered three points of order, and I believe they are absolutely well taken. I think the bill violates the Constitution of the United States.

If the points of order should not be sustained by the Senate, then I am prepared to move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. There has been no study made of the constitution of the new State. The Reorganization Act gives the Committee on the Judiciary the exclusive power to fix the boundaries of States. The Reorganization Act gives the Committee on the Judiciary exclusive power to consider legislation concerning the Federal court system in a State. All of that is being violated. It is being done after only 2 days of hearings on one bill; and, as I understand, the bill on which hearings were held is not the bill which is now being considered by the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. Hearings were held on the Senate bill as reported last August; but on the House bill which is now before the Senate, only short Senate hearings were held. Only today a statement was placed in the RECORD on behalf of the subcommittee to show the differences between the two bills. As the Senator from Mississippi has so clearly pointed out, the very vital constitutional objection to the bill has never been considered by any committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely correct. Does the Senator from Virginia realize that the House committee inserted 69 amendments in the bill, and those 69 amendments have not even been considered by any Senate committee. What kind of legislative procedure is that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has just been glancing through some of the provisions relating to immigration laws. There are a number of such provisions coming from the original bill. We do not know what it is all about. No hearings have been held. There has been no analysis. We have no committee report to tell us why certain things were done.

All we are asked to do now is to abandon the bill which was reported by the Senate committee, and to take without question and without change, the House bill, for fear, because of what it was said would be the ruling of the House Parliamentarian—I am not too sure about this; but that is what is claimed by the proponents—that the bill would go back to the House Committee on Rules, which would keep it bottled up to the end of the session. That is what we, who took an oath to uphold and support the Constitution, are asked to do. We are asked to forget about the best interests of 172 million people of the United States in behalf of 100,000 people in Alaska, and to act on a statehood bill which in every respect is different from any such bill which has ever been enacted heretofore. The bill gives away millions of acres of public domain; it does not, as has always been done before, even reserve the mineral rights and the oil rights. It leaves up in the air how far out in the ocean the rights of Alaska shall extend.

A researcher who acted on my behalf has said that Alaska will extend out 100 miles and claim all the islands within that distance. Certainly even Louisiana and Texas never claimed that they could claim any rights more than 12 miles off the gulf coast. That is all they claimed. Texas claimed she had that right when she was an independent State, and presented a good argument to show that she had never relinquished her claim beyond the 3-mile limit.

But in this situation no limitation is definitely fixed as to the jurisdiction over oil under the waters, the fishing rights in the water, and the control of contiguous islands, even though they may be 50 miles away from the shore of the proposed new State.

I have stated so far one point. The population is too small to deserve the privileges or to discharge adequately all the obligations of a State.

The second point is that the resources have not been developed to such a point that they can support properly all the functions of State and local government.

In that connection, if I wished to do so, I could place in the RECORD a letter I received a few days ago from a person who said he had been in Juneau for 45 years. He said that the taxes in Alaska are higher than they are in any State in the Union. He said that Alaskans could not raise the taxes which would devolve on them if it became necessary to institute State courts to take the place of Federal courts; State police to take the place of Federal marshals; and to assume all the operations which are now being paid for by the Federal Government. He said that if it became necessary for Alaskans to provide all those services, they could not support statehood.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think it is recognized by all, as I have said—and as I shall continue to contend—that any State which comes into the Union must come in on an equal footing with the other States. That is the only basis on which a State should be admitted. If conditions are imposed which impugn the sovereignty of the State, or which do not place it on an even footing with the other States, the action is void. I wish to read, on that point, from the hearings:

Senator JACKSON. I think it might be well, before we go through all of the amendments, if you could give to the committee, through counsel, here, the exact situation insofar as local police power, if any, will exist in the withdrawal areas.

The Chair understands that in the areas of withdrawal, local law will become Federal law—

That is admitted throughout the hearings—

and will be enforced by Federal authorities, save and except the right to serve civil and criminal process and the right to exercise the voting franchise in those areas. And that local law will be invalidated where inconsistent with Federal law.

Does that place this proposed new State on an even footing with other States, which is a rule governing the admission of new States into the Union?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely not. It is different from anything which was required of the 48 States now in the Union.

Mr. EASTLAND. The answer made by the representative of the Department of Defense, who was presenting this amendment, was:

Mr. DECHERT. Mr. Chairman, that is correct only, I think, after a withdrawal is made. Until the withdrawal is made, the land subject to withdrawal remains fully subject to the laws of the State.

The point is that with a withdrawal provision, Alaska would not be placed on an even footing with the other States of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If she were not, Congress would not be performing a constitutional act. We have no constitutional authority to create a second-class State.

I shall enumerate one other general objection. The geographic location of Alaska imposes a permanent handicap to the integration of its population as a homogeneous unit in our Union of States.

Senators may accept those objections, as I do, as adequate grounds for voting against the pending bill, or they may agree with those proponents of immediate statehood who argue that potential advantages outweigh the disadvantages. It is interesting to note, however, that the majorities of both the House and Senate committees which favorably reported H. R. 7999 and S. 49 last year seemed to find it easier to state the objections, which they then tried to refute, than to list and document positive benefits which the United States would derive from granting Alaska statehood now.

For example, the House report on H. R. 7999 devoted four pages to stating arguments against statehood and trying to answer them. It used another three and a half pages to discuss peculiar problems of Alaska and a page and a half arguing the readiness of the Territory for statehood at this time. In contrast, the section headed "Primary Reasons for Statehood," was only a little more than one page in length.

The first peculiar problem mentioned in this report arises from the fact that more than 99 percent of the land area of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government—a condition which the committee recognized as unprecedented at the time of the admission of any of the existing States."

The report pointed out that approximately 95 million acres, or more than one-fourth of the total area of Alaska, is enclosed within various types of Federal withdrawals or reservations for the furtherance of the programs of Federal agencies, and said:

Much of the remaining area of Alaska is covered by glaciers, mountains, and worthless tundra. Thus it appeared to the committee that this tremendous acreage of withdrawals might well embrace a preponderance of the more valuable resources needed by the new State to develop flourishing industries with which to support itself and its people.

Another problem recognized by this committee report, as in some respects the most serious of all is that of financing the basic functions of State government and especially road maintenance and construction in an area where great distances must be covered and costs per mile are exceptionally high.

At this point I digress to mention to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi the point he has been urging about what does not go to Alaska and what can subsequently be withdrawn, and to ask him, if he knows, who will build and maintain all the highways which will be necessary to connect the areas which will still be held by the Federal Government and the areas held by the State, when there is a great necessity to unite both parts? How will the road system be placed under single control for financing, maintenance, and general supervision?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia knows that Alaska will not be a self-supporting State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a conclusion I have reached. If Alaska will not be a self-supporting State, that is one reason why I will not vote to unload that expense onto the taxpayers of Virginia and the taxpayers of the other 47 States of the Union.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Virginia—if he will yield briefly to me—to article 1, section 3, of the Constitution:

SEC. 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year.

Is not that plain?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is very plain. But the pending bill violates that clear provision of the Constitution. In doing so, the Congress would permit Alaska to have a State constitution which would provide for two Senators, neither of whom would be elected, as I recall, for 6 years. Instead, one Senator would have what is called a short term, whereas all the present States had to comply with the constitutional provision that Senators shall be elected for 6 years; and when their Senators reached the Congress, they were divided into the three classes.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senate itself did that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. But in this case, the constitution of Alaska would attempt to make the arrangement to which we have referred.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. How would the Senator from Virginia propose to divide the two Alaskan Senators into three classes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The three classes were formed at the time of the convening of the 1st Congress, so that one-third of the Members of the Senate would be elected every 2 years. But in the case of two Senators, they would go into two-thirds of three classes.

Mr. CHURCH. I think the answer the Senator from Virginia has given suggests the point I should like to make, namely, that the constitutional provision was designed to accommodate the situation which existed when the First Congress convened, when the Senate then consisted of two Senators from 13 States, but that that arrangement obviously is impractical in respect to a single State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But our point is that it is not proper to disregard a constitutional provision merely because some may choose to regard it as impractical. For instance, the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court stated that it is impractical in these modern days to have segregation in the schools, and, therefore, he stated that he would write into the Constitution a provision that is not in it. Similarly, it is said that it is impractical to elect two Senators for 6 years, as the Constitution provides, and that, therefore, a different arrangement will be made.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Constitution provides that each State shall have two Senators, and that Senators shall be elected for 6-year terms. Yet the Constitution authorizes the Senate to divide Senators into three classes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. As the distinguished and very able Senator from Idaho has stated, it might be regarded by some as impracticable to follow the procedure and precedents which without exception have prevailed during the history of this country, namely, that new Senators draw lots. One Senator may draw lot No. 1, and then he would be in class 1, and would have either a 2-year term or a 6-year term.

Another Senator might draw lot No. 2, in which case he would have either a 4-year term or, if the Senator who drew lot No. 1 received a 2-year term, the Senator who drew lot No. 2 would receive a 6-year term. That is the way the arrangement has worked throughout the entire history of this country. That arrangement has been followed without exception.

When Arizona was admitted, when New Mexico was admitted, when Colorado was admitted, when Iowa was admitted, when California was admitted, that system prevailed without exception. We cannot now say it is impractical, and that, therefore, the Senate can change the Constitution of the United States.

So this measure is void.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I shall proceed now with a brief discussion of what I believe is a close approach to doubletalk in the committee report. The report says that the proposed legislation would take care of the distorted landownership pattern, and would provide sources of State revenue by land grants to the new State aggregating 182,800,000 acres—a figure, incidentally, which was reduced to 103,350,000 acres in the bill as passed by the House. So the report is in error, because the bill we are now considering calls for land grants totaling 103,350,000 acres, or materially less acreage than the amount set forth in the committee report.

Except for 400,000 acres to be taken from national forests and 400,000 acres adjacent to established communities for prospective community centers and recreation areas, however, all of this land would have to be selected from public lands which are "vacant, unappropriated and unreserved and which are not included in areas subject to military withdrawal, unless specifically approved by the President."

The question arises, If, as stated on the preceding page of the report, the "preponderance of the more valuable resources" of Alaska already are included within acreage withdrawn by the Federal Government and reserved for its agencies, and if much of the remainder is indeed "glaciers, mountains and worthless tundra," how can the new State expect, even with such an extensive land grant, to find the resources to support itself and its people?

The uniqueness of the Alaska land situation is further emphasized in the committee report, which points out that on the occasion of admission of existing States land grants amounted to a maximum of 6 to 11 percent of the total land area, and much acreage already had passed into private taxpaying ownership, whereas in Alaska, even after a grant of unprecedented proportions to the proposed State, the Federal Government would continue to control more than two-thirds of the total acreage and an even larger percentage of the resources.

To alleviate this situation to some extent, the bill proposes to share with the State profits from Government coal mines, mineral leases, and the fur monopoly, which, of course, would make the State government a pensioner dependent on the Central Government to a much greater extent than the existing States which already, in my opinion, have jeopardized their constitutional rights by too ready acceptance of Federal handouts for a variety of public works and welfare programs.

The report to which I have been referring suggests that a long list of potential basic industries can exist in Alaska now only as tenants of the Federal Government and on the sufferance of various Federal agencies, and implies that there will be a great rush of private capital to the new State. There is a dual danger involved in this change, however. On the one hand, the State, if it succeeded in obtaining valuable resources through its choice of unreserved public lands, might prove to be fully as unsatisfactory a landlord as the Federal Government. On the other hand, if the State sought to dispose of these assets in rapid order, to raise funds for its operation, the process, especially in the hands of inexperienced public employees, might involve favoritism and irregularities which would make the Teapot Dome affair seem trivial by comparison.

Another example of contradictory statements is found on page 9 of the committee report. In one paragraph it is stated that committee members recognize there will be added costs of statehood that are now being borne by the Federal Government, but that Territorial legislators expect this to be offset by participation in Federal programs from which Alaska has been omitted. Another paragraph says the grant of statehood would mean some saving to the Federal Government, as the people of Alaska take over part of the burden of supporting governmental functions. Mr. President, either the Federal Government will save money by shifting the burden of some functions to Alaska, or the new State will gain by obtaining more grants from the Federal Government, but the balance of saving cannot be on both sides at once. And, of course, insofar as statehood involves additional government organization and more levels of employees, there will be increased costs for someone to pay.

The statement to which I have just referred—about the possibility of the Federal Government saving money through statehood—is part of the brief section headed "Primary Reasons for Statehood."

That section frankly admits that in considering extension of statehood to any Territory "it has never been possible in our history to specify in precise terms the exact benefits to be derived," and says that "it is not possible to say definitely in what particular respect the admission of Alaska will strengthen the Nation."

Aside from the vague and contradictory claim I have quoted, that the Federal Government might save some money by granting statehood, this part of the report suggests that matters of local concern can best be determined and most efficiently managed by those most directly affected, and that statehood will permit and encourage a more rapid growth in the economy of the Territory by opening up resources and by providing representation in Congress to advocate policy changes that would stimulate growth.

I am a firm believer in maximum use of State and local authority and a minimum of Federal interference, in line with the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, who believed the central government should do only those things which the smaller units cannot do for themselves. As a matter of practical application, however, I find it difficult to equate the concept of a State control which would be superior to Federal control because it is closer to the people, with the situation in Alaska, which stretches over an area practically as wide, from east to west and from north to south, as the continental United States.

Local governmental units can, and will, exist, regardless of whether the area is a Territory or is a State. The question is whether members of a State legislative body representing Attu and Ketchikan, which are as far apart as Los Angeles and Savannah, Ga., and representing Point Barrow and of parts of the Aleutian Island chain, which are as far apart as the Canadian border and El Paso, Tex., will have a sense of unity that will create a control much more

localized than that which can be provided under the delegated authority given to the Territorial government.

Whether a State government would promote more rapid economic development than would a Territorial government, would depend on the amount of confidence the State government could inspire among businessmen and investors. A stable State government might reassure those who have feared shifting Federal-control policies. On the other hand, a State government torn by local politics and subject to pressures which could be applied in sparsely settled areas where one man or corporation may wield a powerful influence, might inspire even less confidence.

The only additional ressons for statehood advanced in this section of the report are that it would strengthen our foreign policy by proving Americans still believe in equal rights and justice for all, and that it would demonstrate to the world that Alaska is an indissoluble part of the body of the Nation. Our actions during World War II and our present defense installations in Alaska should leave little room for doubt in any part of the world as to our intention to protect the integrity of the Territory against any form of invasion. So far as equal rights and justice are concerned, the treaty of 1867, by which we acquired Alaska, assured full rights of citizenship to its inhabitants; and the act of 1912, which created the Territory gave it full protection of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

In short, the House committee report on H. R. 7999 was a fumbling and apologetic document which failed to make out a positively convincing case for statehood and did not answer, to my satisfaction at least, the opposition arguments which it was frank enough to recognize.

Its weakness was made more apparent, also, by the minority report signed by six members of the House Judiciary Committee, which pointed out the exaggerated political power which would be given to a small group of voters if Alaska were allowed to name a Representative and two Senators, and the dubious financial basis on which the proposed State government would be launched.

Now, let us look at the Senate Judiciary Committee report on S. 49, which was issued last August. Here again we find that the authors required three pages to discuss argument against statehood, but only a page and a half to state all the reasons they could think of favorable to statehood.

In summarizing the positive argument, this report said:

> There are four primary reasons why Alaska should be granted statehood: It would fulfill a long-standing legal and moral obligation to 200,000 Americans, it would benefit Alaska, it would strengthen the Nation internally, and it would prove our adherence to the principles that guide the Free World.

The brief reasoning in support of these points follows the same line as the House report, and the observations I made in that connection would apply here as well. It might be added, however, that the first point as to an alleged legal and moral obligation to grant statehood at this time is refuted on its face by the report's own quotation from the 1867 treaty, which said inhabitants who chose to remain in the ceded Territory "shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may, from time to time adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country."

That treaty has not been violated under the territorial form of government, and the treaty made no specific promise of statehood. It is true, as the report states, that the Supreme Court has said an incorporated Territory is an inchoate State and that its incorporated status is considered an apprenticeship for statehood. There is no argument about Alaska being a potential candidate for statehood, and I certainly would not say that form of government never should be granted. I merely say the period of apprenticeship has not yet been satisfactorily completed, for reasons which I have mentioned briefly, and which I shall discuss at more length later.

The desperate efforts of proponents to make their case look good is illustrated, incidentally, in the part of the Senate report where reference is made to "200,000 Americans" to whom we are legally and morally obligated to give statehood rights. Now, the total population claimed for Alaska, on the basis of latest census estimates, is 212,000, and that includes 35,000 Aleuts, Eskimos, and Indians, who, under terms of the pending bill, would remain wards of the Federal Government. That leaves only 177,000 Americans, and even that total includes about 47,000 who are in military service and another 20,000 military dependents. These 67,000 Americans, who were sent to Alaska as a result of military orders, and who will be removed and replaced in time by other military orders, are citizens for the most part of existing States. They would not acquire Alaska State citizenship, and as loyal citizens of other States, even though temporary residents of Alaska, they would not want it. Therefore, any possible moral or legal obligation would apply to only about 110,000 Americans, rather than 200,000, to whom statehood rights might conceivably be owed.

At this point I wish to refer to the fact that in the very able and splendid speech of Judge HOWARD SMITH, of the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia, he gave figures which showed that there are less than 100,000 American citizens, exclusive of the military, now in Alaska.

But I am taking the census figures and the figures of the military and, for the sake of argument, accepting the proper figure, although there seems to be no real agreement on the subject, as being 110,000, or less than one-third the population of a normal Congressional District, as the 48 States are now organized—with all due deference to my distinguished friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is present on the floor. The election of a Representative in Congress from Alaska would result in a loss of a Representative by one of the existing States. Perhaps it would be applicable to Louisiana, because it would have to apply somewhere. Both Virginia and Louisiana are on the borderline, and Virginians would much rather that a Representative be taken away from Louisiana than from Virginia.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Virginia is making a notable argument, but how can we States Righters vote against statehood? Personally, being a States Righter, I shall support statehood for Alaska.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The first obligation of the Senator from Louisiana is to the 172 million people of the 48 States. We cannot do justice to them if we admit a noncontiguous Territory with a population of about 100,000. If it is done, we will dilute the rights the people of the 48 States now have. That is the first point.

Second, this country would have to give support to the new State far and above anything that has ever been done before.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, a great Virginian by the name of Thomas Jefferson and another great Virginian who was President at the time made it possible that certain territory be acquired so that Louisianians might share some of the power of the great State of Virginia. It would seem to me that perhaps we should show some of the same deference to a great area the people of which want to become a State. I wonder if we should not cast some bread upon the water.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia appreciates the reference to Thomas Jefferson, who was one of the greatest of philosophers. Nothing illustrated his wisdom more than his buying, for 15 cents an acre, a great area that included what was to become the great State of Louisiana. There were fine people in that area. They were cultured people. They were self-supporting people. The port of New Orleans was the greatest port in the South. We obtained an area which already had a cultural and economic development. When we bought that territory the good people of Louisiana became a part and parcel of the Union.

The facts I have stated would not apply to an area which lies beyond the boundaries of Canada and in the frozen wastes. We are spending a great deal of money in that Territory. Much of the money which goes into that Territory is for the support of 50,000 military personnel and for construction work going on there, money spent on the DEW line, airfields, and other activities.

As I had stated before the Senator from Louisiana came on the floor, it was specifically provided that the people of that Territory should have all the freedom guaranteed under our laws. We have given them that freedom. We did not agree to give them the privilege of State government, and control of the area as a State.

As pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi before the Senator from Louisiana came to the floor, it is not proposed that we do that in this bill. We shall have a kind of halfway provision. There would be mixed control in Alaska.

We reserve the right, if an emergency should arise, to take from the State some of the land which was thought to be theirs. Under the fundamental law, we do not have a constitutional right to do that. Neither do we have a constitutional right to permit the adoption of a State constitution which prescribes how Senators shall be classified as to their terms, since the Constitution of the United States stipulates that Senators shall be elected for 6 years and the Senate shall provide three classes. A Senator must go into one or another class, and in that way only one-third of the entire membership comes up for election at one time. Thereby, the Senate became what the House is not, a continuous legislative body.

I respect the views of the Senator from Louisiana. I know he is in favor of the bill, and is sincere in his advocacy of it.

The Senator from Louisiana has just as much right—I would not say he has good reasons, but he has just as much right to be in favor of the bill as the Senator from Virginia has to be against it. At any rate, the Senator will have a full opportunity, before the debate is over, to tell the Senate the reasons he has for supporting the bill.

In the meantime, as the Senator from Virginia indicated at the start, he is simply offering some points for discussion. We are a long way, in the opinion of the Senator from Virginia—unless we are kept here until 12 o'clock tonight, to beat Senators down—from reaching a final vote on the bill. There are many points which need to be looked into and discussed. I do not mean the discussion will be aimless, simply to kill time. The discussion will be on matters which vitally affect the principle that we have heretofore never gone beyond the continental confines to admit a Territory to statehood.

If we take this action, we will be urged undoubtedly, to admit Hawaii as a State. After all, is there not as much a commitment in the demagogic planks of both parties for Guam and Puerto Rico as for Hawaii and Alaska? I do not know how we will be able to provide statehood for Alaska and not for other Territories. All of those are covered. If we are to be bound by what is done in a convention, which everybody expects after the election to be forgotten, we are as bound with respect to all four as we are bound with respect to Alaska.

We are now told, "No, we will not admit Hawaii." The distinguished chairman of the committee said yesterday, "I am in favor of statehood for Hawaii, but if we put Hawaii in this bill some of the Members of the Senate who will be afraid of Communist control and other things in Hawaii will vote against the whole bill." Therefore the Senator says, "Let us leave Hawaii out of the bill now and take up that matter later."

I understand the distinguished minority leader has put us on notice that when the bill presently under consideration has passed he is going to make an immediate motion to take up the bill providing statehood for Hawaii. I may be a little late in the session to get action on both in the Senate and in the House on statehood for Hawaii, but nobody should feel, once we establish the precedent of admitting into the Union a Territory which is noncontiguous, that there will ever be much argument against taking in Hawaii as a State, since the population in Hawaii is so much larger, and the climate is extremely salubrious. It is 72 degrees in the winter and the summer. Flowers bloom in such profusion that the people there can put garlands around their necks without any cost whatever. It is a lovely place. Everyone who goes to the Hawaiian Hotel, puts a longhandled spoon into a ripe pineapple, sees the dancers, hears the music and views the moonlight, comes away to say, "We must have Hawaii in the Union as a State. It is not fair to that wonderful island that it should be kept in a colonial peonage status."

The same is true of those who like the roughness of the wild, who love the softness of the snow under their feet. They go to Alaska, and recite the beautiful words of Robert William Service:

I've stood in some mighty-mouthed hollow
That's plumb-full of hush to the brim;
I've watched the big, husky sun wallow
In crimson and gold, and grow dim.

They say, "Certainly a wonderful Territory such as Alaska must be given statehood."

I am trying to get down to terra firma. I am trying to get my feet on the earth. I should like to look at the facts, separated from emotionalism and favoritism.

When we talk about a wilderness spot such as Alaska, on the one hand, or a beauty spot like Hawaii on the other, or any other beauty spot, one might wish that they were contiguous to the mainland. I say, however, we are asked to set a dangerous precedent and, once the precedent is established, we will be pressed to extend it to other noncontiguous Territory.

How many in Alaska want statehood, how many are opposed to it, and how many simply do not care is an unanswered question. The only official referendum on the subject was held in 1946 and although statehood advocates boast that the vote was two to one for statehood, they usually do not mention that the actual vote cast was only 9,630 for and 6,822 against. Neither do they make clear that the question asked was whether the voters approved statehood as such, not whether they thought the time had come to grant it. Therefore, all we can be sure of is that 12 years ago about 10,000 persons in Alaska thought they wanted statehood at some unspecified time.

The Territorial legislature has acted since then on the assumption that a majority of the residents want statehood now and the voice of the legislature has been accepted as the voice of the people. Last year, however, an informal newspaper and radio poll of sentiment brought a response of more than two to one against statehood, and Mr. William Prescott Allen reported to the Senate committee that a survey covering 75 percent of the people of Alaska indicated they stood more than two to one against statehood.

The truth of the matter is that on the basis of House and Senate committee reports and other statements of its advocates, the case for immediate statehood for Alaska should be thrown out for lack of convincing evidence.

The proponents themselves boast of the progress the Territory has been making during the past few years, in population growth, in tax collections, and in economic development. If things are going that well, no hasty action is required. We can afford to wait a little longer and find out whether the population trend is on a permanent upgrade or whether it has only been temporarily inflated by defense activities. We can afford to observe the trend of economic indicators when military building programs are completed and lessening of world tensions permits withdrawal of some personnel. In other words, the status quo involves no emergency except for those with political debts to pay or political axes to grind, but a change to statehood is not reversible and if we make a mistake in taking that step now, the penalty may be heavy.

Now let us consider the specific objections to immediate statehood which I mentioned at the outset of this statement.

First, there is the population question.

As I have just indicated, the presently estimated total population of 212,000 includes only about 110,000 American civilians. Proponents of statehood speak impressively of the percentage increase in population of Alaska in recent years, but slur over the small number of persons involved in a change which started from a low-base figure. On the other hand, when they compare Alaska's present population with that of other States at the time of their admission, they like to use numbers of people and ignore percentages. For example, it sounds fine to compare Alaska's current estimated population of 212,000 with California's population of 92,000 in 1850. But California's 1850 population represented approximately 0.4 percent of a total United States population of 23 million while Alaska's 1957 population amounted to a little more than one-thousandth of our total population of 171 million.

Growth factors also are distorted by assuming, without sound justification, that Alaska's future population changes will be entirely different from what they have been in the past. Again using California for comparison: The 1850 population of 92,000 existed 2 years after the start of the gold rush of 1848. By 1860 the population of California had increased to 379,000 and by 1890 it was 1,213,000. The upward trend continued steadily with a count of 2,377,000 in 1910 and 3,426,000 in 1920, showing obviously that those who went in search of quick fortunes found the land to their liking and attracted a steady stream of others who wanted to make it their permanent home.

In contrast, Alaska which had a population of about 30,000 when it was acquired in 1867 and of 32,000 in 1890 jumped to 63,000 in 1900, following the Klondike gold rush of 1896, but in 1910 the population remained at 64,000 and in 1920 it had dropped back to 55,000. In 1930 it still was only 59,000, demonstrating that this area did not have characteristics which appealed to large numbers of permanent settlers.

The lure of quick fortunes attracted adventurers and some hardy pioneers remained, to whom all honor is due. They are fine citizens and worthy successors to our early American pioneers. But their kind of life does not appeal to the average man, who wants to give immediate advantages to his family and to develop the kind of home which was made by those who settled the Valley of Virginia, the great plains of the Midwest or the sunny valleys of California. It was in vain that the Federal Government offered bounty lands to veterans of World War I and spent more than $1,000 an acre on subsidized farms. The population has nearly tripled since 1940 only because thousands of men in uniform were sent there under orders and other thousands were attracted by high rates of compensation to provide housing and other facilities and services needed by these involuntary colonizers. There is as yet, however, no real evidence of a genuine boom in population.

The static nature of Alaska's population figures is not a cause for serious concern in itself, but it is important that it be recognized when we start to talk about statehood which would involve a seat in the House of Representatives and two seats in the United States Senate.

The average Congressional District has three times the American civilian population of Alaska, which means that the Alaskan voter would have three times the influence of the average voter in the continental United States on legislation in the House of Representatives. In the Senate 2 men from Alaska representing less than 150,000 civilian residents, including the protected natives, would have the same voting power as the Senators from the largest States of the Union.

I realize, of course, that if Alaska becomes a State, it must have two Senators under our system of government, but to say that this small segment of isolated people is entitled as a matter of right to such disproportionate representation is to misunderstand the basis of our Government.

The compromise reached by the authors of our Constitution in their effort to establish a workable Federal Government and at the same time protect local rights and individual liberties by recognizing some elements of State sovereignty included a House of Representatives where representation was based on population and a Senate in which each State would be equally represented.

When this was done, however, each State had vested interests which it was sacrificing in return for the right of Senate equality. As new States were admitted after adoption of the Constitution, no such fundamental right was involved, but only the question of whether or not the existing States were willing to share their privileges with new groups and the favorable decisions were encouraged by the fact that in many cases new States were carved out of older ones and it was a case of the parent recognizing the maturing of a child. In the case of areas obtained by treaty, there still was the bond of settlers who had gone from the original States and that, of course, applies also to Alaska.

But, while it is quite in order to give Alaska two Senators whenever the present States feel such representation is deserved, there is no basic right of Alaskans to demand such representation at any particular time. The analogy might be suggested of a group of businessmen who form a corporation with each contributing assets and in return receiving an equal number of shares of stock. Later on employees may make contributions of services to the company on the basis of which they are given blocks of voting stock, but in such cases the reward must first be earned and the decision lies within the discretion of the existing stockholders.

My point is simply that as of now the Territory of Alaska does not have enough population to deserve full shareholder's rights in the Senate of the United States, and to grant that privilege would be an injustice to the other States.

I must confess that I feel strongly on this point because of my personal fear that Alaska, with the pressing need for development funds and the heavy burden of taxation, to which I shall presently refer, would be represented in the Senate by men who would gravitate naturally to the side of liberal spenders and proponents of more and bigger grants from the Federal Treasury.

The people of Virginia generally stand for conservatism in fiscal policies and for limiting activities of the central government. I do not want to see the 2 votes by which 3½ million Virginians are represented in the Senate nullified on questions of economy and other basic issues by Senators who will speak for less than 200,000 residents of Alaska.

My second point is that Alaska is unprepared for statehood today, not only from the standpoint of population, but also from the standpoint of developed resources and ability to carry the financial burdens.

One reason that previous efforts to give Alaska statehood failed was the obvious difficulty the State government would encounter in raising revenue from an area 99 percent of which was owned by the Federal Government. To attempt to meet this problem, each succeeding bill proposed to give the new State a larger grant of lands, culminating in the House bill offered last year which would have assigned 182,800,000 acres, or nearly half the total area. That amount was scaled down before the bill was passed to around a third of the total and, as I have indicated, the value of what the State could get is left in doubt because of restrictions on the takings.

In hearings held in 1950, Father Hubbard, the glacier priest who had lived in Alaska for 23 years, said he was for eventual statehood but did not want to see Alaska precipitated into it with too many problems unsolved. He said he fully approved the American attitude toward taxation without representation, but in the case of Alaska he wondered if there would not be too much representation with too little taxation. That question still can be raised with justification.

A witness at the Senate hearings last year said S. 49 was one of the most beautiful bills ever produced on statehood. She said she also believed the Cadillac is a very beautiful car but "if I cannot afford to buy a Cadillac, I would rather do with my Ford until I can afford one."

Last year's House minority report on H. R. 7999 said there was a serious question as to whether the Alaskan economy could finance the added burdens of statehood, pointing out that it is on an artificial basis, bolstered by huge Federal handouts. It said the 1958 budget provides for a total civil-Federal expenditure in Alaska of $122 million, not counting military expense and construction expenditure at a $350 million annual rate, and contrasted these figures with total income from all private industry in Alaska of only $160 million a year. It suggested that territorial taxes, already higher than those of any State in the Union on a per capita basis, might well become prohibitive under statehood and discourage the saving of capital for investment, thus retarding development of the economy.

I previously have referred to the problems recognized by sponsor of this legislation of building the tremendously expensive roads Alaska will need before its natural resources can be unlocked and of providing the civil services needed to encourage growth of the tiny population spread over an area a fifth as large as the United States—a population density of only 22.5 persons per hundred square miles.

There is danger, on the one hand, that development will not be rapid enough to meet the financial demands of an efficient State government. There is danger, on the other hand, that in trying to meet those demands resources which are assets of the whole United States will be wasted or improperly distributed to favored interests.

My Senate colleagues know of my lifelong interest in outdoor life and in conservation of wildlife and other natural resources; and because of this background I am especially concerned by possible abuses under the proposed terms of statehood.

Since the House passed H. R. 7999, I have received a letter signed by representatives of the Wildlife Management Institute, the American Nature Association, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Association, Nature Conservancy, and the Wilderness Society, warning that "the stage already is set in Alaska for the commercial interests to take over the administration of the invaluable fish and wildlife resources upon statehood."

This letter pointed out that under a law passed last year by the Alaskan Legislature commercial interests are assured complete domination of the Territory's fish and wildlife resources. These conservation groups are strongly opposed

to the Federal Government relinquishing management of these resources until the new State legislature makes provision to protect the broad national interest in them.

An amendment providing that the Federal Government shall temporarily retain management of these resources was adopted before the House passed the bill, but, as I have indicated, the private conservation groups which want to be sure that amendment is retained by the Senate have seen evidence of an intended resource grab and they remain concerned. I shall not discuss this in detail now, but would refer my colleagues to the debate on pages 9748–9750 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28, 1958.

There may well be concern also about possible attempts to grab resources of untold commercial value in what is now recognized as one of the most popular areas in the world for oil wildcatting.

These possibilities point up the importance of giving full statehood powers only to a governmental organization which will be politically mature and which will be representative of a group large enough and sufficiently diverse to require that the public interest prevail over greedy manipulators.

Mr. President, I already have talked longer than is perhaps worth while in view of the improbability that what I say here will influence those who have committed themselves to passage of this bill, but I want to conclude with a renewal of the plea I made on this floor in 1954 against establishing a new precedent of national expansion by admission of a State not contiguous to the continental United States.

Opposing the entry of Texas into the Union in 1845 Daniel Webster spoke of a very dangerous tendency and of doubtful consequence to enlarge the boundaries of our Government, and said:

> There must be some limit to the extent of our territory, if we are to make our institutions permanent.

We may concede now that damage Webster feared as a result of admitting Texas to the Union and the admission a few years later of California have not materialized. The fact remains, however, that we must by policy fix some limit to our expansion and Alaskan statehood would represent a shift in policy.

Texas, California and the Northwest Territory were remote from the standpoint of travel time and travel difficulties when previous statehood questions were decided and it may be admitted that those who are willing to fly over wild and undeveloped country can make quick trips today to and from Alaska. However, all travel was in a comparatively primitive stage in the early days of our Nation and as communication facilities improved, the Western area of the United States responded with rapid population increases and resource development. Comparatively speaking, Alaska still is much more remote and isolated from day-to-day dealings with the United States than the last States previously admitted and this difference always will remain.

Our ties with Alaska consist of a single highway traversing a foreign nation, ocean routes which are closed by ice for long periods, and very limited air transportation. The workingman from New England or Virginia can get in his car and take his family for a vacation visit to California or Oregon, and the ordinary man on the west coast can make similar visits to the metropolitan areas and historic shrines of the eastern seaboard. Their contacts promote homogeneity in information, ideas, and ideals which cannot be achieved in the same way between the average resident of Alaska and of the continental United States.

I am not implying that Alaskans are un-American in their attitudes and beliefs. A majority of them come from American backgrounds and their very presence in a largely undeveloped area indicates laudable qualities of initiative and courage. In that respect, I might say, that I feel the population of Alaska as a whole is much more suited to assume statehood responsibilities than the larger population of Hawaii.

But, the physical separation of these people from the main body of United States citizens makes it more difficult for them to understand national problems and viewpoints, and I therefore fear the influence on our national welfare which might be exercised by representatives in the Congress casting votes to represent them.

