

# STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

---

---

1711 - 4

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

## COMMITTEE ON

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

**H.R. 50**

TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF HAWAII  
INTO THE UNION

AND

**H.R. 888**

TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADMISSION OF THE TERRITORY OF  
HAWAII INTO THE UNION

---

JANUARY 26, 27, AND 28, 1959

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

---

Serial No. 1



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1959

## COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado, *Chairman*

LEO W. O'BRIEN, New York  
WALTER ROGERS, Texas  
GRACIE PFOST, Idaho  
JAMES A. HALEY, Florida  
ADAM C. POWELL, New York  
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma  
B. F. SISK, California  
STEWART L. UDALL, Arizona  
J. T. RUTHERFORD, Texas  
WALTER S. BARING, Nevada  
AL ULLMAN, Oregon  
LEROY H. ANDERSON, Montana  
D. S. (JUDGE) SAUND, California  
DONALD F. MCGINLEY, Nebraska  
THOMAS G. MORRIS, New Mexico  
RALPH J. RIVERS, Alaska  
QUENTIN BURDICK, North Dakota

JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania  
J. ERNEST WHARTON, New York  
E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota  
JACK WESTLAND, Washington  
CRAIG HOSMER, California  
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Colorado  
HAROLD R. COLLIER, Illinois  
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin  
BOB WILSON, California  
GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska  
ODIN LANGEN, Minnesota  
EDNA (Mrs. S. D.) SIMPSON, Illinois  
  
JOHN A. BURNS (Delegate), Hawaii  
A. FERNÓS-ISERN (Resident Commissioner),  
Puerto Rico

T. RICHARD WITMER, *Committee Counsel*  
J. L. TAYLOR, *Territories Consultant*

# CONTENTS

Statements of—	Page
Ralph Beck, vice president, Hawaiian Telephone Co., Honolulu, T.H.	103
Mrs. Joseph Fair, Philadelphia, Pa.	164
Hon. Roland D. Libonati, a Representative in the U.S. Congress from the State of Illinois	28
Mike M. Masaoka, Washington representative, Japanese-American Citizens League	72
Hon. John W. McCormack, a Representative in the U.S. Congress from the State of Massachusetts and majority leader of the House of Representatives	22
Rear Adm. Kenmore M. McManes, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Administration	69
Hon. W. B. Poage, a Representative in the U.S. Congress from the State of Texas	151
George D. Riley, legislative representative, AFL-CIO	101
Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior	33, 118
Lorin P. Thurston, chairman, Hawaii Statehood Commission	170
Hon. Francis E. Walter, a Representative in the U.S. Congress from the State of Pennsylvania and chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities	135, 142
<b>Other information submitted for the record:</b>	
Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, statement of	95
Willis A. Carto, statement of	93
Committee Print No. 39, "Hawaii Statehood"	51
Democratic Party of Hawaii, statement of	91
John C. Elliott, Los Angeles, Calif., statement of	115
Hawaiian Electric Co., statement of	87
Hawaii Statehood Commission letters of	90, 91
Hawaiian Telephone Co., statement of	88
Hawaii Sugar Planters' Association, statement of	89
Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, statement of	86
Jamestown, N. Dak., Junior Chamber of Commerce, telegram of	116
Bernard W. Kearny, former Congressman, statement of	92
Richard K. C. Lee, M.D., president, board of health, Territory of Hawaii, letter submitting population statistics of Territory of Hawaii	86
Hamilton A. Long, statement of	163
Pineapple Growers' Association of Hawaii, statement of	90
Tom B. Shuster, student, letter from	93
Hon. William F. Quinn, Governor of Hawaii:	
Statement of	82
Telegram of	21
Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, statement of	93
<b>Statements of Members of Congress:</b>	
Hon. William A. Barrett, of Pennsylvania	31
Hon. Edwin B. Dooley, of New York	32
Hon. T. J. Dulski, of New York	31
Hon. Edith Green, of Oregon	29
Hon. Charles Halleck, of Indiana, minority leader of the House of Representatives	27
Hon. Russell V. Mack, of Washington	32
Hon. J. Arthur Younger, of California	30

Resolutions of—	Page
Association of Local and Territorial Airlines.....	117
General Assembly of the States.....	117
Hakalau Parent Teachers' Association, Kagalau, T.H.....	117
County of Kauai, Lihue, Kauai, T.H.....	96
442d Veterans Club, Honolulu, T.H.....	97
Department of Hawaii, Veterans of Foreign Wars.....	98
Rugby Junior Chamber of Commerce, Rugby, N. Dak.....	116
California Legislature.....	99
Nebraska State Legislature.....	99
New Mexico State Legislature.....	100
Western Governors' Conference, Honolulu T. H.....	117
James M. Thomson, Gaylord, Clarke County, Va., statement of.....	92
U.S. Flag Committee, statement of.....	92

# STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

---

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:50 a.m., in the committee room, New House Office Building, Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the committee, presiding.

Mr. ASPINALL. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will now be in session for such business as is regularly calendared to come before us.

Before we begin our hearing this morning I think it well that the committee pay recognition to the fact that we have lost one of the able members of this committee. I refer to the passing of our colleague, Mr. George Christopher, and unless there is an objection, when we adjourn this meeting this morning we shall adjourn the meeting, and the record will show that we adjourned, out of respect to our colleague.

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

The Secretary of the the Interior is here this morning with his staff from the Office of Territories. The reason that we have not called the Secretary and his staff members before the committee in formal session as we usually do in the beginning of a session of Congress is that we are giving first priority to the legislation now before the committee.

Mr. Secretary, we shall ask you and your staff members to appear before the committee when we get through with this task which we have calendared at this time.

The Chair desires to state that he wishes that the consideration of H.R. 50 and kindred bills will be handled expeditiously and completely, at least as completely as reasonably possible. Those of us who have for many, many years supported legislation granting the status of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii are pleased with the first goal which we reached which was the granting of statehood to Alaska.

Now let us proceed together toward the second—statehood for Hawaii—with a like dedication to our task. Let unhampered and constructive debate prevail at our proceedings. Write a record so that future generations may know that we understand the importance of the task we now undertake.

Above all things, especially in this committee and while we control the legislation, may we committee members keep party partisanship at a minimum, and, if possible, remove it from our deliberations entirely, because this matter is a nonpartisan or rather a bipartisan matter.

I wish to thank Delegate Burns for the outstanding spirit of cooperation which he has shown. It took an understanding, a trusting, a

dedicated person to wait as he has for action on this legislation which means so much to the people of Hawaii.

I sincerely hope that now that the hour of fulfillment for all the people of Hawaii is close at hand, that the galaxy of stars in our flag shall be filled to its presently anticipated completion.

The procedure to be followed in the consideration of the legislation now before us has been agreed upon by the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Brien, chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs and myself.

Mr. O'Brien provided able and effective leadership in the fight for statehood for Alaska. His zeal in that task was second to none in the Congress of the United States. He stands likewise dedicated to securing the status of statehood for Hawaii.

It is given to but few men to be privileged to be a leader in two such endeavors.

Recognizing his ability and his right and honest ambition to assume such leadership, I am now appointing him as acting chairman of our committee for the hearings on H.R. 50 and kindred bills and the marking up of these bills.

I also request that he prepare for and file with the House the committee report showing the action of this committee on the legislation now before us. I request that the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Brien, take the chair.

Mr. O'BRIEN (presiding). Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I appreciate what you have just done. I think that there are few men in Congress, chairmen of powerful committees such as this, that would step aside in connection with consideration of historic legislation and permit the first mate to run the ship. I appreciate what you have done very deeply.

As the chairman has said, we hope to proceed expeditiously with these hearings. There has been a tremendous volume of testimony in connection with statehood for Hawaii. I think that every Member of Congress, new or old, is aware of the basic issue.

I also believe that this matter is of such importance that we on this committee should endeavor to push it to a point where it can have speedy consideration by the whole Congress.

The hearing will be, as the chairman of the full committee stated, on H.R. 50, H.R. 324, H.R. 601, H.R. 1800, H.R. 1833, H.R. 1917, H.R. 1918, H.R. 2004, H.R. 2328, H.R. 2348, H.R. 2476, H.R. 3086, all of which provide for the admission of the state of Hawaii into the Union.

Also H.R. 888, 954, 959, 1106, 2795 to provide for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union.

Without objection, H.R. 50, H.R. 888 will be inserted at this point in the record.

(H.R. 50 follows:)

[H.R. 50, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of this Act, and upon issuance of the proclamation required by section 7(c) of this Act, the State of Hawaii is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, is declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States*

in all respects whatever, and the constitution formed pursuant to the provisions of the Act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "An Act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and approaching money therefor", approved May 20, 1949 (Act 384, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949), and adopted by a vote of the people of Hawaii in the election held on November 7, 1950, is hereby found to be republican in form and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and is hereby accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

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

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

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

SEC. 5. (a) The State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall have and retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however*, That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall be and become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be.

(b) The United States hereby grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon the date of its admission into the Union, the absolute title to all the public lands and other public property within the boundaries of the State of Hawaii as described herein, title to which is in the United States immediately prior to the admission of such State into the Union, except as otherwise provided in this Act: *Provided, however*, That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall retain absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended (48 U.S.C.

511), which authorize the President to restore to their previous status lands set aside for the use of the United States, shall not terminate upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union but shall continue in effect for a period of five years thereafter. As used in this subsection, the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded. The lands hereby granted shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this Act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

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

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

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

SEC. 6. Upon enactment of this Act, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to forthwith certify such fact to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii. Thereupon the Governor of the Territory shall, within thirty days after receipt of the official notification of such approval, issue his proclamation for the elections, as hereinafter provided, for officers of all State elective offices provided for by the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, but the officers so elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by the constitution or laws of said State, said Representatives shall be elected at large, the two offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. In the first election of Senators from said State, the two senatorial offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices.

SEC. 7. (a) The proclamation of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii required by section 6 shall provide for the holding of a primary election not less than sixty nor more than ninety days after said proclamation, and the general election shall take place within forty days after said primary election, and at such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 shall be, and officers for other elective offices provided for in the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii shall be, chosen by the people. Such elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii for the election of members of the proposed State legislature. The returns thereof shall be made and certified in such manner as the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii may prescribe. The Governor of Hawaii shall certify the results of said elections, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

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



"(1) The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the Act of Congress approved \_\_\_\_\_, and all claims of this

(Date of approval of this Act)

State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States.

"(2) All provisions of the Act of Congress approved \_\_\_\_\_

(Date of approval of this Act)

reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property therein made to the State of Hawaii, are consented to fully by said State and its people."

In the event the foregoing propositions are adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, shall be deemed amended as follows: Section 1 of article XIII of said proposed constitution shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of section 2 of this Act in lieu of any other language; and section 8 of article XIV shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the second proposition above stated in lieu of any other language. In the event the foregoing propositions are not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the provisions of this Act shall thereupon cease to be effective.

The Governor of Hawaii is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said propositions to the people. The return of the votes cast on said propositions shall be made by the election officers directly to the Secretary of Hawaii, who shall certify the results of the submission to the Governor. The Governor shall certify the results of the said submission, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(c) If the President shall find that the propositions set forth in the preceding subsection have been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii, the President, upon certification of the returns of the election of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 of this Act, shall thereupon issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President, the State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted into the Union as provided in section 1 of this Act.

Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, all of the officers of said Territory, including the Delegate in Congress from said Territory, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

(d) Upon admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union as herein provided, all the Territorial laws then in force in the Territory of Hawaii shall be and continue in full force and effect throughout said State except as modified or changed by this Act, or by the constitution of the State, or as thereafter repealed or amended by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended. All of the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within said State as elsewhere within the United States. As used in this paragraph, the term "Territorial laws" includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii) all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and the term "laws of the United States" includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Hawaii at the time of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws", as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provisions of this Act.

**SEC. 8.** The State of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to two Representatives until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representatives shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That such temporary increase in the membership shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the Act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13) nor shall such temporary increase affect the basis of apportionment established by the Act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U.S.C., sec. 2a), for the Eighty-third Congress and each Congress thereafter.

**SEC. 9.** Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the terms of office of the district judges for the District of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The district judges, except in Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judge in Puerto Rico shall hold office for the term of eight years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified."

**SEC. 10.** Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico."

**SEC. 11.** Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be six years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be six years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

**SEC. 12.** No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution of said State, or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceedings shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictment, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses. The admission of said State shall effect no

change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

**SEC. 13.** Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

**SEC. 14.** Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out "Hawaii and" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit", and by striking out the words, "Supreme Courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "Supreme Court of Puerto";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (4) and (5) respectively;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "United States district courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided*, That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *And provided further*, That service as a judge of the district court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in commission as a district judge for the district of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act;

(e) section 92 of the Act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the Act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), as amended, are repealed;

(f) section 86 of the Act approved April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(i) section 91 of title 28, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,"; and

(j) the Act of June 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 217; 48 U.S.C., sec. 644a), is amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,".

SEC. 15. (a) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii, the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, (1) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and used for Defense or Coast Guard purposes: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as have been heretofore or hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 16. The first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "When the State of Hawaii is admitted to the Union the Federal Reserve districts shall be readjusted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such manner as to include such State. Every national bank in any State shall, upon commencing business or within ninety days after admission into the Union of the State in which it is located, become a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by subscribing and paying for stock in the Federal Reserve bank of its district in accordance with the provisions of this Act and shall thereupon be an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and failure to do so shall subject such bank to the penalty provided by the sixth paragraph of this section."

SEC. 17. (a) Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, or possessions, or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports.

(b) effective on the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(1) the first sentence of section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1156), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory", the words, "the State of Hawaii, or";

(2) section 605(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1175), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or"; and

(3) the second paragraph of section 714 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1204), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or".

SEC. 18. Nothing contained in this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, nor to terminate nationality heretofore lawfully acquired, nor restore nationality heretofore lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States may have been a party.

SEC. 19. Section 101a(36) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 170, 8 U.S.C., sec. 1101(a) (36)) is amended by deleting the word "Hawaii".

SEC. 20. Section 212(d) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188, 8 U.S.C. 1182(d) (7)) is amended by deleting from the third line of the first sentence thereof the word "Hawaii," and by deleting the proviso contained in the first sentence thereof.

SEC. 21. The first sentence of section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 239, 8 U.S.C. 1421 (a)) is amended by deleting the words "for the Territory of Hawaii, and".

SEC. 22. Nothing contained in this Act shall be held to repeal, amend or modify the provisions of section 305 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 237, 8 U.S.C. 1405).

SEC. 23. If any provision of this Act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 24. All Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress are hereby repealed.

[H.R. 888, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To provide for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union

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

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

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

SEC. 4. As a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of said State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided*, That (a) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections

206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, may be amended in the constitution or in the manner required for State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired by any such amendment, whether made in the constitution or in the manner required for State legislation, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian home lands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act shall not be increased except with the consent of the United States; (b) any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian home lands may be made in the constitution, or in the manner required for State legislation, but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (c) all proceeds and income from the "available lands", as defined by said Act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said Act.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(h) All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property which vests in or is conveyed to the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions pursuant to subsections (a), (b), or (e) of this section, or reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws shall cease to be effective except as they may relate to or affect military installations which have heretofore been or are hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense.

(i) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, 83d Congress, first session; 67 Stat. 29) shall be applicable to the State of Hawaii, and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

SEC. 6. As soon as possible after the enactment of this act, the President of the United States shall certify such fact to the Governor of Hawaii. Thereupon the Governor shall issue as soon as possible his proclamation for the elections, as hereinafter provided, for officers of all State elective offices provided for by constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, but the officers so elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by the constitution or laws of said proposed State, said Representatives shall be elected at large.

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

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

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

"(2) The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the Act of Congress approved \_\_\_\_\_, (date of approval of this Act) and all claims of this State

to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States.

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

In the event the foregoing propositions are adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, shall be deemed amended as follows: section 1 of article XIII of said proposed constitution shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of section 2 of this Act in lieu of any other language; and section 8 of article XIV shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the third proposition above stated in lieu of any other language. In the event the foregoing propositions are not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the provisions of this Act shall cease to be effective.

The Governor of Hawaii is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said propositions to the people. The return of the votes cast on said propositions shall be made by the election officers directly to the secretary of Hawaii, who shall certify the results of the submission to the Governor. The Governor shall certify the results of said submission, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(c) If the President shall find that the propositions set forth in the preceding subsection have been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii, the President, upon certification of the returns of the election of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 of this Act, shall thereupon issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of

said proclamation by the President, the Territory of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted into the Union as provided in section 1 of this Act.

Until the said Territory is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial offices in, under, or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in, under, or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 8. Upon its admission into the Union the State of Hawaii shall be entitled to two Representatives until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representatives shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That such temporary increase in the membership shall operate neither to increase nor to decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the Act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13), and such temporary increase shall not affect the basis of apportionment established by the Act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U.S.C., sec 2a), for the Eighty-third Congress and each Congress thereafter.

SEC. 9. Effective upon the admission of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided*, That the terms of office of the district judges for the district of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) the first sentence of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and". The second sentence of the same section is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and", "six and", and "respectively".

SEC. 10. Effective upon the admission of Hawaii into the Union the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 11. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be six years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words ", except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be six years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 12. No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution of said State, or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to



the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses. The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 13. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit", and by striking out the words, "supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "supreme court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, as amended, is further amended by striking out paragraph (4) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (5) and (6) accordingly;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "United States District Courts for the district of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided*, That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *Provided further*, That service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in commission as a district judge for the District of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act;

(e) section 86 of the Act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(f) section 92 of the Act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the Act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), as amended, are repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(i) section 91 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,"; and

(j) the Act of June 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 217; 48 U.S.C., sec. 664a), is amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,".

**Sec. 15.** All Territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this Act or by the constitution of the State, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as provided in section 4 of this Act with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States. As used in this section, the term "Territorial laws" includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii) all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to its admission into the Union, and the term "laws of the United States" includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provision of this Act.

**Sec. 16.** (a) Notwithstanding the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said Territory into the Union all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said Territory into the Union, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, That (i) the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii or to prevent said

State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and used for defense or Coast Guard purposes: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the terms of the foregoing proviso, the United States shall have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as have heretofore been or are hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense.

Sec. 17. The next to last sentence of the first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251), as amended by section 19 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 350), is amended by inserting after the word "Alaska" the words "or Hawaii".

Sec. 18. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States and its possessions, or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports.

(b) Effective on the admission of Hawaii into the Union—

(1) the first sentence of section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1156), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or";

(2) section 605 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1175), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or"; and

(3) the second paragraph of section 714 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1204), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or".

Sec. 19. Nothing contained in this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, or to terminate nationality heretofore lawfully acquired, or to restore nationality heretofore lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.

Sec. 20. (a) Section 101(a) (36) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 170, 8 U.S.C., sec. 1101(a) (36)) is amended by deleting the word "Hawaii,".

(b) Section 212(d) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188, 8 U.S.C. 1182(d) (7)) is amended by deleting from the third line of the first sentence thereof the word "Hawaii," and by deleting the proviso contained in the first sentence thereof.