More serious than the question of bringing such a new influence into our national legislative body to the extent of 1 vote in the House and 2 in the Senate, however, is the tendency which granting statehood to Alaska would have to bring about similar action in the case of Hawaii and then Puerto Rico and then perhaps more remote areas such as Guam.

As the late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler soundly argued a decade ago, once we go over the line by admitting a State outside this continent, the action is not reversible and the next generation may find itself with a United States of the Pacific and other ocean islands, instead of a United States of America.

> To add outlying territory hundreds or thousands of miles away, with what certainly must be different interests from ours and very different background—
>
> Dr. Butler said—
>
> might easily mark the beginning of the end of the United States as we have known it and as it has become so familiar and so useful to the world.

I fully recognize, Mr. President, that my voice in urging preservation of the kind of Union our forefathers brought forth on this continent may be as unheeded as the voices of the gloomy prophets who centuries ago warned the Hebrews of disasters ahead. But my conscience would not allow me to see this statehood bill passed without crying out, as did the writer of Proverbs who said:

> Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I commend the Senator for his very fine presentation in connection with a highly important bill, perhaps the most far-reaching bill which will be considered by the Senate at this session. The Senator from Virginia always does exceptionally when he sets himself to a task, and this case is no exception.

The Senator from Virginia has brought out some very important points. I invite his attention to one particular point. It has often been alleged—but I have never heard it proved—that the granting of statehood to Alaska would greatly strengthen the national defenses. I did not have an opportunity to hear all of the Senator's speech. Did any of his research cover that problem?

Mr. ROBERTSON. First, I thank my colleague from Mississippi for his kind and complimentary reference to my service and my discussion of this important question.

I assure the Senator that I gave some study to the question to which he has referred—perhaps not so exhaustive a study as might have been possible, but I did consider the question as to whether or not statehood would add anything to our defenses in Alaska, and I could find no worthwhile evidence to indicate that it would unless it be in the realm of psychology and morale. I found no evidence to indicate that statehood would improve by one iota our national defenses in Alaska.

I stated in my prepared remarks that we always had assumed responsibility for the defense of Alaska. Ever since the signing of the treaty under which we acquired it, we have given the people of Alaska all the freedom guaranteed to the people of the 48 States. We have protected them, and we intend, until such time as statehood may be appropriate by reason of their own development, to give them all the defense and protection that we give any physical part of the Union.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is exactly correct. By reason of the geographical location of this area and the nature of the very fine people of Alaska, the defense of Alaska is a part of our national defense system. In that area we have expended untold hundreds of millions of dollars. Some of the finest military installations in the world are located there. From a purely military standpoint, statehood, involving a State government and local governments with which the military would have to deal, would certainly not have a tendency to increase the strength of the Nation. It would create possible barriers. Any additional government is a barrier, in a sense.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia mentioned the fact that even among the people of Alaska there is not full agreement with respect to statehood.

The last poll showed that a very substantial number of the people were opposed to statehood. The majority in favor of it was not very large. Not many people responded to the poll. The Senator from Virginia has given the figures with reference to the military expenditures of our Government in Alaska and he has pointed out that they are

running at the rate of about $360 million a year. The total private income in Alaska is $120 million.

Let us suppose that we could get a bona fide international program of disarmament, and let us suppose that we could forget about atomic weapons and the DEW line, and all about our airfields in Alaska. Let us suppose, also, that we could withdraw the 60,000 or 70,000 military men from Alaska. Let us assume also that we could stop the expenditures in Alaska for future defense. Let us consider where we would be left in such a situation. The 110,000 native population of Alaska would have to assume all the burdens of operating the State, which are now being assumed and paid for by the Federal Treasury. They could not survive.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Virginia has raised another serious aspect with reference to the pending bill. In my years of service on the Committee on Armed Services I have from time to time asked various military leaders to give their reasons to sustain the general assertion that statehood for Alaska would strengthen our national defense. I have never heard any one of them give any substantial reason or bill of particulars.

I had a further experience, which I should like to relate. A few years ago, when a similar bill was being debated, I looked into the question of strengthening the national defense, and I found a statement which had been made by one of the assistant secretaries of what now is the Department of Defense, in support of the bill. I read those paragraphs. When the bill came up again before the same committee 4 years later, another Secretary, who was then in office, made the identical statement, word for word, sentence for sentence, period for period. That proved to me that it is all a canned product and has become related to politics, and has no substance in it, so far as bearing on the point at issue is concerned. I repeat that I have never heard a responsible military man give any substantial bill of particulars as to how statehood for Alaska would strengthen our national defense.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to assure my colleagues, as they know, of course, that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi serves with distinction on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations, which handle these problems from the standpoint of policy and the standpoint of funds. He is well informed on the question of whether statehood would promote the national defense. He states, and the Senator from Virginia agrees, that it would make no difference whatever, unless we enter the realm of psychology, and say, "Well, if the Americans there were called upon in a state of emergency, they would do this or that or the other thing." However, from the standpoint of military science and tactics and firepower and equipment, there would be no difference.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe it would add an additional burden. I say that with all due respect to the people of Alaska, because that would be true also of any other area.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Mr. President, a few minutes ago, in a colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] the subject of Alaskan statehood and its possible influence or effect upon the defenses of Alaska and the military situation there was discussed. It was agreed in that colloquy between the two Senators that statehood would be no enhancement, no advantage, no benefit to the military and, indeed, at the time it was even suggested, surprisingly enough, statehood might in fact be some kind of impediment to the military.

In view of that discussion, I think it appropriate to read into the RECORD the testimony given by Gen. Nathan Twining, Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, at the hearings of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. The testimony appears on page 127 of the committee hearings. Mr. BARTLETT, the Delegate from Alaska, was the questioner:

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, General Twining, you testified on this subject in 1950, on the subject of Alaska statehood, before the Senate committee. And you were asked by Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, if you thought statehood would be advantageous. I am going to read your reply. You said:

"Yes; I feel statehood for Alaska would help the military."

May I ask you, General Twining, if that is your thought today?

General TWINING. I feel it would; yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Perhaps it would be fairer if I were to go ahead and quote your other remarks there. You said:

"For one reason, it would improve the economy of the population in Alaska and would be a great asset to military development."

Then Senator ANDERSON asked you this: "Do you think statehood for Alaska would help in your defense plan?"

And your answer was: "Yes."

And Senator ANDERSON then asked: "Could you give us any indication of ways in which it might be helpful?" And your reply was in these words:

"Well, we can obtain more materials from the increased economy of Alaska. We would not have to send them up from the States. It would be cheaper to build them up there. The people up there would help, and a more stable form of government would help. I think that is about it."

I think the remarks on the subject by the Acting Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff General Twining, are very appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent that these remarks, together with my comments pertaining to them, be included in the RECORD immediately following the colloquy between the Senators to which I alluded.

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

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to make this one brief addition to the testimony to which the able Senator from Idaho has just alluded. General Twining for a number of years commanded all of the military forces in Alaska. They included not only the Air Force, but the Army and the naval forces. I therefore feel, and I am sure my colleague agrees with me, that not only as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is he in a position to speak, but he is in the unique position of having had several years' experience with military problems within the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. CHURCH. I do appreciate that addition. I think it is very pertinent, because General Twining is not only one of the foremost military experts in the country today, but he is a man who personally had experience in Alaska.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia one more question with respect to farming and its critical situation in Alaska.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That point was not covered in my prepared remarks. However, I have looked into it, and I am glad to tell the Senator that I know that after World War II we tried our best to get veterans to go to Alaska to settle on free land. We could not get them to go there. Then we made an appropriation, because we felt it would be helpful if Alaska could produce more food and become a little more self-supporting. We were told that they have to import their eggs and their beef and their flour, and practically everything else, with the exception of a few vegetables that grow in a 90-day season in the subarctic summer. We sent more than a thousand farmers to Alaska, and spent more than a thousand dollars an acre for land for them. They were experimental farms. Only three farmers out that group stayed there. The others had to give up. They could not make a go of it.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that adds a great point to the Senator's speech.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has given a good many facts. He did not intend his remarks to be exhaustive, but merely an attempt to stimulate others to look into this subject and look at the facts. If any Member of the Senate will look at the facts, he will be forced to the conclusion that Alaska is not yet ready for statehood. He will be forced to the conclusion that there is nothing comparable in the future development of Alaska to that of any other States. Outside the military, there are no more native people there than there were in 1896, right after the gold rush. The population has not grown appreciably since the 1900 census.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I have a memorandum which states that there are only about 600 farms in Alaska. That not only shows the inability to farm there, but also the lack of food production for the people. That brings up a major point which cannot be overcome, and that is the point with reference to the climate. The climate is what puts a definite limitation on the economy of Alaska, whether it be farming or industry or anything else.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The persons who go there and come back enthusiastic visit very few places. They come back and say it has a wonderful climate. It is true that in 1 or 2 places the climate is better than in the District of Columbia; it does

not get so cold in the winter and it does not become so hot in the summer. There are wonderful spots, but they are few. Most of the area has temperatures of 50° and 60° degrees below zero. The ground freezes down to 15 or 20 feet. It is not the kind of place in which the average white man of this country prefers to live.

We would like people from the Scandinavian countries and Great Britain, who never fill their quotas for immigration, to move there. They do not go there either. The population has remained relatively static. That is why we see no immediate hope that there will be a population increase in Alaska or a development of resources through their own capital which would qualify the people of Alaska for statehood status. Therefore, the movement for statehood for Alaska is premature, and is giving entirely too much emphasis to the political angle involved.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield to me for the last time, I should like to ask him a question with respect to the form of government. The question has been before the Senate, and I have given a great deal of thought to it. If the people of Alaska were permitted to elect their own governor, I am sure such a bill would be readily passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is referring to commonwealth status, I believe.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the proposal has been made to give Alaska full commonwealth status. I believe that would get a fine response. All such suggestions are rather quickly rejected and more or less spurned. That leads me to believe that political power is one of the prime objects of the entire idea of the statehood bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Evidently. The object is to give Alaska a voice in the Senate equal to that of the Representatives of New York, Texas, California, or any other State, although they would actually represent only one-hundredth as many native Americans.

Mr. STENNIS. That is one of the most serious phases of the entire problem.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is no question about any personal freedom or about any colonialism or mistreatment or anything like that being involved. That is merely dust in the eyes—or "poudre," as the French call it, I believe.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Anyone who has been to Alaska recognizes the correctness of his statement. I know it from my own experience.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Virginia for the very able statement he has made. That Congress should blind itself to the facts which the Senator has laid before it, and should treat the matter so casually, is both appalling and incomprehensible to me. I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator from Virginia for the very able and fair treatment he has given to the issue. I only wish that the people of the United States could have available to them the sound reasoning in the Senator's statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who is our top parliamentarian, knows that the pending proposal is different from anything which has previously been considered concerning the admission of a State. As one of our best students of history, if not the best, he knows that if Congress violated the injunction of the Founding Fathers to keep the area of our Nation intact, and not to include offshore territories, a precedent would be established. Even though the Territory is in the same land mass, there is a nation between the United States and Alaska. Having established this precedent, we would be more or less defenseless to resist the demands of the offshore islands and other Territories which might seek to come into the Union through statehood.

If we yield to the propaganda of the Communists of the Nation, who try to stir up racial troubles for us, and who try to make it appear that we are engaged in colonialism of the most reprehensible character in Alaska and if we endeavor to meet this criticism by admitting Alaska into the Union, we shall have to yield every time they raise the same question concerning other Territories. That we could not do.

After all, let us not forget the political implications of the seating in this body of 8 or 10 new Senators from here, there, and yonder. That is no mere dream.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rose for another purpose, but I have listened with particular interest to the discussion this afternoon. I am one who has never given real study to this problem. None of the questions involved has come before any of the committees of which I am a member.

I think there are simply two questions: What is best for the interests of the United States? What is best for the interests of Alaska? The answers can be set forth in two columns: Would it be of advantage to the United States to have Alaska become a State? Would it be of advantage to Alaska to become a State? I, for one, shall approach the question from that particular angle.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] for bringing light into a picture which, so far as I am concerned, has been not filled with light until the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

WELCOME TO WONDERFUL WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the trout and the pike and the muskies and the bass are striking in Wisconsin. That gets a smile from the Senator from Virginia.

This is America's vacation time. The great tourist industry of the United States—one of our great industries, I may say—is now enjoying what will undoubtedly prove to be its most prosperous season in American history.

Representing, in part, as I do, a State which is known as America's vacationland, it is my pleasure to renew to my tired colleagues an annual invitation to come to God's country—Wisconsin.

I know that all Senators are in need of fresh air; they need fresh water; they need to see the fish strike.

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

Mr. WILEY. No, not at this time. I know the Senator wants to talk about Virginia. But never mind. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was merely going to say that Wisconsin once belonged to Virginia. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. When Congress recesses, I want all Senators to come to enjoy wonderful Wisconsin. I want them to enjoy its lakes and streams, its great tradition of hospitality, its splendid resort facilities, its hotels, motels, lodges, and restaurants.

I want Senators to bring their families and have all of them enjoy the varied attractions of the Badger State, with its incomparable facilities for fishing, hunting, swimming, golfing, and plain relaxing.

Congress may not recess until mid-August, but those of my colleagues who are in the Midwest over weekends will, I hope, have a chance to go to the lake country of Wisconsin and enjoy a weekend, at the minimum.

But, then, when Congress has terminated its labors of the 2d session, I hope that as many Senators as possible will accept, as they have in years past, this invitation from wonderful Wisconsin.

Today, it is my pleasure to introduce a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Act, dealing with the allocation of funds for wildlife projects. Wisconsin has wildlife in abundance. It offers nature, with all its beauty and variety. It has, for example, no less than 1,475 trout streams, with a total length of 8,930 miles.

Our State conservation department lists 39 separate State forests and parks, 31 of which have facilities for camping. Swimming in crystal-clear lakes is available in 17 of these parks.

In Wisconsin, there is a great tradition of having facilities available for the public, as well as for private use.

That is why, for example, no less than 978 miles of lake and stream frontage are held by the State conservation department for public use. That means, for example, that our citizens—all our citizens—can enjoy water sports, such as boating, swimming, water skiing, and fishing.

Naturally, every Member of the Senate is proud of his own State. Naturally, too, each of us likes to comment upon the attractions of his State.

But I submit that the record of America's tourist visits and tourist expenditures documents the fact that, when I speak of wonderful Wisconsin, as America's vacation State supreme, I am speaking not simply from a deep personal preference, but from a record attested to by the American people themselves.

What is more, it is the tradition of my State's tourist industry constantly to excel in its reputation. We do not rest on our laurels. Each day brings news to me of efforts to improve further our splendid facilities so that guests will enjoy the best vacation in the world.

Each day I get literature from hotels, resorts, and fishing lodges, from chambers of commerce and regional groups, pointing up some new additions—some splendid new additions—to our State's excellent road system, for example, so as to help make for the best possible vacation.

The muskies are biting as are the brook trout and all the wonderful other varieties of fish.

It may seem almost incongruous to refer to the pleasures of leisure time here on the Senate floor when we are so crowded with legislative duties. Nevertheless, I believe that this very fact of the heavy burdens upon us emphasizes why it is so important that we get a bit of wholesome refreshment from our labors, and renew ourselves and revitalize ourselves in wonderful Wisconsin.

It is a sportsman's paradise; it is a haven for the tired, the weary, the rushed, the harassed. One can breathe clean, fresh air and swim in clean, fresh water. One can enjoy himself as he has always longed to do.

Vacationing is good sense; vacationing is, in itself, a great industry—long one of Wisconsin's top three industries.

There are facilities for every type of vacation which the tourist may have in mind.

And so, I renew this warm invitation to my colleagues.

Fortunately, I may say, we of the Congress have taken one of the vital steps to strengthen America's recreation industry and to make sure that there will always be adequate facilities for Americans to enjoy themselves. For that reason I send to the desk the text of an article which appeared in the Sunday, June 22, issue of the Milwaukee Journal. It describes the progress toward the new Presidential Commission on the Nation's Recreation Needs.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

UNITED STATES PLANS BROAD STUDY OF RECREATIONAL NEEDS—DEFINITE PLANNING TO BE UNDERTAKEN WITH A $2,500,000 FUND SET UP BY CONGRESS

(By R. G. Lynch)

Definite planning to meet the Nation's recreation needs in the next half century will be undertaken by a special commission, with a $2,500,000 appropriation, as the result of a bill sent to President Eisenhower last week.

The project originated with the Izaak Walton League of America and had the support of all leading conservation organizations. It passed the Senate last week by a voice vote, without debate. This is another manifestation of Congress' recognition of growing demands for recreational opportunities.

The President will appoint seven citizens who are interested in outdoor recreation resources and opportunities and experienced in resource conservation. One of them will be designated as chairman.

EIGHT OTHERS TO BE NAMED

In addition, 2 majority and 2 minority members of the Interior and Insular Affairs committee in each House will be appointed to the new Commission by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

The Commission will create an advisory council which will include liaison representatives of all interested Federal agencies and 25 representatives of State game and fish, parks, forestry, pollution, and water development agencies; private organizations in the outdoor recreation field; commercial outdoor recreation interests; commercial fishing interests; industry, labor, public utilities, education, and municipal governments.

Grants may be made by the Commission to States, and contracts may be made with public or private agencies to carry out various aspects of the review.

The Commission is to establish headquarters in the Capital and employ an executive secretary and whatever additional personnel it needs.

SURVEY IS FIRST PROJECT

This Commisison's first job is to inventory outdoor recreation resources and compile data on trends in population, leisure, transportation and other factors bearing on recreational needs. On the basis of these studies, it is to make recommendations to Congress by September 1, 1961, on a State-by-State, region-by-region, and overall national basis.

The responsibilities of local, State and Federal Governments are to be taken into consideration, as well as possibilities of recreation on forest, range, and wildlife lands and other lands and waters, where such use can be coordinated with primary uses.

The Nation's people, with shorter working hours and more time and money for enjoyment, have been on the move more and more since World War II and the Korean conflict ended. In summer highways are crowded with family automobiles hauling trailers loaded with boats or camping equipment, or both.

MILLIONS VISIT PARKS

National parks and forests draw more than 50 million visits a year; State parks, more than 183 million visits. Hunters and fishermen are buying more than 25 million licenses annually, and other millions hunt and fish who are not required to buy licenses.

Congress approved a 10-year Mission 66 program of the National Park Service in 1956 and a 5-year Operation Outdoors program of the Forest Service in 1957. Both call for improvement and expansion of public facilities involving many millions of dollars.

The Army Corps of Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau, awakened to public demand by swarms of visitors to their reservoirs, have increased recreation facilities and provided more access.

INDUSTRIES HELP, TOO

Forest industries have yielded to pressure for public use of their lands, in many cases have welcomed the opportunity for improved public relations.

At their own expense, they have provided picnic and camping areas, access to lakes and streams, even in a few cases game and fish habitat management.

Now Congress has authorized and financed a nationwide effort to find out what the Nation has and what it is going to need to take care of outdoor recreation for the people.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I observe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on his feet. I am certain that he wants to talk a little about Minnesota's recreational grounds. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I rise only to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his lyrical remarks about the State of Wisconsin.

I simply add, for the edification of the Senate and for our guests in the galleries, that Wisconsin is a good place in which to stop over on the way to Minnesota.

I may also add, if the Senator has no objection, that the speech to which we have just listened was an excellent presentation about a fine, great State, by a fine and good man. I would only do this: I would ask unanimous consent to strike from the Senator's speech "Wisconsin" and insert in lieu thereof "Minnesota." [Laughter.] Having done that, the speech would take on new meaning, new glory, and, may I say, new justification. [Laughter.]

I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his generosity in presenting this factual statement about the great upper Midwest. What he has said is so true about his beloved State of Wisconsin, and is even more true about the great North Star State of Minnesota.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad there is this evidence of unanimity of opinion of Senators about the best place in the Nation to be visited by tired people. Of course, between my State of Wisconsin and Minnesota there are two rivers—the Mississippi and the St. Croix, whereas north of Wisconsin is the greatest inland lake in the world, Lake Superior. On the other hand, Minnesota has only that river boundary. But to the east of Wisconsin is Lake Michigan. Although Minnesota claims about 10,000 lakes——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Eleven thousand three hundred and forty-two. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Wisconsin may not have as many little lakes, but Wisconsin has purer water, because Wisconsin is bounded on the north by Lake Superior and on the east by Lake Michigan; and down through the heartland of Wisconsin are the great rivers and creeks and lakes.

Wisconsin will welcome my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, when he flies back home. We urge him to stop in Wisconsin and really see some things he cannot see in Minnesota.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to observe that if the colloquy is to continue——

Mr. WILEY. Let me ask what State the Senator represents. [Laughter.]

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, if the colloquy is to continue, I should like to offer a substitute unanimous-consent request, in place of the one offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. JACKSON. Namely, to strike out "Minnesota" and "Wisconsin," and substitute "Washington."

In support of my suggestion, I offer as proof the fact that there are living in the great State of Washington thousands and thousands of people who formerly lived in Wisconsin or in Minnesota. [Laughter.]

They are enjoying our wonderful lakes, snowcapped mountains, delightful warm weather without humidity, and numerous other advantages.

So I invite my colleagues to make a brief stopover in Minnesota and Wisconsin as they travel on their way to the great State of Washington.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I must attend a committee meeting which commenced at 2 o'clock. I am glad I began this discussion, inasmuch as all Senators already seem refreshed merely from having contemplated the beauty of Wisconsin. [Laughter.]

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if it were not for my burning desire to speak in behalf of Alaskan statehood, I should like to speak for about 30 minutes in expressing encomiums of my own great State of California. However, at this time I desire to address the Senate for another purpose.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in Tennessee we are very proud of our many, fine, thoughtful newspapers and of the editorial positions which many of them take.

It is very infrequent that the leading newspapers of the Volunteer State are so unanimous on any subject as they are in support of statehood for Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean, one from the Chattanooga Times, one from the Memphis Press-Scimitar, one from the Nashville Banner, one from the Clarksville Leaf-Chronicle, and one from the Knoxville Journal.

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

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of May 30, 1958]

SENATE MUST KEEP ALASKAN PROMISE

With a commendable reversal of form, the House staved off efforts to amend or send back to committee the Alaska statehood bill and passed the measure 208 to 166.

Proponents of statehood for the Territory have only a breathing spell before going on to a new and possibly stronger challenge in the Senate, where the measure has been on the calendar since last June.

Various reasons have been advanced in the Senate for opposing the bill, including the fear of the Southern bloc that its balance of power will be upset by admission of two more Senators.

The people of Alaska have voted overwhelmingly to become a State and have sent Congressional representatives to Washington under the so-called Tennessee plan. The people of the United States favor admission of Alaska; polls have shown the sentiment for admission to range from 5 to 1 to as high as 10 to 1.

Alaska holds rich resources, some yet untapped, many yet undeveloped to anything near full potential. Its products have benefited the United States hundreds of times beyond the price we paid Russia for the area.

It is a key area in our outer defense system and its strategic importance is beyond estimation. Its population is growing fast—almost 49 percent in the first 6 years after the 1950 census.

Its admission is in the best tradition of the past. Both parties have repeatedly vowed in their platforms to work for admission of this rich area in the northwest, and its high time Congress made good on those promises.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of May 25, 1958]

ALASKA'S CHANCE

The bill to grant statehood to Alaska at last is before the House of Representatives. What the legislators do with it now is to be seen, but surely anything less than approval will be regarded as a prime example of Congressional irresponsibility and an affront to the conscience of all America.

It is hard to see on what basis Congress can refuse admission. In 1956 both Democratic and Republican platforms contained planks promising statehood for Alaska, and in a series of public opinion polls taken from 1946 to 1958 United States citizens have increased their support of admission from 5 to 1 to 12 to 1.

At the time the United States purchased the Territory from Russia this Government entered into a solemn agreement with the people there, by which it pledged inhabitants "all the rights, advantages and immunities of the United States." Surely, this must be interpreted as a promise of eventual statehood when the people were ready to assume that responsibility. The time has come when we must redeem that pledge.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press Scimitar of May 29, 1958]

FORTY-NINTH STAR JUST BELOW THE HORIZON

The House finally got a chance to vote on Alaskan statehood yesterday and passed the bill.

Now it is the Senate's turn.

The Senate twice before has approved similar legislation. Its committees have held a multitude of hearings and repeatedly have endorsed admission of this rich Territory to the Union.

The Senate is thus in a position to act promptly and send the bill to President Eisenhower who yesterday, renewed his plea that it be passed.

Only last August the Senate's Committee on Interior, reporting out a statehood bill for the fourth time, stated the case eloquently and concisely. It said:

"Over a period of many generations and under conditions that would stop a weaker breed, Alaskans have tamed a great land and have offered it to the Nation for its many values, all in justifiable reliance on Alaska's ultimate destiny as a full member of our proud Union of States. Now is the proper time for Congress to fulfill this destiny."

The 49th star awaits only the Senate's signal to rise and shine.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 29, 1958]

NOW LET THE SENATE FINISH IT

Statehood for Alaska advanced a long and welcome step Wednesday, with the House approving admission, 208 to 166.

None can say this issue has not been thoroughly deliberated. Congress after Congress has debated it in committee. The pros and cons have been heard. The opinions for and against creating out of this Territory a 49th State have been explored. It is in the light of acquaintance with the facts that the House has rendered an affirmative decision.

That Alaska is ready for statehood there can be no doubt.

That such a step is to the mutual advantage of Territory and Nation, in point both of economic interest and security, is beyond reasonable dispute.

It would fulfill a promise on whose fulfillment America can in justice hedge no longer.

It is to the credit of Tennessee that 6 members of its House delegation voted "Yes." These are Representatives BAKER, BASS, DAVIS, and EVINS, voting "yes," and Representatives REECE and LOSER paired for it.

It is to be earnestly hoped that the two Tennessee Senators will stand behind this statehood bill when it comes to a vote in the Senate.

That must not be unduly delayed.

An important piece of public business is well begun. Let the Senate finish it quickly.

[From the Clarksville (Tenn.) Leaf-Chronicle of May 30, 1958]

ALASKA DUE STATEHOOD

The House has passed a bill to admit Alaska to the Union and the measure now goes to the Senate. The House passage was by a substantial majority—208 to 166. It is unlikely that the Senate will give the bill a proportionately majority, even if it passes it.

None other than politics is keeping Alaska a Territory. Its population is growing rapidly and would grow even faster if the Territory became a State. It is fabulously rich in mineral wealth, fish, and furs. It is strategically located atop the continent and separated from Soviet Russia by only the narrow Bering Strait.

The Alcan Highway and air transportation has brought Alaska closer to the United States.

As a Territory, Alaska is treated as a stepchild and its residents denied representation in Washington. Yet it is our last frontier, and, in time of war, would be the nearest striking point at Soviet Russia.

It is time that a territory one-sixth the size of the United States is recognized and admitted to the Union as our 49th State.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of May 29, 1958]

ALASKA NOT ONLY TREASURES VAST RESOURCES BUT IT IS VITAL OUTPOST FOR OUR DEFENSE AGAINST RUSSIA

Yesterday the House, disregarding a teller vote the previous day which made Alaskan statehood more than doubtful, whooped through the statehood bill by a husky 208 to 166.

Capital observers give the bill a possible chance of being passed by the Senate, whose action would bring to a successful conclusion years of effort on the part of citizens of this country in Alaska and in the States.

With this final action in view, it may be an appropriate time to review a few of the facts about the new State. The first thing that occurs to anyone on the subject is that Alaska covers some 586,400 square miles, including, of course, a good many miles of ice and snow not now marketable. However, the new State will be more than twice the size of Texas, which perhaps accounts for the bitter fight which was made in the House against taking Alaska into the sisterhood of States. It should be comforting to the transplanted Tennesseans who now make up the bulk of the Lone Star State, however, that more hot air will continue to come out of Texas than Alaska, no matter if the size of the latter is double.

When it comes to population, the new State falls short of its pretensions so far as area is concerned. In 1950 the total was 128,643 which compared with the more than 7 million population of Texas and the more than 3 million in Tennessee.

When originally purchased from Russia, there was a great deal of dissatisfaction expressed by many taxpayers who felt the Czar of Russia had perpetrated a swindle when he sold this vast piece of land for $7,200,000. Incidentally, and of interest to Tennesseans, Alaska was bought under the Presidency of Andrew Johnson and history has thoroughly established that the purchase was one of the few, and possibly the last, good trades made with a foreign government by our Federal Government.

Passing over the statistics on natural resources which are yet untapped in this Territory, attention should be directed to the great importance of this land to the United States even if it were as barren as a desert and was known to be totally without resources. It is not only the part of our possessions nearest to Russia but it is also a necessary outpost for the defense of the rest of the country.

We hope the Senate acts before it adjourns to bring Alaska into the Union.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I observe my able friend from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is standing. I ask unanimous consent that I may briefly yield to the Senator from Maine without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to be absent from the Chamber. In order to place my remarks concerning the pending measure on the record, in full support of statehood for Alaska, which position I have maintained firmly for more than 10 years, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in this connection be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE ON ALASKA STATEHOOD

For many years one of the great questions before the Nation has been whether to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union. It is vital that this question should now be answered, and that we grant to the people of Alaska those same full rights and privileges enjoyed by all Americans and which the people of Alaska so justly deserve.

The Constitution of the United States does not establish any specific requirements for statehood, but traditionally three standards have been required for the admission of a new territory. The first is that the inhabitants of the proposed new State be imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government. Another is that a majority of the inhabitants desire statehood; and the third is that the proposed new State have enough population and economic resources to support a State government and provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government. It is most important to note that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at the end of its inquiry into the question of Alaska statehood last year reported that it was convinced that Alaska has met each of these requirements and is in all ways prepared for statehood.

There is no doubt that the people of Alaska have satisfied the first requirement. Their institutions, schools, laws and homes are as American as those of any State in the Union. During World War II when Alaska was the only continental area actually invaded, the people of Alaska displayed a sense of patriotism and loyalty equal to any of the 48 States by the outstanding support they gave to the armed services throughout the war. Morale and stability never faltered at a time when wartime conditions in Alaska were much worse than anywhere else within the continental United States.

As for the second requirement, it is undeniable that a majority of Alaskans desire immediate statehood. The first Alaska statehood bill was submitted to the Congress in 1916, and since 1947 statehood bills have been before the Congress almost continuously. In 1956 the voters of Alaska ratified the constitution for the future State by a 2-to-1 majority. And in 1957 the Senate and the House of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska passed by unanimous vote a joint resolution requesting statehood.

Alaska also meets the third traditional requirement for statehood: A population and economic resources adequate to support State government and to contribute a share of the cost of the Federal Government. Alaska now has a greater population than was the case with at least 25 States at the time of their admission to the Union, and the Territory has exceeded all of the States in percentage population growth since 1940. Alaska's natural resources are vast and include timber, iron ore, copper, oil, coal, tin, nickel, and many others. New industries are emerging, and the Territory's financial position is stable. For the last 4 years Alaska has had a net surplus in its budget and has provided the basic services of State government, except those precluded by Territorial status. There is no question that Alaska has met all the requirements for statehood and is ready for admission into the Union.

The United States is trusted today because it has traditionally espoused the cause of self-determination and has crusaded in behalf of all people seeking to fulfill their political aspirations. Alaskans have requested admission into the Union in order that they be granted full and equal participation in the American system of government. We must not fail to heed the wishes of these Americans who have lived under our flag for 90 years, who are in all ways ready for statehood, and who could contribute to the Nation as a whole some of the great qualities which have allowed them to tame a great land under conditions which would have stopped weaker men. To grant statehood to Alaska at this time would be irrefutable proof that the United States lives in accordance with its principles of self-determination and full political freedom for all men.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank my colleague from California very much for his usual courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last night marked the beginning of intensive debate in the Senate on a highly important American problem. It could culminate, and I hope it will, in Senate approval of proposed legislation to bring the Territory of Alaska into the American Union as an American State. We would thus fulfill a moral and a legal obligation to the people of Alaska dating from our treaty of purchase of the Territory from Russia when we solemnly promised "enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States" to the people of the Territory.

We would demonstrate that solemn promises to our country by the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties are neither hypocritical nor sham. We would show the world that the democracy which we preach we also practice. We would convincingly re-affirm our patriotic delight in the story of the Boston Tea Party, and we would rededicate ourselves to the American doctrine that taxation without representation still constitutes tyranny, in our view.

Thus, we would participate in no ordinary rollcall. It would be an impressive decision, for all the world to note, that the United States continues as a growing, dynamic adventure in the self-government of human beings, and thus add to the strength of American leadership in the continuing struggle for freedom and self-determination for mankind.

We would concur in the overwhelming decision of the House of Representatives that the time for admission of Alaska to statehood is now. And we would fend off parliamentary maneuvers, no matter how honestly advocated, which, if adopted, would destroy Alaska's righteous prayers for statehood one more ugly time.

SIMILARITY TO CALIFORNIA

As a United States Senator from California, I urge, wholeheartedly, that the Senate approve statehood for Alaska. Both these great American areas have much in common. Alaska and California have been pricelessly endowed by nature. Both have great rugged mountains in and under which lie tremendous mineral wealth; both have broad, fertile valleys and plains, areas on which grow abundant crops and livestock forage; each has its vast forests, and the seas around both are rich with great schools of highly prized food fish.

But more important than the geographic and economic similarities are the similarities in the people. By the very nature of the areas, California and Alaska had to be settled by rugged, adventuresome, pioneer stock, restless, energetic, and daring in mind and body.

Of course, California, being nearer to the sources of the westward trek of our people, was settled first. Thus, her resources are much more highly developed, and her population much larger. Her century of statehood has been the solid and sound basis on which she has grown to greatness.

But I state unhesitatingly that the basic raw materials of political and economic eminence: Natural resources, geography, and above all, people, out of which has come the great State of California of today are present, and in abundance, in Alaska, as well. With the stimulus of statehood, I prophesy a growth and development in Alaska not at all dissimilar to the unprecedented achievements of my beloved California since the Gold Rush days 100 years ago.

STATEHOOD ENVISIONED IN 1869

There are similarities in the political history of Alaska and California. The two are the only areas on the North American Continent where the Russians were among the first white men to settle and wield political power. Everyone knows, of course, that until 1867 Alaska belonged to Imperial Russia and that we made a wonderfully shrewd "deal" in purchasing that area with all of its riches for $7½ million. It is interesting and revealing to observe that many of the same arguments which were advanced against Secretary of State Seward's proposal to purchase Alaska are being used today against admitting this American Territory to statehood. "Seward's Icebox," it was called, and "Seward's Folly."

Seward, himself, envisioned Alaska as a State, as is shown by his famous address at Sitka, which was then the Capital of Alaska.

On August 12, 1869, the former United States Senator and Secretary of State under the sainted Abraham Lincoln told the citizens of the newly acquired Territory:

Within the period of my own recollection, I have seen 20 new States added to the 13 which before that time constituted the American Union; and now I see, besides Alaska, 10 Territories in a forward condition of preparation for entering into the same great political family. * * *

Nor do I doubt that the political society to be constituted here, first as a Territory, ultimately as a State or many States, will prove a worthy constituency of the Republic. To doubt that it will be intelligent, virtuous, prosperous and enterprising is to doubt the existence of Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, and Belgium and of New England and New York.

Mr. President, Mr. Seward thus spoke of Denmark and Sweden by way of comparison. Let me now speak by way of comparison, 90 years later, of all four Scandinavian countries: Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark.

These northern European countries correspond closely to Alaska's position of latitude, and geographical identities are similar. Their combined area of 445,173 square miles compares with Alaska's 586,400 square miles. The total areas of these four countries is approximately 76 percent of Alaska, yet these European countries support a population in excess of 19½ million on lands which I am sure any careful scrutiny will show are less hospitable and not so rich in natural resources as is the case in Alaska.

ALASKA MORE RICHLY ENDOWED THAN SCANDINAVIA

For example, in Norway, the largest of the Scandinavian countries, with 3,470,000 square miles, only 4,300 square miles are cultivated and more than 70 percent of her land is classed as unproductive. Norway lacks coal but has developed her water power. In comparison, conservative estimates are that Alaska has in excess of 100 billion tons of coal in already known deposits—much of it readily accessible in the vast coalfields of the railbelt. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates Alaska's hydroelectric potential at more than 8 million kilowatts. That is four-fifths of the combined existing capacity of the three Pacific coast States of Washington, Oregon, and my own great State of California, the greatest hydropower producers in the Union. Norway is home to 3,470,000 people.

Of Sweden's 173,378 square miles only 9.2 percent is cultivated, 54 percent is forests, and one-third is classified as unreclaimable. Yet her resources support 7,341,122 citizens. Incidentally, 90 percent of Sweden's economy is in private hands; however, the Government has developed hydropower and owns and operates the railroads.

Finland, northernmost of the Scandinavian countries, has a population of 4,288,000. Although 70 percent of her land area is forest, the primary occupation of her citizens is agriculture.

Mr. President, tiny Denmark's 16,576 square miles are only 5 times the size of Alaska's Mt. McKinley National Park. Yet Denmark is home to 4,439,000 souls.

GEN. BILLY MITCHELL'S JUDGMENT

All Members of this body, and all Americans everywhere, have reason for profound gratitude for Seward's vision and foresight in purchasing Alaska, and the tenacity with which he successfully pursued his object, despite inelegant and immature obstruction, which, as I say, is strikingly similar to the regrettable criticism lodged against the statehood bill today.

In speaking of Alaska and her strategic importance to our country, the late Gen. Billy Mitchell said, "He who holds Alaska holds the world." I suggest that the wisdom of Seward's treaty of purchase has grown more clear with each passing day. It is the United States, not Russia, which holds Alaska. And now, with her statehood, I hope, about to become a reality, she will take her rightful role in the Nation's future as the 49th member of our Union.

Not as well remembered as the fact that Russia, until less than a century ago, owned Alaska is the fact that the Russians also settled in California. Their colonies did not last, but they were there, giving us still another interesting historical similarity between Alaska and California.

OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS PROVEN INVALID

But the most striking similarity, and the most significant, is that of the arguments used against the admission of California a little over a century ago and these against the admission of Alaska today. The Congressional Globe, which was the publication recording the proceedings of the Senate in that day as is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today, makes fascinating reading, especially in the light of the arguments which were iterated and reiterated against Alaska in each Congress during the 9 years in which her statehood has been under debate.

California was too distant—noncontiguous that is; it could not support statehood; it was a wilderness inhabited by savages.

How like the arguments against Alaska today. It is noncontiguous; it does not have sufficient population for a State; it is not sufficiently developed economically to support statehood.

I wish to quote some of the remarks made on the floor of the Senate, as taken from the Congressional Globe for August 6, 1850, when the California Admission Act was being debated:

Listed to Senator Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois:

I have always thought that the boundaries of California are too large. I have laid upon the table an amendment proposing to divide it into three States.

Listen to Senator Thomas Ewing, of Ohio:

With all the extent of California, it will never sustain one-half the population of the small State of Ohio, not one-half. The population will be very small indeed.

Hear the words of Senator David L. Yulee, of Florida, who tried to filibuster California down the drain:

The first important fact is the insufficiency of the actual population of California. Among 35,500 of the immigrant population, the number of females could not have exceeded 900. This indicates immaturity of social organization.

Let us go over to the House of Representatives on April 10, 1850, when Representative Thomas Ross, of Pennsylvania, inquired:

Mr. Chairman, what was the population of California when this Constitution was formed, and what is it now: When I speak of population, I do not mean gold seekers and other adventurers who have gone there for a temporary object; but what is the number of her resident population? No one can tell. But one fact we do know, and that is that the whole number of votes polled was only about 12,800, and that, too, without any regard to residence or any other qualification of the voter. No single district in Pennsylvania, or in any other State, that polls only 12,800 votes is entitled to even 1 Representative in Congress. My own district polls more than 16,000 votes. But California is to be admitted as a State, with 2 Senators and 2 Representatives, when her entire vote polled was but 12,800. The admission of California, under all these circumstances, will not only be a violation of every rule by which we have been heretofore governed in the admission of States, but will be an act of great injustice to the other States who have for so many years borne all the burdens and the perils of the Government in its most trying period.

Even Senator William Seward, of New York, a friend of California statehood, who was later to become Abraham Lincoln's Secretary of State, said on July 29, 1852:

Nor is California yet conveniently accessible. * * * The emigrant to the Atlantic coast arrives speedily and cheaply from whatever quarter of the world, while he who would seek the Pacific shore encounters charges and delays which few can sustain.

Nevertheless, the commercial, social, and political movements of the world are now in the direction of California. Separated as it is from us by foreign lands, or more im-

passable mountains, we are establishing there a customhouse, a mint, a drydock, Indian agencies, and ordinary and extraordinary tribunals of justice. Without waiting for perfect or safe channels, a strong and steady stream of emigration flows thither from every State and every district eastward of the Rocky Mountains. Similar torrents of emigration are pouring into California and Australia from the South American States, from Europe, and from Asia. This movement is not a sudden, or accidental, or irregular, or convulsive one; but it is one for which men and nature have been preparing through near 400 years.

And Senator Seward was a friend of California statehood.

The intervening decades have seen the Golden State march down the road to preeminence among her sister States in many, many important fields, and those passing years have vindicated the Senate majority which favored California statehood over shoddy fallacies and counterfeit arguments which were vainly urged by a few.

OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS ANSWERED IN FULL

And I say to my brethren who oppose Alaska statehood that history will, just as irrefutably, in my judgment, demonstrate the utter invalidity of the position which they take. Their arguments, of course, are made in all sincerity and honesty. They are made by Senators who are good friends of mine. They should be answered, and happily they can and will be answered, fully and completely.

The facts are that Alaska is not in any sense of the word distant. I can go into the cloakroom, pick up a telephone, and talk with the Governor of Alaska in the capital of Alaska within a few moments. Within a matter of hours, any Senator can be in any part of Alaska.

Contiguity has never been a requirement for statehood. If it ever was a precedent, which I deny, it was broken almost as soon as, and maybe before, it was uttered, for Louisiana did not border upon any State of the United States when she was admitted in 1812. Her boundaries were many miles distant from her nearest neighboring States, Tennessee and Georgia.

Even more noncontiguous was California in 1850. Hundreds of miles of wilderness, infested by hostile Indians, separated California's eastern boundary from those of Texas, Missouri, Iowa, or Wisconsin, the nearest States at the time of our admission to statehood.

As to the population, the Department of the Interior recently stated that Alaska's population today is 220,000.

ALASKA'S POPULATION MATCHES THAT OF OTHERS

Now, let us consider the population of the 17 States which have come into the Union in the past century. Only six of them had more people at the time of entry than Alaska now has. Eight of them had less: Arizona, Minnesota, Kansas, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, Oregon, Nevada. Arizona was the largest in population, with 217,000; Nevada the smallest, only 21,000 claimed residence there. Before 1958, 16 States—apart from the original 13—were admitted to the Union with populations smaller than Alaska's today.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to one of the appendixes appearing in the House hearings, which sets forth the population of every State when it was admitted into the Union, and the population increase in each State.

This brings us, Mr. President, to the highly important, and very technical, question of the matter of the finances of the proposed new State. As pointed out so forcefully by the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee [Mr. MURRAY], who now presides in the Senate, statehood never has failed—never once in any of the 35 instances in which new States have been admitted into our Union of States has statehood failed as a political and social institution.

But that is not by any means the full answer. State governments and their expenditures must of course be financed primarily by State revenue laws, and we have a duty to look at whether the State of Alaska has the resources and the development sufficient to support State government, and, secondly, whether her people are ready and willing to tax themselves to provide the services of statehood.

Mr. President, as the controller of the State of California for almost 7 years, first by appointment from the Honorable Earl Warren, then the great Governor of California, and thereafter by election and reelection, I think I can lay some claim to being at least a student of State finances.

ALASKA CAN AND WILL SUPPORT STATEHOOD

It is my considered judgment, based on my experience in the fiscal field in my own California State government, that Alaska does, in fact, have the means to support a State government, and that she does, in fact, have the will to do so.

So that the Members of the Senate may have before them the factual background, I ask unanimous consent that the official statement of the tax commissioner of Alaska may appear at this point in the RECORD:

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

STATEMENT OF LICENSES AND TAXES COLLECTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA, FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1957, TO DECEMBER 31, 1957

Title 48, chapter 2, section 17, ACLA 1949, states that the tax commissioner shall prepare and annually publish statistics with respect to the revenues derived under the tax laws administered by him. In keeping with this statute the following is submitted for publication:

Revenues—Taxes collected account classification	Total collections	Percent of total
Amusement and gaming devices	$76,379.50	0.34
Automobile license registrations	818,591.45	3.61
Business licenses	1,694,068.48	7.47
Certificates of title	97,574.50	.43
Motor vehicle lien fees	26,666.00	.12
Dog licenses	289.00	
Drivers' licenses	113,307.50	.50
Fisheries:		
Cold storage and fish processors	94,852.36	.42
Cold storage, freezer ships	13,114.62	.06
Fish trap licenses	47,200.00	.21
Fishermen's licenses, resident	78,650.00	.35
Fishermen's licenses, nonresident	81,415.00	.36
Fisheries—Continued		
Gill net licenses	$9,568.00	.04
Raw fish tax	2,119,705.90	9.34
Seine net licenses	18,460.00	.08
Sport fishing and hunting licenses	164,309.78	.72
Inheritance tax, interest	3,830.48	.02
Inheritance tax, principal	44,592.14	.20
Liquor, excise taxes	2,055,472.60	9.06
Mines and mining	30,289.11	.13
Miscellaneous fees	119.05	
Motor fuel oil tax	3,508,502.24	15.46
Motor fuel refund permits	320.50	
Net income tax	9,486,744.84	41.82
Property tax	524.76	
Punchboard tax	1,980.00	.01
School tax	557,582.15	2.46
Tobacco tax	1,051,606.82	4.64
Prepaid taxes, suspense account	11,565.20	.05
Liquor license application fees	20,750.00	.09
Liquor licenses	456,500.00	2.01
Total	22,684,531.98	100.00

Territory of Alaska, first judicial division.

I, R. D. Stevenson, tax commissioner, Department of Taxation of the Territory of Alaska, do hereby affirm that the above statement is correct and true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

R. D. STEVENSON,
Tax Commissioner.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, those official figures bring us up to the end of the calendar year 1957. For the current situation, I present to the Senate a report from the governor's tax committee, published in the Fairbanks News-Miner of June 6, under the headline "Reports Show Cash Balance for Alaska State Treasury."

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

REPORTS SHOW CASH BALANCE FOR ALASKA STATE TREASURY

(By Jack De Yonge)

Should statehood come to Alaska this year, the Territory will change status in a healthy financial condition, reports from the departments of taxation and finance showed today.

The figures, received by John Butrovich, Jr., of the governor's tax committee, shows that total tax collections in Alaska are running more than 2 percent ahead of estimates for the first 11 months of the biennium and that the Territory had a cash balance of $5,154,844.23 in its general fund as of the end of April.

From July 1, 1957, to May 31, 1958, the Territory collected $22,707,300, or 48.2 percent of the total estimated gross collections for the 24-month period ending June 3, 1959—an amount 2.4 percent above estimates for the 11 months.

Biggest single item in the collections was the income tax, which brought in $9,376,807.77 during the periods, leaving $10,623,192.23 to be collected in the remaining 13 months.

"And there was no income tax from the workers on the Sitka pulp mill construction in these figures," Butrovich pointed out. "The heavy payroll there will be from July 1 of this year to July of 1959." Approximately 1,500 men will be working at Sitka building the mill.

Total estimated revenues from taxes for the biennium are $47,098,600. A total of $24,391,299.68 remains to be collected in the next 13 months.

SIGNIFICANT BALANCE

Butrovich called the cash balance in the general fund significant in that expenses for the biennium thus far have been paid and yet over $5 million remains.

He estimated that nontax revenues from oil and mineral leases will bring the Territory $6 million over the biennium and that income from the insurance tax will run to over a million dollars for the same period.

The motor fuel oil tax was second in importance to the income tax for putting money in the Territorial coffers, bringing in $3,540,678.61. However, this money is ear marked for airfields and roads, not general fund use.

Next in importance was the $1,678,323.38. Others were: alcoholic beverage excise tax with a total of $1,795,578.79 collected, followed by the business license revenue.

Raw fish tax, $1,647,944.27; motor vehicle registrations $1,337,018.05; cigarette tax, $944,328.79.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as will be seen from the Tax Commissioner's report, Alaska's present revenue structure is based principally on an income tax designed on a percentage of the Federal income tax. It thus permits flexibility, the percentage capable of being altered by each legislature according to the people's need. It obviates for the taxpayers the annual headache of having to figure out two different income-tax returns; it makes for ease of audit, since the Territorial tax department has access to the Federal returns; it hereby saves collection costs.

Other taxes are a per case tax on salmon based on the value of the pack, business license taxes, and a variety of excise levies on liquor and tobacco as well as a head tax on every adult receiving income in the Territory. There is a gasoline tax, earmarked for highways. There is neither a Territorial property tax nor a Territorial sales tax. These are left to the lesser political units—municipalities and school districts—but they remain, of course, available should more State revenue be required.

NO TERRITORIAL DEBT

Alaska has no indebtedness. Alaska has no counties and hence no county taxes. Alaska now performs, as stated previously, all the needed services of government except those which Congress has specifically prohibited. These, which will be added under statehood, and the estimated annual costs of operating them are, in round figures, as follows:

Courts, $2 million; Governor's office and legislature, $500,000, totaling an additional $2½ million a year.

But against these additional liabilities there are substantial offsets.

Approximately $1,500,000 annually will be forthcoming from 70 percent of the net revenues of the Pribilof Islands Seal fisheries. This has for 47 years been wholly a Federal operation in which, though an Alaskan resource, Alaska has not shared. The statehood bill properly provides for such sharing.

Fines, fees, and forfeitures of the court system, revenues derived from the State lands, and miscellaneous receipts make up an amount estimated at $500,000 annually.

Last year, Congress, in anticipation of statehood, and in lieu of participation in the Federal reclamation program, awarded Alaska 90 percent of gross receipts from the oil, gas, and coal leases on the public domain. Oil was struck last summer on the Kenai Peninsula, and since then oil leases have been filed on 25 million acres, which though only one-fifteenth of Alaska's area and a small part of its potential oil lands, already presents an accrual of approximately $2 million a year. And the filing is continuing.

With the establishment of a second pulp mill—another year 'round industry—at Sitka, which will go into operation in 1960, national forest receipts, now running to about $150,000 annually, will be doubled.

Thus it will be seen that the safely anticipated revenues closely approximate the added costs of statehood.

AMPLE SOURCES OF NEW TAXATION

To meet any additional costs, the State of Alaska will, as I say, have the opportunity to levy a sales tax and, if it so desires, an ad valorem tax on property. They supply an ample margin for additional income. But Alaskans' expectations, which history has shown to be warranted, are that the greatly increased development brought about by statehood will substantially augment her existing sources of revenue.

An example of Alaska's expectations is contained in the report of the Legislative Council of Alaska. In a meeting of the council at Nome, Alaska, on June 9, Phil Holdsworth, Territorial Commissioner of Mines, reported to the council that the Territory can reasonably expect income to Alaska from oil and gas operations as follows: 1958–59, $2,600,000; 1959–60, $8,200,000; 1960–61, $13 million; and up to $15 million in 1964. This estimate does not include the possible development of oil and gas in the Gubik area.

STATES SET OWN LEVELS OF EXPENDITURE

As a former participant in the fiscal affairs of a State, there is no doubt in my mind that Alaska can and will support statehood adequately from her own revenues.

Also, there is this fact: There is no set level for State expenditures. In our Union now we all know there is a wide divergence between the services, such as education, public health, roads, parks, and the like, supplied to their citizens by the States of New York and California, for example, and those supplied by some of the less-privileged States. The States can and do base their expenditures on their income. Alaska will do likewise.

The bill before the Senate carries out the intelligent, conscientious effort first begun in the 83d Congress by the late Senator Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, then the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and a friend of the present distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. MURRAY] and a friend of mine and of other members of the committee, to enable Alaska to support statehood. I remember those days; they were my first days in the Senate. Senator Butler at first had been opposed to Alaska statehood. He headed a group of 6 Senators from the Interior Committee which visited Alaska in the summer of 1953. The then committee chairman's avowed purpose was to try to prove, first, that Alaskans did not want statehood; and second, that they could not support it.

EXTENSIVE HEARINGS THROUGHOUT ALASKA

Hearings were held in all of the major cities of Alaska, and scores of persons were interviewed privately.

Hugh Butler was a big man. From the hearings he conducted, he realized that he had been wrong on both counts. He acknowledged his error and took prompt steps to rectify it. As a result, the Alaska statehood bill in the 83d Congress was drastically amended to provide the proposed State with enough of its natural resources to enable it to enter the Union on a truly free and equal basis.

The measure now before the Senate is substantially the measure Hugh Butler sponsored and fought for in the 83d Congress.

I pay tribute to the late Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska for his greatness of mind and heart, and his genuine intellectual honesty, in changing his position on Alaska statehood, not only in words, but in deeds. I trust that all of the people of Alaska, both now and when it becomes a State, will join me in revering his memory. He was one of the best friends the people of Alaska could have.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Now that I am on the subject of legislative history, I shall sketch, briefly, some of that long, arduous, history.

Mr. President, what is now before the Senate is a measure which has been worked over—and very well worked over—to combine the desirabilities of statehood with the necessities of national defense and economic development. Such a combination is not easy to achieve; the gestation period of statehood has already run for 90 years and the baby has not yet been born. But we think that advocates of statehood have profited by the hearings and examinations of the past, and that this bill does in fact present a proper vehicle for statehood.

Let me review briefly what has gone before, to give Senators an indication of the years of study and preparation which lie behind the proposed legislation now before the Senate. The first statehood bill was introduced by the then Alaskan Delegate James Wickersham on March 30, 1916. Incidentally and parenthetically, Judge Wickersham was a Republican. I point this out to indicate, not only to Senators on both sides of the aisle, but to the people of the country, that this is in no sense a partisan struggle. It represents an opportunity to discharge a commitment to the people of Alaska, and is concurred in by both major parties, as I indicated earlier, in their convention platforms.

ACTION IN EARNEST IN 80TH CONGRESS

Only 10 years earlier Alaska had been authorized to send a delegate to Congress, although it was organized as a Territory in 1884—almost three-quarters of a century ago.

In both the 78th and 79th Congresses, statehood bills were introduced, but little action was taken on them. The real preparation for statehood began in 1947, in the 80th Congress.

At that time bills were introduced in the House of Representatives; and after referral to committee, hearings were held both in Alaska and in Washington. A statehood bill based on the hearings was reported to the House, but no further action was taken.

In the 81st Congress, bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The House passed Delegate BARTLETT'S H. R. 331, and the Senate Interior Committee held extensive hearings on it. The bill was reported favorably—the first time Alaska statehood had ever been reported to the Senate. The motion to consider it was debated for 8 days, and was finally withdrawn when it was clear that a full-scale filibuster was in progress.

The roles on statehood were reversed in the 82d Congress. Statehood bills were introduced into both Houses, but only the Senate acted. Its action, however, was to recommit the measure to committee—by a one-vote margin.

JOINDER OF ALASKA FATAL

In the 83d Congress, the tempo of the statehood fight was stepped up. Both Houses had statehood bills before them, and committees of both Houses held hearings on Alaska statehood both in Washington and in the major cities of the prospective State. The House of Representatives approved a Hawaii statehood bill but took no action on Alaska. The Senate took the House approved Hawaii bill and proceeded to add to it an amendment providing for Alaska statehood. I opposed that amendment. I think I was correct in opposing it. On March 11, 1954, when the question of tying the 2 together in 1 parliamentary package was before us, I said:

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, so that there may be no misunderstanding, I desire to say that I shall vote for statehood for Hawaii; I shall vote for statehood for Alaska; and I shall cast my vote in that fashion whether the bills are presented separately or whether they are tied together.

The question which is now before the Senate does not touch the merits of the case for statehood for either Territory. The question now before the Senate is parliamentary in nature. It has been presented by my friend the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and it takes the form of an amendment to tie the 2 statehood proposals together in 1 bill. The Senator from New Mexico is in favor of statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska, and it is his sincere desire, in offering his amendment, to make it easier for each Territory to be admitted as a State.

But, Mr. President, we are confronted with an extremely paradoxical situation, because there are Senators who will join in supporting the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico for exactly the opposite reason, and they will vote in favor of his amendment, not because they want statehood for either Territory, but because they are opposed to statehood for both.

So, Mr. President, under the circumstances, I think those of us who desire to vote for statehood for each Territory will best serve the purposes of each Territory by opposing the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico and, after having discussed the merits of each one at a time, vote first, on the issue of Hawaiian statehood, and then, as my colleague, the majority leader, has suggested, immediately following that, vote on the question of statehood for Alaska.

I do not quarrel with those in this Chamber who take a different position regarding the future status of the two Territories than that at which I have arrived, but I feel that in opposing the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico I am lending what little strength I possess to having the Senate ultimately pass on the merits of the question of statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska.

I regret very much that by a vote of 46 to 43, the Senate proceeded to tie the 2 bills together. After the combined statehood bill was approved, it was sent to the House, where it died. I mention this simply to argue, on the record, that legislative tampering has sometimes resulted—did result in this instance—in destroying Hawaii statehood and Alaskan statehood as well.

HAWAII DELEGATE BACKS SEPARATE CONSIDERATION

In passing, I pay tribute to the delegate from the Territory of Hawaii, Hon. JACK BURNS, who has said that he hopes the Senate will consider statehood for Alaska separate and apart from statehood for Hawaii.

Eight statehood bills were introduced in both Houses of the 84th Congress, and committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives held hearings on Alaska statehood. The only Chamber action taken was in the House of Representatives, which recommitted a combined Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill.

In this Congress, 11 Alaska statehood bills have been introduced. The measure before us is backed by the findings of hearings held last year by committees of both Houses, and bears the imprint of the hearings and studies of Alaskan statehood that have been conducted, both in and out of the Congress, for more than a quarter century.

There can be little doubt that the legislative preparation for statehood is profound and complete. There is also excellent evidence that the people of Alaska have prepared, and are prepared, to assume the obligations of statehood.

Twelve years ago, the voters of Alaska approved a referendum on statehood. Again and again, the Territorial legislature has memorialized Congress on behalf of statehood. Last year, the Territorial legislature voted unanimously to ask immediate statehood for Alaska.

ALASKANS WANT IMMEDIATE STATEHOOD

But more to the point than such formal action is the impressive manner in which the people of Alaska have set about to establish the machinery for statehood, once such status should be granted. In 1955, a state constitutional convention was authorized, and in the following year a constitution drawn up by that convention was overwhelmingly ratified by the voters in a Territory-wide referendum. That constitution has been described as a model for republican government, and has been found to be strictly in accord with the Federal Constitution. The text of Alaska's constitution may be found in the committee reports accompanying Senate bill 49 and House bill 7999.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I want to say one word more about the most important resource that Alaska or any other area can have—her people. Alaska's population, like that of California, is vigorous, youthful in its dynamic approach to its problems, growing, and expanding. It is a population that has accepted the responsibility for self-government, and now is asking for the opportunity to discharge that responsibility. Alaska has a well-educated population. On the basis of the 1950 census, the figure for the median school years completed by Alaska residents was 11.3—practically the equivalent to high-school graduation. That accomplishment ranks Alaska ahead of nearly every State now in the Union. Alaska has a fine land-grant university, which is training her people for their future roles in what will become a great State. Of the last 17 States admitted to the Union, more than half had no such land-grant college or university at the time of admission.

NO HONORABLE ALTERNATIVE TO STATEHOOD

Within the limitations of Territorial status, Alaska is a going concern. The people of Alaska have organized a government fully capable of dealing with the responsibilities and demands of statehood. They have organized an educational system that reaches throughout the Territory. The people of Alaska are supporting their government, their educational system, and their economy in the same successful manner employed by citizens of all of the fully self-governing States of the Union. While the accomplishments of Alaska are significant, and her people are doing all they can under Territorial status, the full measure of achievement is denied to Alaska. There can be no doubt but that Alaska's already tremendous growth will be insignificant, as compared to her expansion and development once statehood is granted.

Alaska has earned statehood. She is worthy of the honor. She is ready for the responsibilities of statehood.

To deny Alaska statehood would be to deny ourselves the fullest use of her enormous natural and human resources.

To deny Alaska statehood would be to deny her people the fullest enjoyment of liberty that has been the touchstone of our Nation since Revolutionary days.

To deny Alaska statehood would be to break America's word and to breach the commitments of the two great political organizations of this country.

Mr. President, the Senate has no honorable alternative to granting statehood to the people of Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial in the Los Angeles Examiner of June 21, 1958, entitled "Statehood Now," be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEHOOD NOW

With the campaign for Alaskan statehood nearing the moment of final decision in the United States Senate, there is new and vital public interest in the fact that the potential oil resources in Alaska probably constitute the greatest remaining pool in the whole world.

It dramatically underlines the wisdom and necessity of statehood for Alaska that the oil-bearing regions of our northern Territorial outpost may be richer than Texas, and not only bigger than the fields of the Middle East but of easier access to us and more easily defended in the event of war.

The fact that the Free World as a whole, and America itself in some degree, is dependent for oil in a large measure upon the Middle Eastern fields which are menaced by Soviet Russia even now and would be vulnerable to Communist control or destruction in war, is a worrisome thing.

But with the prospects so good that Alaskan oil reserves will give us independence in this respect, within the limits of our own continent, the withholding of statehood not only reflects American indifference and complacency in an urgent situation, but becomes stupid and absurd.

To continue the colonial status of Alaska in the light of the fact that the Alaskan resources, not only of oil but of many other strategic minerals and products, may someday mean the difference between our survival and our defeat in a major war, is shortsighted beyond excuse or understanding.

It has been said that the failure of the statehood program for Alaska at this session of Congress will mean its postponement for an unforeseeable time—a gamble with American security and prosperity that makes sense only to our enemies, and that makes fools of all the rest of us.

Mr. JACKSON and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield first to the able chairman of my Subcommittee on Territories.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my able colleague from California for an exceedingly fine presentation of the statehood issue.

I particularly wish to commend him for his brilliant citation of historical precedents which clearly support statehood for Alaska.

Last of all, let me say that I was very much impressed with the data and other material submitted in support of the financial integrity of Alaska and the ability of this new state-to-be to handle its fiscal affairs.

I believe the distinguished junior Senator from California has made a very helpful suggestion in calling the attention of the Senate to the development of an entirely new resource in Alaska, namely, oil. I know that those of us who serve on the committee have been impressed by the total number of acres either under lease or applied for, which aggregate approximately 32 million. It is my understanding that, in addition, all the major oil companies and an untold number of independent oil companies are now in the process, at one stage or another, of exploratory and development work in Alaska. This will provide, as the Senator from California has so ably pointed out, an entirely new source of revenue to support the new State—a source which heretofore has not been properly calculated.

Again, I wish to commend the Senator from California for his very effective presentation of this issue.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend very, very much, indeed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As the Senator from California knows, for some years I have been very much interested in the subject; and of course I have associated the admission of Alaska with the admission of Hawaii. I believe the Senator from California was correct in taking his position in favor of the admission of both of them as States.

I assume that the Senator from California believes that when Alaska is admitted, Hawaii should also be admited.

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed I do.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. A great many questions have been asked me, and I shall submit a few of the basic ones, on which I should like to have the Senator from California expound.

But, first, I should like to congratulate him on his very able presentation. As the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has said, the Senator from California has given a very impressive exposition of historic facts and data.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, I am concerned from the standpoint of the national security interests and the Nation's foreign policy.

Questions have been asked me along the following lines:

First, am I correct when I say that approximately 70 percent plus of the area will be in the Federal strategic area which the United States will need for its security?

Mr. KUCHEL. The actual fact is that when the new State has made all of its withdrawals, the Government of the United States will still own approximately 72 percent of the area. But the pending bill provides specific authority for the President of the United States to take such area as may be necessary for the defense of our country and to make it, to that extent, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to obtain that answer.

Does the Senator from California, from his study of the matter in committee, feel that from the security standpoint alone—without regard to the other arguments in regard to admission—Alaska as a State would be of more importance strategically for the United States than as a Territory over which the Federal Government would have complete control?

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to answer that question, first, by referring to the hearings which were held in the Senate committee 8 years ago—in 1950—on this question. I now read a letter, which appears at page 45 of those hearings—from the then Secretary of Defense under the then President, Mr. Truman:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 18, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter is further in response to your communication of March 30, 1950, in which you make reference to two bills. H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, which, if enacted, would admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, into the Federal Union as States. Because I understand that your committee intends on April 24 to commence hearings on H. R. 331, which concerns Alaska, and to hold hearings beginning May 1 on H. R. 49, the Hawaiian proposal, I address this letter to you for the purpose of expressing the concurrence of the Department of Defense in both proposals.

As you know, the administration has repeatedly expressed itself as favoring Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood and both proposals have again and again been introduced by the President. On January 4, in his state of the Union message, President Truman urged that the Congress during 1950 "grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii." The enactment of H. R. 49 and H. R. 331 would, I believe, effectively accomplish this objective.

You asked in your letter of March 30 as to whether from the point of view of national defense, it would be advantageous to extend statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, and you inquired specifically as to whether statehood would give greater strength to our military position in those areas than does the present Territorial type of local government. It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be, the more successful would be the control and defense of the area in case of sudden attack. There can be no question but that in the event of an attack any State would be immensely aided in the initial stages of the emergency by the effective use of the State and local instrumentalities of law and order. By the same token it would seem to me that, as persons in a position to assist the Federal garrisons which might exist in Hawaii or Alaska, the locally elected governors, sheriffs, and the locally selected constabulary and civil defense units all would be of tremendous value in cases of sudden peril. Therefore, my answer to your question is that statehood for Alaska and Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the overall defense of both areas in event of emergency.

I am not attempting in this letter to endorse the specific language of either of the bills under consideration, but I do wish strongly to support the principle of granting immediate statehood to both the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii as in the best interests of the United States and of all of its peoples both here and in the Territories.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

I think the letter officially and, in my judgment, excellently contains an answer by one in a position of high responsibility to the relevant question which my friend the Senator from New Jersey has asked.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Since the statement was made some 8 years ago, is the Senator from California, as a member of the subcommittee, satisfied that today, with changing world conditions, the same statement would be true, and that we would be taking the right step, from the national security standpoint, in admitting Alaska as a State?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes. In the hearings which were held last year, Gen. Nathan Twining, then the Acting Chairman and subsequently the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared before the committee. I was there. I recall his testimony very well. He testified both officially and personally. He appeared there in favor of statehood for Alaska, as had been recommended by our Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower.

Earlier today a part of the testimony of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was placed in the RECORD, and I shall not detain the Senate by reading it again; but the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff indicated that the Defense Department unhesitatingly favored statehood for Alaska, under provisions which the President himself had favored, and which are in the bill before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask one more question, if I may. The Senator from California has very ably discussed the fiscal situation and the extent to which Alaska can balance its budget. A large part of the State of Alaska would be under Federal control and probably exempt from taxation. That is the problem faced by many Western States. I lived for a time in Colorado, and I know what it means to have large areas under Federal control and not subject to taxation. Would that fact influence and seriously affect the figures cited by the Senator with regard to the balancing of its budget by Alaska today?

Mr. KUCHEL. That question is highly important, and is certainly relevant. Provision is made in the House bill, as was done in the Senate bill, for the acquisition by the State of Alaska, over the next 25 years, of roughly 25 percent of the vast expanse of territory which Alaska has within its confines. When Federal control terminates, the holding will be placed in the hands of the State government. The State would, I think, be able to act with the some constructive influence which in the early days of the Senator's State and my State characterized the actions of our predecessors there. Surely, the question of Federal ownership is one which some day we shall have to face up to all across the country. My State of California is owned 50 percent by the Federal Government, and thus ad valorem taxes fall on only one-half of the land in the State.

The point of the Senator from New Jersey is a valid and sharply relevant one. I believe, however, on the basis of the values of property in Alaska as they have been estimated, the tremendous wealth in the ground in minerals, and on top of the ground in timber, plus the other great natural resources, the State of Alaska will be able to make maximum use of the property which it will obtain under the bill from the Federal Government. This provision constitutes one additional assurance. I feel sure that economically the new government will succeed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his replies and for his very clear presentation, which has been helpful to me in my thinking.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the acting majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] whether he anticipates any record votes today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I believe the Senate will remain in session quite late, but only speeches will be made. I understand there are three points of order against the bill at the desk. I hope we can consider them tomorrow. So far as today is concerned, the remainder of the session will be used for speeches on the subject before the Senate.

Will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

EXECUTION OF CERTAIN LEADERS OF REVOLT IN HUNGARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On June 19 the Senate adopted by unanimous vote—the yea-and-nay vote was 91 to 0, as I recall—Senate Concurrent Resolution 94, on the Hungarian situation. The House has adopted a comparable concurrent resolution, which is identical in all details with the language of the Senate concurrent resolution. I refer to House Concurrent Resolution 343.

Because both the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who submitted the concurrent resolution, and I feel it is far more important that a resolution be promptly acted on than have it tied up in a conference or have a problem arise as to which House is adopting which resolution, we are prepared to recommend to the Senate, and I do now recommend, that it agree to the House concurrent resolution, which deals with the same subject matter, so that action by the Congress of the United States can be completed on one of the concurrent resolutions expressing the feeling of the Congress regarding the executions of Premier Nagy, General Maleter, and their associates, by the puppet government of Premier Kadar, of Hungary, and his Soviet masters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California that the Senate temporarily lay aside the unfinished business and proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 343?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of House Concurrent Resolution 343, which is identical with the Senate concurrent resolution on the same subject, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 343) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the revolt of the Hungarian people in 1956 against Soviet control was acclaimed by freedom-loving people throughout the world; and

Whereas the suppression of the Hungarian revolt of 1956 by the armed forces of the Soviet Union was condemned by the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas the leader of the Hungarian Government and people in the unsuccessful revolt against Soviet oppression was induced to leave the sanctuary of the Yugoslavian Embassy in Budapest on promises of safe conduct and fair treatment on the part of the Hungarian Communist regime which was not in a position to take such action without the approval of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas these promises were treacherously ignored by Soviet forces and Imre Nagy was seized and held incommunicado; and

Whereas the Soviet imposed Communist regime of Hungary has now announced that Imre Nagy, together with his colleagues Miklos Gimes, Pal Maleter, and Jozsef Szilagyi have been tried and executed in secret; and

Whereas this brutal political reprisal shocks the conscience of decent mankind: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States express through the organs of the United Nations and through all other appropriate channels, the deep sense of indignation of the United States at this act of barbarism and perfidy of the Government of the Soviet Union and its instrument for the suppression of the independence of Hungary, the Hungarian Communist regime; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States express through all appropriate channels the sympathy of the people of the United States for the people of Hungary on the occasion of this new expression of their ordeal of political oppression and terror.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 343.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his courtesy in yielding.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6306) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6322) to provide that the dates for submission of plan for future control of property and transfer of the property of the Menominee Tribe shall be delayed.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if the Senator is willing to yield for this purpose, that the Senator from Colorado may yield to me without losing his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should be happy to yield for that purpose.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, before beginning my address, I should like publicly to comment upon the very excellent statement made by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who preceded me upon the subject of Alaska statehood. In my judgment, the Senator made an outstanding statement and advanced an outstanding argument for the case of statehood for Alaska. I certainly would not want this opportunity to pass without complimenting the Senator for the excellent way in which he handled his subject.