(c) The first sentence of section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 239, 8 U.S.C. 1421(a)) is amended by deleting the words "for the Territory of Hawaii, and".

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be held to repeal, amend, or modify the provisions of section 305 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 237, 8 U.S.C. 1405).

Sec. 21. If any provision of this Act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word, or the application thereof in any circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word in other circumstances shall not be effected thereby.

Sec. 22. All Acts or parts of Acts, whether enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii or by Congress which are in conflict with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The following department reports were requested and received: The Department of Interior, favorable; Department of State, favorable; Department of Defense, favorable, and we have a witness here this morning from the Department of Defense.

Department of Justice, received, and it is favorable with a detailed report to be submitted later; Department of Agriculture, not yet received; Department of the Budget, received, and the report is favorable.

Copies of the aforementioned reports are before each member:

Also before each member is Committee Print No. 2, a comparative analysis of H.R. 50 and H.R. 888. That could be very helpful to the membership and I want to compliment the staff upon preparing it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that the various reports which have been received and the two reports which have not yet been received be made a part of the record at this place.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HALEY. I do not intend to object, Mr. Chairman, but I note that we will receive an additional report from Justice; is that correct?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HALEY. Would it be in order to make that a part of the record at this point?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Under the motion by the gentleman from Colorado, that will be done, yes.

(The reports follow:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1959.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: This will reply to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 50, H.R. 888, and H.R. 954, providing for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union.

We urge the enactment of Hawaii admission legislation. It is noted that H.R. 888 and H.R. 954, which are identical bills, contain technical language changes prepared by your committee staff with the cooperation of this Department while H.R. 50 appears to contain provisions of an earlier bill developed prior to agreement on such technical changes and prior to this Department assimilating the views of the Congress on the related subject of Alaskan statehood.

Now that the admission of Alaska as a State in the Union is a fact, we believe that the prompt admission of Hawaii, our only remaining incorporated Territory, will represent a timely addition to this Nation's complement of States. Furthermore, the admission of Hawaii will fulfill a solemn obligation on the part of the United States to the people of Hawaii—first expressed in the Treaty of Annexation in 1898.

These bills provide for the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State, and prescribe the procedure to be followed for that purpose. They properly recognize the actions already taken by the Government and the people of the Territory to form and adopt a State constitution, and ratify those actions.

With the admission into the Union of Alaska, many of the objectives formerly argued against the admission of Hawaii are no longer applicable. The opposition to admission of noncontiguous areas, for example, is obviously outdated. In fact, Hawaii is in every way as well qualified for statehood as is Alaska.

Hawaii is truly American in every aspect of its life. Its people have been citizens of the United States since 1900 they have no other loyalty. They have lived under the same laws, paid the same taxes, and enjoyed the same constitutional guarantees as other Americans for over half a century. The Americanism of the people of Hawaii goes beyond mere legal conformity. Hawaii is pervaded by American ideals and practices in its civic organizations and private charities, in its educational system and its athletics, in its press and radio, and in its way of living generally.

While a substantial proportion of Hawaii's people are of racial extractions originating in a distant continent, we believe there are no finer patriots in the Nation—as was proved by the kind of service given by Hawaii's sons during World War II and the Korean conflict.

Hawaii has also met every objective test of fitness for statehood. The civilian population of Hawaii for 1958 was estimated by the Census Bureau to be 578,000. Although recent figures on military population cannot be revealed for security reasons, it seems likely that the military population in 1958 amounted to about 59,000, the same figure as for 1957, thus giving Hawaii a total of 637,000 for 1958.

Thus, Hawaii's population exceeds that of the following six States: New Hampshire, 584,000; Delaware, 454,000; Vermont, 372,000; Wyoming, 320,000; Nevada, 267,000; and Alaska, 214,000.

In recent years Federal internal revenue collections in Hawaii have generally exceeded those in 10 of the present States. In fiscal 1958 such collections in Hawaii amounted to \$166,306,000, which were greater than the collections in New Hampshire, Vermont, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, New Mexico, Nevada, or Alaska.

The Hawaiian Tax Commissioner has estimated the island's gross Territorial product for 1958 at the impressive total of \$2,109,890,000.

For many years the people of Hawaii have exercised self-government in a manner that demonstrates their firm adherence to the ideals of free government. The Hawaiian economy is well developed and prosperous. It can easily support the slight additional expense to the Hawaiian taxpayer that will result from statehood.

The Territory of Hawaii has repeatedly petitioned for statehood, and 8 years ago adopted a State constitution which was ratified overwhelmingly by the voters. The constitution evidences a sound and mature grasp of governmental problems.

President Eisenhower has repeatedly recommended statehood for Hawaii. In opening his state of the Union address on January 9, the President said: "May I voice the hope that before my term of office is ended I shall have the opportunity and great satisfaction of seeing the 50th star in our national flag." And in his budget message to the 86th Congress, the President stated: "I again recommend that the Congress enact legislation to admit Hawaii into the Union as a State, and to grant home rule to the District of Columbia. It would be unconscionable if either of these actions were delayed any longer."

The following three provisions of the bills should be noted:

1. Subsection 5(d) provides that for a period of 5 years after Hawaii is admitted into the Union either Congress by legislation or the President by Executive order, made pursuant to law, may take back from the State title to any of the lands that are granted to the State by other provisions of the act.

2. Subsection 5(h) provides that if any of the land that is granted to the State is by law subject to free use by the United States, the law granting such free use is repealed, but either the President or the Secretary of Defense may reinvoke the law at any time in the future by determining an area granted to the State to be a critical one. There is no time limitation on this reserved power to take from the State a right of free use, as distinguished from title.

3. Subsection 16(b) reserves the right of Congress to assume by legislation exclusive legislative jurisdiction over any lands that on the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union are owned or controlled by the United States and are held for defense or Coast Guard purposes. Such exclusive jurisdiction is really concurrent jurisdiction, however, because the subsection specifies that the State shall have the right to serve civil and criminal process, and to exercise concurrently any jurisdiction it would otherwise have that is consistent with the applicable Federal laws.

The last proviso of this subsection, however, gives to the President and to the Secretary of Defense, independently, the right to assume without legislation by Congress exclusive jurisdiction over any military installation that he may determine to be a critical area. There is no time limitation. This exclusive jurisdiction would not be subject to the right of the State to serve processes or to exercise concurrent jurisdiction, as would be the case if Congress acted under the first part of the subsection.

We understand that these provisions were drafted after consultation with the Department of Defense, and we shall therefore not comment on their details. In general, however, we feel that the title to the land conveyed to the State should not be subject to the right of the Federal Government to take back the title, or an indefinite right of free use. The State is entitled to know at some reasonable time what it is authorized to do with the land. Moreover, there should be a limit on the right of the United States to take title to, or free use of, lands which it only holds in trust for the people of the present Territory. With respect to jurisdiction, some further consideration may be warranted of the reserved congressional power to exercise concurrent jurisdiction and the reserved Executive power to exercise sole and exclusive jurisdiction.

We appreciate this opportunity to again express our views on this important

subject. And we stand ready to aid your committee, in any manner, to assure early consideration by the Congress of the petition of the people of Hawaii for admission of Hawaii into our Union. As a matter of simple justice, the prompt admission of Hawaii, our last incorporated Territory, should be accomplished as soon as possible.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON,  
*Secretary of the Interior.*

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
*Washington, D.C.*

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of January 15, 1959, to the Attorney General relative to Hawaii statehood legislation.

The Department of Justice favors the enactment of legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii as recommended by the President in his budget message for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960.

With respect to specific bills introduced in the 86th Congress to admit Hawaii into the Union reports will be submitted promptly upon completion of the study of them now being made.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE E. WALSH,  
*Deputy Attorney General.*

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
*Washington, D. C., February 9, 1959.*

HON. WAYNE H. ASPINALL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on the Hawaii statehood bills (H.R. 50, "To provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union"; H.R. 888, "To provide for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union"; and H.R. 954, "To provide for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union").

The position of the Department of Justice favoring the grant of statehood to Hawaii is firm and unequivocal. As stated in my letter of January 22, 1959, to your committee, "The Department of Justice favors the enactment of legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii as recommended by the President in his budget message for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960."

Our examination of these bills disclosed some typographical errors and matters of a technical nature, information concerning which was furnished informally to members of the committee staff.

The Department of Justice has no further comment to offer with respect to these bills.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE E. WALSH,  
*Deputy Attorney General.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE LIAISON,  
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1959.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your request for comment on H.R. 50, H.R. 888, and H.R. 954, similar bills, to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, has been assigned to this Department by the Secretary of Defense for the preparation of a report thereon expressing the views of the Department of Defense.

With regard to military aspects of statehood for Hawaii, the bills provide for retention of ownership by the United States in all lands held for military purposes. In general, the bills provide that concurrent jurisdiction over such lands is to be vested in the State of Hawaii and the United States with the reservation to the Congress of the authority, by legislative process, to take exclusive jurisdiction on behalf of the United States. These provisions are satisfactory to this Department.

As these bills would adequately safeguard the needs of the services, the Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, supports the admission of Hawaii into the Union.

As a technical matter, it is believed that the language of H.R. 888 and H.R. 954 concerning the setting aside of land for the use of the United States during the 5-year period after enactment is clearer than the language of H.R. 50, and therefore, is preferred by the Department of Defense. In this connection the restoration provisions of section 5(b) of H.R. 50 are preferable to the comparable provisions in H.R. 888 and H.R. 954. Additionally, it is recommended that there be an explicit showing in any bill enacted that not only the Submerged Land Act of 1953 but also the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act will apply to the State of Hawaii.

This report has been coordinated with the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Department of the Navy has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report on H.R. 50, H.R. 888, and H.R. 954.

Sincerely yours,

REAR ADM. JOHN S. McCAIN, Jr.  
(For the Secretary of the Navy.)

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1959.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: I refer to your letter of January 15, 1959, requesting the Department's comments on three bills (H.R. 50, H.R. 888, and H.R. 954) to provide for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union.

The Department's position on the question of statehood for Hawaii, as expressed in response to a similar request made during the 85th Congress, remains unchanged. It is the Department's view that the admission of Hawaii into the Union would serve to support American foreign policy and strengthen the position of the United States in international relations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,  
*Assistant Secretary*  
(For the Secretary of State).

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1959.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will reply to your letter of January 15, 1959, requesting the Bureau of the Budget's views on H.R. 50, H.R. 888, and H.R. 954, bills to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The President has strongly urged the enactment of legislation to admit the Territory of Hawaii into the Union. The President stated in his annual budget message transmitted to the Congress on January 19, 1959, that it would be unconscionable if this action were delayed any longer. We believe that Hawaii is fully prepared to assume the responsibilities that go with statehood and should be permitted to take its rightful place as an equal member of the Union.

It is noted that H.R. 888 and H.R. 954, which are identical bills, contain a number of technical language changes developed by committee staff with the co-operation of the Department of the Interior. H.R. 50 appears to be based on an earlier draft of the bill and does not contain these changes.

Section 7(d) of H.R. 50 and section 15 of H.R. 888 and H.R. 954 would continue in force and effect all Territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union, except as modified or changed by the Statehood Act or the State constitution. Territorial laws would be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii. "Territorial laws" are defined to include "all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress, the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to its admission into the Union."

The purpose of the foregoing sections of H.R. 50, H.R. 888, and H.R. 954 is to assure necessary continuity of laws until such time as the legislature of the new State can enact laws for control of its internal affairs. The definition of "Territorial laws" as including laws enacted by the Congress for the government of the Territory may have the result, in some instances, of continuing Federal responsibility for the administration of laws regulating intra-State commerce. While it may be highly desirable that Federal officials continue administration of such Territorial laws for a transitional period, considerable confusion might arise if the termination of Federal responsibility were left solely to future action by the State legislature. We suggest, therefore, that the section be amended to make clear that such Federal responsibility will cease either on a date specified in the Statehood Act, or on the effective date of any law enacted by the State legislature which modifies or changes such Territorial law, whichever occurs first.

The Bureau of the Budget supports the objectives of H.R. 50, H.R. 888, and H.R. 954, and you are hereby advised that the enactment of legislation to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,  
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

MR. O'BRIEN. I have here a telegram from the Government of Hawaii in connection with the legislation pending before us. It is rather brief and without objection that too will be made a part of the record at this point.

MR. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, is that for or against statehood?

MR. O'BRIEN. I did not read it very carefully, Mr. Rogers, but I would assume it is for.

MR. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, if I am holding up the proceedings can we come back to this?

MR. O'BRIEN. Yes. Without objection we will come back and we will postpone temporarily additional proposed insertions in the record so we may proceed with the testimony.

MR. ROGERS. May I ask one question?

MR. O'BRIEN. Yes.



Mr. ROGERS. How much time do you intend to consume in these hearings?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am very, very much impressed by the caliber of this committee this year and I would think that 2 or 3 days would give us all the time we need for hearings. On the marking up of the bill that is another question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. So far as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, there are very few requests to be heard. Is that correct?

Mr. O'BRIEN. That is correct, very few requests to be heard in person. A number of people have or will send statements for inclusion in the record.

A number of Members of the House have introduced legislation on this subject and one of these is the very distinguished Majority Leader of the House John McCormack. I think it would be very nice for us to hear from Mr. McCormack at the outset.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALEY. I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, the telegram from the Governor of Hawaii will be made a part of the record.

(The telegram follows:)

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 24, 1959.

HON. WAYNE ASPINALL,  
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The people of Hawaii greatly appreciate your efforts to move our statehood bills quickly. The support demonstrated by you and many other committee members is most gratifying. Pursuant to request of Delegate Burns, I am sending short statement of present and prospective economic condition of Hawaii. I believe I should make my views on some of the provisions of the pending bills known to you. I will refer to H.R. 888 which I understand is the same as H.R. 954 since the substance of these bills will probably be considered. Our people are opposed to any provision which would permit an enlargement of military use of land, particularly on Oahu, because of land shortage and present large military holdings. Therefore, we would prefer additional limitations on section 5(d). However, we are pleased with section 5(e) giving us 5 years to recover federally controlled but unneeded lands. If section 5(d) must remain, suggest insert after word "section," line 2, page 5, the words "and that remains the property of the State" so as not to impair States right to dispose during 5-year period. Section 5(h) as now drafted might permit uncompensated Federal taking without State consent with no time limit if military installation, which is critical area, is affected. I do not believe this broad provision belongs in public lands section. Urge that section 5(h) be amended by deleting from word "or" through words "laws," line 2, page 7, and ending subsection with word "effective," line 3, page 7. The provision nullifying present U.S. laws reserving right to alter Territorial laws should be inserted in line 4, page 19, with an exception for the Homes Commission Act. The balance of section 5(h) is well covered in section 16(b) and particularly starting line 18, page 21. I hope these suggestions will not impede hearings. I am aware that you invited no Territorial witnesses because of wealth of prior testimony. I am of course ready to supply you with additional information you might desire in person or otherwise.

WILLIAM F. QUINN, Governor of Hawaii.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentleman will allow me, I might make the observation that the Governor in his telegram indicates that no Territorial witnesses have been requested to appear and he says he stands ready to come here and testify.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK, A REPRESENTATIVE  
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS**

**Mr. McCORMACK.** In accordance with the suggestion of Chairman Aspinall and Chairman O'Brien, I am going to make my remarks very brief. I am going to ask unanimous consent that my full statement be made a part of the printed hearing.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to follows:)

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

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

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

By 1842, five out of six ships calling at Hawaii were American; and Yankee cultural influence, despite strong British competition, rapidly assumed predominance. In 1840, a constitution modeled in part after that of the United States was adopted. Fourteen years later the people of this constitutional monarchy urged their king to negotiate for annexation to the United States. He complied, but the project was abandoned with his untimely death.

In 1893 Hawaii became a republic, and negotiations for annexation were immediately undertaken. A treaty linking the two Republics was soon fashioned, but it was withdrawn from the American Senate by President Cleveland, who had not been in office when the Hawaiian revolution erupted and who disapproved of what he considered the "unseemly" haste by which the annexation convention had been drafted.

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

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

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

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

Let us turn now from the representatives of the people in both Hawaii and the United States to the respective peoples themselves. In a 1940 plebiscite, the Hawaiian people voted 2 to 1 for statehood. A decade later they approved the proposed State constitution by more than a 3 to 1 majority. As for the views of

mainland Americans (Incidentally, the Hawaiians, of course, are just as much American as you and I), Dr. George Gallup has found that a decisive majority has supported statehood ever since pre-World War II days. More recently, the ratio of approval has jumped from 3 to 1 in 1946 to 8 to 1 in August of 1958.

We know that Hawaiians and their compatriots in the States want statehood.

But are we sure that the islanders are "loyal" enough and "Americanized" enough to deserve such status? I say that the question was answered affirmatively long ago, and particularly so during World War II and its aftermath.

Immediately after the infamous assault on Pearl Harbor, rumors were rife, especially in the States, that Americans of Japanese ancestry engaged in the most heinous sabotage, even designating targets for the attacking planes. Mr. Robert L. Shivers, former special agent in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Honolulu from 1939 to 1943, gave the lie to such calumnies. He testified that "all those rumors were false \* \* \*" and that "sabotage and fifth-column activity was never engaged in at any time prior, during, or subsequent to the attack on Pearl Harbor."

Perhaps even more eloquently expressive of Japanese loyalty was the story of the 442d Combat Team and the 100th Battalion. The combined record of these units is probably the most remarkable one in all American military annals. Approximately 10,000 men, most of whom were Japanese from Hawaii, saw action in Europe with the famed outfits. Of these, 4,500 received Purple Hearts. The quantity, as well as quality, of other awards is equally impressive, particularly the 353 Silver Stars and 112 Army and division commendations. Crowning their glory was the fact that not a single one of these boys displayed the slightest cowardice. It's true that three of them went a.w.o.l.—from their hospital beds back to their foxholes.

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

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

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

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

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

It might well be, too, that the Hawaiian people are cognizant that the promise of statehood—at least by implication—was tendered them long ago. Of the 31 incorporated Territories in our history, all but Hawaii have graduated to statehood. From a legal or constitutional standpoint, Hawaii is no different from its more successful predecessors. The Federal courts repeatedly have said that incorporation leads to statehood. In 1883, an incorporated Territory was defined in *Ex Parte Morgan* as an "inchoate" State. About 40 years later, in *Balsac v.*

*People of Porto Rico*, among many similar cases, the Supreme Court asserted that "incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood." Admittedly, the organic act establishing the Territory of Hawaii did not explicitly promise statehood; yet it must at the same time be conceded that precedent and judicial opinion, whether dicta or not, alike have considered Territories as destined for statehood after a reasonable period of tutelage. It would seem that 59 years is long enough.