Prefatory to my own remarks, I should like to say my own statement will cover primarily the historical and legislative background of the Alaskan situation.

Mr. President, on March 19 I made a short statement setting forth some of the reasons for immediate action on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. At this time, I want to expand by statement on Alaska. To prevent misunderstanding, however, let me begin by saying that I still adhere to this view I expressed on March 19:

> It is my understanding the administration opposes the joining of the Alaska bill with the Hawaii bill. For myself, I shall oppose any motion to join the two bills.
>
> I am for statehood for both Territories, and I am in accord with our distinguished minority leader in the hope that we will have an opportunity to vote on each of the bills so that the qualifications may be determined for each Territory on its own merits.

Since that statement was made, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has reaffirmed his stand; on June 12 he announced that he will vote for Alaskan statehood and oppose any move to join the bills. Despite the fact that the majority leader has not seen fit to give an assurance that the Hawaii bill will be considered by this body after the Alaska bill, the senior Senator from California has said that he will do everything possible to get this body to consider a separate Hawaii bill this year—his last year in the Senate.

I am happy again to associate myself completely with the objectives of our minority leader.

Mr. President, I say in all sincerity that, in my opinion, there should be no fewer than 70 affirmative votes in this body on the issue of the admission of Alaska into the Union. For 70 Members of the Senate would not be here today if, in considering the admission of their 35 States, our forefathers had heeded such objections as those now raised against statehood for Alaska. Moreover, if the Senators from our Original Thirteen States follow the example of their illustrious predecessors, they, too, will vote to admit Alaska. How significant it would be if after 91 years of apprenticeship this great land—Alaska—would receive a unanimous vote of confidence.

Alaska has been a part of the United States since 1867. By the Treaty of Purchase with Russia, we acquired almost 376 million acres for $7,200,000—52 acres for every dollar. And many called this historic transaction Seward's Folly. Representative N. P. Banks, of Massachusetts, however, was not one of them. Here is what he said on June 30, 1868, as he led the fight for an appropriation to put into effect the Treaty of Purchase for Alaska:

> It is said that this Territory is worthless, that we do not want it, that the Government had no right to buy it. These are objections that have been urged at every step in the progress of this country from the day when the forefathers from England landed in Virginia or in Massachusetts up to this hour. Whenever and wherever we have extended our possessions we have encountered these identical objections—the country is worthless, we do not want it—the Government has no right to buy it. * * *
>
> If we read the early accounts of the colonists when they abandoned Virginia, or of the colonists of Massachusetts who did not desert their settlements, and what was said by their friends at home, we should learn something of the features of a worthless country.
>
> They remember what they said about Louisiana at the time of its purchase; when a Senator from Massachusetts declared that it would benefit the Atlantic States to shut up the Mississippi River, and he should be glad to see it done. We remember what was said about Texas, that part of the country which from the same disregard of its value had been surrendered by the United States in its negotiations with Spain for the acquisition of Florida; that the country was barren, sterile, a wilderness never wanted by us; that it would cost more than it was worth to keep it. With declarations like these we gave Texas—not to Spain; for before Spain could get possession, Mexico conquered its independence from Spain and with its liberty acquired the province of Texas. There had never been, by any nation, a more unnecessary surrender of territory. We recovered it after the lapse of a quarter of a century with an expenditure of treasure and the sacrifice of life that did not terminate with those who fought or fell in the struggle for the reannexation of Texas to the United States.
>
> The acquisition of California brought with it the same reproaches. It was called the end of creation, and it was said nobody would ever go there. I have many times heard the governor of one of the Western Territories speak of a debate upon a memorial he presented to the Senate at the session of 1845 or 1846 for an overland mail across the continent. One of the first Senators of this country said:
>
> "What use, Mr. President, have the American people for the sandy deserts and arid wastes of the vast interior of the continent, or the rocky coast of the Pacific, destitute of harbors and unprofitable to commerce? Nothing whatever. I will not vote 1 red cent from the Treasury to place the rock-bound shores of the Pacific 1 inch nearer the Atlantic than it now is."
>
> It was said at a later day in the Senate that the valley of the Columbia River was useless to us, costing more every year for its government than its entire value. "We are going to war," it was said, "for the navigation of an unnavigable river."
>
> Upon representations like these we surrendered British Columbia to Great Britain. Mr. John Quincy Adams said in this House that she had no title to it whatever. We acquired it by the Treaty of Ghent, then unsettled our title by joint occupation, and finally gave it up altogether upon the pretext now urged in regard to Russian America, that it was worth nothing, costing more than its value every year to govern it.
>
> It is but a few years since the whole world regarded the country between the hundredth meridian of longitude and the Oregon cascade as barren and worthless. It was compared by the officers of the Government in 1863 to the Asiatic deserts. This country is now organized into prosperous States and Territories, and in 1870 will contain more than 600,000 people; and 1 of the States of this region has given us in 5 years an industrial product of more than $50 million.

Many people argued that we should not pay for Alaska because it was a frozen wasteland—and too far away. To these arguments, Representative H. Maynard of Tennessee, on July 1, 1868, answered:

> We must not forget that * * * the southern portion * * * is in the same latitude as the British Isles, and the northern * * * in the same as Norway and Sweden. The probabilities certain are that it will be found equally habitable * * *. Distance, so far as it respects human intercourse, is measured by time, not by space. So reckoning, Alaska is nearer the Capital today than was California when admitted as a State. We all recollect when the distance from Boston to St. Louis was longer than it now is from Boston to Sitka.

Mr. President, we all know what our position would be today if the Russian sword hung like the sword of Damocles over the northern portion of this continent. Alaska is the key to our global defense. Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell said in 1935:

> I believe in the future he who holds Alaska will hold the world, and I think it is the most strategic place in the world.

We must continue to fortify Alaska and build up our Nation's defenses in the north. But if Alaska, the cornerstone of our northern defense, is worth defending, is it not also worth developing? And how can it be developed fully without admission into the Union? The answer is simple: It cannot.

Why has the development of Alaska not already taken place? Listen to what a California Representative [Mr. Higby] said on July 7, 1868:

> When the American people get hold of a country there is something about them

which quickens, vitalizes, and energizes it * * *. Under Russian rule * * * Alaska has been useful only to a fur company * * *. Let American enterprise go there, and as if by electricity all that country will waken into life and possess values.

I repeat, Why has this new land not been vitalized and energized? In the first place, Congress has not responded to the needs of this Territory. For at least 17 years, we provided no government and no laws to stabilize development. Even after Alaska was made an organized district, in 1884, it was powerless to create even a Territorial legislature, and it continued to flounder in a situation which found the laws of Oregon specially applicable to it—laws constructed upon the framework of organized, local, self-governing entities, counties and municipalities, which Alaska did not have. For 28 years Alaska did not even have any Federal laws pertaining to the disposition of public land; yet the Federal Government owned 100 percent of the land.

Finally, nearly three decades after Alaska's acquisition, Congress established an organized government. The Organic Act of 1912 permitted Alaskans to elect a legislature, to organize municipalities, and to begin to mould a Territorial cocoon, in the traditional sense. The Territory became an embryo State. Again, however, the Congress imposed stringent limitations on the power of the Territory; no law was to be passed interfering "with the primary disposal of the soil." Because the Federal Government still owned about 100 percent of the soil, Alaskans therefore still had no means of accelerating the creation of a tax base, and no means of encouraging private enterprise to come to Alaska. The legislature could not grant any exclusive privilege or franchise without approval of Congress. It could not create county governments without affirmative action by Congress; and it could not create its own judicial system.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the first Territorial legislature met in 1913 in Alaska. It immediately memorialized Congress to help the Territory's development. This procedure has now continued for 45 years, and history continues to repeat itself. Examine with me some of the memorials of that first Alaskan legislature:

First. House Joint Memorial No. 4 of the Alaskan Legislature asked that the homestead laws be amended in their application to Alaska. Those laws, designed for the Midwest and the West, placed hardships on Alaska pioneers as they attempted to subdue the elements and carve out a new life in the climate of the north. Alaskans asked (1) that a small portion of the homestead—one-fortieth in the first 2 years, one-twentieth in the third, instead of one-sixteenth and one-eighth as in the States—need be reduced to cultivation; (2) that absence from the homestead for 6 months, instead of 5, in any one year, be permitted; (3) that the prior acquisition of a homestead elsewhere should not be a bar to filing for a homestead in Alaska; and (4) that a homestead entry be completed without a survey. This last request was particularly important, for the public land surveys had not been extended to Alaska, and the cost of private surveys was prohibitive.

It took 3 years to fulfill item 3, 5 years to accomplish item 4, both in Memorial No. 4. And no action has been taken to this day on either the first or second request in the same Memorial No. 4.

Second. House Joint Memorial No. 6 asked that the act of June 22, 1910, permitting agricultural entries on coal lands, be extended to Alaska. The request was never granted, but the act of March 8, 1922, achieved substantially the same result. That request, then, was almost fulfilled in 9 years.

Third. House Joint Memorial No. 14 asked that oil lands in Alaska be opened for development. They had all been withdrawn by Executive order in 1910. This request was partially fulfilled by the 1920 Mineral Leasing Act; it only took 7 years. Alaskans are still extremely conscious of the withdrawal question; about 92 million acres are withdrawn from entry today. Only recently, the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, started the procedure to open for mineral entry some 23 million acres above the Arctic Circle in Alaska.

Fourth. House Joint Memorial No. 15 informed the Congress of the limited area available for the extension and development of Juneau, the capital of Alaska, made the capital by act of Congress in 1912. The memorial pointed out that available areas could not be used for extension or development because they were not open to entry. These were the tidal areas, lands held in trust for the future State. All the legislature asked was that these lands be surveyed and made available to the city of Juneau on whatever terms and conditions the United States deemed desirable. When was this request fulfilled? This Congress—the 85th Congress—44 years later, by the act of September 7, 1957, provided a mechanism to make the lands available. As Senators recall, this act makes available for transfer to the Territory the so-called tidal flat areas adjacent to surveyed townsites.

Statehood for Alaska would have solved the Juneau problem immediately.

While the house side of this determined Alaskan Legislature was thus engaged, so, too, was the senate. There were further memorials:

Fifth. Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 of that 1913 Alaskan Legislature petitioned Congress to repeal the act of June 7, 1910. That act, applicable only to Alaska, gives adverse claimants an additional 8 months in which to make adverse applications for mineral entries in Alaska. The law has never been repealed.

Sixth. Senate Joint Memorial No. 9 asked that coal lands be opened for development. This request was promptly fulfilled by the Alaska Coal Leasing Act of 1914.

Seventh. Senate Joint Memorial No. 28 asked that assessment work requirements under the mining laws be modified with respect to Alaska. In lieu of performing assessment work, Alaskans sought the right to make a payment of $100 per claim to be used for road construction. Although the request has never been fulfilled, as late as the 84th Congress, H. R. 5554 was introduced to accomplish this purpose. The Department of the Interior offered no objection to H. R. 5554 in principle, but requested that the locator be required to comply with existing law for 5 years, after which the Alaskan suggestion should be followed. In Alaska, I might add, because of another act applicable only to Alaska, failure to perform assessment work on mining claims results in forfeiture of the claim; whereas in all of the States the claim is open to relocation but not forfeited. So a matter of particular importance to the economy of Alaska remains unresolved, despite the fact that Alaskans operate under a special statute not applicable elsewhere under the American flag.

Of all these memorials, pertaining to lands development and subjects upon which the Territory was powerless to act, 1 was accomplished in 1 year, 1 in 7 years, 1 in 9 years, and 1 in 44 years. Others were partially fulfilled: 1 in 3 years and 1 in 5 years. Two have never been acted upon.

Eighth. The last of these memorials of that first Alaskan Legislature which I will discuss at this point is Senate Joint Memorial No. 17. This memorial requested Congressional attention to the problems of mentally ill Alaskans; in particular it emphasized the need for mental hospitals in Alaska so that these people could be near their loved ones. The act of July 28, 1956—43 years later—responded to this request.

Lest I leave an impression apparently critical of the present Members of this body, let me endorse the following statement made by Secretary Seaton in a statement to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on March 26, 1957:

Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives deserve unqualified commendation for the long hours, the energy, and the careful thought which they devote to the problems of the Nation's Territories and island possessions.

* * * * *

To confirm my own impression on that point, I had a check made as to the volume of Territorial legislation considered by Congress recently. No less than 59 separate bills handled by this Territories Subcommittee were enacted into law dring the last Congress; 30 of those laws (just over half) related solely to Alaska.

I do, however, hold the belief that many of these problems would not occupy the time of the Congress if Alaska were a State. If the issues were to be presented to the Congress in any event, we could do our part much more intelligently if Alaska had two Senators here to plead her causes.

On March 16, I also mentioned briefly our implied pledge of statehood to Alaska. That pledge is derived from the third article of the Treaty of Purchase, which provides:

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 exemption of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of

citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

It is interesting that this wording is almost identical with that of article III of the Louisiana Purchase Treaty of 1803. For myself, I do not believe this language compels Congress to admit Alaska, but I do believe it was a solemn pledge that Alaska would be admitted into the Union. And how was the Louisiana Treaty interpreted? Let me read a statement made by Representative R. M. Johnson of Kentucky on January 14, 18(?) during debate upon the admission of the Territory of Orleans, which, of course, is Louisiana:

The 30th day of April 1803, the United States acquired the Territory of Louisiana, the Orleans being a part, by a convention entered into with France at Paris, which convention was ratified by the President of the United States and the Senate, and the Congress made provision for the purchase money. The people of the Orleans Territory have been incorporated into the Union by purchase and adoption, and are entitled to all the rights of American citizens. The third article of said treaty specifies—"That the inhabitants of Louisiana (the ceded territory) shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States." We are thus solemnly bound by compact to admit this Territory into the Union as a State, as soon as possible, consistent with the Constitution of the United States.

Representative John Rhea of Tennessee made the following observation in the same debate:

The United States, a sovereign, have power to purchase adjacent territory. If all the territory of Louisiana had been vacant and unsettled, and citizens of the United States had from time to time purchased lands therein, and settled themselves and families thereon, and in time became sufficiently numerous to form a State, on the ratio of representation, the Constitution of the United States has fully provided in that case for their admission into the Union. If they cannot be admitted into the Union, will the gentleman tell us what he would do with them? How he would dispose of them? How he would govern or manage them? He appears unwilling in that case to manage and govern them united in the social bands of friendly union; it remains then only for him to govern them under a despotic rod of iron in the hand of unrelenting tyranny from age to age. * * * They have heretofore told you, sir, and they now tell you again by their memorial that they pledge themselves, and do solemnly swear allegiance and fidelity to the Nation, and do consider themselves a part thereof; and shall not their solemn declaration be believed? Or shall a jaundiced jealousy forever prevent them from the enjoyment of the rights, advantages and immunities, so solemnly guaranteed to them? But if the objection of the gentleman could at anytime heretofore have had weight, it now comes too late. The United States have acted on the treaty; they have enacted two laws providing Territorial governments for the people of Orleans, and they are solemnly bound and pledged to progress with them until they do admit them into the Union on the footing of the original States.

Similar statements were made in 1820, during consideration of the admission of Missouri. For instance, Representative Johnson of Virginia said:

Another gentleman from New York (Mr. Wood) contended that the President and Senate had no right to negotiate the treaty by which Louisiana was ceded to the United States; no right to stipulate for the admission of a people residing beyond the limits of the United States into the Union on a footing of equality with the original States. I understand that this treaty was submitted to the Congress of the United States; that it received the sanction of the House of Representatives, as well as the President and Senate; that the constitutional powers of the Government to negotiate such a treaty were then brought into discussion, and the right denied by Messrs. Griswold, Pickering, and Dana, who warmly opposed the treaty. But, sir, it is enough to say to the gentleman that he has made the discovery too late; that his protest for defect of title should have been earlier made. What is the situation of the people of Missouri? What has been the conduct of the Government of the United States? This country has been held for nearly 17 years. The people of the United States have been induced to migrate there in great numbers. The supreme law of the land guaranteed to them protection in the full and free enjoyment of their property. Land offices were established there, the public lands have been sold to them, and on terms very advantageous to the Government and people of the United States. Shall the Government, after deriving all the advantages which could result from this course of policy, say to the people that we purchased a defective title to this country; that we will take advantage of the defect in our own title, in order to impose hard and onerous conditions on you, as the price of your admission into the Union? Sir, shall the Government be permitted to do, with impunity, that which would crimson with blushes the cheeks of an individual?

Representative Pinckney of South Carolina said:

I have hitherto said nothing of the treaty, as I consider the rights of Missouri to rest on the Constitution so strongly, as not require the aid of the treaty. But I will, at the same time, say, that, if there was no right under the Constitution, the treaty, of itself, is sufficient, and fully so, to give it to her. Let us, however, shortly examine the treaty. The words are these: "The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted, as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities, of the citizens of the United States." Of these it is particularly observable, that, to leave no doubt on the mind of either of the Governments which formed it, or of any impartial man, so much pains are taken to secure to Louisiana all of the rights of the States of the American Union, a singular and uncommon surplusage is introduced into the article. Either of the words, "immunities," "rights," or "advantages," would have been, of itself, fully sufficient. Immunity means privilege, exemption, freedom; right means justice, just claim, privilege; advantage means convenience, gain, benefit, favorable to circumstances. If either word, therefore, is sufficient to give her a right to be placed on an equal footing with the other States, who shall doubt of her right, when you now find that your Government has solemnly pledged itself to bestow on, and guarantee to, Louisiana all the privileges, exemptions, and freedom, rights, immunities, and advantages, justice, just claims, conveniences, gains, benefits, and favorable circumstances, enjoyed by the other States?

The right of Alaska to eventual statehood cannot be denied. Why should we not act to grant her request immediately? First, we hear that Alaska is not contiguous to the rest of the United States. This is not a new argument. It is an outgrowth, no doubt, of the passionate attacks made upon any area not within the original United States seeking admission to the Union. Note, for instance, the assertion of Representative Josiah Quincy of Massachusetts on January 14, 1811, during the debate on the admission of Louisiana:

Mr. Speaker, * * * I am compelled to declare it as my deliberate opinion, that, if this bill passes, the bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved; that the States which compose it are free from their moral obligations, and that as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for a separation—amicably if they can, violently if they must.

We find it hard to believe in this day and age that such things could have been said about the admission of the State of Louisiana into the Union.

Mr. Quincy was ruled out of order for that comment, later described as the "first threat of secession" in the Congress. Why did he make the threat? Listen again to his own words as he explained:

I think there can be no more satisfactory evidence adduced or required of the first part of the position, that the terms "new States" did intend new political sovereignties within the limits of the old United States. For it is here shown, that the creation of such States, within the territorial limits fixed by the treaty of 1783, had been contemplated; that the old Congress itself expressly asserts that the new Constitution gave the power for that object; that the nature of the old ordinance required such a power, for the purpose of carrying its provisions into effect, and that it has been, from the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution, unto this hour, applied exclusively to the admission of States within the limits of the old United States, and was never attempted to be extended to any other object.

As he continued his argument, Representative Quincy's statement sounded strangely like some of the speeches made in the House a few weeks ago when the Alaska bill was debated:

This is not so much a question concerning the exercise of sovereignty, as it is who shall be sovereign. Whether the proprietors of the good old United States shall manage their own affairs in their own way; or whether they, and their Constitution, and their political rights shall be trampled under foot by foreigners introduced through a breach of the Constitution. The proportion of the political weight of each sovereign State constituting this Union depends upon the number of the States which have a voice under the compact. This number the Constitution permits us to multiply at pleasure, within the limits of the original United States, observing only the expressed limitations in the Constitution. But when in order to increase your power of augmenting this number you pass the old limits, you are guilty of a violation of the Constitution in a fundamental point; and in one also which is totally inconsistent with the intent of the contract and the safety of the States which established the association.

Furthermore, said Representative Quincy, the people of "New Orleans, or of Louisiana, never have been, and by the mode proposed never will be citizens of the United States."

Louisiana was, nevertheless, admitted in 1812. The problem of land outside the original United States was solved. Why then must contiguity be raised now

against Alaska? This was a strong argument against the purchase of Alaska, yet we completed the acquisition. Why? Because arguments, such as the one made by Representative Godlove Orth of Indiana in 1868, are as valid today as they were then. Representative Orth said:

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Shellabarger] * * * has stated as his principal objection that the Territory of Alaska is not contiguous to the United States; that by this acquisition we are entering upon a new and untried experiment; that hitherto our acquisitions have been of territory contiguous to our own; that the strength of a nation depends upon its compactness, and that we weaken ourselves by acquiring territory lying beyond our own possessions. I cannot see the force of this objection. It is true that some 500 miles of ocean travel lie between the northern limits of the United States and the southern boundary of Alaska, but has that gentleman or has this House forgotten that upon our acquisition of California, although the territory was contiguous, so to speak, to our own, yet we were separated from it by the almost impassable barriers of the Rocky Mountains, and that our early emigrants and adventurers sought homes in that new acquisition by way of the Isthmus of Panama, through foreign territory, or else by doubling Cape Horn and incurring the perils of a sea voyage of thousands of miles?

The Senators from Oregon can be thankful that arguments such as that made by Senator Dickerson of New Jersey in 1825 did not prevail:

But is this Territory of Oregon ever to become a State, a member of this Union? Never. The Union is already too extensive, and we must make 3 or 4 new States from the Territories already formed.

The distance from the mouth of the Columbia to the mouth of the Missouri is 3,555 miles; from Washington to the mouth of the Missouri is 1,160 miles, making the whole distance from Washington to the mouth of the Columbia River 4,703 miles, but say 4,650 miles. The distance, therefore, that a Member of Congress of this State of Oregon would be obliged to travel in coming to the seat of government and returning home would be 9,300 miles. This, at the rate of $8 for every 20 miles, would make his traveling expenses amount to $3,720.

Every Member of Congress ought to see his constituents once a year. This is already very difficult for those in the most remote parts of the Union. At the rate which the Members of Congress travel according to law—that is, 20 miles per day—it would require to come to the seat of government from Oregon and return, 465 days; and if he should lie by for Sundays, say 66, it would require 531 days. But if he should travel at the rate of 30 miles per day, it would require 306 days. Allow for Sundays 44, it would amount to 350 days. This would allow the Member a fortnight to rest himself at Washington before he should commence his journey home. This rate of traveling would be a hard duty, as a greater part of the way is exceedingly bad, and a portion of it over rugged mountains, where Lewis and Clark found several feet of snow in the latter part of June. Yet a young, able-bodied Senator might travel from Oregon to Washington and back once a year; but he could do nothing else. It would be more expeditious, however, to come by water around Cape Horn, or to pass through Bering Strait, round the north coast of this continent to Baffins Bay, thence through Davis Strait to the Atlantic, and so on to Washington. It is true this passage is not yet discovered, except upon our maps, but it will be as soon as Oregon shall be a State.

We come to another argument: Do the people of Alaska want statehood? This has been a perennial question, and I might add a good one. The first known tests of statehood are spelled out in the Senate records on the admission of Kentucky, where, on January 7, 1791, it was asserted that it was the "declared will of (the) people to be an independent State" and that the people of Kentucky were "warmly devoted to the American Union."

How have Alaskans declared their feelings? In 1946, by a referendum, Alaskans voted 9,630 to 6,822—approximately 3 to 2—for statehood. In 1956, the Alaskans ratified their constitution, which was a part of the statehood program, by a vote of 17,447 to 8,180, or 2 to 1. If this is not a sufficient expression, the bill before us requires a vote, on a separate ballot, on the question: "Shall Alaska immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?"

Let me set forth some of the votes on constitutions of existing States as they were admitted. Iowans, in 1846, ratified their constitution by a vote of 9,442 to 9,036, a difference of 406 votes; Nebraskans by a vote of 3,998 to 3,898, a difference of 100 votes; Wisconsin voted 16,442 to 6,149; and Arizonians, on their first constitution, 12,187 to 3,822. Certainly no set pattern of votes has been required, and Alaska's 2-to-1 vote seems quite sufficient to me.

There has also been a great discussion about Alaska's population and its sufficiency. The report of the Interior Committee estimated Alaska's population to be 212,500; Time magazine on June 9, 1958, estimated 213,000; some assertions were made in the other body that the population is only 160,000; and I have heard estimates of Alaskans that their population is between 225,000 and 250,000. Of course, we all know Alaskans are somewhat akin to Texans, so we can expect a little variation. When Arizona sought admission Representative Klepper, of Missouri, pointed out similar variations:

The governor's report only claims for Arizona 140,000 people, while Mr. Rodey, ex-Delegate from New Mexico, admits she has 175,000 population, and the last census gives to her 122,931.

Phineas W. Hitchcock, Senator from Nebraska, argued, on February 24, 1875, during consideration of Colorado statehood bill:

There is, I apprehend, and can be but one possible objection and but one possible question to be considered and but one point upon which opposition can be made to the present admission of Colorado. That question is in regard to her present population. Upon that point the Committee on Territories believe from the best information which they were able to obtain that Colorado today contains a population of 150,000. * * * Of course, this must be based to a great extent upon statistics and estimates, as no official and formal census of the Territory has been taken for the last 5 years. The population of the Territory by the census of 1870 was about 40,000.

* * * * *

Twenty-one States have been admitted as States which had at the time of their admission a greater population than Colorado now has, and these Territories were Michigan and Wisconsin, each of them having, I think, a population of about 200,000; Minnesota having a population of about the same amount that Colorado now has, and the others, such States as Illinois and Ohio, having only about one-third the population which Colorado now has.

A rigid percentage of the total United States population has never been a test of statehood, but the sufficiency of the population in each Territory has been inquired into thoroughly. Note, for instance, the comments of Representative Reid, of Arkansas, in 1906 during the debates on statehood for Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico:

Under the ordinance of 1787, which I insist is today an implied contract, in good faith, binding upon the Union, and these people in all these Territories have the right to make its terms in their behalf, 60,000 free inhabitants was all that was necessary. Nothing was said about area, whether small or large, or wealth and resources, whether great or small. But you say the ratio of representation has increased. I deny that this has ever been made the test. Twenty-five States were admitted, beginning with Vermont in 1791 and coming on down to Colorado in 1876, and Maine and Kansas were the only ones that had 100,000 people. From 1836 to 1837 the ratio of representation was 47,700. Arkansas was admitted with 25,000 people, and let me call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that his own State came in, and came in as a matter of right, with only 31,000 people.

From 1845 to 1848, when the ratio was 70-600, Florida was admitted with only 28,700, Iowa with 43,000, and Wisconsin with 30,000. In 1858, with a census ratio of 93,500, Minnesota came in with 7,000 and Oregon with 13,200. With a ratio of 127,000, Nebraska came in with 28,800 and Colorado with 39,000.

"But times have changed," is the argument we hear from those who oppose Alaska. Do we want Alaska's population to nullify the will of California's 14 million people, of Illinois' 10 million, of Georgia's 4 million people—that is the query repeated again and again. It is not new. In 1907 Representative Payne, of New York, said:

Gentlemen plead for justice for the people of Arizona. I believe in the greatest good for the greatest number. There are 100,000 people in Arizona, but there are 80 million people in the balance of the United States. I plead for the rights of the 8 million people in the State of New York, represented in the Senate of the United States by 2 Senators, and I am unwilling that the people of Arizona, with her 100,000 people, shall have an equal representation in the United States Senate. * * *

And in 1911, Senator Root, of New York, posed the question in this fashion:

But, sir, Arizona is now a Territory. She has not the right of local self-government. We are engaged in determining the conditions upon which we shall give her that right. We are engaged in determining the conditions upon which that 200,000 people, who at her election cast 16,009 votes upon the adoption of her constitution, shall send to this Senate as many Senators with as great a voice and as effective a vote as the 9 million people of the State of New York, the 7 million people of the State of Pennsylvania, the 5 million people of the State of Illinois, and the 4 million people of the State of Ohio.

In 1906, Representative Adams, of Wisconsin, answered these arguments in this fashion:

What is the basis of the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in this question there is to be considered on one side the interest of 80 million people and on the other side the interests of less than 200,000 in the Territory of Arizona? * * * Have the people of Arizona any interests that are not common to the people of the United States? Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania expect that in the event Arizona becomes a State her 2 Senators will swoop down upon the 90 other Senators and make a successful assault upon righteous law and just government? * * * Does he imagine that the men who own the hundreds of millions of property now being developed in Arizona through the best forms of American genius and the best examples of American industry, who have built up a civilization there which would be a credit to any State upon the globe, who have the same devotion to the Constitution of the United States and its flag as the people of any other State, will suddenly, upon the admission of Arizona, reverse the principles of their lives and the order of their action and become a menace to the Nation?

Of the 17 States admitted into the Union since Lincoln took office, only 6 had more population than Alaska has today. The others—Arizona, North Dakota, Minnesota, Kansas, Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, Idaho, Wyoming, Oregon, and Nevada—had less population than that of Alaska. Even in terms of percentage of the population at the time when each State was admitted, Alaska qualifies. Secretary Seaton recently stated his position on this matter in no uncertain terms:

Not once, but three times, the Congress of the United States has granted statehood to Territories with no greater percentage of the total population than Alaska now has.

Not once, but 11 times, the Congress of the United States has granted statehood to Territories with no greater actual population than Alaska has now.

Not once, but 17 times, the Congress of the United States has granted senatorial representation to Territories far in excess of what a mere population count would warrant. And remember, the Constitution of the United States expressly negates consideration of population as a measure of senatorial membership.

The Senators and Representatives who thus voted time and again for the entry of new States were not content with the status quo or with a narrow defense of their own States' prerogatives. They were ranging themselves squarely on the side of the future of this country. And their faith in the growth of the United States in the past century has been amply vindicated.

For my own part, Mr. President, I believe this issue was settled in the Constitutional Convention. My State or the State with the smallest population—Nevada has as much right to representation here as do any of the States with larger populations. Those who argue percentage figures in relation to representation in the Senate are arguing with our Founding Fathers; the decision from which they are appealing from was made in 1787.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CHURCH. First, I wish to commend my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Colorado, for making so scholarly an address on the subject of statehood.

I should like to commend him especially for bringing home a point which cannot be overemphasized, namely, the point with respect to the question of population and the right of representation in Congress.

I agree with the Senator from Colorado that the formula governing the representation of States in the Congress was settled at the Constitutional Convention. It was perhaps the most difficult question which confronted the delegates to that convention.

But the formula has worked well for the country for all the years from the time when Washington first took office as President. The constitutional concept is that the Senate is a House of States. It does not matter what may be the comparative populations of the various States. Today they are as different—as between the State of New York and the State of Nevada—as any difference which may be shown to exist between the population of any of the present States and the population of the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho is entirely correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Does not the Senator from Colorado also agree with me that under the historic formula which is embodied in the Constitution, the people are to be represented by their numbers in the House of Representatives, and by their States in the Senate?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is entirely correct, and I thank the Senator from Idaho for his remarks.

Mr. President, the matters I have been discussing this afternoon tend, I believe, to place the whole question in a position where it can be viewed with complete impartiality.

I am particularly impressed by the question asked in 1906 by Representative Adams, of Wisconsin, when he was discussing the proposed admission of Arizona as a State, namely:

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania expect that in the event Arizona becomes a State, her 2 Senators will swoop down upon the 90 other Senators and make a successful assault upon righteous law and just government?

I believe that question makes one of the most pertinent points ever made in this field.

Mr. CHURCH. I certainly concur.

I should like to add that I cannot understand the argument that the admission of Alaska to statehood will, somehow, give overrepresentation to the 225,000 persons who now live in Alaska. Would those who make that argument have us believe that overrepresentation is worse than no representation at all?

Today, Alaska has no representation at all. She does not have even one voting delegate in the House of Representatives, she does not have even one Senator on this floor, to vote for Alaska.

Although Alaska is taxed, although the Congress exercises all the prerogatives of government over Alaska, the United States does not grant the people of Alaska any voting representation in the Halls of Congress.

So I am not influenced by the argument that statehood will mean overrepresentation for Alaska. Statehood means representation in accordance with the historic formula which has served our Nation well, under the Constitution of the United States; and the granting of statehood to Alaska will put an end to the entire lack of representation that does violence to the fundamental concepts of democracy.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Colorado upon the splendid address he is making.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, let me say that I agree that when one thinks about the subject, it is natural to have a reaction against such situations as have been referred to; and an expansion of one's mental horizon is accomplished when the matter is studied and when one realizes that the time has come when no longer can statehood be denied to this great Territory, which, with its abundant natural resources, constitutes a great bulwark for our country. Certainly, the Congress can no longer continue to deny statehood to Alaska.

Mr. President, statehood was predicted for Alaska as early as 1906. In that year Senator Nelson said:

I have no doubt in the years to come, in the years of my grandchildren perhaps, even Alaska will come here asking for admission into the Union, not as a single State, but perhaps as three States. The coastline, the Aleutian Archipelago, and the archipelago along the British boundary, and the south shore, or southern Alaska, as it is called, will no doubt some day come knocking at the doors of Congress for admission as a State; then the great interior of that country, the great Yukon and Tanana and Koyukuk Valleys will come to Congress and ask for admission as a State; and by and by Seward Peninsula, with its 30,000 square miles, with its endless amount of gold-bearing creeks and the country beyond that will be knocking at the doors of Congress. If we who are now in this chamber could look down upon this world of ours 100 years hence I have no doubt that we would find 3 States in this Union from what now constitutes a portion of the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. President, I have quoted freely from past debates. I am certain that many of my distinguished colleagues recall a similar exposition presented to this body by Senator Seaton of Nebraska, on February 20, 1952. Mr. President, I ask that Senator Seaton's speech be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Nation's pulse is quickening on this issue of statehood. Every national magazine, it seems, has devoted considerable space to setting forth the issues. Editorials pour into each of our offices daily. The vast majority urge immediate action on the statehood questions. These have raised Alaska's hopes of affirmative action by this Congress on her plea for statehood.

As a distinguished Alaskan recently said: "Alaskans live on hope, and we can afford to, because we have faith in the future."

This was implicit in the feeling expressed by Samuel C. Dunham, in a short verse, part of which was reproduced by Time magazine in its fine article about Alaska's vibrant young Governor, Mike Stepovich:

ALASKA TO UNCLE SAM

Sitting on my greatest glacier
With my feet in Bering Sea
I am thinking, cold and lonely
Of the way you've treated me.
Three-and-thirty years of silence!
Through ten thousand sleepless nights
I've been praying for your coming—
For the dawn of civil rights.

When you took me, young and trusting
From the growling Russian bear,
Loud you swore before the nations
I should have the the Eagle's care.
Never yet has wing of eagle
Cast a shadow on my peaks,
But I've watched the flight of buzzards
And I've felt their busy beaks.

I'm a full-grown, proud souled woman,
And I'm getting tired and sick—
Wearing all the cast-off garments
Of your body politic.
If you'll give me your permission,
I will make some wholesome laws
That will suit my hard conditions
And promote your country's cause.

You will wake a sleeping empire,
Stretching southward from the Pole
To the headlands where the waters
Of your western ocean roll.
Then will rise a mighty people
From the travail of the years,
Whom with pride you'll call your children—
Offspring of my pioneers.

Mr. President, Mr. Dunham composed this verse in 1900, 33 years after the purchase of Alaska. The 33 years of silence has now lengthened to 91 long years. It is appalling to think that this poem, if written today, could read that Alaska has now awaited the fulfillment of our 1867 pledge for 91 years and through more than 33,000 sleepless nights.

Let us give support to Alaska's faith in the future; let us show to the world that America practices what she preaches; and let us again reaffirm the stand taken 35 times before. Each new State has enhanced the position of the Union. As this Nation increases in size, so will the greatness of each State, large or small. In the words of Senator Charles Sumner's address to the Senate in the Fortieth Congress urging ratification of the Treaty of Purchase:

> There are few anywhere who could hear of a considerable accession of territory, obtained peacefully and honestly, without a pride of country. * * * With an increased size on the map there is an increased consciousness of strength and the citizen throbs anew as he traces the extending line.

The same pride of country all Americans will feel, I believe, upon the entry of the State of Alaska into the Union. And, as Senator Sumner said in closing his address, in 1867, for Alaska:

> Your best work and most important endowment will be the republican government, which looking to a long future, you will organize, with school free to all and with equal laws, before which every citizen will stand erect in the consciousness of manhood. Here will be a motive power, without which coal itself will be insufficient. Here will be a source of wealth more inexhaustible than any fisheries. Bestow such a government, and you will bestow what is better than all you can receive whether quintals of fish, sands of gold, choicest fur or most beautiful ivory.

EXHIBIT A

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 1, pp. 1194–1198]

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

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

Mr. SEATON. Mr. President, I understand there is a tradition in the Senate that a freshman Senator should be seen but not heard. Because of the fact that I do not expect to be here for a full year, Mr. President, I beg your indulgence to speak today; otherwise I may be forever foreclosed from addressing this body.

Mr. President, the old adage "There is nothing new under the sun" could hardly be truer than in its application to the objections we hear to statehood for Alaska.

The same type of objections were made against practically every Territory which ever applied for admission as a State. Experience has proved the objections false. California, Oregon, Wyoming, Arizona, Nebraska, and the others have gone on to become perfectly respectable and self-sufficient States despite the cries which were raised against them in earlier sessions of Congress. Each is a credit to itself and to the Union.

It is difficult to believe now that, when California's admission was under consideration a little over 100 years ago, Senator Daniel Webster could have said:

"What can we do with a western coast? A coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it. I will never vote 1 cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer Boston than it is now."

I am sure some of the dreadful things we have been hearing about Alaska will be as hard to credit 100 years from now, when she is a prosperous and populous State, as are today the harsh words of the old Senator from Massachusetts.

Let me refer to what happened when my own State of Nebraska was seeking admission into the Union. The case for Alaska today is fully as strong, from the standpoint of population, of prevailing sentiment in favor of statehood, of resources and of record of accomplishment under a Territorial status, as was that of Nebraska when she was seeking admission.

A bill to enable the people of Nebraska to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, was introduced in the House of Representatives early in the first session of the 38th Congress in 1864.

When the bill was reported by the House Committee on Territories, Representative Cox moved an amendment which read:

"*Provided*, That the said Territory shall not be admitted as a State until Congress shall be satisfied by a census taken under authority of law that the population of said Territory shall be equal to that required as the ratio of one Member of Congress under the present apportionment."

The amendment was defeated on a yea and nay vote by 72 to 43, and the bill was then passed by a voice vote.

In the Senate, the bill was sponsored by Senator Wade, of Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Territories. Senator Trumbull, of Illinois, raised the question that there were not enough people to justify statehood, stating that he was informed the population was between 20,000 and 30,000, and adding: "The number of inhabitants necessary to send a Representative to the Congress of the United States is about 125,000." Senator Davis said it was 127,000, and added that the population of Nebraska at that time was twenty-eight thousand and a fraction.

Senator Foster, of Connecticut, also objected to the bill saying:

"If 25,000 people in that far-off region are desirous of paying the expenses and bearing the burden of a State government, it seems to me wonderful. I should like very much to know how many of the population of that Territory have asked to be made a State. For one, I should not wish to impose upon them the burden of a State government without their asking for it. It will make taxation very heavy to sustain a State government there."

To these objections Senator Wade replied:

"The first objection of the Senator from Illinois is that the population of Nebraska is not sufficient; that there ought to be population enough there for a representation in the House of Representatives. That has never been the rule in the organization of these Territories. I hardly know of one that has been admitted that had population enough at the time of admission to demand a representation in the House of Representatives under the apportionment. Some of them may have had sufficient population but they were very few. Why, sir, Florida existed as a State for a great many years before it had sufficient population to entitle it to representation. * * * You may take Florida, Arkansas, and Texas, and not one of them had the population requisite to entitle a State to a Representative. Texas had two Representatives assigned to her when she had nothing like population enough to entitle her to one.

"The next objection is that we are about to impose a State government on a people against their will. I should be as much opposed to that, sir, as the gentleman from Connecticut. He demands of me to know whether it is the wish of the people to be enabled to form a State government. That is the purpose of this bill. It is only to enable the people there, if they see fit, to meet in convention and determine either to have a State government or not."

Adverting to another objection by Senator Foster, Senator Wade continued:

"The Senator is afraid that we shall burden them with the expenses of carrying on a State government. I do not believe they would thank the gentleman for that kind advice. I have no doubt they are able to take care of their own concerns; they are intelligent; they do not want any counsel on that subject from without. If they do not want a State government they are not obliged to have it. The bill only enables them to have it if they want it. Then that objection falls to the ground."

It is interesting to note that the above-quoted remarks on population were the only ones in the Senate debate. The bill came up on April 12, 1864, and was passed by a voice vote.

When the constitutional convention had been held, a bill to admit Nebraska was introduced in the next Congress. It came up in the Senate in July 1866. In response to Senator Sumner's question as to the size of the population, Senator Wade replied:

"I am assured by gentlemen who have been there and know all about it that the population cannot now be less than 60,000."

He added:

"The Territory is settling up with unprecedented rapidity; settlers are going in there very fast, as I am informed and believe. * * * I do not suppose that any extended argument need be made on this subject, because * * * when the people think themselves capable of carrying on a State government, when they feel that they would like to have the control of their own affairs in their own

hands; it has been the policy of the Government to grant them that privilege * * * and certainly when the intelligent people of the United States residing in a Territory anywhere have deliberately made up their minds that they are wealthy enough and numerous enough to set up for themselves, their decision ought to be respected."

Senator Johnson, of Maryland, asked what was the majority in the State that voted for the constitution; and to that question Senator Wade replied: "About 150, I think."

Senator Sumner then said:

"The Senator from Ohio tells us that the majority of the people in favor of the State government was about 150. Sir, it is by such a slender, slim majority out of 8,000 voters that you are now called to invest this Territory with the powers and prerogatives of a State."

Actually, Senator Wade had overstated even this small majority; for subsequently in the debate appears the official certificate of the election from Gov. Alvin Saunders, of the Territory of Nebraska, saying that at the election authorizing the people to vote for or against the adoption of a State constitution for Nebraska, the vote for the constitution was 3,938 and the vote against was 3,838—a majority of 100 votes in favor of the constitution, out of a total vote of 7,776.

Senator Sumner continued:

"I think the smallness of that majority is an argument against any action on your part; but if you go behind that small majority and look at the number of voters, it seems to me that the argument still increases, for the Senator tells us there were but 8,000 voters.

"Sir, the question is, Will you invest these 8,000 voters with the same powers and prerogatives in this Chamber which are now enjoyed by New York and Pennsylvania and other States of this Union? I think the argument on that head is unanswerable. It would be unreasonable for you to invest them with those powers and prerogatives at this time."

It is interesting to note that the subsequent debate brought out the fact that two companies of soldiers from Iowa, who were not eligible to vote, had voted, and that there was much discussion of the fact that the total vote was small and the margin by which the constitution had been voted infinitesimal; that it was beclouded by charges of illegal voting.

Senator Cowan, of Pennsylvania, speaking in opposition, said:

"There are fewer people in the State of Nebraska today than there are in the county which I inhabit in Pennsylvania. Is it fair that their Senators, representing some 60,000 or 70,000 people, shall weigh as much as the three and a half millions of Pennsylvanians do?"

Senator Hendricks, of Indiana, likewise was opposed on the ground that the denial of the suffrage to colored men was a violation of the act to provide a republican form of government, and that the 100-vote margin by which the constitution was accepted was tainted with fraud. He declared his complete opposition to the proposal for Nebraska statehood.

Thereupon, Senator Brown, of Missouri, proposed an amendment that the act to admit Nebraska could not take effect until there had been held in Nebraska an election at which the voters could express their assent or dissent from the proposition to deny the franchise by reason of race or color.

Several other amendments having as their objectives the elimination of discrimination against color in the Nebraska constitution were proposed, but all of them were defeated.

Finally an amendment was presented by Senator Edmunds, of Vermont. It read as follows:

"And be it further enacted, That this act shall take effect with the fundamental and perpetuate condition that, within said State of Nebraska there shall be no abridgement, or denial, of the exercise of the elective franchise, or of any other right to any person by reason of race or color, excepting Indians not taxed."

The amendment was first defeated by a tie vote of 18 to 18, with 16 absent; but later the amendment was brought up again, and was adopted by a vote of 20 to 18.

Meanwhile, there had come to the Senate reports from members of the legislature that the constitution, instead of being adopted by a majority of 100 votes, had in fact been rejected by 48 votes.

Senator Buckalew further charged that an Indian agent who had been in the State only 4 months not only had voted himself, but had cast the illegal votes of 18 half-breed Indians under his control. He pointed out that 6 months' residence was required and that Indians were also not qualified electors.

These frauds, he pointed out, were on top of the illegal voting of the Iowa soldiers previously referred to, of whom 134 had voted for the constitution and 24 against; and he said they were disqualified not only on the ground of being nonresidents but also because the organic act of the Nebraska Territory provided that "no soldier shall be allowed to vote in said Territory by reason of being in service therein."

The bill nevertheless passed the Senate by a vote of 24 to 15.

The reasons for this favorable Senate verdict, despite the smallness of the Nebraska vote in favor of the constitution, despite the smallness of the total population, despite the cloud which hung over the verdict because of alleged frauds, and despite the issue that had been raised over the discriminations against people because of their color, may be found in the arguments of a number of Senators who pushed the case against the condition of territoriality, as follows:

Senator Howard, of Michigan, said:

"I hope that the condition of vassalage, that inconvenient territorial condition, of which every man who has resided in a Territory any length of time will have seen great reason to complain, will now be removed, and that this intelligent, this enterprising community of pioneers will be relieved from these inconveniences and admitted to a full and complete fellowship as one of the sister States of the Union. I dislike territorial government; it is the most degrading, it is the most inconvenient, and it is the most corrupting and embarrassing of all governments upon the face of the earth."

Much the same thought was expressed in the debate by Senator Sherman, of Ohio, who said:

"I know very well that a Territorial government in a rapidly growing community like Nebraska is a great burden, irritating constantly. Their governor is appointed by the President. He may not have any sympathy with them, although I believe as to the Governor of Nebraska, he is in hearty sympathy with the people there; but he may not be. * * * He is their governor by no vote or voice of theirs. This state of affairs is always unpleasant to a people. They like to have the choice of their own governor. * * * Their judges are appointed by the President. * * * The people of the Territory elect only the legislative government. They have not their benefit of the share of public lands.

"Is there any reason why we should continue these people under this kind of pupilage; why, we should keep them under this kind of burden, unpleasant, irritating, depending upon the President of the United States for their executive authority, upon judges appointed by him for the administration of their laws, without any opportunity to improve their Territory? Is it right, or just, that for any slight reason we should keep them in that condition? It is always the case that these new communities rapidly seek to get out of the state of pupilage or Territorial state into the government of their own affairs. It is natural that they should do so. It seems to me that this Territory has now within itself all the elements necessary to enable its people to assume their own government. They have a hardy population; they have every advantage that we have. Why not, therefore, let them enter into the race of progress? Until this Territory is admitted as a State they cannot progress rapidly, no encouragement can be held out to them. * * *

"Mr. President, is it not the interest of the United States to form as soon as possible all these infant Territories into States? What object can the United States have in holding any portion of the territory of the United States in a condition where it must be governed by executive laws or executive influence? None whatever."

Senator Sherman concluded.

These moving arguments are what persuaded the Senate to vote to admit Nebraska. The House, however, did not concur in the amendment of Senator Edmunds, but proposed a substitute which would leave the question of discrimination against colored people to a future action of the State legislature. The Senate agreed to the amendment.

Nebraska was now admitted to statehood, subject to the approval of the President. However, President Johnson vetoed the bill.

He vetoed it on the ground, he wrote, that Congress had no right to prescribe the conditions of franchise to a State, and that the matter of acceptance of Congress' terms should be left to the people, rather than to the legislature. As a further reason for veto, he stated that the majority of 100 in a total vote of 7,776 could not, "in consequence of frauds" alleged, "be received as a fair expression of the wishes of the people."

President Johnson's unpopularity caused his veto to be overridden by a vote much greater than that by which the bill had passed, namely, 31 to 9 in the Senate and 120 to 43 in the House.

Mr. President, it was under these inauspicious circumstances that my own State entered the Union. That the circumstances were not unique, and that they certainly are not unique to Alaska, can be demonstrated by referring to what happened in the case of Oregon, now one of our most favorably known States.

When the bill to admit Oregon came up for a second time on May 5, 1858, the Congress having previously passed a bill for an enabling act to authorize the people of Oregon Territory to form a constitutional government, Senator William H. Seward, of New York, spoke as follows:

"They are 2,000 miles from the center. It is not a good thing to retain provinces or colonies in dependence on the Central Government and in an inferior condition a day or an hour beyond the time when they are capable of self-government. The longer the process of pupilage, the greater is the effect which Federal patronage and Federal influence has upon the people of such a community. I believe the people of Oregon are as well prepared to govern themselves as any people of any new State which can come into the Union.

"I do not think the matter of numbers is of importance here. The numbers are estimated at 80,000. The present ratio of representation is 93,420, * * * but I shall never consent to establish for my own government any arbitrary rule with regard to the number of population of a State. I can imagine States which I would not admit with a million of people, and I can imagine those which I would admit with 50,000. * * * I shall vote for the bill."

Subsequently in the debate, Senator Douglas, of Illinois, discussing the question of population, had this to say:

"Now, one word as to population. I do not think there are 93,423 people in Oregon—the number required, according to the existing ratio, for a Member of Congress. I think it ought to be a general rule for the admission of States to require that number. * * * I brought in this year such a proposition with a view to apply it to all Territories. I was willing to apply it to Kansas now, and to Oregon, if we applied it to Kansas. * * * But, sir, here are two inchoate States which have proceeded to make a constitution and take the preliminary steps for admission into the Union. You have agreed to receive one with less than the population required, and it has the smaller population of the two. Now, the question is, Shall we, after having agreed to admit Kansas with—say 40,000—refuse to admit Oregon with 55,000, as I think she has, or with 80,000, as her delegate estimates? I think it is a discrimination that we ought not to make."

Senator Mason, of Virginia, said this:

"Well, where are we to stand if States are to be admitted into this Union without reference to this population. Each State must of necessity have one Representative, at least, in the other House, and two here. You then have a vote of 3 in the joint legislation of the country against the half of 1 vote in 1 of the States which is properly entitled by its population to representation in the 2 Houses. It is unfair, unequal, and unjust; it is destroying the equilibrium of our institution."

However, Senator Green, of Missouri, a member of the committee which reported the bill, took issue with Senator Mason. He said:

"Is Oregon to come in as a sister in this Republic? She fancies herself capable of sustaining a State government. We see, by clear, moral evidence, satisfactory to anyone who will investigate the subject, that she has at this time about 80,000 inhabitants. We see a train of circumstances directing population to that Territory. We have a reasonable ground of expectation that even before next December there will be more than 100,000 people there. Why, then, should Oregon be kept out of the Union? By the admission of her as a State, we save the Federal Government from all the expenses of maintaining her Territorial organization. If she is willing to take upon herself the organic form of a State, and bear the burdens of a State, why not allow her to do so? Consider her great distance from you, and the uncertainty of communication. Is it to be a mere dependency of the Federal Government? Must it always look to the Federal head, and that Federal head more than 2,500 miles distant? * * * I believe it to be good policy for the Federal Government, and I believe it will be to the advantage and development, and growth and increase of Oregon as a State. While they feel dependent they do not exert themselves. It is a constant tax on the Federal Government to pay for governors, legislative councils, legislative assemblies, courts of justice, grand juries, and prosecuting attorneys. Why not save ourselves from all that expense, when we know it does not endanger the existence of the State to acknowledge her independence?"

It seems to me that those words are very prophetic today.

The final speech on the bill was, again, by Senator Seward of New York, who, later as Secretary of State, was instrumental in bringing Alaska under the American flag. In his final argument, which was peculiarly pertinent to the admission of the Territory of Alaska into the Union as a State, he said:

"In coming to this conclusion (to support the admission of Oregon as a State), I am determined by the fact, that, geographically and politically, the region of country which is occupied by the present Territory of Oregon is indispensable to the completion and rounding off of this Republic. Every man sees it, and every man knows it. * * * There is no Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, and, probably, no man in the United States who would be willing to see it lopped off, fall into the Pacific or into the possession of Russia or under the control of any other power; but every man, woman, and child knows that it is just as essential to the completion of this Republic as is the State of New York, or as is the State of Louisiana, on the Mississippi. It cost us too much to get it, we have nursed and cherished it too long, not to know and feel that it is an essential part. * * *

"Well, then, she is to be admitted at some time, and inasmuch as she is to be admitted at all events, and is to be admitted at some time, it is only a question of time whether you will admit her today, or admit her 6 months hence, or admit her a year or 7 years hence. What objection is there to her being admitted now? You say she has not 100,000 people. What of that? She will have 100,000 people in a very short time. * * *

"For one, sir, I think that the sooner a Territory emerges from its provincial condition the better; the sooner the people are left to manage their own affairs, and are admitted to participation in the responsibilities of this Government, the stronger and the more vigorous the States which those people form will be. I trust, therefore, that the question will be taken, and that the State may be admitted without further delay."

The vote being taken, Oregon, although lacking the requisite population, was admitted by a vote of 35 to 17.

There is yet another case I should like to mention. In Wyoming, the State so ably represented here in part by the distinguished Senator who is chairman of the committee which reported the Alaska statehood bill, the situation was similar.

The 50th Congress in 1889 failed to act on the Senate bill to provide admission of Wyoming as a State, although the bill had been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Territories. However, a majority of the boards of county commissioners in Wyoming had petitioned the Governor of the Territory to issue a proclamation for a constitutional convention, such as had been contemplated in the Senate bill.

The Territorial Governor of Wyoming thereupon issued the proclamation, calling for a constitutional convention for the purpose of framing a constitution and forming a State government preparatory to admission. The convention met and framed a constitution, which was submitted to a vote of the people of the Territory and which was adopted by a vote of 6,272 for, 1,923 against; the total number of votes being 8,195.

And here I quote from the memorial of the State constitutional convention of the Territory of Wyoming, praying the admission of that Territory as a State into the Union, which began:

"The people of Wyoming, prompted thereto by a consideration of the great importance of an early escape from the Territorial condition and of the rights which pertain to American citizens."

Discussing briefly the grounds upon which the admission may be urged as a right, the memorial then stated:

"It may be declared a settled principle of the Government that territory acquired by the United States is, in the language of Chief Justice Taney, 'acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress by absolute authority'; that 'Territorial governments are organized as matters of necessity, because the people are too few in number and scant in resources to maintain a State government,' but 'are contrary to the spirit of our American Constitution,' and 'are to be tolerated and continued only so long as that necessity exists.'"

Senator Vest, of Missouri, spoke in opposition to Wyoming's plea for statehood, as follows:

"If the question of admitting a State into the Union affected only and exclusively the population of that State, this conduct on the part of Congress might be to some extent excusable; there might be some palliation for the utter indifference with which such matters are now considered. But there is a dual aspect of this question. The admission of a State into the Union affects the rights of the people of every State in the Union alike. The admission of a State here without the requisite population, a reasonable population within the judgment of Congress, directly and absolutely affects the interests of the people in all the States."

Senator Vest was answered by the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Platt:

"I want to take up the objections which have seemed to be prominently urged by the Senator from Missouri. He says that two Senators ought not to come here upon this floor from a sparsely settled State with a population which is 151,912, and have the same influence in this body and the same number of votes that the State of Missouri has. What he says about that applies as well to the State of Connecticut as to the State of Missouri, and I say as a representative of the State of Connecticut that I have no prejudice and no objection to 2 Senators from a new State, if that State is fairly entitled to admission into the Union, coming here and having just as many votes upon this floor as the 2 Senators from Connecticut, that is older and has a larger population.

"It applies to the State of New York as well as it does to the State of Rhode Island or to the State of Missouri or the State of Connecticut. It might be said that New York, with its 5 million people or more, ought to have more representatives upon this floor than the State of Oregon, with three or four hundred thousand, or the State of Missouri, with its million, more or less—I do not speak by the book. But such has not been the theory of the Constitution of our Government. It was not the theory of the fathers, of the framers of the Constitution. They did not apportion the Senators who should occupy seats in this body according to the population of the States which they represented. The disproportion and disparity existed at the formation of the Constitution. It was never intended that there should be popular representation upon this floor; but it was intended that two Senators should represent each State. If that is so, and it be admitted that, under the general policy of this country and the conditions and circumstances under which other States have been admitted, Wyoming is to be admitted here as a State, then as a State she is entitled to 2 Senators upon this floor, as much as Florida is entitled to 2 Senators or Rhode Island is entitled to 2 Senators or Montana is entitled to 2 Senators, when New York and Pennsylvania and Ohio and Missouri and all those States have vastly more population.

"That argument falls to the ground the moment Wyoming presents herself within the conditions and circumstances which have hitherto been supposed to justify the admission of Territories into the Union as States; and I say, and the facts given in the report which has been read here show, that if a comparison were made between the resources, the population, the wealth, the character, the stability, the prospects of future growth of Wyoming and the other Territories that have been admitted as States it will be found that Wyoming does not fall below them in any respect, except in this one respect of population required by law for one Representative

at that time, and those States are Florida, Oregon, Kansas, Nevada, Nebraska, and Colorado. Up to the admission of the four States at the last Congress, Oregon, Kansas, Nevada, Nebraska, and Colorado were the States last admitted, in the order named, and no one of them had at the time of admission an estimated population equal to the then unit representation. Other States have been admitted when the population was barely equal to the unit of representation. * * * The character of the people has been deemed to be of immensely more consequence than the question whether it possessed just exactly the number, or a number exceeding the unit of representation. * * *

"But there is another consideration, and that is whether in the immediate future there is prospect that the population will be great enough so that the unit representation will be observed. Look at Wyoming. With perhaps a slow growth at first, her population is now most rapidly increasing. * * * This idea that we must wait before citizens of these Territories, as good as the men who occupy seats upon this floor, as well qualified to exercise and discharge all the duties of citizenship as the citizens of Missouri, or New York, or Texas, or Connecticut, or Vermont; that we must wait until they get the exact number, 151,912, and have it proved to a mathematical demonstration that they have it before the Territory can be admitted, is a claim which I think ought to find no support in this Senate. It never has found support here hitherto."

Arizona's entry into the Union was accomplished recently enough that an eyewitness account of the objections to her statehood was given a few years ago by the late Sidney Osborn, a member of the constitutional convention who lived to be Governor of that State. Speaking of the early days and the cry which was raised against Arizona, Governor Osborn said:

"Arizona's resources, although developed only to a minor extent, were real; but its public revenue was altogether unequal to the building of roads, to securing the various things the desire for which moved the Territory's people to seek self-government.

"No great perspicacity was required to discover that the reason for this lack of public funds was inherent in the Territorial revenue system. Taxes were, as a matter of fact, quite low—a condition, other things being equal, usually deemed to be highly desirable—but these other things, such for instance as taxes, were not equal. The reason was that by means of defective laws relating to the subject, corporate property—meaning specifically the property of mining, railroad, express, telegraph and telephone, and private car-line companies—constituting by far the Territory's major wealth, was assessed on a basis representing only an insignificant fraction of its value. * * *

"When victory finally came to the forces which for so long had been struggling for statehood—and it is pertinent to mention that internal opposition to this movement centered to a large extent in the interests responsible for the prevailing unequal and inadequate taxation—the problem described was attacked.

"A few figures will serve to illustrate the result. In 1911, the year immediately preceding statehood, all property in the Territory was valued at less than $100 million. Mining property comprised 19.3 percent of the total, and railroad property 19.1 percent. In 1914, when the State's new tax system became fairly operative, the assessed valuation was $407 million, of which 36 percent was mining property, and 22.14 percent railroad property, a readjustment rendered still more conspicuous by fairly adequate assessments of the property of express companies, private car lines, and telephone and telegraph companies. The Territorial levy of 90 cents on each $100 valuation in 1911 was reduced in 1914 to 44½ cents, and there was a proportionate reduction in county levies, while the total revenue of $881,000 for Territorial purposes in 1911 grew to $1,806,000 in 1914. * * *

"The arguments against statehood, which were used in Arizona, were insufficiency of population, and prohibitive cost of supporting government. Subsequent events demonstrated that the arguments had no merit at all. It is well understood at the time they were advanced that opposition to statehood within Arizona was confined to industrialists who desired the status quo, and to a few politicians whose views were formed in Washington."

Note what was said of Arizona:

"The arguments against statehood * * * were insufficiency of population, and prohibitive cost of supporting government."

Those arguments have a strange familiar ring as we talk about statehood for Alaska today. They are no more valid of Alaska than they were of the States against which they were earlier raised.

Alaska is as deserving of statehood, and as ready for statehood, and as greatly in need of statehood, to come into her own, as were any of the present States when it was their turn before the bar of the Senate. Let us deal with the American citizens in Alaska no less generously in this matter than were our forebears dealt with in their respective Territories. Alaska, like all the other States, will keep the faith and carry on the grand old United States tradition.

Mr. President, we have heard much from those who oppose statehood for Alaska, and I doubt neither the sincerity nor the patriotism of those distinguished Members of this great body. But I cannot, in good conscience, join with them in opposition to Alaska's plea for statehood, or even in counseling further delay. Alaska, through more than 80 years as a Territory, has long since served her apprenticeship. As an organized Territory—as an inchoate State—Alaska's star has for too long been denied its rightful place on the glorious flag of the United States of America.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. SEATON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Nebraska upon his excellent address. It is very informative, and I am happy that he has given the Senate the benefit of his views. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator if he believes that Alaska will develop as rapidly as a Territory as it would as a State.

Mr. SEATON. I do not believe there is any possibility of its developing as rapidly as a Territory as it would as a State.

Mr. MCFARLAND. In other words, the Senator from Nebraska is of the opinion that more people would go to Alaska and develop it if it were a State than would be willing to go there and cast their lot with those already there if Alaska remained a Territory. They would want the full privileges of citizens of the United States, including the right to vote and govern themselves.

Mr. SEATON. I think the conclusion of the Senator from Arizona is a very logical one, because that has been the experience when other Territories subsequently became States.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Does not the Senator feel that the question is whether there exists in Alaska the natural resources necessary to support the population, and which, if developed, would also support the government?

Mr. SEATON. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, and I wish to say again that I am happy he has made such a forceful address and reviewed the debates when in earlier days other Territories sought admission to the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SEATON. It is a pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to remark that I count myself fortunate to have had the opportunity of listening to the splendid address on statehood for Alaska which the junior Senator from Nebraska has just made. He has revealed a very broad knowledge of all the facts which surround the problem, and has presented them in a logical manner which, it seems to me, should convince any open mind that statehood should be granted.

I was particularly pleased to hear the Senator's reference to the fact that, in his opinion, statehood will be a stimulus to population, and that the argument that the people of Alaska should wait for statehood until they have increased their population is a false argument which falls of its own weight. The population of every State which has been admitted to the Union has increased after statehood.

Mr. SEATON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Population does not increase at a rapid rate before statehood. To say that a Territory must have sufficient population before it may attain statehood is to deny to the present inhabitants of a Territory, and to those who would like to go there if it were a State, the opportunity of attaining statehood.

If ever there was a time when the door should be opened to local development, to local industry, and to local mining, now is the time. The records which are before the Senate are clear that the vast mineral resources of Alaska can best be opened by granting statehood. We all know that the people and the industries of the United States need a much greater supply of minerals from United States Territory than is now available.

It has been correctly pointed out that in the first 50 years of this century the consumption of minerals in the United States, exclusive of petroleum, increased fourfold. When petroleum is included, the increase was fivefold.

Alaska is a Territory which is rich in undeveloped mineral resources. The granting of statehood, with the opening of the door of opportunity to people who desire to seek opportunity, will mean the unlocking of this vast storehouse of mineral wealth.

I am happy that the junior Senator from Nebraska has made the argument so clear.

Mr. SEATON. I join heartily in the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming as to the advantages to flow from granting statehood to Alaska. I should also like at this time to express my thanks, both to the majority leader and the Senator from Wyoming, for their gracious comments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Colorado has delivered one of the outstanding addresses in connection with the consideration of statehood for Alaska. It was an eloquent address. It was filled with facts. It was filled with that something which is responsible, I believe, for the growth of the American Union. It envisions the future. It was a pleasure for me to hear the Senator, and I know that his address will be quoted in years to come by those who treasure the history of the growth of this Union.

It was my privilege to visit Alaska in 1953, representing the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on

Armed Services. I spent a few very busy days in Alaska, seeing a great deal of the installations our Government has there. I met a great many persons. I saw something of the energy with which they are devoting themselves to the development of what is now a Territory and what we hope soon will be a State. I was impressed by the spirit of the people.

They have the spirit of the people who have advanced our frontiers in American history from the very outset. They are the kind of people who made Colorado. They are the kind of people who discovered gold in the Black Hills of South Dakota and who helped to open up a territory there. When I was in Fairbanks, I could imagine the town of Deadwood, S. Dak., almost half a century ago. When I was in Anchorage I felt I was in a community which had all the spirit and drive of a city such as Denver, Colo., or Sheridan, Wyo., or Billings, Mont. One feels a kinship and somehow feels the same kind of spirit when he goes into the Western States.

I was impressed by what I saw in the Kenai Peninsula, which I think some day will be an important agricultural area. When I was in Kodiak I was impressed by the climate and its possibilities. When I was in the Ketchikan area and in Juneau I found the same kind of spirit. Although I had been informed about the salubrious climate there, I was surprised to find such good year-around climate in places like Juneau and Ketchikan.

In addition to what one sees and feels there, I should like to say the resources of the Territory, which are yet untapped and which have not really been surveyed in great detail, offer, as has been so well expressed, a hope for the greater growth and development of the United States as a whole.

One cannot see the magnificent scenery of Alaska, one cannot see the glaciers, one cannot see the great mountain peaks, and one cannot see the vast forests without realizing there are resources in Alaska which certainly are not understood or realized by many persons in the States who have not had an opportunity to visit there.

So I congratulate the Senator from Colorado for taking the active part which he has taken in forwarding the bill, and I am glad I can add these few words in commendation of what he has done.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. Although the Senator from South Dakota could not be called a man of more than middle age, I am sure in his own youth he saw his own section of the country and his own State develop, as I have seen in my lifetime my own State develop. Those of us who have seen areas develop, and who have seen Territories like Alaska, cannot help but have their imaginations stimulated. The development of Alaska will probably surpass even the wildest imagination which we have had in regard to it up to this time. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. As a fellow member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to join with the Senator from South Dakota in expressing my gratitude to the Senator from Colorado for his learned and moving address on the subject of Alaskan statehood.

The Senator from Colorado struck a note in the closing paragraphs of his address which ought to be given much attention in our deliberations on this issue. He spoke of the pride in country that is involved as we consider extending the American Union to the Territory of Alaska.

In the 19th century, as our country spread from the narrow tier of States along the Atlantic shores, across the Alleghenies, and then westward across the prairies to the great mountains of the Rockies, and finally to the coasts of the Pacific, so that our Nation at last came to bridge a mighty continent, there was a feeling of manifest destiny in America, and there was a tremendous pride in the growth and expansion of our country.

I think the same feeling and the same pride is to be found in the extension of the boundaries of the Union to embrace Alaska as our 49th State.

There are those who object to the admission of Alaska as a State on the ground that we ought not to include within the Union any noncontiguous area. They tell us that ours is a finished country. I do not believe it.

We are told that ours is a completed Union. I do not believe it. So long as there are hundreds of thousands of American citizens in our two incorporated Territories, which, by all the historic and legal precedents qualify for statehood, our Union cannot be complete and our story has not been finished.

The step which we take in making the Territory of Alaska our 49th State is a step in the finest tradition of our Nation and involves not only a refusal to believe that this is a completed Union and a finished country but also an ingredient of the same pride—the same feeling of manifest destiny—which characterized the history of this country in the period of its most vigorous development and growth, the 19th century.

Let me once again commend the Senator from Colorado for his splendid address. I thank the Senator for the contribution he has made to this historic debate.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. The Senator from Idaho expresses more eloquently than I can the idea I was trying to convey about the completeness of our Union. Rather than feeling averse or resentful, it seems to me we would acquire not simply a few hundred thousand acres of land, but actually greater strength, greater unity, greater patriotism, and greater everything, by giving the people of Alaska what we have really promised them during all the years.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I concur in the favorable comments made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho about the able address delivered by the Senator from Colorado on behalf of Alaskan statehood. I think all of us who come from the Western States have a particular stake in the issue. It seems to me virtually every argument voiced against statehood for Alaska could have been voiced—and perhaps indeed was voiced—against statehood for such present States as Colorado, Idaho, and Oregon. Certainly, those States, when admitted to the Union, were not wholly contiguous to the area which was made up of fully qualified States. Certainly we were lacking somewhat at that time in a fully developed and fully integrated culture and civilization. Indeed, a long journey from the more settled and more established portions of the United States was necessary by comparatively primitive methods of travel to reach Colorado, Idaho, or Oregon at the time of their statehood.

There is one further argument for statehood which I have not heard, but, of course, it may have been uttered during the course of the debate when I was not present in the Chamber. I think to some degree statehood for Alaska might strengthen our ties with our closest neighbor and most intimate ally, Canada. As Canada is not only the country with the longest unfortified frontier in the world, but a country which, through British Columbia, separates one integral part of the United States from another, the admission of Alaska as a State might add, if that is possible, to the intimacy of our ties with the great Dominion to the north.

I can see very few arguments against statehood, and many arguments for statehood. I want to again express my compliments to the Senator from Colorado for the very able and effective manner in which he has contributed to this thoroughly meritorious cause in the Senate today.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I agree with the Senator wholeheartedly. While that question has not been discussed, every element lies on the side that statehood for Alaska will strengthen our ties and friendship with Canada rather than anything to the contrary.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Will the Senator from Idaho yield so that the Chair may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests the absence of a quorum, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have previously set forth on this floor, at considerable length, my views on Alaskan statehood. I do not wish to take unnecessary time to engage in useless repetition of those views today. Convincing presentations have already been made

here by fellow members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, relating to the fiscal capacity of Alaska to support statehood, and detailed explanations have been given of the land grants to be made to the State of Alaska under the provisions of the pending bill.