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

The third requirement for statehood—the ability to pay for statehood—poses no problem for Hawaii. The islands constitute, in terms of financial solvency, the richest Territory ever to knock on the statehood door. The gross Territorial product of Hawaii for 1957 was about \$1½ billion, a figure twice as large as that of any other State at the time of its admission. In 1956 the per capita income exceeded that of 26 States, while the per capita tax burden was higher than that of 33 States.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hawaii justifiably has been called the melting pot that melts. Although its people comprise diverse blood strains, the Territory has a unique record for interracial harmony and cooperation. With the closer association between the islands and the mainland which would accrue from statehood, continental Americans would become more acutely aware of the degree to which democracy

is practiced in Hawaii. The example assuredly would have a salutary effect on race relations throughout the States.

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

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

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

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

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

**MR. McCORMACK.** Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the last Congress Alaska came of age. It is now long past the hour to end Hawaii's apprenticeship. It is an indisputable fact that Hawaii meets the traditional threefold test of eligibility for statehood to wit: First, the people of the Territory to meet the three tests of eligibility must evince sympathy and love for the ideals of American democratic government. And there is no question about that so far as the people of Hawaii are concerned. We have the evidence of that in the tremendous strain under which the Americans of Japanese ancestry served during World War II with outstanding valor and we have the record of their large percentage of casualties, both killed and wounded in their loyalty and love of America and the service that they rendered during World War II—and we can all appreciate the fact—under most trying circumstances, because one cannot forget the land of the birth of their forebears, whether it is Japan, Germany, Ireland, or any other country, there are those ties that go back even when generations might separate them.

Second, a majority of the electorate must express a clear desire for statehood. There is no question about this in the case of Hawaii. The evidence is indisputable in this respect and to review it would only be taking the time of the committee.

Third, the Territory must possess sufficient resources and population to support the cost of State government. There is no question of that in the case of Hawaii.

The first two tests I shall set forth in my statement and I will make a brief reference to the third test because I know that plays a very important part in the minds of Members of Congress, based upon past experiences I have had with the Members of Congress in connection with resolutions coming before us for the admission of a Territory as a State of the Union.

The third requirement of statehood is the ability to pay for statehood. This poses no problem for Hawaii. The islands constitute in terms of financial solvency the richest Territory ever to knock on the statehood door.

The gross Territorial product of Hawaii for 1957 was about \$1 $\frac{1}{4}$  billion, a figure twice as large as that of any other State at the time of its admission.

In 1956 the per capita income exceeded that of 26 States at present in the Union, while the per capita tax burden was higher than that of 33 States.

Hawaii's population was estimated in 1956 to total 569,504, and is larger now, probably several thousand larger now, is larger than any one of five States and is more than twice that of Alaska. It is also larger than that of any State at the time of admission except Oklahoma.

Now that it has been established that Hawaii merits statehood, it is in order to examine the principal benefits that would accrue to the people of Hawaii under statehood. They may be listed as follows—and no rights were ever more precious:

1. The right to full voting representation in both Houses of the U.S. Congress;
2. The right to vote for President and Vice President;
3. The right to choose their own Governor and to carry on functions of government by their own elected officials instead of by Federal administrators;
4. The right to determine the extent of the powers of their own legislature;
5. The right to have their judges locally selected rather than federally appointed;
6. The right to have Federal and local jurisdiction clearly defined and separate;
7. The right to a voice in any proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution; and
8. The right to help write the Federal taxes.

Can any reasonable person deny that these rights are basic to the American way of life or that so long as they are withheld no citizenship can be first class?

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any further time because, as has been stated by both chairmen, the printed hearings of the Congress are replete with arguments for and against the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union, arguments made in the past that are not so pertinent today as they might have been at that time, and anything I might say further would be imposing upon the committee's time and I think would be unnecessary.

I have always, since I have been a Member of Congress, been a strong advocate and supporter of the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the Union. I am so happy that I was a Member of Congress while Alaska was admitted. I think that is one of the historic events of the 85th Congress. It will make me very happy if, before I get through Congress—and I expect it will happen and I confidently predict it will happen in the 1st session of the 86th Congress—I see Hawaii admitted as a State of the Union.

I strongly urge favorable action by this committee in reporting out a statehood bill for Hawaii and I can assure the committee that I will cooperate in every way possible in bringing it up as quickly as possible in the House after the committee has reported the bill.

Thank you very much.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Mr. McCormack. We appreciate your taking your time in a very busy schedule. We appreciate not only your statement but particularly the last part of it.

Thank you, Mr. McCormack.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Berry.

Mr. BERRY. Congressman Halleck, the minority leader, has requested permission to appear as a witness. May I ask unanimous consent that his statement may appear in the record at this point?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF CHARLES HALLECK, MINORITY LEADER

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I come before you today to urge that you start statehood for Hawaii legislation on the way toward final enactment by the 86th Congress. The last Congress granted statehood to Alaska and I do not believe there can be any valid claim that Hawaii is not equally qualified for and deserving of statehood from the present Congress.

Hawaii become an organized Territory 13 years before Alaska. Her population is about three times as great as that of Alaska. No argument can be made that her economy cannot support statehood.

Statehood has been the destiny of these islands for more than 100 years. It was in 1854 that the Hawaiian people first petitioned their monarch to seek annexation to the United States. In 1898, Hawaii did become an integral part of the United States. During debate on the Hawaii Organic Act in the Congress in the year 1900, an amendment was offered which would have had the effect of declaring it to be the intent of Congress that nothing in the act should be construed as being a pledge of ultimate statehood for Hawaii. This, a House amendment, was defeated and a similar one in the Senate was lost on a point of order.

The very fact that such an amendment was deemed necessary by its sponsors back there in 1900 demonstrates that, prior to the annexation of Hawaii, no incorporated Territory had been acquired by the United States whose manifest destiny was not to become a State.

But here we are, 59 years later, with Hawaii still in the status of a Territory. Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of this country's world prestige, particularly in the Far East and the remainder of Asia, it is now more important than ever, with the admission of Alaska, that we act immediately to also grant statehood to Hawaii. We must give equal treatment to the Americans of Hawaii or suffer the consequences of charges of discrimination on racial grounds. And in that connection, let us not forget that 85 percent of the people of Hawaii are native-born American citizens.

I think it most appropriate that I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the House of Representatives has passed a Hawaii statehood bill on no less than three previous occasions. The first time by the 80th Congress, by a vote of 196 to 133.

Again, in the 81st Congress, the House approved statehood for Hawaii, this time by a vote of 262 to 110. In the 83d Congress, Hawaiian statehood again won the approval of the House, by a vote of 274 to 138.

On these previous occasions, Hawaii statehood did not meet with equal success in the other body. Once, however, in the 83d Congress, the Senate did also pass a Hawaii bill but they added Alaska statehood to the same bill. That was the closest Hawaii has ever come, but they lost out then because a request for a conference by the other body was objected to in the House in the last stages of the session.

Mr. Chairman, this review of the history of Hawaiian statehood legislation certainly should prove to all of us that we do not lack precedents as we again take this matter up in the 86th Congress.

There can be no doubt of popular support for Hawaii's cause. National public opinion polls have always demonstrated that the people of this country are overwhelmingly in favor of statehood for Hawaii. With rare exceptions, the Nation's press has editorially come out for Hawaiian statehood. In fact, after we gave statehood to Alaska last year, there was a tremendous and spontaneous flood of editorial demands from all over the country that Congress act immediately to also admit Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to close my remarks by again referring to the action of the House on statehood for Hawaii in the 83d Congress. I was privileged at

that time to serve as majority leader in this body. I think the record of what we did then on Hawaiian statehood will be particularly interesting to the new members of your committee and to the entire House.

On March 3, 1953, your committee reported out a bill to admit Hawaii as a State of the Union. Only 3 days later, on March 6, the Rules Committee sent the bill to the floor. And it was only 4 days after that, on March 10, that the bill was approved by the House, as I said before, by the overwhelming margin of 274 to 138.

Now, as the elected leader of my party in our honorable body, I would like to see that record matched or beaten in this year of 1959. I assure this committee of my vigorous support of statehood for Hawaii and ask that you send a bill to accomplish that purpose to the floor of the House with all dispatch. Thank you.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Are there any other Members of Congress who have statehood bills before us who wish to file statements or to speak briefly?

### STATEMENT OF HON. ROLAND D. LIBONATI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

**Mr. LIBONATI.** Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I realize, being a neophyte, that anything I might say here has been thoroughly discussed in an analytical sense relative to the admission of a State to the Union.

After all, Congress acts purely as the machinery of government toward this accomplishment—granting admission upon the manifest approval of all of the people of the United States. It should not be determined in Congress by sectional division based on political or racial bias.

Hawaii has contributed much to the defense of the Union. Hawaii is a strategic place. We are spending millions of dollars upon various geographical sites for the protection of America. How can we now deny people of the Republic, who are stepcitizens or secondary citizens, the right to what they have earned—a voice in Government?

I say to you that we, as servants of the people, can only analyze this question from the standpoint of what is the fundamental belief of each citizen of the United States relative to the entry of Hawaii; and I am sure that the public press and other disseminators of information (the radio and television), have indicated to us that the people of America are asking that you admit Hawaii into the Union; that you facilitate this matter; that you create, in Hawaii, a spiritual and cultural feeling of contribution to the common cause of the United States; that you, in your honest endeavors, set aside any political question or any question based upon the contribution of the economy of Hawaii to this great Government.

On the other hand, the people of America are asking that you admit Hawaii because they are fellow Americans; that they have a common interest; that they have a constitution similar to our own; that they are a proud State, too, except that, as a Territory, we gave them the opportunity to work toward the successful accomplishment, in the future, of becoming a State in the Union.

Some of us seem to feel that it is a personal opinion for determination, or is related to political questions of our state, or on consideration of financial factors, each contributing to a background which might negate or approve the acceptance of Hawaii.

This is a national question—whether Hawaii as a State in the Union will contribute to the common cause of the American citizenry in



maintaining its democratic institutions and establishing a firm government.

You cannot deny Hawaii the right to participate in our governmental affairs. In order that she might participate, you must recognize her as a State. It is an edict already determined by the American people.

I thank you very much.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Mr. Libonati.

Are there any other Members of the Congress present?

If any other Members of the Congress desire to submit statements—and I have two here—they will be accepted at this point in the record.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statements follow:)

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EDITH GREEN OF OREGON

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to put my views on Hawaiian statehood before you and the distinguished members of this committee. I am especially anxious to address myself to the newly appointed members. As those of us who have had the privilege of serving on this committee in the past are aware, the question of Hawaiian statehood is not one upon which the committee and the House lack information. The hearings, the debates on the floor of this House and in the other body, the long crusade by many distinguished American newspapers—in all these ways the facts, the merits, and alleged defects of Hawaiian statehood have been discussed, examined, and considered from every conceivable angle. In the light of this truly monumental accumulation of facts upon which the Congress may base its judgment, I am sure that committee action will not be long in coming, and that action—favorable action by the House and in the other body will be one of the bright spots of this 86th Congress.

I have always supported Hawaiian statehood, Mr. Chairman. But this year I feel a particular interest in the matter. For this year is the 100th anniversary of the admission to the Union of my own State, Oregon. Because of the imminence of that centennial, I have, as have many of my fellow Oregonians, been reading and thinking about the infancy of my own State. Like Hawaii, Oregon was noncontiguous Territory in 1859. But then the problem of noncontiguity was a real one. Oregon was separated from the rest of the Nation, not by an ocean which could be flown over in 8 hours, but by dangerous and forbidding country, little known and justly feared even by the brave Americans who dared to traverse it in the hope of finding a new home in the Far West. Oregon's links with the Eastern States were not links of copper wire, steel rail, and concrete highways. They were treacherous rivers, windswept mountain passes, trails to be traversed on foot, or horse or wagon.

When Oregon had been admitted to the Union, her people elected delegates to the 1860 national conventions of both parties. The Democratic delegates, for the most part, were men whose presence in Washington enabled them to travel easily to Charleston, S.C., for that meeting. But the delegates to the Republican Convention were men chosen from among the people in the new State. The distance was so great that few, if any, of those first delegates were able to get to the convention, and their votes had to be cast by proxy. Oregon is rather proud of the fact that one of her first delegates to a national party convention was the famous New York City editor, Horace Greeley, who voted one of the State's proxies in the Republican Convention in Chicago—the convention which named Abraham Lincoln as a candidate for the Presidency.

So, Mr. Chairman, the arguments of noncontiguity, which had been raised vehemently in the prolonged debates which preceded the admission of Oregon, are arguments with which I am not unfamiliar. I am no more impressed by these arguments as applied to Hawaii than our forebears of a century ago were impressed by them as applied to Oregon.

There were other arguments raised in that early antistatehood filibuster, of which we hear the echoes now. It was stated that Oregon could never support a sufficient population to bear the burdens of statehood. It was suggested, though not often in the open light of debate, that if Oregon were admitted, this would mean more votes against slavery in the Congress. It was suggested that

Oregon's people were too heterogeneous a group to fit in with the American way of life. It is intriguing, Mr. Chairman, to note that among the numerous ethnic groups present in Oregon 100 years ago were not only the Canadians, as the French-speaking mountain men were called, and the English-speaking Americans of many national extractions, but also a not unimportant settlement of Kanakas—natives of the Hawaiian Islands, who had manned American whaling ships and found the beautiful Oregon coast to their liking. The Owyhee River country, in eastern Oregon, is simply a 19th century spelling of Hawaii.

So, Mr. Chairman, we in Oregon are familiar and we have continued to be familiar with the invalidity of the charge that strange peoples cannot become an integral part of the American way of life. Our Chinese and Japanese communities in Oregon are sources of real pride to our State. We in Oregon know that the argument, seldom voiced, but always present, that a Ching or a Nomura cannot be a good American is completely without basis, and that it is an argument unworthy of the American tradition.

Mr. Chairman, I have given careful study to the question of Hawaiian statehood. I have read the hearings that have been held. I have read articles in nonofficial publications, both those of a prostatehood turn and those written by opponents of statehood. I have read carefully the debates on the floor of both Houses of the Congress when this question has come before us. I have come to the unalterable conclusion that the question of statehood is one of the clearest and most unequivocal moral issues to come before the Congress during my 4 years here.

The people of Hawaii, Mr. Chairman, are American citizens. Their beautiful land is an integral part of our great Nation. These people pay their share of the taxes which we impose. Their people have fought beyond what could be expected of them in the wars which this Congress has supported. They have performed every duty which citizenship imposes. They have obeyed, willingly and without resentment, laws in the making of which they have no voice. They have shown a patience, a devotion to their Territory and to their Nation which, in a time of surging nationalism, is almost beyond belief. We, in the Congress, may legitimately say that the people of Hawaii have done no more than their duty to the freest Nation in the world.

We may say, rightly, that Territorial status under American rule is the very antithesis of colonial bondage, either under the older forms of European colonialism, or the newer and more subtle form of Soviet colonialism. All these things we may say with pride. But we cannot evade the fact that we are denying, for no legitimate reason at all, the rights of American citizens—the right to a voice in making the laws that govern them and choosing the men who lead them, to Americans whose duties have not been shirked and whose patriotism cannot be exceeded.

Mr. Chairman, 100 years ago, a farsighted Congress gave statehood to a struggling community on the Pacific coast. I think that that venture in state-making was not proven a failure. We have done the same thing a total of 36 times. In no case has the Union been anything but enriched and strengthened as we have added to the Federal family. Let us then, once more, show our faith in our own past and our even greater faith in our future. Let this be the last year in which Hawaiian statehood must come before the Congress of the United States.

---

#### STATEMENT OF HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

I favor granting statehood to Hawaii for the following reasons:

(1) It seems to me that it carries out an implied promise when the islands voluntarily joined the United States as a Territory which some day could hope to be a State.

(2) They have both the population and the tax base to adequately support a State and I am sure they will not be coming to the Federal Government for financial assistance, nor will they be applying for special consideration not granted in the 48 contiguous States of the Mainland.

(3) I am sure the Federal Government will not be undertaking any additional financial or protective burdens than they now have in connection with Hawaii as a Territory.

I sincerely hope that your committee will promptly favorably report a statehood bill for Hawaii.

## STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM A. BARRETT

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee: The Territory of Hawaii is ready for statehood, a status for which she has been preparing for more than half a century. Our only remaining incorporated Territory has come of age politically, economically, and culturally.

In the first place, the Hawaiian people are fiercely proud of their American citizenship and insist on the fulfillment of the promise of statehood tendered them more than 50 years ago. Secondly, we could not detach Hawaii from our body politic even if we wanted to. The Supreme Court has affirmed time and again that an incorporated Territory is an integral part of the United States and as such has no more right to secede from the Union than does a State. And thirdly, Hawaii's position in the Pacific is indispensable to our national security.

Strategic considerations, which are not confined strictly to things martial, indicate that Hawaii, as the 50th State, would do much to enhance our awareness of Pacific affairs and serve as an administrative center for our growing business as well as military interests in that region. As a cultural and political bridge to the Orient, Hawaii would promote the mutual understanding of and insight into the problems which face the United States and its neighbors—friendly and otherwise—in the Far East. Admission would, in itself, go far in this direction: The fear of a "white supremacy" policy of the United States towards Asia would be largely dispelled in the minds of reasonable men while, at the same time, the American concept of democracy would be given infinitely wider currency.

Reason, justice, and self-interest combine to demand an immediate, and long-overdue, admission to the American family of States.

## STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE T. J. DULSKI OF NEW YORK

I am deeply grateful to the chairman and the distinguished members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for giving me the opportunity to express my views favoring Hawaiian statehood.

To be or not to be—that is the question. Will Hawaii become the 50th star in the flag of the United States? Or will she be treated as our only stepchild?

We in the United States pride ourselves on being a land of justice. I feel that, as a matter of justice, Hawaii meets every historical standard we have required for the admission of new States. Hawaiians have been immersed in American traditions since 1820. They have demonstrated their devotion to the principles of democracy and to the American form of government in numerous ways, including the adoption of a constitution, in 1950, which has been commended as a model among such instruments.

The Hawaiians paid over \$150 million in Federal taxes—a sum larger than that paid by some of our States in the Union. One can only go back into the early history of this country—"Taxation without representation." The people of Hawaii have no voice as to the levy of taxes or its expenditures.

In 1950 about 84 percent of the Hawaiians were native-born American citizens. The record of island troops in combat is impressive testimony to their loyalty. Gen. Mark Clark described the Hawaiian organization as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." They served with equal valor in Korea.

Here is a colony bearing arms with us, but it cannot vote for the President who patterns their foreign policy.

That the majority of Hawaiians desire statehood is unquestionable. In 1940 they voted 2 to 1 for admission. In 1950 they approved the proposed State constitution by more than 3 to 1.

Hawaii has first-class qualifications insofar as population and resources are concerned. It has more people than five of the present States; more than twice as many as Alaska. It has a well-developed and prosperous economy. Its citizens support a per capita tax burden considerably higher than the national average—larger, in fact, than in 33 States.

Hawaii richly merits statehood as a matter of equity as well as justice. Permanent political inferiority for American citizens in American Territories is simply too foreign to our ideals to be tolerated for long. Hawaii is the only incorporated Territory not yet welcomed into the Union. It has been petitioning

for entrance since 1903. It has more people and a better developed economy than Alaska, our newest State. Both political parties have, in their platforms, approved Hawaiian statehood. Both President Eisenhower and former President Truman are for it. According to recent polls, the people of the United States are also for it by a ratio of more than 4½ to 1.