I should like to address myself—and confine my remarks entirely—to the question of our legal responsibility to grant statehood to the people of Alaska. That responsibility finds its origin in the very terms of the treaty through which the United States acquired Alaska nearly a century ago. In that treaty, our Government solemnly pledged that the inhabitants of the Territory—

shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty.

There is no question, Mr. President, as to the meaning of that provision in the treaty of acquisition.

There is no other way to interpret this language except in the context of our whole national tradition. From the beginning, lands acquired by the United States and subsequently established as incorporated Territories have always been destined for statehood. Alaska has been an incorporated Territory for nearly 90 years. It has served the longest apprenticeship for statehood in our history. This is the legal basis of our obligation to grant statehood to Alaska.

The framers of our Constitution gave to us the power to admit new States into the Union. The Congress, beginning even before the ratification of the Constitution, provided the legislative cornerstone for the admission of new States, by providing for incorporation of the Northwest Territory as Territories in the Federal Union.

The Supreme Court has long recognized that an incorporated Territory is an inchoate State the ultimate destiny of which is statehood, and in the case of *Rassmussen* v. *U. S.* (197 U. S. 516 (1905)), recognized that Alaska had long been an incorporated Territory.

Those who warn against Alaskan statehood by asserting that it will pave the way for the admission to statehood of Guam, American Samoa, Midway, the Virgin Islands, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, forget that these possessions are not incorporated Territories, and thus lack legal status for statehood. In no sense would Alaskan statehood open the floodgates. It is one of the two remaining incorporated Territories that qualify, by legal precedent, for statehood in the American Union.

The Constitution of the United States itself does not specify what conditions must be met before an incorporated Territory should be admitted to statehood. Article IV, section 3, states simply:

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

The precedents make clear, however, that once an area has been incorporated, the only question which remains for determination is when it is to be advanced from the provisional status of a Territory to the permanent status of a State. The question whether it is to be admitted into the Union as a State is settled upon incorporation. In Alaska's case, it was settled many years ago.

To determine when an incorporated Territory should be admitted to statehood, Congress has, by precedent and practice, applied three historic tests. These tests have been, first, that the inhabitants of the proposed new State are imbued with, and are sympathetic toward, the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government; second, that a majority of the electorate desire statehood; and, third, that the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

It can hardly be doubted that the people of Alaska have satisfied the first of these requirements. Alaskan institutions, homes, schools, laws, and people are as typically American as in any State of the Union. The patriotism of Alaskans and their loyalty to their country have been indelibly written in the blood of battle by Alaskans who wore our uniform and fought in our ranks through two World Wars. Alaska was the only part of the American continent invaded by the Japanese; and wartime conditions in Alaska were more exacting and severe than on the mainland of the United States. Yet, at all times during World War II, the support given to the Armed Forces of this country by the populace of Alaska, together with their stability and unflagging morale, were ever beyond reproach. As to the first historic test for statehood, there can be no question that Alaska qualifies.

What of the second test? Do the majority of the Alaskan people desire statehood? In 1946, 12 years ago, a general referendum was held in Alaska on the question. It resulted in a 3-to-2 majority in favor of statehood. A decade later, in 1956, the people of Alaska again passed upon the issue of statehood by ratifying a proposed constitution for the new State, this time by a majority of more than 2 to 1. Only last year, the members of the Territorial legislature, the elected representatives of the Alaskan people, passed unanimously a joint resolution calling for statehood by March 30, 1957.

In order that it may be perfectly clear, on the evidence, that Alaska fully meets the requirements of the second historic test for statehood, I ask that the official tabulations in the referendums to which I have referred, together with the text of the joint resolution, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulations and joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKANS VOTE FOR STATEHOOD

1. Referendum on statehood, general election, October 1946:

For statehood	9,634
Against statehood	6,822

2. Ratification of the State constitution, primary election, April 1956:

For ratification	17,073
Against ratification	8,060

3. Vote on the Tennessee plan, primary election, April 1956:

For the plan	14,957
Against the plan	9,427

4. Joint memorial passed unanimously by the Senate and House of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, January 1957:

"ALASKA SESSION LAWS, 1957—HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 1

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States House of Representatives; the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 23d session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas statehood in the American Union on a basis of full equality has long been an aspiration of the people of Alaska, believing in government of, by, and for the people; and

"Whereas the people of Alaska have, for a long time past, demonstrated their ability and fitness to assume the full rights, obligations, and duties of citizens of the United States, and now desire to form themselves into a State, as the people of all other Territories have done before them; and

"Whereas the people of the United States, committees of the Congress of the United States, and the national platforms of both our major political parties have called for the early admission of Alaska to statehood; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has now written and adopted a constitution for the proposed State of Alaska, by overwhelming majority, and has elected a Representative and Senators to the Congress of the United States, as provided by the constitution: Now, therefore,

"Your memoralist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States, at its present session, adopt legislation admitting Alaska as a State of the Union and seating its duly elected representatives.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Mr. CHURCH. As to the third and last of the historic tests for granting statehood, that is, sufficient population and resources to support State government plus its share of the cost of the Federal Govrenment, we have already heard the evidence well and cogently presented on this floor. I shall not repeat that evidence here. It overwhelmingly demonstrates that Alaska possesses both the population and the economic vitality to support statehood.

Mr. President, Alaska clearly meets the traditional tests the Congress has applied, over the long span of our history, in admitting 35 States into the American Union. By the force of the original treaty of purchase, by the statutes and practices that have given Alaska the status of an incorporated Territory, by the precedents established and tests applied in admitting all former States into our Union, Alaska qualifies. Alaska is entitled to statehood. The bill is before us. Our duty is clear.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the issue of Alaskan statehood is a complex one. It is a highly important one. It involves questions of national defense, conservation of resources, rights and duties of States, and the setting of a precedent for admission of additional noncontiguous territories to statehood in the Union.

I hope that we all will bear in mind, in considering this momentous question, the element of finality involved. Statehood once granted is irrevocable. The time to consider all aspects of the question is now, for once the statehood bill becomes law, it will be too late for this body to reconsider its action and to correct the situation by repealing its previously enacted bill, as it can do in most other cases. In view of this finality which stares us in the face, I feel that we should all take a long and careful look before setting forth down this road of no return.

We have already heard and read a great deal of background information on the subject of Alaska. We have heard eloquent and glowing descriptions of the physical grandeur of the land. We have heard much of the character of the inhabitants, both the native Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts and the newcomers who now make up a great majority of the population. We have heard detailed reports of the economic situation in Alaska. We have been given an abundance of statistics and figures of every sort. In short, we have been provided more than generously with background information, piled high, pressed down, still running over.

However, according to the Senate's sentiment as indicated in the press, this information has not been properly digested by the Members of this august body. I shall, therefore, review some of these facts and figures during the course of my address.

Mr. President, I reaffirm my opposition to the admission of Alaska to statehood. I shall state the reasons for my position. I shall urge my fellow Senators to join with me in opposing the pending bill, so fraught with danger to the future well-being of the United States of America.

First, I shall state, and then answer, the principal arguments—of which there appear to be seven—which have been advanced by the proponents of statehood.

Next, I shall deal—at some length, if I may—with the principal reasons why I feel that the admission of Alaska would be unwise.

Finally, I shall show why the admission of Alaska is unnecessary.

The advocates of statehood argue that the Alaskan economy is suffering and that this suffering is due to the disadvantages of Territorial rule. They claim that statehood is necessary to bring economic progress to Alaska, even though, at the same time, they proclaim that Alaska is making great economic progress.

It is of course quite true that Alaska has made considerable economic progress, under Territorial rule, it should be noted. The Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska's Delegate in the House of Representatives and leading advocate of statehood, inserted in the March 3, 1958, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the magazine Business Week describing the prospect of an economic boom.

Despite the great progress which has been made, it remains true that the Alaskan economy is in unsound condition. But what is it, specifically, that is wrong with it? It is this: Alaska suffers from high taxes and a high-price economy. And this is a situation which would be aggravated, rather than ameliorated, if Alaska were to be admitted to statehood. The people of Alaska, already overtaxed and burdened with an extremely high cost of living, simply cannot afford to pay the high cost of running an efficient State government.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the Anchorage Daily News of June 10, 1958. This newspaper is filled with thousands of names of persons listed as defendants in a suit to collect delinquent taxes. These defendants are all in one school district. These thousands of people are unable to pay the taxes which are now levied by the school district under Territorial rule. I ask, Mr. President, How many more names would appear in this newspaper if the high taxes which would surely accompany statehood were imposed?

Responsible opinion in Alaska is aware of the economic facts of life in Alaska. A highly respected newspaper in the capital city of Juneau recently declared in an editorial:

> Alaska needs a 10-year moratorium on the statehood issue, which is a political football, and is being forced by intimidation on the property owners of Alaska. During this moratorium we can put our house in order to develop industry so that we can afford statehood at the end of 10 years.

Mr. President, I have read only a small portion of this editorial. It is such a good editorial, however, that I should like to read its entire contents as it was published in the Daily Alaska Empire, of Juneau, Alaska, on a recent date. It was reprinted in the Washington Daily News of March 12, 1958. The text of the editorial follows:

> Alaska's Delegate ROBERT (BOB) BARTLETT, has put his finger on the statehood problem in the only realistic way that it can be solved for the benefit of the 48 States and the Territory of Alaska.
>
> Delegate BARTLETT announced February 2 of this year that he has a bill pending in Congress to remove the 25-percent ceiling on the cost-of-living bonus given Federal employees in Alaska and allowing this 25-percent tax benefit to be placed at a realistic figure of about 50 percent or more.
>
> Statehood in Alaska is the most misunderstood fact facing the House of Representatives and Senate, because it is loaded with political emphasis and is sponsored by voters in Alaska, 90 percent of whom never remain in Alaska longer than 36 months.
>
> Congressman Dr. MILLER, of Nebraska, conducted a survey and found that the overwhelming majority of the people of Alaska only want statehood after some realistic adjustment of taxes and are against statehood at this time. And yet Congressman MILLER stated before his survey that he would be for statehood regardless of what his sample balloting reflected.
>
> The Alaska Daily Empire is the oldest daily newspaper in Alaska, and it has been owned by three separate families, including the present owners, who have had interests and members of their families in Alaska more than 60 years.
>
> Considering statehood, this is what the Federal internal revenue department announced last fall: "The tax collections in Alaska have dropped from a high of $43,566,000 down to $36,431,000, which indicates that Alaska's economy has only approximately 20 percent of the strength of the Hawaiian economy.
>
> In other words, Hawaii pays in Federal income taxes five times as much as Alaska ever paid, and Hawaii's is increasing, and Alaska's economy is decreasing.
>
> To further reflect the soundness of Alaska's economy, 65 percent of all income in Alaska is paid to Army personnel and Federal Government employees, and because the Army spending in Alaska is on the decline, Alaska's economy is on the decline.
>
> To further reflect the truth about Alaska, we combined some figures for Mr. Seaton and for Congressman MILLER, of Nebraska, and this showed that Lincoln, Nebr., had a far greater amount of money in savings accounts than the total of Alaska, and yet the population of Alaska was approximately twice the population of Lincoln, Nebr.
>
> Alaskans are the highest-taxed group under the American flag, with sales tax, and Territorial income tax, and a cost of living that runs 50 percent to 100 percent higher than the balance of the United States.
>
> Alaska needs a 10-year moratorium on the statehood issue, which is a political football, and is being forced by intimidation on the property owners of Alaska. During this moratorium we can put our house in order to develop industry so that we can afford statehood at the end of 10 years.
>
> And we need to have Delegate BARTLETT'S realistic tax concession granted to Federal employees and extended to all taxpayers in Alaska for 10 years so industry can be established and we in Alaska can pay into the Treasury of the United States rather than being a liability, which is now the case. We believe industry will bring us revenue and growth plus statehood.
>
> Now here's some sober thinking for the Congressmen and Senators who have the interests of the United States in the uppermost part of their minds: To grant statehood to Alaska at this time, we would find that the leftist extreme element in Alaska and Hawaii would undoubtedly run a race in case of war to see which area would voluntarily join the Communist bloc first; and, being next door to Russia, Alaska might go first.
>
> These Congressmen and Senators should heed the statement of Dr. Allan M. Bateman, professor of geology of Yale University, who said on February 23 of this year: "There are 32 critical minerals necessary for successful war or peace or industry." Now what he did not say was that Alaska is the great reservoir under the American flag for these 32 necessary minerals and statehood at this time would delay the development of these minerals for at least 25 years.
>
> Dr. Bateman stated that Russia alone has more of these necessary 32 minerals and is less dependent than any country in the world. The British Commonwealth has a surplus of 25 of these minerals, with a deficiency of only 7 of these minerals.
>
> He further stated that the United States is third from the top and is in a serious position.

Alaska has more of these necessary minerals. Therefore, statehood taxes and the welfare of our Nation should be considered in one package—which is the true way to develop Alaska. Bring about statehood and at least a 10-year moratorium by having Congress wash its hands of this situation which is festered throughout with leftist intimidation and is lacking in integrity and good for the 48 States plus the Territories.

Our continued request to be heard has been jockeyed and moved around. Anyone who speaks realistically about the development of Alaska for the benefit of all of the United States meets the propaganda of the emotionists and the leftists and those who put political gain first and our Nation second.

Mr. President, that was the editorial to which I referred. I thought it would be of interest to the Senate to know exactly what that Alaska newspaper published. The editorial was published in the Daily Alaska Empire, of Juneau, Alaska; and, as I have said, the editorial was reprinted in the Washington Daily News of March 12, 1958.

Mr. President, it is asserted by the advocates of statehood that Alaska has a sufficiently large population to warrant statehood. It is estimated that the civilian population increased from 108,000 to 161,000 from 1950 to 1956, while the military population was estimated at between 45,000 and 50,000. Statehood advocates point out that 18 Territories were admitted to statehood when their respective populations were less than 150,000.

What they do not say, however, is that the situation existing in the United States today is not what it was when earlier States were admitted. The total population has grown to such an extent that 150,000 is now a much smaller proportion of the whole United States population. Although much of this great increase in popualtion has occurred in the last 4 decades, as far back as 1912, when New Mexico and Arizona were admitted, they attained populations of 338,470 and 216,639, respectively, before being granted statehood.

In considering the size of the Alaskan population, it should also be borne in mind that the situation there is atypical, in that 65 percent of the workers are employed by the Federal Government. Furthermore, because of the huge size of Alaska, the population per square mile is very much smaller than that in even our most sparsely-settled States. The population density of Alaska is less than one-third of that of Nevada, the least densely populated of our States.

Mr. President, time and time again I have heard the proponents of this proposed legislation argue that statehood for Alaska will mean immediate and immeasurable growth in the population of the new State. They say that Territorial status is prohibitive of growth and that statehood means an immediate boom in population.

I do not think those claims are borne out by the experience of the States that have entered the Union. I think it would be highly illustrative to examine these States and disclose for the record whether or not statehood meant an immediate boom in population.

Arkansas was admitted in 1836, and increased in population 112.9 percent in the decade before admission; 221.1 percent in the decade in which she was admitted; and only 115.1 percent in the decade after.

Colorado was admitted in 1876, and in that decade increased in population 387.5 percent. How much was acquired before admission and how much afterwards is a matter of speculation. The growth in the next decade dropped to 112.1 percent.

The Dakotas were admitted in 1889. From 1860 to 1870 the Territory of Dakota increased in population 193.2 percent; from 1870 to 1880, 853.2 percent; from 1880 to 1890, 278.4 percent; and in the decade succeeding admission the combined percentage of increase of the 2 States fell to 87.7 percent.

Florida was admitted in 1845. In the decade before she increased in population 56.9 percent; in the decade in which she was admitted, 60.5 percent; and in the succeeding decade, 60.6 percent.

Idaho was admitted in 1890. In the decade from 1870 to 1880, she increased 117.4 percent; from 1880 to 1890, 158.8 percent; and from 1890 to 1900 decreased to 88.6 percent.

Illinois was admitted in 1818. In that decade she increased 349.5 percent; in the next decade, 185.2 percent; and in the succeeding decade, 202.4 percent.

Indiana was admitted in 1816, in which decade she increased 500.2 percent, as compared to 334.7 percent in the preceding decade, and then fell back to 133.1 percent in the succeeding decade.

Iowa was admitted in 1846, and increased in that decade 345.8 percent, as compared to 251.1 percent for the next decade.

Louisiana was admitted in 1812, and increased in that decade 100.4 percent, and only 40.6 percent for the next decade.

Maine was admitted in 1820. Her population increased, from 1800 to 1810, 50.7 percent; from 1810 to 1820, 30.4 percent; and 1820 to 1830, 33.9 percent.

Michigan was admitted in 1837. In that decade she increased 570.9 percent; as compared to 155.7 percent the preceding decade, and only 87.3 percent the decade after her admission.

Minnesota was admitted in 1858. Her increase in that decade reached the marvelous figure of 2,730.7 percent, which dropped down the next decade to 155.6 percent.

Missouri was admitted in 1821. From 1810 to 1820 she increased 219.4 percent; from 1820 to 1830, 110.9 percent; from 1830 to 1840, the highest figure reached in her history as a State, 173.2 percent.

Montana was admitted in 1889. From 1880 to 1890 she increased 237.5 percent, and from 1890 to 1900 only 75.2 percent.

Nebraska was admitted in 1867. In that decade she increased 626.5 percent; the next decade 267.8 percent; and from 1880 to 1890, 134.1 percent.

Oklahoma increased from 1890 to 1900, 518.2 percent, a figure even she, with all her marvelous possibilities, will likely never again equal, regardless of admission to statehood.

Oregon was admitted in 1859. In that decade she increased 294.7 percent, and in the next decade 73.3 percent, and from 1870 to 1880 only 92.2 percent.

Utah was admitted in 1896. Her population increased from 1850, when she was organized as a Territory, to 1860, 253.9 percent; from 1860 to 1870, 115.5 percent; from 1870 to 1880, 65.9 percent; from 1880 to 1890, 44.4 percent; from 1890 to 1900, 32.2 percent, a constantly decreasing ratio.

Washington was admitted in 1889. From 1860 to 1870 she increased 106.6 percent from 1870 to 1880, 213.6 percent; from 1880 to 1890, 365.1 percent; and in the decade after her admission only 46.3 percent.

Wisconsin was admitted in 1848. From 1840 to 1850 she increased 886.9 percent, and in the next decade 154.1, which dropped in the succeeding decade, 1860 to 1870, to 85.9.

Wyoming was admitted in 1890. In 1870 to 1880 she increased 128 percent; from 1880 to 1890, 192 percent; and in the last decade only 49.2 percent.

Arkansas remained an organized Territory 17 years; Colorado, 14 years; Iowa, Kansas, and Louisiana, about 7 years; Minnesota, 8 years; Missouri, nearly 9; Montana, about 25; Nebraska, 13; the Dakotas, 28; Wyoming, 22; Nevada, 3; Utah, 44; Idaho, 27; Oregon, 11; and Washington, 36.

The unavoidable conclusion is that statehood has little to do with growth. In nearly every instance the percentage of growth dropped off very materially after a Territory became a State. Where the natural advantages induce people to settle, there they will flock, regardless of the form of government or the lack of government. Where the people go, railroads and other industrial developments follow.

As their third argument, the proponents of statehood claim that the United States has a legal and moral obligation to admit Alaska to the Union. This argument is based, in part, on the treaty between Russia and the United States by which Alaska was ceded. Article III of this treaty states as follows:

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, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may, from time to time adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country.

To claim that this treaty obligates the United States to admit the Territory of Alaska is a far-fetched and specious argument. The treaty of cession obviously refers to the individual rights of the inhabitants, not to the right of statehood, since statehood could be conferred only through established procedures set forth in the Constitution, and could not be conferred by treaty.

It is further claimed that the Supreme Court has settled the right of the Territories to ultimate statehood. This

claim is presented as follows in the Senate Report:

Forty-five years ago the Alaska Organic Act was approved and Alaska became the incorporated Territory of Alaska as we know it today. All Territories that were ever incorporated have been admitted to statehood except Alaska and Hawaii, and only three Territories remained in incorporated status for longer than 45 years before admission. The Supreme Court of the United States has stated that an incorporated territory is an inchoate State, and has uniformly considered that the incorporated status is an apprenticeship for statehood.

The Supreme Court, it is true, has attempted to state, or to imply, that there is an obligation to admit incorporated Territories to statehood. As we have all been made painfully aware, however, the Court is not infallible. In attempting to make this determination of policy it was once again usurping the power of the legislative branch. This was an early example of what was later to become, in our own day, a confirmed habit on the part of the Court—that of legislating for the Congress.

In making their fourth point, the proponents of statehood have tried to advance their cause by loudly stating and restating the axiom that local problems can best be solved by local self-government. I certainly support that principle and am a firm believer in local self-government; but I must point out that statehood is not the only kind of local self-government which is possible.

The Alaska Organic Act of 1912 could be amended to give the Territory as much local self-government as is consistent with the welfare of the Territory and of the United States as a whole. But in pressing so single mindedly for admission into the Union, statehood advocates in Alaska have been delinquent in seeking changes in the Organic Act which would provide more practical relief from their difficulties. This inescapably leads one to suspect that local self-government is not really a genuine issue there, but is only being used as a smokescreen. If it were local self-government which is primarily desired, it could easily be provided without a grant of statehood. In fact, especially when one considers how little self-government is being left to the States in the face of ever-increasing Federal encroachment, a nonstatehood solution to Alaska's dilemma could provide that Territory with a far greater degree of self-rule than the people there could obtain through statehood.

The point is, of course, that it is not really local self-government which the statehood advocates are after. What they seek is the very large and disproportionate degree of political power in national affairs which they would wield if Alaska were admitted as a State; for, although Alaska could actually obtain much more self-rule by choosing a nonstatehood status, it is statehood alone which would provide Alaska with two Senators and a voting Representative in Congress.

A fifth argument advanced by statehood advocates is that Alaskan statehood would be helpful to our national defense by providing better machinery for getting local militia into action in case of invasion.

To this argument I shall only say that those who rely on it will be deceived by a false sense of security. The area of Alaska is so great and its civilian population so sparse that there seems little likelihood that local militia would be able to deal effectively with an enemy invasion of any substantial size. In fact, regarding the areas of Alaska most crucial to national security—the north, the west, and the Aleutian Islands—the administration asks for a proviso in the bill giving it permission to withdraw this land from State domain for national security purposes.

According to Gen. Nathan Twining: "From the military point of view, the overall strategic concept for the defense of Alaska would remain unaffected by a grant of statehood."

In argument No. 6, it is claimed that the admission of Alaska would be a saving to the United States, in that many costs now borne by the Federal Government would fall on the new State government.

This argument simply will not hold melted snow. The Alaskan economy could not support an efficient State government. It has been estimated that the cost of State government in Alaska might amount to as much as $217 per capita, which is more than the economy of the Territory could bear. The Federal Government, it would appear, would be obliged to give extraordinary aid to Alaska in order for the new State to remain solvent. I shall have more to say on this matter of Federal aid later in my remarks.

Mr. President, I have dwelt at some length upon a qualification for statehood which I strongly believe should be possessed by any State hoping to enter the Union, that qualification being that the new State has sufficient population, economic resources, and ability to sustain itself of governmental functions and, at the same time, carry its fair share of the burdens imposed upon it by the Union of States. I have stated before, that Alaska cannot meet that requirement. I do not feel that its population is sufficient, nor do I perceive that it has the economic and financial resources to carry its burden.

This requirement or test that has historically been demanded of the States that have entered the Union has been debated time and time again in this body. In the consideration of debate on the admission of Arizona, Oklahoma and New Mexico in 1906, Senator Morgan, of Alabama, laid down a principle which I think is equally applicable in the present instance. Senator Morgan said:

The admission of a State into the Union is intended for the benefit of all of the people of the United States rather than for the benefit of the inhabitants of an area or territory that is included in the limits of such a State.

I say those remarks are applicable here because we are concerned not only with the effect of statehood upon the people of Alaska but also its effect of statehood upon the present Union of 48 States. How can the admission of Alaska at this time prove beneficial to all the people of our Nation? The proponents state that Alaska is necessary as a State because it is vital to our national defense needs. I fail to see how it can add to our national defense any more as a State than it is presently benefiting us in its territorial status.

I ask, Mr. President, Will the admission of Alaska benefit the people of all of the United States? Will it benefit our Nation if, after we have granted statehood, it develops that the new State has neither the economic nor financial strength to carry on its state functions, but rather has to depend upon financial aid from the Union itself in meeting its financial obligations? This could very easily happen, in view of the past economic development and progress of that Territory. This would mean that this new State, rather than conferring a benefit upon the people of the 48 States, imposes a burden on our Nation by forcing it to assume the obligation of carrying that State rather than looking to that State to carry itself.

Since 1791, 35 States have been approved by the Congress as meeting the necessary requirements for admission into the Union of States. While no form of procedure for the organization of a new State is prescribed by the Constitution, and Congress has not by statutory enactment prescribed a mode of procedure by which new territories shall become a part of the Federal Union, each State has been admitted after full debate and after the determination has been made that these States have met various necessary requirements. The growth and development of the United States has been such, since the time of the adoption of the Constitution, that no hard and fast rule has been evolved to declare with particularity what the necessary elements of statehood shall be. Within this framework the Congress has determined the admission of these States on the broad principle of—Shall the new State's admission benefit the entire Union? Within this pattern that has evolved since the formation of the Union, Congress has taken a long and hard look at each new State in order to insure that the new States shall contribute to a more perfect Union. Time and experience has proved that the Congress has acted wisely.

Congress has been extremely careful in insuring that each new State measure up to its sister States in all respects before granting the privilege of statehood. The reason why Congress debates this so carefully and screens the applicants so thoroughly is obvious. Legislation enacted by the Congress admitting a new State is not of a temporary character. Legislation enacted into law by this Congress admitting a State fixes the status of that State for all time. It clothes that new State with all of the rights and privileges, authority and immunity that is now possessed by each one of the 48 States of the Union. Because of the permanent character of this legislation it is of the greatest importance that Congress, in each instance, give carefull consideration not only to the interests of the people who are

seeking statehood, but also as to the possible effect that favorable action on a proposal such as this will effect all of the States that now form our Federal Union.

Therefore, viewing the relative position of the Territory of Alaska today, and its possible effect upon the States of our Union and its citizens, I feel that Alaska would be more of a burden than a benefit to our people.

As their crowning argument, advocates of statehood claim that the admission of Alaska to statehood would prove to other nations of the world that we believe in territories becoming self-governing, according to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

This is an irrelevant argument. In the first place, as I have already mentioned, and as I shall explain in some detail a little later, statehood is not the only form of self-government open to Alaska. The same purpose would be served by permitting the Territory of Alaska a greater degree of self-government, either under Territorial law, or by the establishment of a Commonwealth type of government there. But in any event, we should not take a step that is unwise and unsound merely to please or impress foreign nations. Surely we should have learned that by now. Four years ago our Supreme Court rendered a decision dealing with a domestic issue largely on the basis of foreign propaganda considerations. The result has been turmoil and strife at home, which in turn has led to increased disrespect and enmity abroad.

The Alaska problem is not a colonial problem. The majority of the inhabitants are of American stock, most of them born in the States, or children of parents born in the States. The problem of Alaska is, therefore, strictly an internal United States problem. No nation which decides its internal affairs on a basis of what would be the most pleasing to the masses of Asia will keep the respect of any other nation in the world—not even of the masses of Asia.

Having now reviewed briefly the principal arguments advanced in favor of statehood for Alaska, I should like at this time to discuss what I feel are the main reasons why Alaska should not be admitted to statehood in this Union.

The first reason is this: By conferring statehood on a territory so thinly populated and so economically unstable as Alaska, we, in effect, cheapen the priceless heritage of sovereign statehood. If Federal aid in extraordinary doses is necessary to keep Alaska solvent—and it would be needed, make no mistake about that—it will be used as an excuse for increased Federal aid to all the States, with accompanying usurpation of State powers by the Federal Government.

I realize full well that there are some Members of this body who do not concern themselves with the preservation of the rights of the States. To them the States are little more than convenient electoral districts within an all-powerful monolithic national structure. They are far more interested in the attainment of an all-powerful central government and certain socio-political objectives in relation to which the doctrine of States' rights often appears to them to be an annoying obstacle.

I do not believe, however, that this is true of most of the Members of this body. I do not believe that the majority of Senators are ready to throw down and cast aside completely, once and for all, one of the two main principles which the Founding Fathers established to protect the individual liberties of the people. I believe that more and more people, including Members of this Congress, are coming to realize that the principle of separation of powers, alone, is not enough to insure our individual liberty; that the principle of separation of powers cannot, in fact, stand by itself, but must be supported by the complementary pillar of States rights, in the manner that the Founders intended and prescribed. I believe that the people are at last beginning to see that, if their liberties are to be preserved, the trend toward ever greater centralization of power in the Federal Government must somehow be halted. I believe that this growing awareness of the necessity for action is shared by an increasing number of the Members of this body.

I, therefore, urge my fellow Senators, Mr. President, those at least who are aware of the dangers of centralization and who are interested in stopping the flow of powers to Washington, not to support a step which would very shortly lead to greatly stepped-up Federal encroachment on what remaining powers the States have. This would definitely be a result of granting statehood to a territory economically unable to support an efficient State government. Vast amounts of Federal financial aid would be needed to enable the new State to maintain services which the Federal Government maintains directly now, and this would be seized upon as an excuse for further Federal financial involvement in similar programs maintained in the other States, even where Federal aid was not needed. That acceptance by a State of Federal financial assistance leads sooner or later to Federal usurpation of State power is a truism which I consider unnecessary to explain.

My first reason, then, for opposing the admission of Alaska to statehood is that it would further weaken, to a very great extent, the already-weakened position of the States in our Federal system.

My second main reason for opposing Alaskan statehood is that I believe that in admitting a noncontiguous territory to statehood we would be setting a very dangerous precedent. Statehood advocates have tried to brush off this objection as arbitrary, whimsical, silly, and merely technical. But the admission of Alaska will serve as precedent for the admission of Hawaii, which will in turn be cited as precedent for the admission of other, even more dissimilar, areas.

No, Mr. President, our objection to noncontiguity is not based on any mere arbitrary whim. There is no mere sentimentality at stake—we are not urging that the United States keep its present geographical form simply because it looks pretty on the map that way. The entire concept and nature of the United States is at stake, and therefore the future of the United States also.

Three years ago in an article published in Collier's magazine, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] expressed in a very clear fashion the importance of maintaining our concept of contiguity. I should like to quote him at some length:

> Unless the proposal is blocked or altered we will be on the highroad—or high seas—moving no one knows how swiftly toward changing the United States of America into the Associated States of the Western Hemisphere, or even the Associated States of the World. We will be leaving our concept of a closely knit Union, every State contiguous to others, bonded by common heritages, common ideals, common standards of democracy, law, and customs.
>
> There is physical strength and symbolism in our land mass that stretches without break or enclave across the heart of North America. If we depart from the long-established rectangular land union that represents the United States on all maps of the world and bring in distant States, unavoidably they will be separated from existing States by the territory of other sovereign nations, or by international waters. It would be physically impossible to extend to them such neighborhood associations as now exist among our 48 states.
>
> But far more than the physical shape of our country would be changed if we embark on this policy of offshore states. Senators and Representatives from them would stand for the needs and objectives and methods of the areas from which they come. Inevitably there would be serious conflicts of interest, and a few offshore Members of Congress could, and someday probably would, block something of real concern to a majority of the present States. Island economies are, by their very nature, narrow and insular.
>
> The debates in Congress indicate to me that many Members have not thought the issue through to its ultimate possibilities, but regard it as a matter of immediate political expediency of no great long-range importance one way or another. I think our two parties in their conventions have been much too casual about statehood.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] put his finger on the vital matter at stake when he mentioned the ultimate possibilities. As men charged with the responsibility for the future welfare of the United States, it is our responsibility to consider ultimate possibiilties. We cannot consider the admission of Alaska, or of Hawaii, in a vacuum, closing our minds to the future. We must weigh carefully any and all considerations which are likely, or even reasonably possible, to flow out of our present actions.

And it should be emphasized that in mentioning these ultimate possibilities, the Senator from Oklahoma was not bringing up any argumentum ad horrendum. He was not simply raising nightmarish specters which have no basis in fact. The possibilities to which he and I are referring as ultimate are not necessarily remote. In fact, once the principle of contiguity were broken by the admission of Alaska, they would no longer be possibilities but probabilities.

If Alaska is admitted to statehood into this Union, Hawaii will be admitted, regardless of the entrenched and often-demonstrated power which is wielded there by international communism. And if Alaska and Hawaii are admitted, is there anyone so naive as to think that the process will stop there? The precedent would have been set for the admission of offshore territories, territories

totally different in their social, cultural, political, and ethnic makeup from any part of the present area of the United States.

There is on Puerto Rico still a faction that would like to see statehood. The admission of other offshore territories will greatly strengthen their hand in that island's political scene. And if Puerto Rico demands statehood, on what excuse can we deny it, once we have broken our contiguity rule by admitting Alaska and Hawaii?

Nor could we discriminate against Guam. That would have to be another State. Then would come American Samoa, to be followed by the Marshall Islands and Okinawa.

Furthermore, I see no reason why the process should stop with American possessions and trust territories. Suppose some Southeast Asian nation beset by political and economic difficulties should apply for American statehood. Would we deny them? On what basis? The argument might be raised that unless we granted the tottering nation statehood and incorporated it into our Union it would fall to Communist political and economic penetration. Even without that dilemma as a factor, there would always be a considerable bloc in both Houses of Congress who would favor admitting the nation to statehood for fear that otherwise we might offend certain Asian political leaders or the Asian and African masses generally. Add to these the bloc of Senators and Representatives we would already have acquired from our new Pacific and Caribbean States, and the probabilities are that Cambodia, or Laos, or South Vietnam, or whatever the nation might be, would be admitted to American statehood.

I wish to make it clear that I bear no ill will toward the Cambodians, the Laotians, or the Vietnamese, just as I have no enmity toward the people of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. But I do not feel that Cambodia or the United States or the Free World, in general will benefit by the participation of two Cambodian Senators in the deliberations and voting of this body. I feel that such dilution of our legislative bodies would gravely weaken the United States and reduce its capability to defend the rest of the Free World, including Cambodia.

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] pointed out:

> The French have tried making offshore possessions with widely differing peoples and interests an integral part of the government of continental France. The plan has been less than satisfactory. It has played a part in the instability and the inconsistency of the French parliamentary system.

The late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, long the president of Columbia University and Republican candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States in 1912, devoted long and careful study to the question of distant, noncontiguous States. Here is the conclusion he reached:

> Under no circumstances should Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or any other outlying island or Territory be admitted as a State in our Federal Union. To do so, in my judgment, would mark the beginning of the end of the United States as we have known it and as it has become so familiar and so useful to the world. Our country now consists of a sound and compact area, bounded by Canada, by Mexico, and by the two oceans. To add outlying Territory hundreds or thousands of miles away with what certainly must be different interests from ours and very different background might easily mark, as I have said, the beginning of the end.

A country that is not American in its outlook, philosophy, character and makeup—and here I refer not to Alaska but to the ultimate possibilities which Alaskan statehood would make probabilities, and, in the case of Hawaii, a foregone conclusion—cannot be made American by proclamation or by Act of Congress. An Act of Congress may admit such a country to statehood in the American Union, but it cannot make it American, and, therefore, its admission would constitute a dilution of the basic character of the United States.

The development of the American character—the character and identity of the American people, of the American Nation, of American institutions and civilization—is the work of centuries. It did not come about overnight. Two centuries and one-half had already gone into that development, from the time when this country had its beginnings in Virginia, before Alaska was even acquired from Imperial Russia.

Mr. President, I know that there are some who will attempt to brush all this aside. They will make the point that, despite this early development, this country, during the past half-century, has received millions of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe and elsewhere. They will point out that these immigrants were of very different ethnic and national backgrounds from those of the earlier settlers; that they were accustomed to very different institutions, and sprang from very different cultures; but that these immigrants have nevertheless, become just as good Americans as the descendants of the earliest Virginians.

The point, however, is this: These were people who were emigrating from their native lands to America. That is a very different proposition from a proposal which would have American statehood emigrating from this country to embrace the shores whence these people came. The immigrants who came here in late decades settled among established Americans, amid established American institutions, surrounded by established American characteristics and ways of living, which they were bound to pick up and adopt as their own—thus, indeed, becoming Americans in fact as well as in technical citizenship. But the bestowal of American statehood on a foreign land will not make its inhabitants Americans in anything but name. If, for example, a native of Sicily were to settle among us, after several years he would pick up our language and customs, he would acquire a grasp of American institutions and culture; and he would adopt the ways of those about him. In short, while still retaining a sentimental attachment to his native land and some of his native characteristics, he would become an American.

It most certainly does not follow, however, that the granting of American statehood to Sicily would, or could, be a happy event either for the United States or for Sicily. The same is true in the case of, let us say, Greece. The mere fact that many citizens of Greek extraction or Greek birth make fine Americans is absolutely no basis whatsoever for assuming that Crete or the Peloponnesus or Macedonia or Thrace or all of Greece could be successfully incorporated into the American Union as a State—even if Greece and the Greeks desired that.

The argument that America has successfully absorbed people of several very diverse foreign stocks has no bearing, then, on the question of whether American statehood could be successfully extended to offshore areas and overseas lands inhabited by widely differing peoples. To bring the peoples to America and settle them among ourselves and make of them Americans is one thing; and even then it is not always easy, and often takes a long time—perhaps a generation or longer, depending on the degree of dissimilarity to the basic American stock. But to attempt to bring America to the peoples, by means of the official act of statehood, is quite another thing. Statehood may make them Americans in name, Americans by citizenship, Americans in a purely technical sense; but it cannot make them Americans in fact. Furthermore, to the extent of the voting representation in the Senate and the House to which they would be entitled under statehood, we would be delivering America into their hands—into the hands of non-Americans. We have too much of this today.

But, Mr. President, perhaps you are asking yourself why I am going into all of this discussion about foreign stocks and overseas peoples, when the subject before us is Alaska, and when I, myself, have already declared earlier in this address that the majority of the population of Alaska is composed of American stock, a great proportion having actually been born in the States.

I will tell you why, Mr. President. The reason is that I am opposed to Alaskan statehood, not so much as something in and of itself, but, rather, as a precedent—an ominous and dangerous precedent.

Should we oppose something otherwise good and beneficial, merely because of considerations of precedent? Some may well ask this question. Let me reply: First of all, I do not consider Alaskan statehood otherwise good or beneficial. On the contrary, I consider it harmful and unwise, for many reasons, as I have already pointed out. But even if I did consider it a good and beneficial step, unless the good to be derived were of such a tremendous magnitude as completely to outweigh all other considerations, I still most definitely would oppose this measure because of the overriding consideration of precedent, especially when I know full well that the precedent which would be established could well lead to the destruction of the United States of America and the collapse of the Free World.

Some say that our rule against admission to the Union of noncontiguous areas was long ago broken, anyway, and that we are a little late in being so concerned about precedent. They refer to the case of California, which was admitted to the Union in 1850. It is true that at the time of its admission California was not contiguous to other already-admitted States. The same may have been true in one or two other instances in our history. But always the territory in between, if not already possessed of State status, was commonly owned American territory, an integral part of our solid block of land.

Thus, we can see that our rule against admitting noncontiguous areas has been kept intact throughout our history as a country. The question before us today is whether to break that rule, thus establishing a precedent for the admission of offshore territories to statehood in the American Union.

Let no one be deceived into thinking that we can safely break the line by admitting Alaska, and then reestablish another line which will hold. I hope that no Senators feel that it is safe to admit Alaska, in the mistaken belief that even after doing so we can still draw forth a sacred and holy rule which is not to be broken: a rule against admitting any Territory not a part of the North American Continent. Such a rule will not hold for even a single session of Congress, because you know, Mr. President, and I know that, once Alaska becomes a State, the doors will be wide open for Hawaiian statehood. And with the admission of Hawaii, out goes any rule about North American Continent only. Then will come the deluge: Guam and Samoa, Puerto Rico, Okinawa, the Marshalls. The next logical step in the process would be that to which I have already alluded: the incorporation in the American Union of politically threatened or economically demoralized nations in Southeast Asia, the Caribbean, and Africa. This is a progressively cumulative process, each step being relatively easier than the preceding one, as the legislative vote of the overseas bloc grows steadily larger with each new admission. Indeed it is conceivable, when we consider the ultimate possibilities which may result from passage of this bill, that we who call ourselves Americans today may some day find ourselves a minority in our own Union, outvoted in our own legislature—just as the native people of Jordan have made themselves a minority in their own country by incorporating into Jordan a large section of the original Palestine, and thus acquiring a Palestinian-Arab population outnumbering their own.

I repeat: This is not a case of conjuring up a ridiculous extreme. This is a distinct possibility which must be considered by this body before we take the irrevocable step—irrevocable, Mr. President, irrevocable—of admitting Alaska to statehood in the American Union.

Mr. President, within the general framework of my opposition to this proposal, in view of the great distance which separates Alaska from the United States mainland, I wish to point out a factor which mitigates against the admission of a noncontiguous Territory.

In the early days of statehood, when the original 13 States banded together to form a more perfect Union, one of the compelling reasons why the 13 States banded together was the fact that they were so closely allied geographically, and united in a common bond of friendship due to the exchange of social ideas, culture, and knowledge. The distance between the then existing States was measured within a relatively few miles so that the people of the various States could get together and communicate with each other and visit back and forth because of their close proximity. Because of their geographical locations, the States were able to unite not only in their thinking and in their political and cultural ideas but also to unite in their common defense. From this geographical closeness there developed a cohesive action which could be used in defense or in promoting better understanding and knowledge among the peoples of the various States. As the boundaries of the growing Nation expanded and its frontiers were extended westward from the original 13 States, the knowledge and culture and communal spirit proceeded with the advancing of the frontiers. This advance into the Territories, and the subsequent admission of the Territories into statehood, differs far more from what we could expect today in relationship to the connection between our present continental limits and those of Alaska. There is between our extreme northern border and Alaska no frontier which can be conquered, as was done by our early settlers, because of the intervening territory of a foreign power which forms a natural barrier to any exchange of ingress and egress with the people of Alaska and the citizens residing within the continental limits of the United States.

In the past our country has grown from a small island of 13 original States into its present 48 States by the very nature of the geographical characteristics of this continent lying between two oceans. It was only natural for the settlers to push to the frontiers beyond as the population increased State by State, and that influx from an established State to a new Territory was able to continue until stopped only by the barrier of the Pacific Ocean.

I submit, Mr. President, that viewed in the light of the way our States developed, this idea now of trying to bring Alaska into our Union of States flies in the face of historical development of our civilization and culture.

Mr. President, is it not obvious that we are on the horns of a dilemma? Heretofore the question of statehood has been basically simple. Heretofore the areas which have been involved in statehood measures lay south of the Canadian border; north of Mexico and the Gulf of Mexico; bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean and on the west by the Pacific Ocean. Within those limits, Mr. President, lay all of the area comprising admission to statehood of the now 48 States of the Union. Never before in our history have we come up against the problem of admitting into the Union a Territory or an area so far removed from direct contact with the United States as now constituted, or any one of those States. Always before, the Territory or area to be admitted has either been next to a State of the Union, or at least a United States Territory. Here we have the situation of considering for statehood a Territory which is neither next to a State of the United States nor adjacent to a Territory of the United States but, in fact, is bounded on two sides by foreign nations. Indeed, Mr. President, this is a precedent. This is a case of first impression never before known in the prior history of the United States.

Mr. President, let me digress for a moment to assure my friends in Alaska, and my friends in the Senate, who are in favor of statehood for Alaska that I hold the people of Alaska in the highest esteem. It is not my purpose to in any way detract from their ambition or their loyalty or their desires to become a portion of the United States in its ultimate sense. When I say "ultimate sense" I mean a full-fledged State, equal in all respects to any other State of the Union. As a matter of fact, I admire the people of Alaska who desire statehood for that ambition. So, I wish to make it clear that the remarks I make in this connection are not critical of any person or any community of Alaska. My remarks are not critical of the land and waters emcompassed within the Territory of Alaska. In fact, I am proud of them. My remarks are directed solely to the advisability of admitting this vast Territory to the sisterhood of States.

To return to the situation I was describing above, it would seem to me that favorable action to admit the Territory of Alaska to statehood would create the foundation for the admission of all other Territories and Possessions. To take this step is to write into law processes that form the foundation for perhaps many other like proposals in the future. Let us know that this is not just the 49th State to be admitted to the Union under the same conditions as the other 35 States which have been admitted, but, Mr. President, it is a great deal more than that. It is a reaching out many miles from our continental borders and shores to bring into this Nation as a State a vast territory—a territory at least twice as large as the State of Texas—and bringing it into statehood even though it is many miles away.

At different points in this address I hope to touch upon other subjects which I deem of importance to this matter. I refer to the situation in regard to the common defense. That I shall touch upon, as I have stated, later. I shall also touch upon the subject of a more perfect Union, as those terms are set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution, but now I am confining myself solely to the question of contiguity, and in this instance it is a great deal more than contiguity. The area sought to be brought within the Union does not even approach contiguity. It lies far off and away from the United States as we know it.

When we consider, Mr. President, the annexation of such an immense area, lying so far away, we must pay heed and attention to what possibly could be the result. Let us keep in mind that once this Territory has been admitted to statehood, it shall be forever thus—nothing can be changed.

I referred to the borders of the continental United States previously, and I again draw them to the Senate's attention. The present 48 States lying within these borders are contiguous and are a cohesive union. All of this was one of the intents of the formation of the United States of America. Among other things, it was to take in those territories which naturally, geographically and logically, would fit into the American way of life, culturally, socially, and in all other manners and ways of living. Again, I repeat that these remarks are not in any way directed to the people of Alaska, but to a situation. Does the admission of this vast territory far to our north add to the cohesiveness of our Union? Does it add to the compactness of the Union, or, as a matter of fact, may it not detract therefrom? May we not be spreading ourselves too thin? Is it not possible that statehood for Alaska would take away from the United States that unity in territory which, in my opinion, has always been one of its mainstays of strength? As I have said, between the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans and between the northern and southern borders of the United States lie the 48 States of the Union, unbroken and unfettered by the inclusion of any foreign area. This is strength; this is compactness; this is cohesiveness. Therein lies one of the greatnesses of the United States. While I have no desire in any way to deny the people of Alaska that to which they are rightfully entitled, I do believe that, in all sincerity, honesty and for the good of the country, the utmost care, consideration and study should be given to the matter.

It is not enough to say that the people of Alaska have earned the right to become a State of the Union. It is not enough to say that they can support themselves as a State. It is not enough to say that they have been a Territory too long. One of the answers we should have before acting upon a bill of this nature is, What will be the ultimate effect of statehood? Will it dilute the authority and strength of the Union as it now exists? Will it leave as prey to foreign countries a State which we shall be unable to defend in the manner that we now defend the present States of the Union? There are so many questions, Mr. President, which have not been answered and which I believe should be answered before this momentous step is taken.

I note that some reference has been made to the fact that the Territory of Alaska has been so long a Territory, and this is assigned as one of the reasons why we should admit it to statehood. I cannot believe that the fact that any given area is entitled to statehood simply because it has been a Territory for a longer period of time than any other area. There must be much, much more than that, and yet that has been pointed out—it is said that Alaska has been a Territory for so long, it is time for us to admit it to the Union. If that type of argument is persuasive for the admission of any Territory into the Union, let me say that there is no argument I know of against the admission of any area into the United States.

Mr. President, even at the risk of touching upon the dramatic, I shall refer to portions of the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States, which, in effect, states, "In order to form a more perfect union," and "for the common defense." To me, these words have a definite meaning and are not just what one might say are "pretty words." We should all like to have a perfect Union from every standpoint conceivable—geographically, politically, socially, and culturally. Perhaps unconsciously this has always been in the back of the minds of our predecessors in the admission to statehood of the various Territories, even though it may not have been expressly the purpose of statehood. We know that the banding together of the States has created a strength and a stature that never could have been attained by each individual State acting on its own, or by any other form of federation. Therein has been the progress leading toward a more perfect Union. Therein lie the materials, both tangible and intangible, which, as a whole, give the strength for our common defense. The United States of America as it is presently constituted, while perhaps not perfect, or not indestructible, has reached a position of leadership in the world as we know it today.

I do not say that there is not room for improvement of our lot, both from the individual point of view and the collective point of view, because there is, and to that end we should always strive. I do say, however, that the consideration of the admission of any Territory to the United States should be carried out, based upon the proposition primarily as to whether or not it will add to that more perfect Union and will add to the common defense of all of the United States.

All of this, it seems to me, was a comparatively simple proposition when we dealt with the areas and the Territories which now constitute the United States. As I have stated before, that area was confined to the oceans on the east and the west of us and the borders to the immediate north and south of us. I do not believe it could have been argued at that time that the addition of this Territory would in any way weaken us. That was particularly true in the admission of the State of California and the other States of the west coast, for the reason that California was comparatively well populated, while the intervening territory between California and the East was sparsely populated. This, of course, gave us a better means of protection from the West in admitting California as a State. It also gave us better means of protection for the intervening territory, so that it could be developed and brought to the point where it could, as time passed, qualify for statehood. All of these things have come to pass and we have the United States of America as it is now constituted.

What is the situation in regard to Alaska? We go many miles to the north—beyond the borders of a foreign nation and to the border of another foreign nation—and select a vast Territory, a Territory so large as to be almost fantastic in size when compared to any other present State of the Union. I do not say that this is wrong. I do say that the questions I impose have not been, as far as I have been able to discern, considered adequately or reasonably satisfactorily. Should it be that a real consideration of the ultimate effect of the admission of Alaska as a State of the United States be for the good of the entire Nation and would not detract from our international stature, I should not object. This has not been done, Mr. President, either from the standpoint of common defense or a more perfect Union. If it has, it has not come to my attention.

No doubt, Mr. President, the proponents of the legislation may say that Alaska, from a military standpoint, is a bastion not to be underrated. They may say that it is one that is of the utmost importance to us and, as such, should be admitted to statehood. Of course, to me this does not follow, because from the military standpoint it can be just as valuable—just as well manned—just as well armed, and just as powerful as a Territory as it can be as a State. On the other hand, the fact that it is an isolated State of the United States of America may well be a handicap in case of war. Would there not be a different political implication if the State of Alaska were invaded, as opposed to the Territory of Alaska? Frankly, I do not know, but I do want these questions answered before I shall feel that I can vote for a proposition so foreign to anything that we have done before, and this even in view of the fact that some consider it just another State admission. The proponents of the legislation would like us to believe that all we are doing is admitting another State into the Union. I cannot emphasize or re-emphasize more than is humanly possible that this is not so. We are doing a great deal more than just admitting another State. If this were not so, I should be the last to object.

Militarily speaking, Alaska is of vast importance. In fact, it has been recognized in the present legislation that such is the case, and it is so well recognized that in section 10 of the bill it is sought to reserve to the United States, at the pleasure of the President, vast territories for national defense. If there is an indication on the part of the administration or any of the proponents of this legislation that such a reservation of territory is necessary for the national defense, it seems to me that to release the other area contained in the Territory for purposes of statehood is not sound. If we must reserve a great portion of Alaska under the aegis of the President of the United States so that he may, at his will, exercise exclusive jurisdiction, it seems to me that not to reserve the balance of the Territory is to cut off our nose to spite our face, from

a military standpoint. If, on the other hand, we may set aside to the State of Alaska that area which the bill does not reserve for military purposes, then I see no reason why we cannot safely give the rest to them. Why is it that such importance is attached to one area of Alaska above a certain parallel and not to the remainder of it? So far as we know, this reservation has never existed in the admission of any other State into the Union.

Mr. President, I point out these matters because I believe that they are not in the interests of a more perfect Union or do not tend to enhance the proposition of the common defense.

Mr. President, in addition to the two major objections which I have just outlined, there are a number of other reasons why I oppose statehood for Alaska.

For one thing, I have grave doubts that Alaska is economically capable of assuming the responsibilities that go with statehood. I have already briefly touched on this subject, but now I should like to go into this aspect in a little more detail. Hon. CRAIG HOSMER of California, clearly outlined to the House, when this bill was under consideration there, some of the economic aspects of this problem.

Mr. President, one of the requirements for statehood which has been adhered to by the Congress in screening the capability of the State to carry its burden of proof that it is ready, willing, and able, is that the proposed new State has sufficient population, resources, and financial stability so as to support State government, and at the same time carry its fair share of the costs of the Federal Government. I believe that this is a fair test to which the Congress should adhere in determining whether a State is ready and able to join the Union of States. With this in mind, I think it proper to examine the financial and economic position of the Territory of Alaska in order to evaluate its present position, its income, its taxing power, and how it has been carrying its financial burdens while in a Territorial status.

Proponents of Alaskan statehood have spoken in glowing terms of the tremendous natural resources the Territory possesses and have said that the development of this vast resource potential has been retarded by Alaska's Territorial status. They argue that statehood would aid development of these natural resources and that statehood would encourage a vast flow of new capital and settlers into the new State.

Secretary of the Interior Seaton, while speaking in Alaska recently, observed that one of the reasons why Alaska would be a welcome addition to the family of States is that these tremendous untapped riches of natural resources would be more available and sooner developed by statehood. The Secretary went into considerable detail about the mineral resources, particularly coal, oil, its pulp potential, its fishing industry, its development of hydroelectric energy—all should offer great incentive for the bringing in of risk capital by stateside investors. It is all very well to speak about this vast natural resource potential, but I think close scrutiny belies the glowing picture that the proponents seek to paint. I venture to say that these resources could no more be developed under statehood status than they have been in the past under Territorial status. In this connection it should be noted that Alaskans have been seeking statehood for many years. The first statehood bill was introduced in the Congress in 1916. Since 1916, there have been bills introduced in many Congresses and numerous Congressional hearings, not only in Washington but also in Alaska. I am sure that since 1916 and during the intervening years up to the present those people most vociferous in arguing for statehood keep reiterating the cry that the natural resources and the great economic potential would realize its greatest potential upon admission as a sister State. It seems to me that if this economic potential has been in existence and the development of these great natural resources has been going on since 1916—because the Alaskans had been working for statehood since that time—there appears to have been no great progress toward this economic dream during the 40-year span. Assuming this bill is enacted and Alaska becomes a State, and we use as a yardstick the economic progress made in the past 40 years and project that 40 years into the future, I fail to see how Alaska can even support its own State government expenses and administration of its own fiscal affairs, let alone carry its fair share of the burden of Federal governmental expenses.

Those sponsoring this legislation try to create the impression that Alaska is simply an additional frontier which our pioneers have finally reached and are about to bring into productive use rapidly. This amounts to a complete misunderstanding of Alaska's recent history and current situation.

Since our purchase of Alaska from the Russians, it has had two population booms. The first occurred between 1890 and 1900 when gold was discovered. The population increased sharply from about 30,000 to approximately 60,000 during that decade. Gold discovery did not lead to a steady, solid, permanent growth. As a matter of fact, the population of Alaska actually declined between 1900 and 1930.

The second spurt in population occurred between 1930 and 1950, but this did not result from increased use of Alaska's natural resources. It was due almost entirely to something else—the growth of Federal Government activities.

The increase of Alaska's population closely paralleled the increase in Federal spending and in the number of Federal jobs. Federal expenditures specifically earmarked for Alaska in 1950 amounted to $71 million; in the 1951 budget estimates, $112 million. These figures do not include a great part of the military spending there.

As of December 1948, there were 11,536 Federal employees in Alaska, most of whom it is safe to assume went there after 1930. To this figure must be added the employees of companies having Federal construction contracts in the Territory.

During the years since 1930, the population of Alaska has increased at an accelerated rate. It is clear, however, that substantially all of this increase can be accounted for by the increase in Federal job holders, employees of Government contractors, their families, and the trade and service establishments dependent upon them.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator is making a very able address. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the Senator from South Carolina losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from South Carolina is planning to speak for some time, and would like to have a break in his speech at any time, with the understanding that any interruption would follow his remarks, I should be very happy to make a short speech I have planned to deliver, because I have announced previously today that I would speak. But I leave that decision entirely to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I do not think I shall speak for more than 10 minutes.

What will happen to this increased population if the Army follows its announced policy of evacuating its civilian employees from Alaska?

On the other hand, military expenditures in Alaska depend entirely on the international situation. Eventually Alaska must look forward to a sharp decrease in military activity there.

During this artificial boom created by Government spending, the basic industries of the Territory, instead of expanding, declined.

Gold mining, the principal industry of the interior, has fallen off sharply. In 1941, gold production amounted to approximately $28 million. By 1949 this production had fallen to less than $8 million. Statehood cannot improve the condition of this industry. Increased production costs and a fixed selling price have crippled it. Unless the price of gold is changed, there can be no relief for the gold-mining industry in the foreseeable future.

The story of the fishing industry is similar, although not quite so bad. Production of canned salmon on the average

during the years 1945–49 was less than the average production for any 5-year period since 1910–14. Those familiar with Alaska conditions agree that the salmon and most of the other fishing industries in the Territory have about reached their peak on a sustained-yield basis. Even the most ardent proponent for statehood will admit that passage of H. R. 7999 will not increase the annual run of salmon.

Take away military expenditures and Alaska's entire economy must depend almost entirely on the fishing industry. This means that the economy of the new State would depend on this resource's conservation and protection. The fishery resource, in turn, is affected by imports of foreign products. Furthermore, the conservation and protection of the industry are dependent to a large extent on the establishment of international treaties extending protective measures beyond the 3-mile limit.

What are the prospects for other industries which are supposed to develop with such amazing speed once statehood is granted?

There are still only about 600 farms, including fur farms, in the entire Territory—less than in the average agricultural county in the continental United States. For years we have been hearing about the possibilities of agricultural expansion in Alaska. But thus far the combination of climate, geography, and Federal redtape has prevented any substantial additional settlement there. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that statehood will remedy this situation.

We have also heard glowing, optimistic reports about the future of timber and pulp in Alaska. High transportation and production costs plus foreign competition have halted development of these resources.

One large contract for woodpulp production has been signed. But the contractor has been hesitant about going ahead with his plans and making the large investment required. Reports are that the prospect of excessive taxes under statehood has been a dominant factor in causing this delay.

Instead of hastening the development of the timber and pulp industry in Alaska, passage of H. R. 7999 might well thwart it.

In short, there is no evidence of any industry that will appear and develop once statehood has been granted. The only industry—if such it can be called—which has developed at a rapid pace during recent years has been Federal bureaucracy. A Federal bureaucracy is hardly a fit basis on which to erect a structure of statehood.

It must be remembered that Alaska's climate is unfriendly to many ventures—that it necessitates that all industries be of seasonal nature because of severe winters in the interior and heavy rainfall on the coast. Outside work is difficult for many months under these conditions. Construction, for example, is limited to the summer months in most parts of Alaska.

Alaska has been preserved for many years as a sort of happy hunting ground for Federal bureaus which have withheld its resources from development. Either that, or they have tried to control its development according to plans drafted 5,000 miles away in Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, I have much more information that I wish to present to the Senate, but I shall do so on another occasion. At this time I shall yield the floor, especially out of respect for my distinguished friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want my friend from South Carolina always to know that I appreciate his courtesies.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12716) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DURHAM, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. VAN ZANDT, and Mr. HOSMER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 6306. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or highway bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes";

H. R. 6322. An act to provide that the dates for submission of plan for future control of the property of the Menominee Tribe shall be delayed; and

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an amendment of the agreement between the States of Vermont and New York relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

POLITICAL IMMORALITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak for a very few minutes, but with an expression of sympathy for the loyal members of the staff of the Senate who, on more than 1 occasion during the past 13 years, have borne with me at this hour of the night. I had expected to deliver this speech at a much earlier hour today; and once I have given my word to the press or anyone else that I shall back up on the floor of the Senate what I have said in a press conference, I keep my word, irrespective of the lateness of the hour.

Mr. President, on June 18 I spoke in the Senate concerning the political immorality revealed by the testimony received before the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 17.

As I pointed out in that speech, the House hearings disclosed that Mr. Sherman Adams called on the then Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Edward F. Howrey, for information concerning an FTC action against one of the mills owned by Mr. Bernard Goldfine. Section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act reads as follows:

Any officer or employee of the Commission who shall make public any information obtained by the Commission without its authority, unless directed by a court, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

Also the Commission Rules of Practice, Procedures, and Organization reads, from paragraph 1.134:

Release of confidential information: (a) Upon good cause shown, the Commission may by order direct that certain records, files, papers, or information be disclosed to a particular applicant.

(b) Application by a member of the public for such disclosure shall be in writing, under oath, setting forth the interest of the applicant in the subject matter; a description of the specific information, files, documents, or other material inspection of which is requested; whether copies are desired; and the purpose for which the information or material, or copies, will be used if the application is granted. Upon receipt of such an application the Commission will take action thereon, having due regard to statutory restrictions, its rules, and the public interest.

(c) In the event that confidential material is desired for inspection, copying, or use by some agency of the Federal or a State Government, a request therefor may be made by the administrative head of such agency. Such request shall be in writing, and shall describe the information or material desired, its relevancy to the work and function of such agency and, if the production of documents or records or the taking of copies thereof is asked, the use which is intended to be made of them. The Commission will consider and act upon such requests, having due regard to statutory restrictions, its rules, and the public interest.

And rule 1.115, part 1, subpart (b), reads as follows:

Confidentiality of applications. It has always been and now is strict Commission policy not to publish or divulge the name of an applicant or a complaining party.

There is no doubt that section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by both fine or imprisonment, or both, for any officer to disclose, without permission of the Commission, confidential information, as set forth in paragraphs 1.134 and 1.115 of the Commission's rules of practice.

On page 1794 of the transcript before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, the following appears:

Mr. LISHMAN. Now I would like to call your attention to the fact that in the memorandum dated January 4, 1954, from Chairman Howrey, of the Federal Trade Commission, to you, the statement is made, among others, "On November 3, 1953, Einiger Mills lodged a complaint against Robert Lawrence, Inc., a Boston coat manufacturer, operating under the trade name of Leopold Morse, which was using Northfield fabrication labeled 90 percent wool, 10 percent vicuna.

According to our wool division, this letter was inaccurate for the reason that the fabric contained nylon fabrication."

In the concluding paragraph of this memorandum to you from Mr. Howrey, "Mr. Hannah advises me that if Northfield will give adequate assurances that all their labeling will be corrected, the case can be closed on what we call a voluntary cooperative basis."

In my opinion, Mr. Edward F. Howrey violated section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Ordinarily, Mr. President, the statute of limitations on misdemeanors is for 3 years; but on September 1, 1954, section 18, United States Code, 3282, was enacted, providing as follows:

Except as otherwise expressly provided by law, no person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense, not capital, unless the indictment is found or the information is instituted within 5 years next after such offense shall have been committed.

This was one of the early actions of the Eisenhower administration, and, in my opinion, was enacted in order to extend the statutory time so that the alleged wayward conduct of the previous administration could be thoroughly sifted. How ironical—because now the wayward conduct of one of the Republican chosen few can be reached under this Republican-sponsored law. Mr. Howrey's memorandum was dated January 4, 1954; and the 5-year statutory period has not yet elapsed. Extension of this statute of limitations has been one of the few really foresighted actions of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. President, in my opinion, when a law of a given agency, such as the Federal Trade Commission, is violated, it is the duty of that agency to see to it that redress is obtained thereunder. It is my intention to call upon the present membership of the Federal Trade Commission to see to it that that violation of its statute by its former chairman, Mr. Edward F. Howrey, is called to the attention of the Attorney General of the United States, for action. In order that there can be no misunderstanding, however, I am also calling this matter to the attention of Mr. William P. Rogers, the Attorney General, so that there can be no mishap or failure to consider the prosecution of Mr. Howrey for his overt violation of section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, that if an ordinary employee had been guilty of the violation which Mr. Howrey committed, such an employee would have received swift justice. I trust that our laws are not meant only for small fry, but apply equally to members of "the team." During Mr. Howrey's testimony, he made it perfectly plain that he did not take up this matter with his fellow commissioners, but that he acted solely on his own authority, at the request of Mr. Sherman Adams. I state here and now that I shall not be content with any rationalizations by any person or parties to the effect that Mr. Howrey was not an officer within the meaning of section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, or that the matter he disclosed was not confidential. I can read the English language, and I insist that section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act is clear and unequivocal on this point. If we are to have justice in this land of ours, it must be applied fairly and impartially.

There are those who seek to leave with the American people the impression that Members of Congress as a body are tarred with the same brush of political immorality. It is my judgment that such a charge is at great variance with the facts. There is no analogy between the improper conduct, in violation of the conflict-of-interest principle of Sherman Adams, Adolphe Wenzell, Harold Talbott, Peter Strobel, Jerome Kuykendall, and others within the Eisenhower administration who have been playing fast and loose with the conflict-of-interest principle, and, on the other hand, the acceptance by the campaign committee of a candidate for Congress of campaign contributions.

Those who smear Congress with the insinuations that campaign contributions are the same kettle of fish as influence peddling by an Adams or a Talbott or a Wenzell are guilty of a disservice to public confidence in our free election system.

Campaign contributions are a matter of public record; they are published for all to see, under State law in Oregon and in most other States. Those who seek to give the impression that contributions to a candidate's finance committee have strings or commitments attached, besmirch the election system in our country.

Undoubtedly there have been, from time to time, abuses in the raising of campaign funds. All of us know of notorious examples of campaign and political slush funds, but they are the notorious exceptions. In my 13 years in the Senate, I have seen little evidence that Members of Congress are guilty of any conflict of interest, because of any campaign contributions they may have received, in carrying out their Congressional duties. The requirement of public disclosure of campaign contributions and the penalties for violation under the Corrupt Practices Act have proven to be effective checks against corruption in this area.

It is true that the sources of campaign funds for most candidates to Congress can be divided into two main categories. Candidates who are conservative in their political philosophy find that most of the campaign contributions sent to their campaign finance committees come from conservative individuals and conservative economic groups from within our society. On the other hand, liberal candidates find that their campaign committees received most of their contributions from liberal citizens and consumer groups.

However, it is fallacious reasoning to argue that Members of Congress automatically become guilty of conflict of interest because the campaign committee of a conservative Member of Congress receives campaign funds from conservative groups and the campaign committee of a liberal candidate receives campaign contributions from liberal groups. The political philosophy of the candidate is not created by the campaign contributions. He was a conservative or a liberal before he ran for office, and it is only in the natural course of events under our political system that he is supported by the individuals and groups in our citizenry who share his political philosophy.

That is part and parcel of the democratic process. In a very real sense it is the essence of our system of free elections. Undoubtedly there is a need for some improvements and reforms in connection with the financing of political campaigns, in order to give the American people greater protection from such abuses as have crept into the system. That is why for many years I have agreed, here in the Senate, with those who have proposed that our Federal election laws be amended so as to provide for more stringent control of the costs of elections. There is no doubt that campaigns for Federal office, including not only membership in the Senate and the House of Representatives, but also the Presidency of the United States, cost entirely too much. An election race should not be a race between dollars. Instead, it should be a race between candidates. It should not be a race to see which campaign committee can raise the largest campaign fund. Instead it should be a race between alternative political policies and programs espoused by the several candidates.

Several years ago, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DOUGLAS) proposed that the Federal Government pay at least a part of the costs of radio and television expenses in the campaigns for election to major Federal offices, and that, in return, the Federal Government exercise greater control in the allocation of program time, in the interest of seeing to it that the voters have a fair opportunity to hear the views of each candidate, and thereby be in a better position to cast a more enlightened vote.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. NEUBERGER), has introduced an election reform bill, which several of us have joined in sponsoring, based upon somewhat similar principles, in carrying out the position taken by Teddy Roosevelt on this matter. The Senator from Missouri (Mr. HENNINGS) also has a fair elections bill which recommends some needed reforms in this field.

The objectives and goals of these proposals have a great deal of merit, and I shall always be on the side of those who seek to improve the system of free elections in the United States.

However, I do not intend to mislead the American people into believing that our election system is honeycombed with corruption, and that Members of Congress and other elected officials—local, State, and Federal—in our country are political puppets dangling at the end of strings held in the hands of campaign contributors. Our system of elections, based upon the free ballot box in America, has made a glorious record in self-government, unequaled anywhere else in the world. Fortunately, and to our everlasting credit, it is probably the greatest threat to the spread of communism in

the areas of the world where we are seeking to win men's minds over to the side of freedom. Free elections and communism are not handmaidens. Granted that we need to be constantly vigilant to protect our election system from the erosion of corruption and malpractices, we should not destroy public confidence in its democratic strength simply because we find that a timber here and there has been infested by political termites.

By analogy we should remember that termites fully exposed to the sunight or sprayed by insecticides do not last very long. Likewise, the crooked politician who seeks to undermine the strength of our free election system cannot last very long under such reforms as proposed by Senators DOUGLAS, NEUBERGER, HENNINGS, and others.

That is why I have proposed each year since 1946 the Morse bill requiring annual public disclosure of the sources and amounts of income, including gifts, of each Federal official, including Members of Congress, who receive from the Federal Government $10,000 or more a year.

Why should not the voters have an opportunity to decide for themselves what cause-to-effect relationship may exist between the personal finances of a Federal official and his official conduct in office? Such an open-account book approach to officeholding should not be opposed by any Federal official who seeks office, provided the rule is uniformly applied, as I propose in my bill. This is a more direct approach to the problem of checking any conflict of interest which may exist among Members of Congress than it is to leave the innuendo with the American people that because some Members of Congress, find it necessary to supplement their income with fees from speeches, or royalties from books, or articles in magazines, or special feature stories in newspapers, they are guilty of a conflict of interest practice.

My bill provides that all Members of Congress, as well as other Federal officials, shall make a public report once a year, to be released by the Federal Government, as to the sources and amounts of such income and gifts. If they give some of their income to charity or other good works, they should be privileged to list it in their public accounting.

Public disclosure of the sources and amounts of income and gifts received by Federal officials would have a very salutary effect on any malpractices which now exist, but it also would disclose that elected officials are relatively free of conflict of interest abuses. Why do I think this is so? Because, in my opinion, the ballot box itself is a remarkably effective check upon Members of Congress and holders of other elective office who may be tempted to engage in conflict of interest financial transactions.

The code of ethics among elected officeholders is very, very much higher than some critics would seek to lead the American people to believe. The elected official really does live in a glass house. At all times, we are fair game. I would not have it any other way. It is an essential part of our democratic system. Although from time to time we find that an individual elected official is guilty of financial improprieties it is the rare exception.