Finally, as an act of diplomacy, the admission of Hawaii would be of incalculable value. It would reverberate to our credit throughout the Far East. It would stand as an irrefutable proof that we really live by the principles of freedom and self-government we preach.

For these and many other reasons, I shall, in Congress, support passage of a Hawaiian statehood bill.

---

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EDWIN B. DOOLEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, permit me to express my deep sense of appreciation for being permitted to state my views on the important subject of Hawaiian statehood before the distinguished members of this committee.

Anyone who has visited Hawaii is aware that topographically, geographically, and climatically it is one of the earth's most beautiful and attractive areas. Any nation should be proud to have as part of itself a segment of land so beautifully endowed.

I am firmly convinced that Hawaii should be admitted as the 50th State of the United States for the following reasons:

(1) Situated as it is, midway in the north Pacific, it provides a bastion of air, naval, and military strength, as well as a strategically located base for missiles.

(2) It is the only haven for large ships, and jetplanes, between our west coast and Asia, approximately 6,000 miles away.

(3) It has a population of 575,000 persons, the majority of whom, judging by surveys and petitions, are eager for statehood.

(4) Since 1900 (1898) when Hawaii ceded its sovereignty to the United States, it has had second-class citizenship. Its citizens have never had the privilege of voting for a President, despite the fact that they pay taxes and are subject to the laws of the United States. Hawaii does not participate in the National Defense Highway Act of 1956 on the same basis as do the States, despite the fact that Hawaiians pay a fuel tax.

(5) No Territory in our history has possessed the advantages which Hawaii does in the way of population, a sound economy, a system of town government patterned after ours, and a sense of loyalty to the United States. As an example of Hawaiian loyalty one has but to recall that during World War II when the Nisei regiment was almost wiped out in Europe, it was reformed in Hawaii. Some 2,000 volunteers were requested to report. Instead some 9,000 Americans of Japanese origin offered to join up, knowing full well it meant almost certain death in battle.

(6) While 34 percent of the population of the islands is Japanese, they are intensely American. They speak only English and are eager to become full-fledged citizens.

(7) Today, with the currents of history flowing toward Asia, it would be immensely helpful if the United States were to admit Hawaii as a State. By so doing we would show the world that we are not averse to offering political equality to Asiatics. We would have a strong bridge with the people of the yellow race.

By making Hawaii—which is composed of heterogeneous people of Polynesian, Philippine, Japanese, and Oceanic origins—a State, we would be adding strength and vitality to our country.

---

STATEMENT ON STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII PRESENTED BY REPRESENTATIVE RUSSELL V. MACK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the reasons why Hawaii should be admitted into the Union as its 50th State, to me are clear, convincing, and compelling.

The Congress, during many statehood debates, has established a list of traditional qualifications which a Territory should have, or ought to have, to be considered eligible for statehood.

Among these qualifications are: (1) The Territory should possess adequate area; (2) it should have sufficient population; (3) its economic situation should be such as to permit its people to assume and to carry their proportionate share

of the Federal Government's financial responsibilities; (4) the people of the Territory must have manifested a sincere desire for statehood; and (5) finally, and most important, the people of the Territory must believe in the American republican form of government and be qualified by education and experience for self-government according to American traditions.

All of these five qualifications, I am convinced, the people of Hawaii now abundantly possess.

In area, the Territory of Hawaii covers more than 6,600 square miles of land. Hawaii, therefore, is larger in area than Connecticut, Rhode Island, or Delaware. Since these three now are States, an argument cannot effectively be made that Hawaii is too small in area for statehood.

In population, Hawaii now has more than half a million inhabitants. This is more people than any Territory, except Oklahoma, in all the history of the country possessed when it was admitted to statehood. Furthermore, Hawaii's present population is larger than that now possessed by six of our States. Surely, Hawaii cannot be denied statehood on the ground she has too few people.

Is the economy of Hawaii such as to permit her to assume her full share of support of the Nation's financial responsibilities? As to that qualification we also must answer in the affirmative. During recent years the people of Hawaii have paid more than \$90 million a year in Federal income taxes. There are many present States which do not pay that much. To deny statehood to a people who pay so much toward the support of the Federal Government is to practice what our forefathers denounced, taxation without representation.

Then there is the question of whether the half million people of Hawaii want statehood. They have said they do again, again, and again. In 1940, in a plebiscite held on the issue of statehood, the people of the Territory voted two to one for statehood. The Hawaiian Territorial Legislature, composed of duly elected representatives of the Hawaiian people, have petitioned the Congress in the past half century almost a score of times for statehood. These representatives, or similarly minded ones, have been elected and reelected time after time indicating they were, in petitioning statehood, expressing the will of the people.

And lastly, are the people of Hawaii qualified by training and experience for statehood? Few can doubt that they are. Their educational system is of the best. Their rate of literacy is high. For more than 50 years they have lived under and been faithful to an American system of representative form of government.

When Hawaii was admitted to the status of a Territory, the United States made her people an implied promise that, someday, when qualified, Hawaii would be admitted to statehood. The conventions of both political parties in their platforms declared that they favored statehood. We, of both parties, should keep those promises.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Our next witness will be the very distinguished Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred A. Seaton.

Mr. Seaton, may I ask you first: I understand you have an out-of-town appointment sometime today. Will it be possible for you to make your presentation and after that answer what questions may be asked? Or do you have a time problem that might require a return for the questions?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Chairman, I think that we would have time up to noon anyhow and come back later if you so desired.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you. You may proceed.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. FRED A. SEATON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, at first, if I may, I should like to join in the sentiment expressed by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. Aspinall, in also expressing my regret at the absence today because of death of the Honorable George H. Christopher, of Missouri, whom I knew both to be a fine gentleman and a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to appear before your committee this morning to urge the enactment of bills before you to admit Hawaii into the Union. I am grateful for the promptness with which you have scheduled consideration of this legislation.

The views of this administration on Hawaii statehood are well known. Already, since the convening of this Congress, the President has twice repeated his previous recommendations to the Congress that Hawaii be made a State of the Union. In his most recent statement to you, which was contained in his budget message, President Eisenhower said that it would be unconscionable if statehood for Hawaii were delayed any longer.

It is my personal hope that the Congress will find it possible to complete its action on statehood in this year, 1959. I recognize, of course, that Congress must set its own time schedules, and that for various reasons there are often delays, even on bills the ultimate passage of which is inevitable. Be that as it may, speaking for the executive branch of the Government, I assure you we will be most pleased and gratified if a statehood admission act for Hawaii is passed immediately.

In discussing the grant of statehood, it has been customary to speak of admitting States "into the Union," as if the Territory were in some sense outside and apart from the Nation; the bills before you use those words. As for myself, I have always considered that this language is somewhat deceptive.

The fact is that Hawaii is today in the Nation. It is true that Hawaii is not a member of the sisterhood of States, but it certainly is an integral part of this country, legally, politically, and constitutionally.

Hawaii is an incorporated Territory—the only one we have left—and as such it is covered by our Constitution, subject to our laws, protected by our Bill of Rights, defended by our military strength. And like the rest of us, Hawaiians are subject to military service and pay Federal taxes.

In many respects Hawaii is to be sharply distinguished from any of our other offshore Territories and possessions, none of which has been legally incorporated into this Nation.

Therefore, the question before you, it seems to me, is solely that of determining what status Hawaii should have within the Nation, whether that of State or that of Territory.

Every incorporated Territory has served an apprenticeship for statehood. However, none has been held in a Territorial status indefinitely. We believe that it does harm to an incorporated Territory, and harm to the Nation as a whole, to refuse or delay the grant of statehood to such a Territory when it fully meets the necessary conditions for statehood.

In terms of its devotion to American ideals, the American stamp of its culture, its economic development, its political stability, and its ability to maintain the costs of statehood and the responsibilities of equal status with the other States, Hawaii has fully met all the traditional tests for statehood.

To most of the members of this committee, the background facts on Hawaii are an old story, since the question of statehood for this Territory has been more thoroughly studied, investigated, and explored than for any one of the present 49 States. For the benefit

of your new members and the record, however, it should be worth while again to review some of the basic facts about Hawaii's application for statehood, her qualifications, and her place in the America of today and tomorrow.

Hawaii, as you know, was annexed by the United States in 1898 and became an incorporated Territory by the terms of the Organic Act passed by Congress in 1900. It has, therefore, served an apprenticeship in Territorial status for 59 years. That period is longer than the equivalent apprenticeship required of any of the present States.

Long before its annexation, Hawaiians were thoroughly imbued with American ideals and American culture. As long ago as 1820, the native people were converted to Christianity by American missionaries. The first sugar plantation in the islands was established in 1835. Since that time Hawaii's trade has been more and more strongly oriented toward the continental United States.

The first English language newspaper was started in 1836. Punahou School, a school for the education of young chiefs established by the American mission in 1840, quickly gained recognition as a leading education center throughout the entire Pacific. For example, there was a period when many leading Californians sent their children to school at Punahou.

A form of constitutional government was established by the Hawaiian monarchy in 1840, private ownership of land in 1848. The progressive adoption of American ways and American ideals led, as early as the 1850's, to agitation for annexation to the United States. Although this movement did not bear fruit immediately, a commercial treaty of reciprocity between the two nations in 1875 tied Hawaii even more firmly to the American economy.

All through the 19th century a steady stream of Americans—businessmen, educators, churchmen, professional men, and others—migrated to the islands, made their homes there, and introduced American skills, knowledge, ideals, and culture into the life of the islands.

Ultimate annexation was inevitable. In 1893, as a result of the attempt by the then Hawaiian rule, Queen Liliukalani, to reestablish an absolute monarchy, the kingdom was overthrown and replaced by a republic, headed by Sanford Dole, who was born in Hawaii but educated in the United States. Annexation followed in 1898 by treaty between the Hawaiian Republic and the United States.

Since the annexation and the incorporation of the Territory, the Americanization of Hawaii has continued at a rapid pace. The steady flow of people from the mainland to the Territory has continued and grown. The excellent territorial school system early converted the Hawaiians—of diverse racial strains—of Hawaii into a predominantly English-speaking population.

American business methods prevail throughout the economy. Hawaii's press, radio and television, her political institutions, her religious and charitable organizations, and her social life all duplicate, or are modeled after those of the continental United States. In every way, Hawaii is a mirror of the mainland—it is the showcase of American democracy.

I emphasize this similarity because it seems to me that part of the opposition to statehood has been based on a feeling that Hawaii is

somehow "foreign" in its makeup or in its outlook. Nothing, I assure you, could be further from the truth. It is true that a large percentage of the population is of Oriental and Polynesian racial extractions. But from that fact it would be both unfair and highly inaccurate to draw any conclusions that such people have an outlook or loyalty that is in any way foreign to our way of life or is non-American in concept.

Quite the contrary is true. The overwhelming majority of the people of these racial groups were born on American soil, are American citizens by birth, and have never known any other nation. They are as proud of their American citizenship as you and I.

For those who have not as yet had an opportunity to study the geographical and economic facts of present-day Hawaii, it may be of interest if I summarize some of the more important features.

This committee recently took a leading part in the movement which gave us our 49th State. In your deliberations on Alaska you heard opposition arguments that Alaska was too vast and sprawling, too thinly settled, too undeveloped economically, and too poor in state revenue sources to justify the grant of statehood. You rejected those arguments—rightly, I believe—but we all concede that Alaska is comparatively undeveloped as yet.

Hawaii represents an extreme contrast to Alaska in those respects.

It is comparatively small—6,423 square miles—although not so small as three of our present States—which you will recall as being: Rhode Island, Delaware, and Connecticut.

The Territory is thickly settled, comparatively thickly settled, with a population recently estimated at about 635,000—larger than that of six of the present States: New Hampshire, with 584,000; Delaware, 454,000; Vermont, 372,000; Wyoming, 320,000; Nevada, 267,000; and Alaska, approximately 214,000.

In fact, Hawaii today has a greater population than that enjoyed at the time of admittance by any of the States—other than the original 13—with the single exception of Oklahoma.

In Alaska, economic development has barely scratched the surface of the resources which are known to exist there. Hawaii, by contrast, is well developed. It is an economically self-sustaining area, with flourishing industries and abundant local tax revenues to meet the costs of statehood.

More than a million tons of sugar, worth nearly \$150 million are produced annually, from over 200,000 acres of cane. Capital investment in this industry amounts to nearly \$200 million of which about \$50 million is in irrigation facilities alone. In sugar production techniques and per acre production Hawaii leads the world, and its hourly rated employees receive the world's highest year-round agricultural wages.

Hawaii also produces 85 percent of the total United States supply of canned pineapple products: that is to say, 65 percent of the world's production. Pineapple production uses about 75,000 acres of intensely cultivated land, and provides employment for over 22,000 people annually. The annual value of the output, estimated at about \$115 million, gives pineapples second rank to sugar.

Although other specialty crops for export may be considered as minor in comparison to those already named, they add annually about \$10 million to Hawaii's gross income.



Aside from agriculture and the processing of farm products, a second major source of income for the people of Hawaii is the tourist trade. In 1922, the total number of visitors was less than 10,000. As late as 1941, the peak prewar year, it was only 32,000. By 1957, however, it had reached a total of 169,000, more than 5 times the number of 16 years before.

That 169,000, incidentally, represents the number of persons staying 2 days or more. They spent nearly \$80 million in Hawaii in that year, and thus put tourism next to sugar and pineapples as a source of income from private industry.

Other industries and industrial possibilities could be mentioned—fisheries, minerals, and timber. For example, while it had always in the past been generally believed that Hawaii was lacking in mineral resources, there have recently been discovered tremendous quantities of bauxite ore, the raw material for the aluminum industry.

Although the ores tested thus far have not been of very high grade, there still seems to be a real possibility that these ores may lead to a substantial mineral industry in Hawaii. If they can be profitably used, there is a tremendous quantity of the ore available—over 200 million tons of bauxite contents—a quantity several times as large as all that in other known bauxite reserves in the United States and its possessions.

Most of Hawaii's economic possibilities are already well developed, as I have said, and the Territory is already a taxpaying partner, carrying a full share of the burden of supporting the Federal Government. Federal internal revenue collections in Hawaii last year amounted to \$166,306,000, a figure higher than in 10 of the present States: New Hampshire, Vermont, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, New Mexico, Nevada, and Alaska.

This is the picture of Hawaii's economy and present state of development. As can easily be seen, economically Hawaii is well developed and prosperous, with an economy based upon sound foundations.

With this picture in mind, how well does Hawaii measure up, when tested by the standards that in the past have commonly been applied to applicants for statehood?

The three standards which are said to be traditional are these:

(1) That the inhabitants of the proposed new State are imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government.

As a matter of fact, I hope my statement thus far has been convincing that the people of Hawaii fully meet this test in every regard.

(2) That a majority of the electorate desire statehood.

The Territorial legislature has petitioned for admission as a State again and again; Delegate after Delegate has introduced a statehood bill; the Territory has drafted and the people have ratified a proposed constitution, and the people have voted overwhelmingly for statehood in both 1940 and 1951. Thus there is ample evidence of the electorate's desire for statehood.

(3) That the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

As I pointed out previously, Hawaii's population today is greater than that of any other State at the time of admission, save one.

The additional cost of statehood to Hawaii would be only a few hundred thousand dollars a year, since the Territory already pays from its own local revenues substantially all the costs of functions normally assumed by a State.

As for providing its share of the cost of the Federal Government, Hawaii will do that, with or without statehood, as it already does.

Evidentially these tests are easy for Hawaii. In fact, if these tests had been the only ones to meet, Hawaii would surely have been a State many years ago. What other objections can there be?

It used to be argued that we should refuse to admit to statehood an area not contiguous to the rest of the United States. However, the admission of Alaska provides an excellent rebuttal to that argument. Contiguity is not, in this day of jet transportation, essential to preserve our Union.

One argument against Hawaiian statehood persists in some quarters—communism. It has been alleged that Hawaii is susceptible to control by Communists, that they exercise key positions of influence throughout the political system, and that after statehood this influence would continue.

How much fact and how much fiction is there in these charges?

The fact is that the people of Hawaii, time after time, have utterly rejected the Communist philosophy and every attempt of Communists to influence their government.

The people of Hawaii wrote into their proposed State constitution a far-reaching prohibition against any Communist holding public office or public employment of any kind.

In 1949, when a prolonged dock strike threatened the economy of the Territory, the Territorial legislature, notwithstanding the most severe pressure in opposition, enacted laws providing comprehensive power and authority for the Territorial government to step in and seize the docks in the event of a strike. Four general Territory-wide elections for the legislature have been held since those laws were enacted. In each election the laws were an issue, but the Hawaiians have held firm. Those laws are all still on the books in Hawaii today.

For another example, when the Korean conflict broke out, young men from Hawaii responded eagerly to the call for service. They fought bravely and suffered a high rate of casualties. Not one committed an act of cowardice in the face of the enemy. Not one became a turncoat or rejected repatriation to the United States.

The people of Hawaii have been alert to the Communist menace and are not afraid to resist it. In fact, I am informed that no known Communist has ever been elected to public office in Hawaii.

The charge of Communist influence and control in Hawaii is not a new one. It was first used as an argument against statehood in 1948. This, I need not remind you, is 1959, 11 years later. In those 11 years the people of Hawaii have been tested again and again. They have responded to every test magnificently. Never once have they failed.

In those 11 years dire warnings have been uttered again and again that a growth of communism was imminent, that communism was about to seize control of this or of that activity.

For example, there were warnings that communism would control the constitutional convention called in 1950 to draft a constitution for the proposed State. Instead, that convention wrote into the proposed constitution the strongest kind of anti-Communist protective language.

Regrettably there were warnings that boys from Hawaii of oriental extraction could not be trusted at the fighting front in Korea against enemy Communist troops of similar racial origins. But the boys from Hawaii behaved magnificently, with not one single action that could possibly reflect on their loyalty.

Mr. Chairman, Hawaii deserves statehood. Hawaii has earned the right to fair and equal treatment, if indeed such a right must be earned. In my opinion, Hawaii has long since served her apprenticeship in the American way of life and the American way of government. She has accepted voluntarily and wholeheartedly our ideas and concepts and methods.

To be sure, some critics have asked: "Statehood will help Hawaii, but how will it help us?"

I urge this committee to reject that brand of thinking. The admission of any fully qualified partner does strengthen the whole. Certainly it might have been argued 170 years ago that the Original Thirteen States would be foolish to grant equal rights to others.

Whatever such illogical counsels were uttered at that time—and history does record some—they were not listened to. What a travesty of a Union we would have today if the Original Thirteen States had attempted to reserve all powers to themselves and to keep all the rest of the Nation under their rule.

This Nation has lived and grown great on the principles of dealing fairly with all its people and granting equal rights to all those able to fulfill their responsibilities and share in carrying the common burdens. The same principles apply to Hawaii.

We need Hawaii. We need Hawaii as an equal partner as much as Hawaii needs statehood. The grant of statehood to Hawaii will prove to the world—and particularly to Asia—that we practice what we preach. I say we need the participation of Hawaiians in our counsels and their advice and experience in dealing with the peoples of the Orient. We need and want their voluntary participation and enthusiasm, so much more valuable to us than any help we can draw from them under force of law. The voluntary cooperation of free people has made this Nation great.

Admission of Hawaii, Mr. Chairman, will demonstrate our continued adherence to all of the principles of our Founding Fathers. Hawaii pleads for simple justice. Answering that plea, to me, involves only a question of when to act.

Our report on these various bills is before you. In it we have made some suggestions for your consideration. The personnel of the Department are available to you for any assistance or information you may require.

Thank you.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I congratulate you on a very able and at the same time dispassionate statement. I hope it is and was as convincing to the other members of the committee as it was to me.

Secretary SEATON. I thank the chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Aspinall.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take the time of the committee to ask any questions. I do wish to congratulate the Secretary on his presentation. Especially do I wish to thank him for the thought that is in his fourth paragraph.

In other words, Hawaii is today as much a part of the Union, an indissoluble part of the Union, as if it were a State. I know of no way by which Hawaii could get out of the Union unless it was by an action of Congress, and I do not know how that would be accomplished. I know of no machinery. In other words, it is a question now of whether or not we recognize an age-old tradition of the United States.

I thank the Secretary for his contribution.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to join you and the chairman of our committee, Mr. Aspinall, in commending the Secretary for his excellent statement.

Mr. Secretary, I think the question which you have raised on page 6, where you state that some people want to know how the admission of Hawaii could help us is well answered by you in the remainder of that page and the top of page 7. Because it has been my experience with a number of people in the Orient that they are pointing to Hawaii and saying that the only reason we have not admitted them to statehood is because of their ancestral background, I certainly think that this country could do nothing that would so impress the peoples of the East, that regardless of racial background, if you are an American citizen, you are entitled to full equality wherever you may be found.

I certainly commend you for this statement.

I would also like to commend you for getting the report of your Department up here so promptly. In other words, I realize you only had a week to submit it, and knowing the problems you have in clearing reports through various bureaus, I commend you in seeing to it that you have your report here.

Thank you.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, you made a very good statement, a very impressive statement. But would not the arguments that you have advanced here apply to other Territories of the United States the same as they do to Hawaii, with the exception of the wealth proposition?

Secretary SEATON. I am sorry, Mr. Rogers. I did not hear the last part. With the exception of what?

Mr. ROGERS. With the exception of the wealth situation.

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, so far as the foreseeable future is concerned, I do not think so.

In the first place, as I point out in the statement, the Territory of Hawaii is the only incorporated Territory we have left.

Secondly, I am not aware—and I think I should be aware—that any of the other Territories or possessions of the United States are petitioning for statehood or have that in mind.

Thirdly, with all respect to the other Territories and possessions of the United States, I think I should have to say, upon the basis of what I think is ample evidence, that no one of them is presently qualified for admission into statehood in the Union.

Now as to what might transpire many, many years from now, sir, I could not prophesy as to that.

Mr. ROGERS. What are the qualifications you have in mind for a territory to qualify for statehood?

Secretary SEATON. I think, sir, that the three traditional qualifications which I have listed in my statement cover that subject reasonably well. I shall be glad to discuss them further if you would like.

I might, before I get to that, if I may, sir, with your indulgence, point out that in our dealings with Hawaii, too, there have always been at least the implied promises of eventual statehood. I mean there is a long history of that which goes back even to the time of the original annexation. I personally should not want to rest our case for statehood solely and wholly on this premise, but, as I say, it is a matter of record.

Mr. ROGERS. Now the three qualifications that you were speaking of, I noted with interest when you read them, and it seems to me the only one that probably does not apply to the other Territories of this country would be No. 3, that is, its relation to the resources and the economic situation necessary to support statehood, let us say.

Now are those the only qualifications you have had in mind, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary SEATON. No, Mr. Rogers; there are others which are threaded through the document which I presented to the committee. But I would hazard this, that if only No. 3 were taken into consideration, No. 3 would preclude the admission of other Territories and possessions into statehood at this time.

I repeat that, so far as I know—and I think I should be thoroughly aware if it is contrary to the case—we have no other Territory or possessions which are petitioning for statehood or overwhelmingly committed to trying to get it. And Hawaii, as I said, is the only incorporated territory we have.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, do you feel, as has been said on so many occasions, that the failure to grant statehood to Hawaii would leave the people of Hawaii in the situation where they would have second-class citizenship with relation to other citizens of the United States?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, I would rather put it in this context: that our failure to grant statehood to Hawaii would leave us, the rest of us, the other 49 States which make up the Federal Government, in an impossible position.

And then so far as your premise—

Mr. ROGERS. What do you mean by an impossible position?

Secretary SEATON. I think it would simply demonstrate, sir, that we do not practice what we preach. And then, so far as the people of Hawaii are concerned, if you want to put it in the semantics of second-class citizenship or not, it is a fact that they are forced to carry out all of the responsibilities of statehood.

By that I mean they are subject to all of our Federal laws, they are subject to military service; they pay all the Federal taxes which are imposed on any other citizen of the United States; and what they are really denied are none of the obligations; what they are really denied is one of the virtues, and that is the right of full suffrage.

They cannot vote for their own Governor; they cannot vote for an elected Member of the House of Representatives who has a right to

vote; and they cannot choose U.S. Senators who have the right of a vote. They are precluded by the very terms of an organized Territory, as differentiated from the State, from enjoying the full privileges of American citizenship.

Mr. ROGERS. That is the thing that has me somewhat disturbed. I have heard this term "practice what we preach" very much. Do I understand what we are doing is preaching that everybody ought to be on an equal basis, and that if the inhabitants of a Territory are imbued with the ideals of democratic principles and willing to subscribe to them, and the majority of those people desire statehood, that unless they have the wealth to become States in accordance with your yardstick here, then they have got to remain in a position of second-class citizenship as has been observed?

Secretary SEATON. Of course, the present status of Hawaii, as we have insisted it should be, as I say, has the very practical effect of imposing on Hawaiians all of the responsibilities of citizenship, but denying them one of the most precious assets of citizenship, which is the full right of suffrage.

Rather strangely, Mr. Rogers, if I understand the Constitution correctly, it would be possible for an Hawaiian to become President of the United States because he is a citizen while, at the same time, it is absolutely impossible for Hawaiians to vote for President of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS. Would not those same arguments, though, apply to other Territories, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary SEATON. Some of those arguments, Mr. Rogers, would apply to other Territories if other Territories had qualified themselves for statehood. And I say, so far as I am concerned, the record is clear that as of now no other Territory of the United States has been able to qualify themselves for statehood.

Mr. ROGERS. Because of their means in the AMS test?

Secretary SEATON. Not alone, sir. Other tests, too.

Mr. ROGERS. According to the third section of the yardstick you put down here, that would be the situation, say, in the Virgin Islands. If those people wanted to come in and were willing to subscribe to democratic principles, because they did not have the money to support themselves, would be the only reason they would be denied their statehood?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, I do not want to quarrel with you about it, but I would feel it necessary to point out that standard No. 2 would also apply.

Then, of course, we also have this: We have in the platforms of both political parties, which is to the credit of both of them—it has been there for a number of years—the promise of statehood to Hawaii. And we have had declarations on the part of several Presidents of the United States, Presidents of both political parties, and that does not apply, either of those, in the cases of these other Territories and possessions.

I have seen no such promises in party platforms and I am not aware of any such utterances on the part of the Presidents.

Mr. ROGERS. You would not argue that statehood would depend on whether or not a political party put it in its platform, would you? That would not be a controlling factor.

It seems to me the controlling factor, as advanced by the proponents of statehood has been simply this: What this country needs to do is to get away from this brand of colonialism that we apparently bear in the minds of some people. I do not think that we bear it. But that we have got to admit all of the Territories as a State in order to escape being branded a colonial power.

Secretary SEATON. I did not intend to make any such point, Mr. Rogers. But go ahead.

Mr. ROGERS. You will admit this: That when we admitted Alaska we moved into an entirely new political area. I am not speaking about political parties; I am speaking about the science of government in my definition of politics. When we made a State out of a Territory that was separated from the other 48 States by a foreign country over which we have no jurisdiction, or by the seas over which we have at most joint jurisdiction, or equal jurisdiction with other foreign powers, we did move into a new political area in that decree, do you not think, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, we did, Mr. Rogers. But I need not remind you that California was admitted into the Union when it was widely separated from the other States, and it certainly was debatable, to put it mildly, whether we both had jurisdiction and authority over the intervening territory there?

Mr. ROGERS. You say it was debatable whether we had jurisdiction.

Secretary SEATON. I said both jurisdiction and authority, authority in the sense of control over that wide expanse, some 3,000 miles.

Mr. ROGERS. I think we had a right to put Armed Forces in there to enforce any law we wanted to enforce. But we did own the territory in between California and the rest of the States.

Secretary SEATON. I think that is admitted. But, as you say, we covered that question with the admission of Alaska. That is why I pointed out in my statement that contiguity no longer seemed to me to be an issue.

Mr. ROGERS. But your statement said that by admitting Alaska we answered the question about whether or not you can preserve the Union because of noncontiguity.

Now, the admission of Alaska did not answer that question, it created the question of whether or not the Union can be preserved if Alaska was attacked, did it not, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, I have got a lot more faith in the Union than that.

Mr. ROGERS. Than what?

Secretary SEATON. I certainly would not admit that the admission of Alaska had jeopardized the future of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS. I did not say it jeopardized it, but it created the situation. It created the situation insofar as the preservation of the Union is concerned by having a State separated from the other 48 States, did it not?

What I am saying, Mr. Secretary.—

Secretary SEATON. I do not quite understand you, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Prior to the admission of Alaska that question was not presented, was it?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, I think I would have to insist that precisely the same question was posed with the admission of California

because of the vast expanse of area between California and the States which were then presently members of the Union, and we survived that.

I have every faith that we will survive the admission of Alaska, to put it mildly.

Mr. ROGERS. On several instances there have been Territories between a new State and the rest of the Union, but that has been territory owned by the United States and over which we had jurisdiction and had the right to assert it. We certainly do not have the right to move military operations into Canada without their permission, do you think?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, I tried to make it clear—perhaps I failed in that, and if I did, I apologize—that in this day and age the question of land travel or water travel is not nearly as important as it may have been many, many years ago. You can get forces in and out of Hawaii more efficiently, perhaps even more—well, I would say more—safely and more economically today by means of air transport than you could have gotten those same munitions or forces into California out of the other States at the time of California's admission.

Mr. ROGERS. I will agree with that, Mr. Secretary, but you will have to agree with this: That the international law as it is presently applied still utilizes the yardstick of land masses to divide sovereignties and inland waters, does it not?

Secretary SEATON. Generally speaking.

Mr. ROGERS. And the fact is that the Hawaiian Islands are not only separated from this country by wide expanses of water over which we do not have exclusive jurisdiction; the eight component parts of the Hawaiian Islands are also separated by the same expanses of water over which we do not have exclusive jurisdiction nor do the Hawaiian Islands have exclusive jurisdiction. Is that not correct?

Secretary SEATON. I think from an academic point of view of international law it is. From a practical point of view, I do not know I could completely concur.

I am not sure of your point. Are you questioning our ability to defend Hawaii?

Mr. ROGERS. No.

Secretary SEATON. Or of Hawaiians to contribute to their defense?

Mr. ROGERS. No; I do not question that. I think we can defend Hawaii.

Let us put it this way: Do you think it would be any easier to defend Hawaii as a State than it would as a Territory?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, I would have to say so, based upon my fundamental belief that the granting of statehood to any people strengthens those people and the whole fiber of their economy and political system.

Mr. ROGERS. You mean they would fight harder or we would fight harder?

Secretary SEATON. It might be both.

Mr. ROGERS. Let me ask you this, Mr. Secretary: Do you know how much money is put into the Hawaiian Islands each year out of the tax coffers of this country?

Secretary SEATON. Give me a moment, sir. I think we may have that figure.



Mr. Rogers, I think the last figures we can give you for that—perhaps the Department of Defense can update them—for the year 1957 the appropriated funds for Armed Forces expenditures—I assume that is what you are speaking to—amounted to about \$308 million.

In 1956 those same appropriated funds amounted to \$285 million.

Mr. ROGERS. Percentagewise what part of the income of Hawaii is that?

Secretary SEATON. I would have to refer back to the total productivity, if you will give me a moment.

Mr. ROGERS. One thing I was thinking about, Mr. Secretary, you made a point here that the Hawaiian Islands paid in \$166 million, and yet there was not anything in your statement about how much they got out of the Federal Government.

Secretary SEATON. Well, Mr. Rogers, we will furnish the figure of the total Territorial gross product of Hawaii for you. We will have to add it up from figures that we have.

But I should not want to enter into a debate about how much the Federal Government is spending in my State of Nebraska for military installations as indicating any diminution in the desirability of having Nebraska as one of the 49 States. That might apply even more to some other States.

In the interest of amity, I will not discuss Texas.

Mr. ROGERS. If they do not stop these oil imports, we are going to have to start getting more from the Federal Government than we are paying in, too.

But the point is simply this: That the great part of the Hawaiian economy, Mr. Secretary, is based upon income put there by the Federal Government from tax sources. That is correct; is it not?

Secretary SEATON. If I understand what you mean by "great part" I should not want to subscribe to that definition at the moment. I think I would agree a substantial amount of money certainly is spent, because when you get it up in the magnitude that I have recited, that, to me, is substantial.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you think it is over 50 percent, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary SEATON. I cannot answer that question at the moment.

Mr. ROGERS. If you would get those figures I would appreciate it. I am sure you have them somewhere. Just submit them for the record, if the Chair will permit.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection.

(The information follows:)

The gross Territorial product of Hawaii for the calendar year 1957 was about \$2 billion. Military expenditures in the Territory for that year were about \$308 million. Federal grants to Hawaii for 1958 amounted to \$22 million. The total of military expenditures and Federal grants was \$330 million. Thus the percentage of gross Territorial product represented by income put there by the Federal Government from tax sources was 16½ percent.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, there is some talk in your statement about colonialism. Do you think that we in this country have done things that require us to take some affirmative action to prove to the people of Asia that we have been wrong and we want to make some correction?

Secretary SEATON. I should not want to say that we have been wrong. I would say that so far as I am concerned as an official of the Government I have been disappointed that Hawaii has not long since

been granted statehood. I do not think that we have to admit any wrongs.

I think, if we were to perpetuate the present situation, we certainly would weaken our position, not only in Asia, but before the world, and just as truly in our own country.

I have never seen the public opinion polls compiled by any source which did not reveal an overwhelming support on the part of the U.S. citizens for the admission of Hawaii as a State.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not want to get your prediction—

Secretary SEATON. May I give you one figure on your question about the Hawaiian economy vis-a-vis the military expenditures?

Mr. ROGERS. Surely.

Secretary SEATON. The gross annual product of the Territory of Hawaii, on the latest available figures, is something in excess of 2 billions of dollars, and Hawaii's 1957 mainland dollar earnings were \$856 million. Hawaii expended some \$833 million on the mainland.

That may help in answer to your previous question.

Mr. ROGERS. You said the military expenditures. Are there any other government expenditures over there besides the military?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, there are some. There are some in connection with the various governmental functions. I do not at the moment recognize any of those as major. I might want to look further into that.

Mr. ROGERS. I want to know what you mean by "major." You mean up into the hundreds of millions of dollars?

Secretary SEATON. That is right; or anything approximating that.

Mr. ROGERS. Of course, the military would constitute the greater part; would it not?

Secretary SEATON. Of the governmental expenditures, I am sure that is right, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to ask the Secretary a question at this point. The percentage of governmental expenditures to Hawaii's total economy, is it not substantially less than the percentage of governmental expenditures to the total economy of Alaska?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, I would agree with that.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Which has been admitted as a State?

Secretary SEATON. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Does that means you are going to turn Alaska loose?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Loose?

Mr. ROGERS. You mean we made a mistake when we took Alaska in?

Mr. O'BRIEN. No. What I mean, if the gentleman will yield further, is that the Congress considered that argument because it was so brilliantly presented by the gentleman from Texas, and then voted to make Alaska a State.

Mr. ROGERS. I will not yield further. [Laughter.]

Mr. Secretary, the fact remains that the Hawaiian Islands, even though they make a contribution to the Federal Government of some \$166 million, as pointed out by you, get from the Federal Government approximately twice that amount; do they not?

Secretary SEATON. You mean in comparing Federal income taxes with the military expenditures?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Secretary SEATON. Something in that magnitude. Of course, the mere fact we have expended all of that total moneys for military purposes in the Hawaiian Islands, Mr. Rogers, is simply another demonstration of how important we think the Hawaiian Islands are to the defense of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, I do not discount the importance of the Hawaiian Islands at all. As a matter of fact, I think the Hawaiian Islands are probably—I do not want to make Alaska feel badly—as important as any other possession we have ever had. I think they are highly important and I think the people of Hawaii are great people. I think they are wonderful people. Any opposition I have ever voiced to Hawaiian or Alaskan statehood has been from the standpoint of political—and I mean by that the science of government—rather than because of any race or anything of that kind that has been generated in this argument.

I just do not think race or those kind of things should enter into it.

One other question and I will quit.

You went into communism at length. Do you think, Mr. Secretary, that Harry Bridges could throttle the economy of the Hawaiian Islands if he wanted to?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, if you are just asking for my personal opinion—and that is all I am competent to give in answer to your question—

Mr. ROGERS. I am asking you as an expert witness.

Secretary SEATON. I am not an expert witness on Mr. Bridges.

Mr. ROGERS. You have charge of the Department in Government that has charge of the Hawaiian Islands, though.

Secretary SEATON. But not of Mr. Bridges, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. I understand that, but you know the problem. Sometimes I wish you did have charge of him.

Secretary SEATON. Thank you.

I think the record is clear enough that Mr. Bridges has in the past called strikes and certain other labor actions which have been vexacious, to put it lightly, to carrying on the orderly commerce of the islands.

However, that is just as true in a good many States of the Union, whether it is Mr. Bridges' union or somebody else's union.

We have had recent examples of that. Very recent ones.

Then I would also like to point out that the Hawaiian Legislature did meet that head on in the labor legislation which it adopted and which has been under attack from obvious sources four times since that legislation was adopted, and those laws are still on the books, which, among other things, provide for the seizure and governmental operation of the docks if, in the opinion of the duly constituted government of Hawaii, it becomes necessary.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, we can argue about communism forever and not get any place.

I have one other question and then I will quit.

Is it your position that, if Puerto Rico met the first two parts of your yardstick for statehood and established the fact that it could meet the third one, that it should be admitted as a State, too?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, that is a question which I certainly do not deny your right to ask, but I must say it is wholly academic to

these purposes, if for no other reason than that the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have shown absolutely no evidence of desiring American statehood. And at this time we do not have that question before us.

Mr. ROGERS. I am asking if it was that they wanted it.

Secretary SEATON. As I say, I would rather meet that question if and when the people of Puerto Rico meet at least the three tests I have enumerated. Of course, I am not the author of these tests. These are tests which have gradually been evolved by action of the Congress of the United States.