Unfortunately, the American people are not told enough about the high ethical conduct of Members of Congress. They do not hear enough about the sacrifices which elected officials make for the common good in carrying out a career of public service. Too frequently, it is not until the eulogies of an elected official are being spoken that the public becomes aware of many of the sacrifices he made in dedicated public service.

Take, for example, the ethical problem that is raised when there is before the Senate of the United States a bill which might conceivably be subject to the interpretation of involving the personal financial interest of some Member of the Senate. It has been my observation that Senators are very sensitive about this matter. On some occasions, I have thought that some Senators were not sensitive enough, but on occasion a Senator will ask to be excused from voting on a given measure because he thinks it does involve or might involve his personal financial situation.

Some weeks ago, when the bill on postal rates was before the Senate affecting the postal rates on newspapers, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] set a very good example by asking to be excused from voting on that part of the bill which involved newspaper postal rates. They simply announced that, because of their financial interests in newspapers, they would like to be excused from voting; and, of course, such permission was granted to them by the Senate. As a matter of fact, that is the purpose of the Senate rule which permits a Senator to vote "present."

I have made these comments today because I have noted that there have been those who have tried to minimize the misconduct of Sherman Adams by seeking to give the impression that the conflict of interest violations are rampant in Congress as well. Their insinuations that campaign contributions are in the same class as conflict of interest gifts in the form of paid hotel bills or loaned rugs overlook the legal checks on the campaign contributions to which I have referred. They have failed to point out the checks which are applicable to an elected official but not applicable to a Sherman Adams, a Harold Talbott, or an Adolph Wenzel.

So the point is raised in opposition to the dismissal of Sherman Adams that his conduct has only been in accord with a common standard of political ethics and practice prevalent in America today. These defenders say, in effect, "Why single out Sherman Adams? Why single out one man? It is the system that is wrong."

That raises the second issue of whether there is to be individual responsibility for political actions and behavior, an issue as old as the ancient democracies.

Historically, the people of America have tried to deal adequately with both public standards and personal acts.

We have laws, which I have cited, requiring reporting of campaign contributions; we have laws to regulate lobbying, at least to some extent; we have laws against conflict of interest on the part of executive officials; and we have a law against unauthorized release of confidential information from the Federal Trade Commission, which I believe Mr. Howrey has violated at the request of Sherman Adams.

Are we going to hold individuals responsible under these laws, or are we not? Are these laws on the books merely for persuasive and exemplary purposes, or are they there to be enforced?

Is there to be personal responsibility for political conduct, or is there not?

Does anyone think for a moment that public standards and ethics are improved when violations of law, or even of a code of ethics we all recognize, are shrugged off with the excuse that "everyone is doing it"?

The way to begin elevating our standards is by enforcing the standards we already have. And I do not know how that can be done except against individuals.

Letting off the known violators is never going to improve any political code. Mr. Howrey may very well have violated the law. If so, he did it at the request of Mr. Adams from his desk at the White House. If the Federal Trade Commission Act does not hold the solicitor of such information equally guilty with the person who gives it out without authorization, then the moral law does.

I ask the defenders of Sherman Adams who do not think he should be dismissed, where would they begin? If they do not want to punish a known violator of the ethical code we have today, how can they expect to improve that code?

I also point out that no code is any better than its universality of application, and its sureness of enforcement.

If the history of nations and of the world reveals any lesson on this point, I think it is that there must be personal responsibility and accountability for public acts. It is said that whole nations cannot be punished for evil policies and practices. Neither can whole classes of people, nor entire political parties. But individuals can and should be.

Without adherence to that principle, I see no hope for improvement in the ethics and morality of government in America, or in the morality of international relations.

On this problem of conflict of interest which has characterized the Eisenhower administration from the beginning, I think that Drew Pearson's column this morning hits the nail on the head.

Mr. President, without taking the time to read the column I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WHY IKE NEEDS ADAMS CLARIFIED

(By Drew Pearson)

The last Gridiron Club dinner featured a skit on Sherman Adams which was so rough that Sherman canceled his reservations to come to a repeat performance the next afternoon. The skit showed him telephoning to

the FCC for TV channels for favored Republicans to the tune of the song:

"Sugar in the morning, sugar in the evenin',
Sugar at supper time,
FCC's our baby
And TV ain't no crime."

To understand whether Sherman Adams was telling the truth regarding his relations with Bernard Goldfine, and in order that the American public may better understand how the Eisenhower administration operates, it's important to take a comprehensive look at the activities of Sherman Adams.

He occupies the same position in the White House as Matt Connelly did under President Truman. Connelly's job was to make appointments for the President. If you can decide who can or cannot see the President, tremendous power and favor comes your way. Connelly went far beyond this one duty, but never anywhere near as far as Adams.

ADAMS' ALL-SEEING EYE

Every report requiring affirmative action that comes to the President's desk is initialed "O. K.—S. A." If the paper doesn't bear Adams' initials, the President returns it with a query, "What does Sherm say about it?" Adams presides over staff meetings, which used to be presided over by Mr. Truman and Mr. Roosevelt. He attends meetings of the National Security Council. He pulls wires with Congress, despite the fact that an efficient liaison officer, Gen. Wilton Persons, is appointed to do that job.

And despite his sworn testimony to the contrary, he keeps a very careful eye on the regulatory agencies, supposed to be independent of the White House. The heads of all regulatory agencies come over to see Adams at regular intervals, and he goes over policy and personnel.

Members of the regulatory agencies all know this, and that is why a call from Adams to Chairman Ed Howrey of the Federal Trade Commission merely asking a question was equivalent to an order.

When members of the regulatory agencies do not conform, they are fired. When Paul Rowan, Commissioner of tne Securities and Exchange Commission, voted against the giant Dixon-Yates private power project for the Tennessee Valley, he was dropped on Adams' orders.

When Col. Joseph Adams fought for small airlines, as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, he also was dropped. Formal notification came from Adams' assistant, Robert Gray.

It was Adams who also decided to dump Dr. Leonard Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; also to fire Peter Strobel of the General Services Administration after this column revealed that Strobel was guilty of making an inquiry on behalf of his company, somewhat in the same manner Adams made an inquiry on behalf of his benefactor, Bernard Goldfine.

UNNECESSARY TO PHONE

Much of Adams' intervention with the independent agencies does not consist of actual phone calls. Members of the agencies know that when he has the power to hire and fire they must conform. Under the law the regulatory agencies are supposed to have a majority of only one Republican under a Republican administration. The other members are supposed to be Democrats. But by a process of appointing such weak "Republicrats" as Richard Mack, Adams has succeeded in stacking the independent agencies so that they follow the Sherman Adams line.

Technically this is not against the law, but it is certainly against the spirit of the law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on a couple of other occasions in the past 2 weeks I have commented upon the public service which Drew Pearson has rendered in the muck raking job he does as a columnist, pointing out the malfeasance in public office as he finds it. I think we are particularly indebted to Mr. Pearson for the courageous journalistic job he has done in connection with the Sherman Adams case.

There are many in our country who share the point of view which Mr. Pearson has expressed in regard to the Adams case. In my State, at least, it is very interesting to find that many of the leaders of the Republican Party have had enough of Mr. Adams. I hold in my hand a headline story from the Oregon Journal for Thursday, June 19, 1958, the headline of which reads, in large black type: "State GOP Heads Seek Adams Firing—Ike Aide Declared Liability to Party."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATE GOP HEADS SEEK ADAMS FIRING—IKE AIDE DECLARED LIABILITY TO PARTY

Insofar as Oregon Republican leaders are concerned, Sherman Adams had better grab his hat and depart the White House.

Robert T. Mautz, of Portland, Oreg., GOP national committeeman, added his voice to the swelling chorus in a message sent to Meade Alcorn, Republican national chairman.

Mautz told Alcorn that in his opinion the fact that the President's chief aide had accepted gifts and hospitality from Bernard Goldfine, Boston woolen manufacturer, was a matter that could not be dismissed as mere imprudence.

In Mautz' view, Adams' "so-called imprudence" is akin to the influence-peddling incidents in the Truman administration.

The opinion that Adams should get out of his top post also came from Elmo Smith, former governor. Earlier, much the same sentiment was expressed by State Treasurer Sig Unander and James F. Short, Republican State chairman.

Mautz said bluntly that Adams should resign and, if he didn't, President Eisenhower should ask for the resignation.

"I believe any person so highly placed in government as Mr. Adams should be like Caesar's wife—beyond even suspicion, let alone reproach."

The committeeman said he has no way of predicting the effect of Adams' indiscretion on the results of the November election. Integrity in government is the major issue, Mautz asserted, and "Adams should resign his position whether it will affect the election or not."

Smith called Adams "a liability from now on." He said it would be naive to think that a call to the Federal Trade Commission from the Presidential assistant would mean no more than a call from any Joe Doakes. Adams has been accused of intervening with the FTC in Goldfine's behalf. Adams has admitted calling the FTC but has denied, under oath, any pressure or attempt at influence.

The former governor and long-time State Republican leader said flatly, "I think Adams should get out."

But, said Smith, he does not favor Unander's proposal for the Republican State central committee to censure Adams in a formal resolution. Such censure, in Smith's view, should come directly from the President.

Short, now in Washington, D. C., attending a Republican campaign school, predicted that Adams will be a handicap to the party in the drive for contributions and volunteer workers for the November election. He said Adams "ought to be booted out."

The Oregon State party official, who was one of the first in the country to demand that Adams be fired, also said today that Adams' defense of himself before Congressional investigators Tuesday did not change his feeling.

Short, faced with the task of rehabilitating his shattered party in Oregon, told Roulham Hamilton, of the Journal's Washington bureau, "It would make it easier for us" if the President would fire Adams, despite Eisenhower's flat assertion Wednesday, that "I need him."

Except for the possible effect of the Adams case, Short told reporters he feels strongly that the Republican cause is looking up in Oregon. He said that while he looked for a very close race, he believes that Mark Hatfield will succeed in regaining the statehouse for the Republicans by ousting Gov. Robert D. Holmes in November.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Oregonian of Thursday, June 19, 1958, entitled "Why Sherman Adams Should Resign."

In my judgment the Portland Oregonian has set forth some very sound advice for the Eisenhower administration, which it has so consistently supported since this administration has been in office.

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

WHY SHERMAN ADAMS SHOULD RESIGN

Sherman Adams' explanation of favors he received from and gave to his millionaire friend, Bernard Goldfine, confirmed, rather than refuted, the charge that he acted improperly as a White House employee. By the White House's own definition, Mr. Adams arranged for preferential treatment of Mr. Goldfine by a Federal agency, the Federal Trade Commission.

The report sent to Mr. Adams by FTC Chairman Edward F. Howrey, at Mr. Adam's request, and delivered by Mr. Adams to Mr. Goldfine, was in violation of the confidence rules of the FTC. It was also in violation of Federal law which prohibits the disclosure of information in FTC files not already public.

Two years ago, President Eisenhower said in a press conference:

"I cannot believe that anybody on my staff would ever be guilty of anything indiscreet, but if ever anything came to my attention of that kind, any part of this Government, that individual would be gone."

But Wednesday, Mr. Eisenhower said in his press conference: "I need him." He repeated Mr. Adams' own admission that he had been imprudent, that he had not been sufficiently alert. But he said, also, "a gift is not necessarily a bribe," there was "a lack of intent to exert undue influence," Mr. Adams is "an invaluable public servant, doing a difficult job efficiently, honestly, and tirelessly," and "no one believes he could be bought."

Thus, the President has decided on the bases of expediency, his own need, and personal loyalty, that his earlier position must be modified. He is going to keep Mr. Adams.

Even though one may discount the holier-than-thou expressions from some Members of Congress, who have been knocking on Sherman Adams' door seeking special favors since January 1953, the President's decision is not defensible. It weakens his moral leadership of the Nation and casts a reflection on the administration and the Republican Party.

There is no essential difference between the deep freeze and mink coat gifts to high Federal officials in the Truman regime and the vicuna cloth, hotel bills and oriental rug gifts of which Chief Presidential Assistant Adams was the beneficiary. President Truman got angry and refused to fire Harry Vaughan. President Eisenhower became angry when questioned by the press Wednesday and refused to fire Sherman Adams.

Mr. Adams' explanation of his intervention on Goldfine's behalf with the Federal Trade Commission, which was considering charges against Goldfine of mislabeling textiles, was that he did not ask FTC Chairman Howrey to violate any rules; that he did not know the FTC rules against disclosure of confidential information, including the name of Goldfine's accuser; that he did not exert pressure.

But if Mr. Adams did not know the FTC rules, Chairman Howrey certainly did. He violated the rules and Federal law because the White House, in the person of Sherman Adams, asked him for a report. Thus is disclosed the patent fact that a mere request for information from an official as close to the President as Mr. Adams becomes, in itself, pressure of the most severe kind.

Mr. Adams told the House committee that he had made a legion of such calls on behalf of persons dealing with Federal agencies. Why? Citizens are entitled to equal treatment from public officials and agencies. They can get all the information they are entitled to legally by going directly to the agency in which their interest lies. One citizen, because of friendship or other reason, is not entitled to preferential treatment.

The fact that this sort of thing goes on all the time does not mitigate the evidence that Mr. Adams not only was imprudent, he performed acts which resulted in a law violation and discriminatory treatment of citizens. He did this for a personal friend who had given him expensive presents. Like the President, we don't think he was bought. But he certainly was had, and willingly.

The most disturbing thing about the Adams case is that neither the White House aide nor the President is willing to admit there is anything basically wrong with Mr. Adams' conduct. Both excuse it on the grounds of inexperience, carelessness and and imprudence. How can there be morality in government if our highest officials have these blind spots? Mr. Adams should resign—not only because of the Goldfine incident, but because he has become too powerful in the executive branch, and because he has misused this power.

Mr. MORSE. In closing my speech on this matter, prior to the insertion of some other material in the RECORD, Mr. President, let me say that I do not find it particularly pleasing to have to discuss such matters as the Sherman Adams case, any more than I found it particularly pleasing to have to discuss day after day the Talbott case, prior to his resignation. I think, however, that attention needs to be focused on the ethical issues which are involved. I intend to continue to focus attention on malfeasance in office as I find it in carrying out the public trust which I owe to the people of the State of Oregon.

I have no intention at any time, Mr. President, to excuse malfeasance on the ground that perhaps somebody else is likewise guilty.

As a father, Mr. President, who has had the fascinating parental experience of trying to raise children, when giving advice to the child as to why she should not have done what she did I was never stopped in carrying out my parental duties by the common childish alibi, "Well, Susan, or Mary, or somebody else did it too."

I think, Mr. President, in a very real sense in the Senate of the United States, under the free election system, we do have a trust to do what we can to keep government as clean as a hound's tooth," even though our President may have forgotten his preachments in respect to that same moral principle.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE EFFORTS OF THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we hear much of juvenile delinquency these days and are properly shocked at the disrespect shown for law and order which these stories illustrate. Sometimes, in my judgment, we neglect to pay tribute to the constructive civic projects our other teen-aged citizens participate in with enthusiasm and skill.

An example of the fine work being done in this area of constructive community effort is exemplified by the Future Farmers of America. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "More Scouts Watching for Ragweed as Result of Educational Program" published in the June 1958 issue of the Agriculture Bulletin, a publication of the State of Oregon, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

These young men who are participating in this worthwhile community service project are not only performing a valuable public service, they are also learning the basic essentials of good citizenship through doing so. They deserve our respect and commendation.

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

MORE SCOUTS WATCHING FOR RAGWEED AS RESULT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The 1958 program to control ragweed in the western Oregon counties is already under way, with first spraying done at the turn of the month.

As result of the educational work carried on during the winter and early spring, more persons than ever will be on the lookout for this innocent looking plant which causes extreme discomfort to its allergy victims.

Among the new recruits to the stop-ragweed campaign are between 350 and 400 Marion and Clackamas county high school Future Farmers of America. George Moose, the department's ragweed supervisor, and Weed Supervisor Neufeldt of Marion County, carried the ragweed message to from 1 to 5 agricultural classes in 7 high schools last month.

During the winter, Supervisor Moose discussed the control program and showed slides of ragweed in its various stages of development to Grange and Farmers Union meetings, to weed conferences, to highway conferences and to soil conservation service groups.

These and other contacts have served to acquaint more people with ragweed and the need to be on the lookout for any new infestations this spring.

The department needs and appreciates volunteer help in locating ragweed.

First ragweed plants found this year were in the Woodburn and Butteville areas of Marion County.

Last year the special ragweed spray equipment covered about 5,000 acres of land in western Oregon. All but a major infestation in Josephine County (20,000 acres off the highway and away from centers of population) was treated in the 1957 program.

Landowners are reminded that all ragweed spraying on their property is paid for under the appropriation made by the 1957 legislature.

THE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, now that we have disposed of the railroad bill I desire to comment upon a very interesting letter which I received from the State of Oregon concerning the tactics which sometimes are used to persuade people to write letters to their Senators and Representatives in support of some particular bill.

Senators will remember that the railroads were recently very much interested in the so-called Smathers railroad relief bill. I was strongly for the bill. I thought that on the merits the railroads were entitled to the assistance which the Smathers bill proposed to give. I supported the bill. I voted for the bill.

Mr. President, a very fine citizen of my State whose name and address will be deleted from the letter, in confidential fairness to him, wrote to me with regard to the pressures which were put on the employees of the railroads to engage in a letter-writing program to Members of Congress in support of the bill. He said:

JUNE 6, 1958.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: On the basis of the enclosed material I was supposed to write a letter as per sample.

After a few days with no letters the boss herded all of our crew into the office where we signed a typed letter which the railroad will mail.

I know nothing about the Smathers bill. Please act according to your best judgment and be sure of my continued support.

Yours truly,

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of some mimeographed material entitled "Examples of Letters That May Be Written But Changed to the Language of Parties Writing Them."

This is a very interesting exhibit, Mr. President, containing a whole series of form letters which the railroad officials prepared and had mimeographed, and then turned over to the railroad workers with instructions from the crew bosses, in effect, that the workers should get busy and put the pressure on Members of the Senate by sending such letters.

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

EXAMPLES OF LETTERS THAT MAY BE WRITTEN BUT CHANGED TO THE LANGUAGE OF PARTIES WRITING THEM

Hon. (John Doe),
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. (John Doe),
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

(example)

DEAR SIR: I am writing you, Mr. (Senator) (Congressman), about the Smathers bill that deals with railroads.

I am a railroad worker in (State) and have seen a lot of my fellow workers leave in force reductions because our business is not good and we don't seem able to do anything about it.

If the recommendations in this bill were made into laws, then we could compete as we should be able to and it would mean a better prosperity for everybody, everywhere in this State.

(example)

While I know you are very busy, Mr. (Senator) (Congressman), I assure you it's better to be busy than out of a job right now. I am a railroad man—or was, until recently when our force was cut again.

The bill dealing with the recommendations for relief of railroads by the Smathers committee is very important to me and a great many of my railroad friends. We feel it's most unjust to impose almost impossible restrictions on the railroads and allow others to undercut in every way to the detriment of railroads. We want to be good citizens, good Americans, and vote for those who believe in fairness to all Americans.

(example)

I have never written a letter to any of my State representatives because I always figured our interests were in good hands, and I still do. If you will pardon me for taking up a minute of your valuable time, and you surely must be working around the clock, now just don't forget the Smathers bill means very much to me as a railroad man with some (35) years of seniority that seems so inadequate right now.

If we railroaders are given a chance to stay in business by making some equitable laws in fairness to all, then we can continue to add something to this Nation's recovery.

Again, thank you, and I and many others in this city will appreciate your favorable consideration of the Smathers bill.

(example)

Please permit me to call your attention to Smathers bill S. 3778 that's designed to give relief to the plight of our Nation's railroads.

As a railroad man, I know of nothing pending that's more important to me and my job security. While I know there are many foreign country matters of grave importance to all Americans that take your constant indulgence, a business balance in this country is the most immediate concern to most of us, and I trust you will use your influence and highly regarded judgment in considering the merits of this legislative matter that means the successful operation of railroads in the future.

Mr. MORSE. This is an interesting example of the so-called senatorial pressure mail, a great deal of which is utterly worthless. As this very honest constituent pointed out, he did not know anything about the Smathers bill.

He expressed the view that he wanted me to do what I thought was right under the circumstances.

I think that will usually be found to be the case. Ordinarily people who, for one reason or another, are pressured by bosses to put this kind of heat, so to speak, upon Members of Congress are hoping that, notwithstanding any such pressure mail, their Senators and Representatives will continue to do what they think is right in accordance with the facts in connection with a particular bill.

In this case the bosses have gone so far as to prepare a mimeographed list of United States Senators and Representatives in the Territory of the Union Pacific Railroad Co., State by State.

I ask unanimous consent to have that list printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LIST OF UNITED STATES SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES IN UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO. TERRITORY

IOWA

Senators: BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican.

Representatives: District 1, FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican; district 2, HENRY O. TALLE, Republican; district 3, H. R. GROSS, Republican; district 4, KARL M. LECOMPTE, Republican; district 5, PAUL H. CUNNINGHAM, Republican; district 6, MERWIN COAD, Democrat; district 7, BEN F. JENSEN, Republican; district 8, CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican.

NEBRASKA

Senators: ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Republican; CARL T. CURTIS, Republican.

Representatives: District 1, PHIL WEAVER, Republican; district 2, GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican; district 3, ROBERT D. HARRISON, Republican; district 4, A. L. MILLER, Republican.

WYOMING

Senators: FRANK A. BARRETT, Republican; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat.

Representative-at-Large: E. KEITH THOMSON, Republican.

COLORADO

Senators: GORDON ALLOTT, Republican; JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat.

Representatives: District 1, BYRON G. ROGERS, Democrat; district 2, WILLIAM S. HILL, Republican; district 3, J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Republican; district 4, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat.

KANSAS

Senators: ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Republican; FRANK CARLSON, Republican.

Representatives: District 1, WILLIAM H. AVERY, Republican; district 2, ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Republican; district 3, MYRON V. GEORGE, Republican; district 4, EDWARD H. REES, Republican; district 5, J. FLOYD BREEDING, Democrat; district 6, WINT SMITH, Republican.

MISSOURI

Senators: THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Democrat; W. STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat.

Representatives: District 1, FRANK M. KARSTEN, Democrat; district 2, THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican; district 3, Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat; district 4, GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, Democrat; district 5, RICHARD BOLLING, Democrat; district 6, W. R. HULL, Jr., Democrat; district 7, CHARLES H. BROWN, Democrat; district 8, A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Democrat; district 9, CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat; district 10, PAUL C. JONES, Democrat; district 11, MORGAN M. MOULDER, Democrat.

UTAH

Senators: ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican; WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican.

Representatives: District 1, HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, Republican; district 2, WILLIAM A. DAWSON, Republican.

CALIFORNIA

Senators: WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican.

Representatives: District 1, HUBERT B. SCUDDER, Republican; District 2, CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat; District 3, JOHN E. MOSS, Jr., Democrat; District 4, WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican; District 5, JOHN F. SHELLEY, Democrat; District 6, JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., Republican; District 7, JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Republican; District 8, GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat; District 9, J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Republican; District 10, CHARLES S. GUBSER, Republican; District 11, JOHN J. MCFALL, Democrat; District 12, B. F. SISK, Democrat; District 13, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican; District 14, HARLAN HAGEN, Democrat; District 15, GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Republican; District 16, DONALD L. JACKSON, Republican; District 17, CECIL R. KING, Democrat; District 18, CRAIG HOSMER, Republican; District 19, CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat; District 20, H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican; District 21, EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Republican; District 22, JOSEPH F. HOLT, Republican; District 23, CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat; District 24, GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican; District 25, PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican; District 26, JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat; District 27, HARRY R. SHEPPARD, Democrat; District 28, JAMES B. UTT, Republican; District 29, D. S. SAUND, Democrat; District 30, ROBERT C. WILSON, Republican.

NEVADA

Senators: GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican; ALAN BIBLE, Democrat.

Representative-at-Large: WALTER S. BARING, Democrat.

IDAHO

Senators: HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Republican; FRANK F. CHURCH, Democrat.

Representatives: District 1, Mrs. GRACIE PFOST, Democrat; District 2, HAMER H. BUDGE, Republican.

MONTANA

Senators: JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat; MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, Democrat.

Representatives: District 1, LEE METCALF, Democrat; District 2, LEROY H. ANDERSON, Democrat.

OREGON

Senators: WAYNE MORSE, Democrat; RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat.

Representatives: District 1, WALTER NORBLAD, Republican; District 2, AL ULLMAN, Democrat; District 3, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Democrat; District 4, CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat.

WASHINGTON

Senators: WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat; HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat.

Representatives: District 1, THOMAS M. PELLY, Republican; District 2, JACK WESTLAND, Republican; District 3, RUSSELL V. MACK, Republican; District 4, HAL HOLMES, Republican; District 5, WALT HORAN, Republican; District 6, THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Republican.

Representative-at-Large: DON MAGNUSON, Democrat.

FUTURE CITIZENS — OUR MOST PRECIOUS NATURAL RESOURCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, upon more than one occasion, I have stated that one of our most precious national resources is to be found in the boys and girls who will be the citizens of tomorrow.

We, in our generation, owe to them the duty of providing a sound education in those values we wish to have conserved for the future. One method of inculcating these values, among them the love and understanding of nature and the relationship of formal education to the tangible sights and sounds found in nature, is that exemplified by an article published in the June 1958 issue of the Oregon State Game Commission Bulletin.

This pilot project described in the article, which is under the supervision of Mrs. Ellen McCormack, a sixth-grade schoolteacher in the Crooked River Elementary School in Prineville, Oreg., was designed to put into practice the principle "Things which can best be taught in the outdoors should there be taught."

In my judgment, Mrs. McCormack and the Prineville school system deserve commendation for this worthwhile program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

LET'S TEACH IN THE OUT-OF-DOORS

Luther Burbank once said, "Every child should have mud pies, grasshoppers, waterbugs, tadpoles, frogs, mud turtles, elderberries, wild strawberries, acorns, chestnuts, trees to climb, brooks to wade in, water lilies, woodchucks, bats, bees, butterflies, various animals to pet, hayfields, pine cones, rocks to roll, sand, snakes, huckleberries, and hornets, and any child who has been deprived of these has been deprived of the best part of his education."

Most conservationists and many educators undoubtedly agree with Burbank and, as a result of the cooperative effort of a few, outdoor education through school camping has arrived in Oregon. It is one of the newest teaching techniques, providing youngsters with rich learning experiences in the outdoor laboratory. Outdoor education may be defined as "effective use of the out-of-doors to help promote the growth, welfare, and total education of children." It is a practical approach to those subjects which are normally taught only in an indoor classroom. In the outdoor laboratory the learner may, through firsthand observation and direct experience, develop appreciations, skill, and understandings that will supplement the curricula of the public schools.

A pilot project in outdoor education through school camping has just been completed with a sixth grade in the Crooked River Elementary School at Prineville. Thirty-four students and their teacher, Mrs. Ellen McCormack, spent a week in an outdoor classroom at Camp Tamarack in the Cascade Mountains near Sisters. Before taking her class into the out-of-doors, Mrs. McCormack asked herself this question, "What things can we do in camp which will add to, enrich, and reinforce the learnings which have already taken place in the classroom?" Without a clear-cut, definite relationship to the regular school curriculum, school camping would find little acceptance in the eyes of parents or educators. One youngster remarked after helping the forester measure the height, circumference and board feet in a large Ponderosa pine, "Now I can see why arithmetic is important."

The idea of outdoor education through school camping as an enrichment of the curriculum first started in Michigan about 1940. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation helped establish the first public school camp, and by 1950 Michigan had more than 60 schools that provided a week or more of outdoor education for their children.

San Diego followed suit in 1945 with its city-county school camp, and by 1950, New York, Texas, and Washington were giving outdoor education a try. More than half the States in the United States now have school camping programs in their elementary schools. California schools send more than 30,000 sixth graders to school camps.

The story of how Mrs. McCormack took her class to Camp Tamarack for a week in the outdoor classroom is an interesting one. Here is a teacher who dared to accept the principle so long preached by Dr. L. B. Sharp that "Things which can best be taught in the outdoors should there be taught." With encouragement and support from her principal, Lloyd Lewis, and the county school superintendent, Cecil Sly, Mrs. "Mac," as she was affectionately known in camp, enthusiastically worked the three R's into the whole outdoor education program. Before the youngsters ever left the classroom they had learned enough about weather in their science studies to really want to know how to predict weather with the equipment available to them in camp. With the help of student-counsellors from the public school camping class at Oregon State College, they constructed wind vanes, simple anemometers, and temperature and humidity gages.

Conservation of natural resources received major emphasis and in this area of study the teacher had assistance from resource consultants of the Oregon Game Commission, the United States Forest Service, and the Soil Conservation Service. These agencies helped to coordinate the learning activities in the outdoors with those at school. Before the week was over the youngsters were beginning to understand that soil, water, plants, and animals have "interdependency," and that man's careless use of one may destroy all the rest. They began to see that conservation means not only wise use, but also careful use, and scientific management.

A typical day at the school camp included plenty of other learning activities. From the time the bugle sounded in the morning until the singing of the friendship song around the evening campfire, students were learning. Sometimes the learning was related more to the simple problems of getting along with people.

Recreation had its place in the school camp. Every afternoon there was time in the schedule for games, a scavenger hunt, folk dancing, or a similar activity. Cookouts were part of the instruction, but it was easy to see that the children considered them fun. As part of the arts and crafts study they made plaster casts of deer tracks around a pond, and this appeared to be fun, also.

Dr. Elmo Stevenson, president of Southern Oregon College, has this to say about outdoor education. "In an age of expanding leisure, millions of people are seeking the out-of-doors. Thousands of them will be denied the full measure of enjoyment of outdoor experiences because they lack basic attitudes, knowledges, skills, and appreciations. These may be learned and developed through a sound school program of outdoor education. Thus the school has a vital responsibility for equipping every youth with these basic requisites so essential for lifelong enjoyment of the out-of-doors." If other educators will accept the responsibility for and see the value of this learning experience, outdoor education through school camping will be here to stay.—Austin Hamer.

DISPARITY BETWEEN SECRETARY BENSON'S PRESS RELEASES AND FACTS OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from time to time I have commented about the disparity between the glowing press releases of Mr. Benson and the hard, cold facts of agricultural economics that affect Oregon's farmers.

An item that appeared on page five of Agriculture Bulletins, an official publication of the Oregon State Department of Agriculture for June 1958, helps to document the points I have made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to entitled "Chicken Industry Sells $25 Million in Meat and Eggs" be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

CHICKEN INDUSTRY SELLS $25 MILLION IN MEAT AND EGGS

Consumers ate chickens and eggs at less drain on their pocketbooks in 1957 but it cost the poultryman and broiler grower a good share of the already narrow spread between costs and income.

This is one of the stories between the lines in the United States Department of Agriculture April report on poultry production and income in 1956 and 1957.

In 1957, Oregon's cash farm income for chickens, eggs, and broilers was $25,978,000; in 1956, $29,952,000.

This is the way the subdivisions looked on farm money received:

	1956 (*Thousands*)	1957 (*Thousands*)
Chickens	$2,129	$1,794
Eggs	21,788	18,839
Broilers	6,035	5,345

Last year 2,913,000 chickens, 7,697,000 broilers, and 568 million eggs were sold from Oregon's production. The same figures for the previous year were: 2,896,000, 8,382,000 and 581 million.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 4047. A bill authorizing appropriations for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. 4048. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, RELATING TO FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS IN AREAS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. KERR) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 11378) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, to make permanent the programs providing financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, insofar as such programs relate to children of persons who reside and work on Federal property, to extend such programs until June 30, 1961, insofar as such programs relate to other children, and to make certain other changes in such laws, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public

hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 1, 1958, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424 Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

William Z. Fairbanks, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 6 years—reappointment.

Edgar D. Crumpacker, of Hawaii, to be first judge of the first circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, for the term of 6 years, vice Carrick H. Buck, term expired.

Harold W. Nickelsen, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the third circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, for the term of 6 years, to fill a new position.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself, as chairman.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I announce that it is the hope of the leadership that, starting tomorrow, the Senate will begin voting on points of order and amendments to the Alaska statehood bill.

As Senators know, it is planned to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. It is the intention that the Senate shall remain in session until late tomorrow night, in the hope that consideration of the bill can be expedited, and that amendments and points of order can be voted upon.

RECESS TO 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 25, 1958, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24, 1958:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The following-named persons to be United States attorneys for the district indicated with their respective names:

Harry Richards, of Missouri, for the eastern district of Missouri for a term of 4 years.

Herbert G. Homme, Jr., of North Dakota, for Guam for the term of 4 years.

Julian T. Gaskill, of North Carolina, for the eastern district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years.

Robert Vogel, of North Dakota, for the district of North Dakota for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The following-named persons to be United States marshals for the district indicated with their respective names:

Harry R. Tenborg, of North Dakota, for the district of North Dakota for a term of 4 years.

Kenner Wilburn Greer, of Oklahoma, for the western district of Oklahoma for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

James 1: 5: *If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.*

Almighty God, our gracious Benefactor, with confidence and joy, we invoke the blessings of Thy grace and favor, of wisdom and understanding.

Always and everywhere we need Thee; in our weakness to sustain us; in our strength to discipline us; in our despondency to encourage us; in our perplexities to give us vision and insight.

We humbly confess that our finite minds are frequently enslaved by a sense of futility and frustration and we feel unequal to our tasks and responsibilities.

May the spirit of our blessed Lord be our conscience and controlling influence as we seek to find the right solution to our many difficult problems.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2548. An act to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of the construction area of the New Cumberland Dam project by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of New Cumberland Dam project;

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Lake Greeson Reservoir, Narrows Dam;

H. R. 5033. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.;

H. R. 6641. An act to fix the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land therein, and to provide for the transfer of certain land not included within said boundary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7081. An act to provide for the removal of a cloud on the title to certain real property located in the State of Illinois;

H. R. 7917. An act for the relief of Ernst Haeusserman;

H. R. 9381. An act to designate the lake above the diversion dam of the Solano project in California as Lake Solano;

H. R. 9382. An act to designate the main dam of the Solano project in California as Monticello Dam;

H. R. 10009. An act to provide for the reconveyance of certain surplus real property to Newaygo, Mich.;

H. R. 10035. An act for the relief of Federico Luss;

H. R. 10349. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 10969. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended;

H. R. 11058. An act to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments;

H. R. 11399. An act relating to price support for the 1958 and subsequent crops of extra long staple cotton;

H. R. 12052. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed at Stewart Ferry, Tenn., as the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir;

H. R. 12164. An act to permit use of Federal surplus foods in nonprofit summer camps for children;

H. R. 12521. An act to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to withhold certain amounts due employees of the House of Representatives;

H. R. 12586. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury;

H. R. 12613. An act to designate the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River, Ill., as the "Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam";

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an amendment of the agreement between the States of Vermont and New York relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; and

H. J. Res. 577. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7898. An act to revise the authorization with respect to the charging of tolls on the bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.;

H. R. 8054. An act to provide for the leasing of oil and gas deposits in lands beneath inland navigable waters in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 11424. An act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to extend special livestock loans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12088. An act extending the time in which the Boston National Historical Sites Commission shall complete its work;

H. J. Res. 551. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 576. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12716. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HICKEN-