Also, as I understand, before Puerto Rico or any other Territory or possession, Commonwealth, as the case of Puerto Rico, would become a State, I think it is right that Congress first would have to make an incorporated Territory of it as a prelude to admission to statehood. I have seen no demands for that in Puerto Rico.

Mr. ROGERS. I am speaking of the mechanics having been gotten out of the way.

One question in that connection. Suppose they had a plebiscite in Cuba and they decided they could meet these requirements. Do you think we ought to take Cuba in?

Secretary SEATON. I think that is an entirely different question, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. In what way?

Secretary SEATON. In the first place, there is no such request before us. The mechanics are not present to put it before us.

Mr. ROGERS. I know.

Secretary SEATON. You might just as well ask me if I thought if that should happen in Germany or Great Britain whether they should become part of the Union. They have an independent government.

Mr. ROGERS. Of course, we could go on and ask it, but I say Cuba because it is close, and we are much closer to it than the Hawaiian Islands. Much closer. And if those people decided they want to join up with us—what I was probing for was really the general philosophy of this whole situation, because we have had so many arguments about second-class citizenship and not practicing what we preach. And I do not know what we are preaching. I mean it is hard to know what to practice if you do not know what is being preached.

If we are talking about second-class citizenship, I want to know how far we are going to go in this new political area.

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, I indicated earlier that I personally do not like to use the phrase "second-class citizens." It has certain implications in it, which I think are unfortunate to the citizens involved, to say nothing of us.

What we are preaching here is that here are American citizens, as I said earlier, shouldering all of the responsibilities of American citizens, but enjoying only certain privileges. And one of the greatest privileges of American citizenship, which is the right of suffrage, is denied to them.

They have petitioned the Government of the United States for almost 60 years for statehood. There have been repeated investigations and repeated attempts to make a State of Hawaii. I think Hawaii has qualified in all of the necessary ingredients of statehood.

That is my opinion. And I think, as I said, to me it is just a case of simple justice.

As Chairman Aspinall so pertinently pointed out, Hawaii is part of the Nation. I know of no process by which Hawaii gets out of the Nation. We just keep them suspended here in sort of a never-never land, and to me, sir, that is grossly unfair both to them and to us.

Mr. ROGERS. You have been very kind, Mr. Secretary. Thank you very much.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota and asks him first to yield to the Chairman.

Mr. BERRY. I will yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to explain, before the gentleman from South Dakota asks his questions, that he served on a committee under the chairman which went to Hawaii last year and performed a wonderful service, sometimes kept the rest of us with our feet on the ground.

I think that he will agree with me that, if there was one subject at which the committee looked very, very carefully, it was the question of communism in Hawaii.

Mr. Berry.

Mr. BERRY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I would commend the Secretary for a very fine and very complete statement. In that connection, I wish it would have been possible for us, as members of the subcommittee, to have filed a report that was done as well as the Secretary's report.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would ask at this time that the report made by yourself, Congressman Sisk, and myself of the subcommittee hearings in Hawaii be made a part of the record at this point.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HALEY. The Chair is going a little fast here. Not that I want to object, but please give us an opportunity to object.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes, the gentleman is in order.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I realize the practical situation, and I am sure everybody here does, but I think that we have ample time to have full discussions on hearings. I think that the chairman could move just a little slower here.

The gentleman from Florida does not want to impede the progress of the committee or anybody else. I do want to have an opportunity to object.

I have this report of the subcommittee for the first time before me this morning. It consists of six pages. No doubt it is a good report. I would like temporarily to object so that I might have an opportunity to study it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Do I understand, if the gentleman will yield, that the gentleman from Florida is objecting to the inclusion in the record—

Mr. HALEY. At this particular time.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Of a previous report by three members of this committee who were officially designated by the committee to go to Hawaii and study the situation and make a report?

Mr. HALEY. At this time, until the gentleman from Florida has an opportunity to study the report, I do.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The objection is heard. Does the gentleman wish to move?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I will move that the report of the committee be made a part of these hearings, if there is no objection, following the study of the report.

Mr. HALEY. All right.

(By later order of the committee the report follows:)

REPORT  
OF A  
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND  
INSULAR AFFAIRS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION  
PURSUANT TO  
H. Res. 94  

---

HAWAII STATEHOOD



NOVEMBER 24 TO DECEMBER 8, 1958

Printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs  
House of Representatives

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1959

## COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

**CLAIR ENGLE**, California, *Chairman*

<b>WAYNE N. ASPINALL</b> , Colorado	<b>A. L. MILLER</b> , Nebraska
<b>LEO W. O'BRIEN</b> , New York	<b>JOHN P. SAYLOR</b> , Pennsylvania
<b>WALTER ROGERS</b> , Texas	<b>J. ERNEST WHARTON</b> , New York
<b>MRS. GRACIE FOST</b> , Idaho	<b>E. Y. BERRY</b> , South Dakota
<b>JAMES A. HALEY</b> , Florida	<b>WILLIAM A. DAWSON</b> , Utah
<b>GEORGE A. SHUFORD</b> , North Carolina	<b>JACK WESTLAND</b> , Washington
<b>ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.</b> , New York	<b>JOHN R. PILLION</b> , New York
<b>ED EDMONDSON</b> , Oklahoma	<b>CRAIG HOSMER</b> , California
<b>GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER</b> , Missouri	<b>JOHN J. RHODES</b> , Arizona
<b>B. F. SISK</b> , California	<b>J. EDGAR CHENOWETH</b> , Colorado
<b>STEWART L. UDALL</b> , Arizona	<b>JAMES B. UTT</b> , California
<b>CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.</b> , Michigan	<b>KEITH THOMSON</b> , Wyoming
<b>J. T. RUTHERFORD</b> , Texas	<b>PHIL WEAVER</b> , Nebraska
<b>WALTER S. BARING</b> , Nevada	<b>HAROLD R. COLLIER</b> , Illinois
<b>AL ULLMAN</b> , Oregon	
<b>LEROY ANDERSON</b> , Montana	
<b>E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT</b> , Alaska	
<b>JOHN A. BURNS</b> , Hawaii	
<b>A. FERNÓS-ISERN</b> , Puerto Rico	

---

### SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE

<b>LEO W. O'BRIEN</b> , New York	
<b>B. F. SISK</b> , California	<b>E. Y. BERRY</b> , South Dakota



## HAWAII STATEHOOD

---

Pursuant to authority granted the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by House Resolution 94 (85th Cong.), the undersigned members of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs visited the Territory of Hawaii during the period November 24 to December 8, 1958, to make intensive inquiry with respect to H. R. 49 (85th Cong.) granting statehood to the Territory.

On the basis of comprehensive and exhaustive study, including numerous interviews with a complete cross section of the population of the Hawaiian Islands, your subcommittee believes that Hawaii is entitled to statehood by every fair test and precedent.

This area of our Nation, last incorporated Territory under the American flag, has been in training for statehood for 60 years. In 1898 it became a firm and irrevocable part of the United States. Its people are our people. Its philosophy is our philosophy. Its loyalty, like its language and currency, is identical to ours. Its servicemen are our servicemen, and its flag is our flag. Except for the full flowering of the voting franchise these people are us. They may travel anywhere in the 49 States.

Hawaii has been denied statehood in the past by close margins in the Congress of the United States. With the admission of Alaska as the 49th State, it would be unthinkable to delay further the fruition of Hawaii's magnificent dream of statehood and its demonstrated capacity for, and right to, full brotherhood in the Union of States.

Your subcommittee brought neither a whitewash brush nor an ax to its survey task. We met head on, and with objective eyes and ears, the vexing and controversial subject of communism in the islands, an issue which has been raised before and, we know, will be raised again in Congress.

Each member of our committee arrived in Hawaii with an open mind, prepared to recommend against statehood if he developed serious doubt about the loyalty and political maturity of the people, or their ability to cope as adequately with communism as do the people of the 49 States.

We deliberately decided against public hearings, for two reasons. The files of Congress are jammed with the records of such hearings, some of them very recent, and all the testimony therein was available to us. The questions we desired to ask could be answered best by going into the highways and byways among the people. That is why we deserted hearing rooms for homes and street corners, labor halls and business marts, schools and churches, professional groups and law-enforcement agencies, farmers and politicians, chambers of commerce and veterans' organizations.

Among all these we found our answers. From these people, literally thousands of them, we received assurance that they recognized their problems and were able and willing to solve them now and when they don the coveted mantle of statehood. We found them ready to admit that communism in the islands existed, but we learned that they abhor it as we do and are meeting its evil challenges as capably as do people and government in the 49 States.

During most of our 15-day inquiry in Hawaii, 2 members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were engaged in a similar inquiry. We exchanged information with them, but we cannot, of course, include their conclusions in this House document.

Among the individuals and organizations with whom we conferred were the Governor of Hawaii, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, IMUA, officers and members of the ILWU, the head of the Territorial subversive activities commission, the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, the statehood commission, members of the Federal and Territorial judiciary, members of the Territorial legislature, representatives of the Democratic and Republican Parties, top officials of the sugar and pineapple industries, ranking members of our Armed Forces in the Pacific, members of the faculty of the University of Hawaii, and countless others.

With the exception of the FBI, which was not requested to take a position, these representative and highly placed and knowledgeable people were predominately for statehood and convinced that all existing and future problems could be handled thereunder.

Underscoring the scope and thoroughness of our study, we list below the organizations represented by two or more members which met with us at a session on the island of Maui. The list follows:

East Maui Community Association	Maui League of Republican Women
Haleakala Lions Club	Maui Merchants' Association
Hawaii Government Employees' Association	Maui Outdoor Circle
Hawaii Postal Employees' Association (Maui chapter)	Maui Planters Association
ILWU Local 142	Maui Rotary Club
Kahekili Chapter No. 4, Order of Kamehameha	Maui Teachers Association
Kahului Business & Professional Association	Maui Toastmasters Club No. 910
Kahului Kiwanis Club	Maui Toastmistress Club
Kahului Lions Club	Maui Young Democrats
Kahului Rotary Club	Maui Young Republicans
Kamehameha Alumni Association	Puunene Community Association
Kihel Community Association	Republican Party
Lahaina Improvement Association	United Public Workers
Maui Chamber of Commerce	Walluku Improvement Association
Maui County Committee on Children and Youth	Walluku Professional and Businessmen's Association
Maui County Medical Society	Club 100
Maui District Nurses Association	DAV
Maui District PTA	Maui AJA Veterans Club
Maui Junior Chamber of Commerce	442d Veterans Club
	West Maui Veterans Club
	Hawaiian Airlines
	TPA Aloha Airlines
	Farmers' Home Administration

#### OTHERS

Harold W. Rice, Senator from Maui County for 6 terms.  
 R. R. Lyons, chairman, Maui Economic Development Association.  
 C. H. Burnett, Jr., manager, Kahului Railroad Co.  
 W. J. Lanquist, Bishop National Bank, Kahului branch.  
 Jack Vockrodt, Bank of Hawaii, Kahului branch.

Donald H. Tokunaga, general manager, Budget Finance Plan.  
 Mrs. Ben Baker, public relations, Girl Scouts.  
 James Ohta, Maui Scout executive.

## PRESS

Hank Sato, Maui News.  
 Lou Head, Honolulu Advertiser.  
 Charlie Young, Star Bulletin.  
 Jack Teehan, Star Bulletin.

Your committee took a long look at the effect of communism in the islands since communism is the prime target of many of those opposing statehood.

We were told by those in positions to know there was no evidence to indicate or prove that those men and women who had previously been named by congressional committees or convicted in the Federal court under the Smith Act of being Communists or affiliated with the Communist International had changed their Communist status or connections. None of them had even offered to go before any Government official, either of the Federal or Territorial Government, disclaiming such previous connections or beliefs.

On the other hand, Jack Hall, regional director of the ILWU, named in all committee reports as having been a card-carrying Communist and member of the Communist International and who, with five others active in ILWU, was indicted and found guilty in Federal court of violation of the Smith Act, making it a criminal offense to advocate and teach the overthrow of the Government by force, told your committee that he and the other members of the ILWU would take an oath they had not been affiliated with the Communist International for the past 5 years. It is, however, interesting to note that he had offered none of his services, knowledge, or information either to the FBI or to the subversive activities committee of the Territory.

In fairness, the committee also wishes to point out that the ILWU organization maintains not only a well-staffed and well-equipped main office in Honolulu but a county office on each of the island subdivisions with a staff of several employees, a labor hall with dormitory and recreational facilities. It has representatives in each district or plantation whose job it is to maintain close contact with workers and members of the organization. These district officials meet on union business in Honolulu every 60 days—one of which meetings we attended. These meetings, in addition to the publications of the organization, are an effective means of transmitting and distributing union ideas, ideals, and purposes throughout the islands. They could be made use of for political purposes, purposes of propaganda, etc.

The committee was informed, however, that known Communists had not been elected to high Territorial offices. Union support seems to have gone primarily to liberal candidates, and in instances, without seeming regard to political affiliation of the candidate.

On the other side of the coin, it should be pointed out that no present State in the Union is attempting to do the kind of effective anti-Communist work that is being done on the islands. The Territorial legislature has authorized and established a Territorial subversive activities committee which reports to but is not subservient to either the Governor or the legislature. It is headed by William B. Stephenson. Cooperating with the FBI they have complete files on all named and known Communists and have complete information on subversive activity.

In addition, there is an organization of patriotic men and women known as IMUA with the dedicated purpose of keeping the public informed on anti-American activity. It has an office, a staff, all available information and files and, through use of the radio, television, and newspapers, keeps the public informed, not only as to activity of Communists and the threat of communism but also on facts concerning the activity of those known to be or to have been connected with the Communist movement. It is probably safe to say that the public in Hawaii is kept better informed on the threat of communism than is the public in any similar community on the mainland.

There are about 25 identified Communists in Hawaii. We have no exact knowledge as to the number of so-called fellow travelers but investigating agencies told us they know of no additional Communists since the previous congressional reports. We were unable to find any evidence in the social fabric of Hawaii that communism had made any substantial progress or that the community as a whole was unable and unwilling to cope with the problem.

We were told that the FBI investigations, plus the Federal court convictions, had "crippled" the Communist apparatus in Hawaii and that, with the continued white light of publicity and the alert citizenry, it would remain crippled.

We also were told that no proof exists of Soviet espionage contacts on the part of Communists in Hawaii.

We would like to be able to report that the day is imminent when there will not be a single Communist in Hawaii, but that would be the utopia which our States also desire but cannot achieve.

The important question is whether the communism which exists can and will be controlled. We so believe.

The economic control of the islands by the ILWU, some leaders of which have been identified in the past as home-grown or mainland-imported Communists, goes without saying. That union, with more than 20,000 members, can and has tied up the civilian docks. It can and has idled the sugar and pineapple industries, arch stones of the islands' economy. The question is whether that power can or has been used for bargaining or subversive purposes, or both.

We deplore the stupidity of the political strike which was called by ILWU leaders 2 years ago when the Eastland committee went to Hawaii for hearings on communism. It should be noted, however, that two-thirds of the ILWU workers refused to engage in that strike. It was stated to us, moreover, that some of those who did strike felt they were protesting, not the Communist inquiry but what they regarded as an antilabor move.

We cannot pass judgment on the motives of those who did strike nor can we minimize the danger of any political strike. However, it should be noted that the crippling of the islands' economy, regardless of motive, would be as harmful to the interests of Hawaii and the mainland whether Hawaii were a State or a Territory. We should point out that some labor unions in some strategic parts of the United States have power to cause economic havoc and that, in a few instances, certain leaders in those unions have been identified as Communists.

Our committee, from past experience, knows that the major argument against statehood for Hawaii will be, as it has been in the past, the contention that the Communist apparatus in Hawaii, especially

that part linked with ILWU leadership, is so powerful that, in the event of statehood, it could and would be able to elect to the governorship, the legislature, the courts, and the United States Congress Communists or persons soft toward communism. One Member of Congress has stated that 3 or 4 Soviet agents would be elected to Congress.

With this we must disagree sharply. The voters of Hawaii would never permit that to happen.

The ILWU, it is conceded, is a strong political force, comprising about one-ninth of the labor forces on the islands. Its leaders have engaged in political activities, backing and opposing candidates and issues.

It is true that ILWU-endorsed candidates have been elected, but in many instances they would have been elected without the support of ILWU leaders because of their general popularity.

The ILWU fought tooth and nail against the proposed Honolulu city charter, but it was approved by 4 to 1.

The ILWU opposed vigorously the Territorial law permitting seizure of the dock fronts by the Government. The legislature enacted it anyway. The union repeatedly sought its repeal and failed.

In the most recent elections numerous ILWU-backed candidates, some of whom were union leaders, were soundly defeated. In other instances the ILWU sought to "fatten its batting average" by endorsing candidates who were sure to win anyway. Despite this strategy, the union made a poor showing.

We are convinced that where a community or a State is dominated by Communists or has a substantial number of Communists their efforts show up in the vulnerable field of education. We spent many hours in the schools of Hawaii, from the elementary schools to the colleges. If the Communists sought to plant their evil seed there, it fell on extremely barren ground. That was attested to by our own observation and the solemn assurances of educators and clergymen.

During our visit to the University of Hawaii, we spent considerable time with the president, some regents, and some faculty members. We learned that most of the faculty came from colleges on the mainland, all the way from the west coast to the east coast. We asked these men the straight question:

"Have you found your student body receptive to or alined with communism?"

This was the answer:

"We find less interest in communism in the University of Hawaii than in most of the mainland colleges, particularly in the East."

Because of claims in some quarters that because of the oriental strains in the mixed population of Hawaii the people are less loyal to the United States than are their fellow citizens on the mainland, we looked closely into that subject.

We, all of us, saw and met in Hawaii an intelligent, gentle, loyal people of whom our Nation should be proud. We saw the actual operation, without strain or stress, of the American "melting pot" of which we speak so proudly and do so little to achieve in some of our larger mainland cities.

If the races on the mainland, races stemming back ethnically to other lands, were to mix as successfully as they already have in Hawaii, our democracy would be advanced by a century.

It is absurd to question whether the people of Hawaii would be loyal in the event of some future war or disagreement with nations from which they have their ethnic strains. It is absurd because the test has already come and been weathered magnificently. Proof of the loyalty of these people is written in bloodshed on the battlefield, in battle stars, in the records of military intelligence and the FBI. It is written on the gravestones of countless military dead.

All the members of your committee had important roles in the 85th Congress in winning statehood for Alaska. Admission of that 49th State, after years of frustration, greatly simplified our work in Hawaii and lessened our task in preparing this report, because—

1. No longer is it necessary to answer the contention that 575,000 people in Hawaii should not have the same number of United States Senators as existing States, such as heavily populated New York, California, and Pennsylvania. We gave the 212,000 people of Alaska 2 Senators.

2. We do not have to answer the possible claim that Hawaii might not be able to support statehood economically. Hawaii is much more advanced economically, as of now, than is Alaska.

3. Creation of the 49th State out of the Territory of Alaska ended the alleged precedent that we should not admit as States Territories noncontiguous to the other States. Many miles of foreign land lie between the first 48 States and the new 49th.

We found little sentiment for commonwealth in Hawaii, less than in Alaska prior to statehood. We believe the people of Hawaii, except for a rather articulate minority, favor statehood by at least as wide a margin as did the people of Alaska, who voted 5 to 1 for statehood last fall.

When a Territory seeks statehood, as now does the last remaining incorporated Territory under the American flag, it is fair to ask what the new State will have to offer the rest of the Nation. We spoke of oil and other largely undeveloped resources when we were asked the same question about Alaska, but we believe our greatest resources are our human resources, abundantly present in Hawaii.

We believe that admission of Hawaii, with its mixed races and its geographical position, will vastly improve our posture and relationship throughout the vast Pacific area, where we are striving with all our might and means to keep 800 million free and friendly.

This is the considered opinion of the military men in charge of our vital interests in the Pacific. They, and we, know what those 800 million people in the Pacific area will say if we deny statehood to Hawaii after granting statehood to Alaska.

They will say that our protestations of regard and friendship are untrue and that we have denied full brotherhood to American citizens because many of them come from the same ethnic lines as those we call friends in an area vital to our very existence as a nation.

Your committee went to Hawaii in an objective mood. We performed our task as best we could. We know all the difficulties and dangers. But we also know the people who will administer the new State. Calmly and soberly, we urge that the 86th Congress, as soon as possible, place in the flag a 50th star called Hawaii.

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN, *Chairman.*

HON. B. F. SISK.

HON. E. Y. BERRY.

**Mr. BERRY.** There is one point I would like to add, Mr. Chairman: When we were in Hawaii we attended a briefing of the Governors of the Western States being held there at that time, which we just happened to get in on, a briefing by Admiral Felt, the British commander of the Pacific.

Following the briefing I asked this question of the admiral: "What would be the effect of our admission of Hawaii to the Union at this time on our posture in the Far East?"

His reply was that, after admitting Alaska to the Union, if we did not now admit Hawaii it would seriously hurt our posture in the Pacific.

There is one question I would like to ask, Mr. Secretary.

On the question of communism, do you know of any State in the Union that has its own un-American activities committee serving the Governor and serving the legislature in about the same capacity as the Un-American Activities Committee of Congress?

**Secretary SEATON.** Congressman Berry, there may be similar cases, but I must say that I am not aware of any.

**Mr. BERRY.** You would agree that the Territory of Hawaii has done a very exceptional job of attempting to ferret out Communists and keep the public informed of their activities, probably more than any other State in the Union?

**Secretary SEATON.** Mr. Berry, to my own personal knowledge and observation, the Territory, through the agency of which you spoke and public interest, has done a magnificent job in this area of keeping the public aware of communism and its objectives as they change from time to time, always with the central idea but as the pertinences may change.

I have also been so advised by other officials of the Government, who are in a better position to know perhaps than I, that Hawaii has done a most commendable job in this respect.

**Mr. BERRY.** I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Mrs. Pfof.

**Mrs. PFOF.** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Secretary Seaton, about the tremendous quantities of bauxite ore that have been discovered in Hawaii. Can you tell me the location of the bauxite ore discovery, Mr. Secretary?

**Secretary SEATON.** I believe, Mrs. Pfof, that the original discovery was made on the island of Maui.

**Mrs. PFOF.** Is it found on the other islands, as well?

**Secretary SEATON.** Yes, there is evidence to that effect.

**Mrs. PFOF.** Thank you very much.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Mr. Westland.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** Mr. Chairman, I have no questions. The Secretary has presented the case for statehood for Hawaii in an extremely well-illustrated manner, in my opinion. It seems to me he has answered many questions I had.

I might say, I was fortunate to spend a little time there during the war and found the people to be extremely generous, good American citizens.

I have had some question in my mind since then about Mr. Bridges and his operations in the Territory. I am delighted to know that the Legislature of Hawaii has seen fit to take the action it has with

respect to Mr. Bridges and with respect to fairly well-known Communists in that area.

I can only say I trust they will pursue that same attitude and continue to be vigilant, because if there is a Communist cell operating in that area they are in an extremely strategic part of the world.

I have been satisfied as a result of the subcommittee meetings in Hawaii. I have read their report and I consider their report to be an excellent one. I have great faith in their judgment. I am sure they are just as concerned as I am, or as I have been.

Again let me commend you, Mr. Secretary, for the manner in which you have conducted your appearance.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Haley.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding that the Secretary will return here for further questioning, or do you intend to end the questioning of the Secretary today?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I intended to ask the Secretary about that, because I have been aware of the passage of time and your other commitments. Of course, we cannot meet this afternoon. If we could the Secretary could not be here. I do hope we can meet tomorrow, and if the House is not in session then we can meet tomorrow afternoon as well as in the morning. I am anxious that all members of the committee have an opportunity to ask questions of the Secretary because of his background and knowledge in this matter.

Mr. Secretary, when might you be available again?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Chairman, I feel this matter is of such importance that I would, of course, make myself available no matter what changes we have to make in my schedule so far as they are under my control.

As to tomorrow morning, I am scheduled to appear before the House Appropriations Committee, and that, I assume, would preclude my being here tomorrow morning. I would make myself available at any other time that is convenient to the chairman and members of the committee.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Then tomorrow afternoon or Wednesday morning.

Secretary SEATON. If the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Chairman, will dismiss me, I would be very glad to be here tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Fine. Let's assume if you can be here tomorrow afternoon you will be; if not, you will make an effort to be here Wednesday morning.

Secretary SEATON. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think that would probably cover the situation. Do you not think so, Mr. Haley?

Mr. HALEY. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed for just a moment, I have a couple of questions I would like to ask and then reserve my time.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes.

Mr. HALEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, apparently one of the arguments that has been used for statehood for Hawaii is the fact that it has been said that both political parties included admission of Hawaii for statehood in both political platforms. Do you use that argument too?

Secretary SEATON. Not as a primary argument, Mr. Haley. It is a matter of record, however, sir.



Mr. HALEY. Mr. Rogers, the gentleman from Texas, asked you concerning Puerto Rico. Was not a plank also included in the Republican platform of 1952 and again in 1956 in regard to the admission of Puerto Rico to statehood?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Haley, I recall that it was part of the Republican platform in 1952. I do not recall it was part of the Republican platform in 1956. In any event, whether my memory is faulty or not, the status of Puerto Rico was changed in the interval and she was granted what is referred to as a commonwealth status.

I am also, as I have said earlier, certainly not aware of any desire on the part of the people of Puerto Rico to become one of the States of the Union. I think that has been rather clearly indicated as a result of certain elections that they have held.

Mr. HALEY. You are not aware of any movement, then, in the island of Puerto Rico to obtain statehood?

Secretary SEATON. Not of any successful movement, at any rate, sir.

Mr. HALEY. On page 6, Mr. Secretary, you make reference in paragraph 2 and again in paragraph 7 as to the fighting ability or the bravery of the people of Hawaii. I think that has been clearly demonstrated. But you also say, in paragraph 2, "Not one committed an act of cowardice in the face of the enemy."

Do you mean by that, Mr. Secretary, to reflect on the bravery of any State in this Union and the men who served in the Armed Forces?

Secretary SEATON. Oh, no, of course not, Mr. Haley.

Mr. HALEY. Why then—

Secretary SEATON. What I mention here simply comes from information furnished by the Department of Defense.

Mr. HALEY. Why then is this an issue?

Secretary SEATON. I do not know it is an issue, sir. But the questions were raised, and they are a matter of record, that at the time of the outbreak of hostilities certain people, sincere enough, I presume, publicly questioned either the advisability of sending Hawaiian troops into the Korean area and also questioned whether they would be loyal in the face of an enemy which had some of the same racial background as had they. It was because of that being a part of the record at that time we feel impelled now to give this committee the benefit of the true record of what ensued. No reflection on anybody intended.

Mr. HALEY. I am glad to hear you say that, Mr. Secretary, because it would seem to indicate to me—you say further, "not one became a turncoat or rejected repatriation to the United States."

Maybe we had some turncoats, but I do not think we had any from my State at least.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will yield at that place so that the record can be firmed up here.

Mr. HALEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is a fact, is it not, Mr. Secretary, that there were instances of defection to the enemy, and that in those instances some of our troops did defect and did stay with the enemy in their own area, and that there are instances where members of our troops defected and furnished information while they were prisoners against their comrades. That is all a matter of factual history; is it not?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, sir; unfortunately it is.

Mr. ASPINALL. And there is not one of those, as far as the Defense Department can determine, who was a resident of Hawaii or a native of that area?

Secretary SEATON. That is right, sir.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Secretary, on page 7, in your second paragraph, you state:

The grant of statehood to Hawaii will prove to the world—and particularly to Asia—that we practice what we preach.

The gentleman from Texas went into that. Just what are we preaching to the world and particularly to Asia? I would like to know what the administrators have been saying.

Secretary SEATON. Well, Mr. Haley, the paragraph immediately preceding that one says, and I quote:

This Nation has lived and grown great on the principles of dealing fairly with all its people—

and “it’s people” certainly includes the Hawaiians—

and granting equal rights to all of those able to fulfill their responsibilities \* \* \*

Now the granting of equal rights has been a matter of record for 172 years. We think we have substantiated completely our case that they are able to fulfill their responsibilities. [Continuing:]

and share in carrying the common burdens.

And it is my considered belief that the Hawaiians have long since demonstrated their ability in carrying the common burdens.

Then we go on to say the same principles apply to Hawaii.

Now to me, sir, that, in essence, is what we have been preaching as being reflective of what we call Americanism.

Mr. HALEY. Have not the policies of this Nation been such that we do not have to go out and prove anything? Has not our treatment of people all over the world shown the other nations of the earth that we want to treat them fairly?

Secretary SEATON. I could not agree with you any more, sir, and I would like to believe that the world always understands from day to day and year to year that is exactly the way we intend to treat other people.

The world being what it is, there are occasions—we think this is one of them—when we have to make a new demonstration of our dedication to the principles upon which this Government was founded. I wish it were not so, but evidently it is from time to time.

Mr. HALEY. You say “particularly to Asia.” What do we have to prove to Asia we have not already proven?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Haley, if I may, I would like to go back to what Mr. Berry said about the briefing which he and other members had by Admiral Felt; that here you have in Hawaii American citizens of mixed races, many of which are derived from Asia and that area; that the admiral felt, particularly since Alaska had been granted statehood, that if we were now to refuse the same privilege to the Territory of Hawaii it would impair our situation in Asia. I think that is a very fair conclusion.

Again I do not think, as I said when I discussed this first, that is the sole issue involved, but it is one of them.

**Mr. HALEY.** Mr. Secretary, do you not think that the population of Alaska, being made up primarily from the 48 States of this Nation, do you not think that probably they were deserving consideration? Many of them have been residents of the States and had gone to Alaska. Do you not think probably we took less chances there where we had people of our Nation, you might say, that made up that territory? Do you not think there is a different situation there than there is here?

**Secretary SEATON.** Mr. Haley, I certainly agree with you that those people resident in Alaska prior to statehood were deserving of consideration, as you put it.

I must say, when we granted statehood to Alaska, when we did that, we also granted the full privileges of statehood to approximately 40,000 Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts.

Further, in answer to your question, implied at least, as to whether I would think the Alaskan citizenry deserved more consideration than the Hawaiians because the Alaskans in the main came from the States whereas that is not necessarily the case in Hawaii, my answer to that, sir, must be: "No, I do not think that the people who are resident in the Territory of Hawaii, simply because many of them are of a race of mixed strain, are any less deserving of statehood than are the people of Alaska or of Nebraska."

**Mr. HALEY.** Mr. Secretary, do you have a chart or anything that you could furnish this committee that would show the percentage of population of the Territory of Hawaii as to the background?

**Secretary SEATON.** Yes, Mr. Haley, we do. One of the studies which we have on hand is a copy of Senate Report 1164, the 85th Congress, the 1st session. I think I recall that there is a similar report which was prepared at one time and submitted to this committee by members of this committee.

**Mr. HALEY.** Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to ask that table be made a part of the record at this point in the proceedings?

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** I do not think there would be any objection. I assume it would carry with it the connotation that these people are all American citizens.

**Mr. HALEY.** If there is objection, I will read it into the record.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The information follows:)

*Population of Hawaii by race, 1900-1950*<sup>1</sup>

Race	1900 <sup>2</sup>		1910 <sup>2</sup>		1920 <sup>2</sup>		1930 <sup>2</sup>		1940 <sup>2</sup>		1950 <sup>2</sup>	
	Population	Percent	Population	Percent	Population	Percent	Population	Percent	Population	Percent	Population	Percent
1. Hawaiian.....	28,718	18.6	26,041	13.6	23,723	9.3	22,636	6.1	14,375	3.4	( <sup>4</sup> )	-----
2. Part-Hawaiian.....	9,536	6.2	12,506	6.5	18,027	7.0	28,224	7.6	49,935	11.8	<sup>4</sup> 86,091	17.2
3. Caucasian.....	26,252	17.1	39,158	20.4	49,140	19.3	73,702	20.0	103,791	24.5	114,793	23.0
4. Chinese.....	25,762	16.7	21,674	11.3	23,507	9.2	27,179	7.4	28,774	6.8	32,376	6.5
5. Japanese.....	61,115	39.7	79,675	41.5	109,274	42.7	139,631	37.9	157,905	37.3	184,611	36.9
6. Korean.....	-----	-----	4,533	2.4	4,950	1.9	6,461	1.8	6,851	1.6	( <sup>4</sup> )	-----
7. Filipino.....	-----	-----	2,361	1.2	21,031	8.2	63,052	17.1	52,569	12.4	61,071	12.2
8. Puerto Rican.....	-----	-----	4,890	2.5	5,602	2.2	6,671	1.8	8,296	2.0	( <sup>4</sup> )	-----
9. Negro.....	-----	-----	695	.4	348	.1	563	.2	255	.1	( <sup>4</sup> )	-----
10. Other.....	2,618	1.7	376	.2	310	.1	217	.1	579	.1	20,852	4.2
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>154,001</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>191,909</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>255,912</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>368,336</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>423,330</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>499,794</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>1</sup> Statehood for Hawaii, hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, 81st Cong., 2d sess., on H.R. 49 (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> United States census figures, except that the number of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians has been corrected in accordance with the 1937 report of the Joint Committee on Hawaii, S. Doc. No. 151, 75th Cong., 3d sess., p. 38.

<sup>3</sup> United States census. <sup>4</sup> 1

<sup>4</sup> This classification, in 1950, includes all persons who are part-Hawaiian as well as full-blooded Hawaiians.

<sup>5</sup> Included in "Other" for 1950.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Collier?

Mr. COLLIER. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Ullman?

Mr. ULLMAN. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Cunningham?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have one thing I want to ask. I appreciate the fine statement you have given.

On page 6, in the first paragraph, it says:

In 1949, when a prolonged dock strike threatened the economy of the Territory, the Territorial legislature, notwithstanding the most severe pressure in opposition, enacted laws,

and so forth.

I think that is to be commended. However, sometimes the pressure is less severe in the beginning and mounts as time goes on. I see they have withstood that pressure now for sometime.

I am wondering if you would have an observation as to whether or not statehood would strengthen the legislature in the preservation of these laws or whether there would be something that, if statehood were granted, would cause this pressure to grow faster or more rapidly and to eventually perhaps cause the overthrow of these laws.

In other words, what I am saying is that this is a major thing which bothers all of us, and they have made their stand so far. But do you see anything in enacting of statehood that would effect those laws to the good, or would there be anything present you could think of that would tend to weaken those laws?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Cunningham, because of my own personal profound belief in the American system of government I cannot help but believe that, if Hawaii were to be granted statehood, her stand on this question and all of the questions involving order would be strengthened. If I did not believe that, I could not believe in the United States of America.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You are closer to it than certainly most anyone else, and that is why I asked the question. I am glad to hear you feel as though statehood would not weaken these laws or cause them to be weakened in any way.

That is the only question I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I made two trips to Hawaii and I will get on record later my conviction that it is important to bring Hawaiian statehood to accomplishment without any delay.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to take just a few seconds to take advantage of this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Secretary of Interior for the assistance he rendered me in my last campaign for reelection. [Laughter.]

Secretary SEATON. The gentleman is welcome.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am told that I am the first Democratic candidate for the United States Congress to ever carry Yellowstone County, which is the largest in my district, and I have been advised that the campaigning of the Secretary of the Interior in the city of Billings, which is the largest city in my district, at least partly is responsible. I wanted to take this opportunity to express my gratification.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HALEY. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that observation because the Secretary apparently in his campaigning in Alaska did not have quite that kind of success.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think he had the same kind of success in Alaska that he had in Montana.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that such matters as this be kept out of these hearings. The Secretary's former predecessor, who was a member of my party, saw fit to go out and do some campaigning. In some places he was perhaps more successful and in other places was not so successful as the present Secretary.

All of us get ribbed quite a good bit for our partisanship and efforts in behalf of the party, and I think that is all understood. But I hope we will not color up this hearing with such matters.

I say that with all understanding of my good personal friend's—the Secretary's—activities, as far as that is concerned. He reserves the same right to me.

Secretary SEATON. I join the Chairman in that.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I might say, Mr. Aspinall, all of us have had experience of campaigning for people who did not get elected.

Mr. LANGEN?

Mr. LANGEN. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Saund?

Mr. SAUND. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mrs. Simpson?

Mrs. SIMPSON. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. McGinley?

Mr. MCGINLEY. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman from Alaska?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions, and I want to say that I consider that you, Mr. Secretary, have exhaustively stated the case for statehood for Hawaii, and that I would be proud to have been able to evaluate the case as well as you have done.

I wanted to bring up the point in regard to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas to how far this will go, where will the dividing line be in granting State status throughout the world—generally the route of statehood is through an initial grant of organized territoriality, is it not?

Secretary SEATON. That is right sir.

Mr. RIVERS. And if Cuba were to inquire about becoming a State, the question would first arise as to whether or not we would take Cuba in as an incorporated or organized Territory. Would that not be the case?

Secretary SEATON. That is right, Mr. Rivers. There might even be a question of taking them in at all as either a possession or a Territory prior to taking them in as an organized Territory.

Mr. RIVERS. If we were to entertain a request from the Virgin Islands, would not the Virgin Islands probably first have to go through a period of apprenticeship as an organized Territory?

Secretary SEATON. Following precedences in the Congress, that would be true, yes, sir.

Mr. RIVERS. I mean historically that is the general route?

Secretary SEATON. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Then the place to draw the line is not right here now with Hawaii, which has been an organized Territory since 1900, but rather to draw the line the next time that one of these unincorporated areas makes an application, and to decide the question when we decide whether to grant organized territoriality or not. Would not that be the place to draw the line?

Secretary SEATON. That certainly would be within the prerogative of the Congress, Mr. Rivers; yes, sir.

Mr. RIVERS. I see. Now then, on the protection against Communists, is it not a fact that the Federal Government has the jurisdiction to protect the country against Communist cells and the activity of Communists and other subversive elements?

Secretary SEATON. Within the guidance of the laws that exist.

Mr. RIVERS. The FBI generally has complete jurisdiction to chase the Communists everywhere under the American flag, has it not?

Secretary SEATON. I believe so.

Mr. RIVERS. And the protection of our country against subversives is peculiarly a Federal function, is it not?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, that is right.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Under our new rules we have a new termination of these hearings at a quarter of 12, and we will do so now with the understanding that the gentleman from Alaska will resume questioning when the Secretary returns either tomorrow afternoon or Wednesday morning, whichever is more convenient. And the gentleman from Florida has reserved his right to proceed with further questions.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Haley.

Mr. HALEY. On Committee Print No. 39, offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, I withdraw any objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, the report referred to will be made a part of the record at the point where the gentleman from South Dakota made the motion.

Tomorrow, if there are any Members of Congress who might want to file brief statements we will hear them, and then we will hear Rear Admiral McManes, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Administration.

The hearing is adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9:45.

(Whereupon, the committee adjourned at 1:45 a.m. to reconvene at 9:45 a.m., Tuesday, January 27, 1959.)





# STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

---

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 9:50 a.m., in the committee room, New House Office Building, Hon. Leo W. O'Brien, acting chairman of the committee, presiding.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be in order for further consideration of H.R. 50 and related bills providing for admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union.

Our first witness this morning is Rear Adm. Kenmore M. McManes, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Administration.

Admiral, I want to thank you for your patience in standing by yesterday and waiting to give your testimony here today.

## STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. KENMORE M. McMANES, DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION

Admiral McMANES. Mr. Chairman, I am Rear Adm. Kenmore M. McManes, the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Administration.

Mr. Chairman, in testifying before this distinguished committee as the representative of the Department of Defense, I shall confine my statement to the military aspects of H.R. 50 and similar bills providing for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The portions of H.R. 50 of chief importance to the Department of Defense include those providing for retention by the United States of its interest in all lands held for military purposes. Section 15b of the bill provides that jurisdiction over such lands will be vested in the United States and the State of Hawaii, with reservation to the Congress of the authority to take exclusive jurisdiction on behalf of the United States; however, the United States will continue to have exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as may be determined to be critical areas.

As these bills would adequately safeguard the needs of the services, the Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, supports their provisions for the admission of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Does that complete your statement?

Admiral McMANES. That completes my statement, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Apparently you are confining your statement to an expression of the belief that the bill as drawn adequately protects our military interests in Hawaii?

Admiral McMANES. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Aspinall?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman. Admiral, do I understand that each one of these bills—and there are two categories—and in each category the position of the Navy is the same?

Admiral McMANES. I think all of them adequately protect the interests of the Department of Defense insofar as the defense aspects are concerned, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii at this time to follow through on the question I just asked.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

The particular matter in point is a section which appears in H.R. 888, section 5d, which does not appear in H.R. 50.

Admiral McMANES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNS. Can that be left out of the bill, or is that desired? I do not have any reference to critical areas or anything else.

Admiral McMANES. Yes, sir. If we do not leave in that provision, sir, regarding the extension for 5 more years of section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, H.R. 50 and similar bills would result in the following:

They would confirm title, possession, and management of the United States in lands withdrawn for Federal use. Now we have no objection to that.

They would also transfer complete fee title in the rest of the ceded lands, which have not been withdrawn for Federal use, to the State of Hawaii. Now that we do not like because at the present time we hold those lands under license. It would require, when Hawaii becomes a State, that we renegotiate with the State of Hawaii, and undoubtedly there would be rentals charged for that land.

We would be deprived of the continued use without cost of about 114,000 acres of ceded land now occupied under Territorial license. We would be obliged to pay the market value for the lands which may be needed in the near future.

This period of 5 years gives us an opportunity to negotiate with the State of Hawaii for the purpose of, shall we say, determining the conditions under which we can continue to occupy the land, and what the cost of it will be.

Mr. BURNS. Your concern then, Admiral, is with lands which you presently have custody of or usage of, regardless of the method in which you use them?

Admiral McMANES. That is correct, sir.

Mr. BURNS. And not over the possibility or the potentiality of taking any further lands?

Admiral McMANES. No, sir.

Mr. BURNS. I think that answers the question, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Berry?

Mr. BERRY. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Edmondson?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I was also concerned about that provision of subsection d and about the take-back provision that applies. I am glad to get the assurance that nothing is contemplated other than lands now presently in use for military purposes.

Admiral McMANES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BURNS. As I understand the admiral's statement, we can so amend the bill to secure that which he wants to bring about without objection from the Department.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that might be desirable.

I have no further questions.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Sisk?

Mr. SISK. May I make this inquiry of the Chair: Is there anyone else from the Military Establishment in the Territory that will be testifying before the committee?

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is no present plan to have anyone from the Military Establishment in the Territory. I believe we will have to stand in that respect on the information the special subcommittee gathered from conversations with the military in that area. As you know we talked with Admiral Felt and practically his entire command one day.

Mr. SISK. My only point, I might say to the Chair, in the parliamentary inquiry was whether or not the record would be amply clear with reference to any possibility of any tieup of the military with reference to any labor problems or other problems that might exist. I had in mind the possibility of reestablishing in the record that type of statement. I think at this time I will forego the question to the admiral.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman from California may, if he desires, ask the admiral the degree of cooperation received from the people in Hawaii as compared with people in other areas, where there are military operations. I assume it would be perfectly proper to ask him any questions you may have in mind about the loyalty of the people in that area.

Mr. SISK. I do not think I shall do that.

Just one question, Admiral. So far as you are aware has there been any tieup or any holdup of munitions, the things that are needed at Pearl Harbor or with reference to the Military Establishment, in any way bought on by any action of labor or anyone else in the islands in recent years?

Admiral McMANES. I have no knowledge of anything whatsoever in that category, sir.

Mr. SISK. Thank you.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Judge Saund.

Mr. SAUND. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. McGinley?

Mr. MCGINLEY. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Rivers?

Mr. RIVERS. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Burns?

Mr. BURNS. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much, Admiral. I imagine you are somewhat surprised at the complete acceptance of your testimony. Thank you very much.

Admiral McMANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is George D. Riley present?

If not, is Mike M. Masaoka present?

Mr. MASAOKA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** I understand you are the Washington representative of the Japanese-American Citizens League? Is that correct?

**Mr. MASAOKA.** Yes, sir.

**Mr. SISK.** Mr. Chairman, might I make a comment before the gentleman testifies?

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Mr. Sisk.

**Mr. SISK.** I just want to say I am very happy to welcome before this committee Mike Masaoka, who happens to be a good friend of mine and represents a great many people in my area. I simply want to commend him on the fact we have him before the committee here this morning. Thank you.

**Mr. ASPINALL.** Will the gentleman yield to me?

**Mr. SISK.** I will be happy to yield.

**Mr. ASPINALL.** He not only represents your area but he represents the people of his nationality throughout the Nation, and he does a very fine piece of work. Mr. Masaoka, it is a pleasure to have you here this morning.

#### **STATEMENT OF MIKE M. MASAOKA, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE**

**Mr. MASAOKA.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Sisk.

Mr. Chairman, I have no prepared statement. However, I am here on behalf of many American citizens in your respective areas to endorse very heartily statehood for the long-deserving Territory of Hawaii.

Many of us served in World War II with our fellow Americans of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii, and we can attest their valor on the battlefield.

Many more of us served with them also in Korea, and there again we can attest to their loyalty.

As many of you know, in World War II, Americans of Japanese ancestry were suspect because of the accident of our birth. Many of us were placed under mistreatment, if you will, by our Government. Yet those of us on the mainland of the United States and the Territory of Hawaii had enough faith and vision in the American way that we volunteered for combat duty with the Armed Forces of our country.

Some of you will recall that, because of the attack by the Japanese military on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the Selective Service and our Army decided that they would not ask Americans of Japanese ancestry to serve in our Armed Forces.

As a matter of fact, they decided that we were not wanted.

But a great number of us, thousands of us in fact, in Hawaii and in the mainland, demanded the right to serve our country and we demanded that right, not to serve in the supply forces or in the rear areas, but we demanded the right to serve in combat.

Those of us who could not speak the language too well served in Europe, many in the same 442d Regimental Combat Team which has been described as the most decorated American military unit for size and length of service.

Others, who were able to speak the language, served in a more difficult, though less-publicized activity. They served as part of the military intelligence in the Pacific against people who looked like them.

In many ways they contributed far more, perhaps, to the winning of the war in the Pacific than they have been given credit for.

In Europe we had some idea of the battle operations of the Germans. In the Pacific we had no idea whatsoever of the battle plans of the Japanese. Yet Japanese-Americans, knowing the language, often did counterespionage, often did very hazardous work at the risk of double jeopardy, at the risk of being captured by the Japanese and being treated as perhaps no other American soldiers would be treated, and also at the risk, which some of them faced, of being shot by their fellow Americans.

And throughout this entire gamut, gentlemen of this committee, more Americans of Japanese ancestry, on a percentage basis, served in World War II than any other nationality group in the United States.

There were those who said that, because of the color of our hair and the slant of our eyes, and because of our affinity to the Japanese enemy, we could not be trusted. Yet in the handling of thousands of pieces of military, naval, and Air Force intelligence in the Pacific there was not even a single mistake caused by an American of Japanese ancestry.

As one who was proud to serve with the 442d Regimental Combat Team in Italy, I want to say that perhaps of all Americans that served in World War II, we are realizing what we fought for. We fought for recognition of our loyalty as Americans. And today we are continuing the fight, which we hope will soon be achieved, for recognition of the ability to be citizens in the Territory of Hawaii on the same basis as our fellow Americans everywhere.

I think I need not recount to this committee the casualty rate suffered by Americans of Japanese ancestry in World War II. Suffice it to say that over 309 percent of the members who served from Hawaii and the mainland in the 100th Infantry Battalion in the 442d Regiment suffered casualties. Over three times, gentlemen.

In spite of all of that, we have a record that we are proud of because I think that we have proved for once and for all that America is a land worth fighting for, that when the facts are out the American people and the American Government will give all peoples their just due.

Some stories, of course, have been cited from time to time, and unfortunately some of our World War II motion pictures carry on some of the lies, if you will, about so-called espionage at Pearl Harbor by persons of Japanese ancestry. May I repeat again for the record, as it has been repeated over and over again before this committee, the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the records of the Army and Navy intelligence attest to the fact that before, during, and after the attack on Pearl Harbor not a single act of espionage or sabotage was committed by any resident Japanese national or American citizen of Japanese ancestry. Whatever espionage was carried on for the Japanese Government was carried on by non-Japanese. And of course for obvious reasons. The very fact of our color perception make us pretty poor spies.

Coming now to Hawaii, we hear so much of threatened Communist domination of workers in a way, we hear so much about the fact that perhaps the labor unions there exert tremendous influence upon persons of Japanese ancestry and other Americans in Hawaii.

The record, as attested to yesterday by the Secretary of the Interior—and what I want to emphasize again today—is this: Hawaii contributed more than her share in manpower in the Armed Forces in the Korean war, and many of the members from Hawaii who served in Korea were members of the International Longshoremen Workers Union. And in spite of this, to utterly refute the arguments of those who say that this labor union or any labor union commands the dedication and loyalty of these workers, in spite of it there was not a single person, not a single citizen-soldier from Hawaii who defected to the enemy in any way. And without attempting to say anything about the loyalty of other Americans, the rest of us on the mainland, as the chairman, Mr. Aspinall, pointed out yesterday, there were some who defected, unfortunately, from the mainland. But not a single one from Hawaii.

One other aspect that I would like to discuss before closing this plea for a bit of justice to our fellow Americans in the Pacific islands, and that is this:

Sometimes the racial composition of the people of Hawaii is raised as a reason against, as a reason to oppose statehood. It seems to me, as an American of Japanese ancestry, that this very racial composition of Hawaii should today, in this terrible age, be one of the prime reasons why we ought to grant citizenship to the peoples of Hawaii immediately. Because here we not only have a showcase of democracy but we also have the one place in all the world where the peoples of Asia, the uncommitted peoples of Asia, where two-thirds of the peoples of the world reside around the Pacific basin—we have one place where they can look to see what democracy can do.

And those of us who are of Japanese ancestry know that democracy at times in periods of hate and hysteria, as during World War II, does abuse itself. But the remarkable story of democracy in action is this: Once you prove yourself worthy the American Government, certainly this Congress in its evacuation claims and other legislation, has more than compensated the Japanese people for its tragedies and have demonstrated that the American system can correct its abuses and its mistakes.

In the complex of the world situation today, I think it is important that the peoples of Asia realize that Hawaii is an integral part of the Union, that the people of Hawaii, in spite of their racial ancestry, if you will, can vote for the President of the United States, can vote for a Representative in the House of Representatives, can vote for a U.S. Senator, can do every other act of every other citizen in the United States.

Now this perhaps may not seem as important to some of you as it does to the peoples of Asia. But the people of Asia are sorely tried. I think that the great majority of them want to follow the leadership of freedom, but too often they are discouraged. And perhaps one of the most effective single concrete examples of our recognition of Asians as fellow human beings that we want on our side of the struggle for a free and better world would be to give to the people of Hawaii this long-desired goal—statehood.

By every test, by every fair test, the people of Hawaii are entitled to statehood. To deny them this status longer is not only to deny justice and Americanism but also to jeopardize our hold on the free peoples of the Pacific area.

Thus, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as an American who, perhaps, understands better than most other Americans the importance of this type of activity on the thinking and the feeling in the hearts and the minds of the more than 2 billion peoples in Asia, as an American who fought in World War II and recognizes the importance of having friends in any kind of conflict, but most of all as an American who believes deeply in the justice of the American way, we urge statehood now, this year, for Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much for your fine, very eloquent statement.

Of course, you have lived with this problem much longer than I have. I went to Hawaii last fall for my first visit there. One of the things most prominent in my mind while there was the actual working of what we claim our country really is—a melting pot. It is not reserved for the Fourth of July over there; it actually works. I was tremendously impressed by that.

I am sure the other members of the committee feel that you yourself represent the kind of full citizenship we would have if we admit Hawaii as a State.

Mr. ASPINALL?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the witness for his statement.

I have just this one other thought in mind. Would you not say that inasmuch as you have referred to only one of the obligations of citizenship, that is, the defense of our country in time of war, the loyalty of our people, that the people whom you represent, the citizens of the United States of Japanese ancestry, performed their other obligations of citizenship—and I refer now to payment of taxes, to jury service, to discharge of the duties of public office where they are given the opportunity, to securing an education, and giving special attention to the payment of taxes for educational purposes, and many other activities in which a good citizen must engage—the people of your nationality in America discharge that duty just as loyally and just as ably as they do the duties you referred to in your presentation?

Mr. MASAOKA. Thank you for that contribution, Mr. Aspinall. As you emphasized, the records of the law-enforcement agencies will indicate, as you yourself from Colorado, Mr. Sisk, from California, and Mrs. Pfof, from Idaho, are particularly aware, the law-of-obedience ratio of persons of Japanese ancestry is considerably better than the norm.

The ability of the Japanese-American to stay off of relief rolls and to take care of his own, I think, is well known too. In fact, as you have pointed out, in every aspect of good citizenship and good community living I think Americans of Japanese ancestry have proved that they can not only assimilate the American way but are proud to be a part of it.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I just say, in my own community throughout the last 25 or 30 years I have had neighbors of your nationality, and I have found them possessed of those qualities. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Withrow?

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Masaoka, I have a great deal of respect for you, and I also appreciate the service rendered by your people in cooperating with us in our Armed Forces. But there is one thing that

is in my mind, and that is the question of the public acceptability of statehood. Have you anything to say about that?

Mr. MASAOKA. Do you mean in the United States, sir?

Mr. WITHROW. In Hawaii.

Mr. MASAOKA. I think that there is no question that the people of Hawaii want statehood. They want statehood because it means to them the recognition of the fact that they are accepted by their fellow Americans.

Perhaps before the war, before World War II, there may have been some question regarding the acceptance of the Japanese by fellow Americans throughout America. But I think that after World War II, particularly today when it is a part of our national policy to encourage and promote cordial relations with Japan, that there is no question but the acceptance of the loyalty of people of Japanese ancestry in the United States is greater than it has ever been.

I think on statehood, too, it is the desire of Americans to see Hawaii granted statehood as part of the Union, and it is greater than it has ever been. I think the Gallup poll and other polls so indicate. I think the various polls taken in Hawaii, both officially and unofficially, would indicate that overwhelmingly the people of Hawaii and the people of America desire statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. WITHROW. I had in mind the people of Hawaii, if they were willing to accept it and if the majority of the people there wanted it. That is a question that has not been settled in my mind as yet.

Mr. MASAOKA. I believe in the various plebiscites taken in Hawaii, particularly in reference to the establishment of the constitutional convention for the writing of their constitution and the selection of their delegates to Congress, they have indicated in every way possible not only their desire but their great hope for statehood.

I think it is difficult, perhaps, for many of us who enjoy statehood as a matter of birth, it is difficult for us to appreciate the psychological and the other great—I do not know quite how to put it, but just the passion to enjoy statehood. This may be an awkward way and may not be a good illustration, but as an American citizen born in California, in fact, in the very city represented by the Congressman from California, Fresno, as an American for many years before the war I accepted freedom as a natural part of my heritage as an American. It was not until I was placed behind barbed-wire fences in World War II that I realized what freedom really meant in terms of democracy.

I think that the people of Hawaii really know what they want and what statehood means to human beings in terms of dignity.

I think many of us here on the mainland who have never been denied these rights can never really appreciate the fullness of their desire for this status.

I do not know whether I expressed myself very well, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. WITHROW. I think you have.

Mr. MASAOKA. I think, without any question, the overwhelming majority of the people of Hawaii of all nationalities, all of whom are Americans, want statehood.

I might say, it is not the slant of a man's eyes that determines the slant of his heart, because in a way, as everywhere else in the Federal



Union, people who know and understand America love America and want to be a part of it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the gentleman has raised a good question, because from his experience he knows that is one of the questions that must be answered on the floor.

Mr. WITHROW. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I know that a year ago when we had the Alaska bill here we had the same problem in the committee and on the floor as to whether the people of Alaska really wanted it, and we had some rather sharp exchanges and some polls taken as a result, and so forth.

When the chips were down and they voted in Alaska it was 5 to 1, as the gentlemen will recall.

May I say it is my considered opinion—we went to Alaska in 1955 and that was one of the questions we were concerned about. We went to Hawaii in 1958, and I am convinced beyond any doubt that the people of Hawaii favor statehood by a greater percentage than did the people of Alaska, and they were 5 to 1 for it.

Another significant thing: We had heard rumors—and I think they were a little more than rumors—for some years here that certain people in Hawaii were giving only lip service to their support for statehood, that actually they did not want it, that it was the popular thing to do and they were going along.

We have learned—and there will be statements later in the record—that some of the people who were supposed to be in that category now support it 100 percent. I have in mind, for example, the sugar planters. There was some talk that the sugar planters were not quite solid on that. They are now. And the same with the pineapple growers.

I think, if you had a vote on a bill whether or not Hawaii would accept statehood, if it were offered to them as it was to Alaska, I would be convinced it would be at least 8 to 1 and maybe 10 to 1.

That is from personal observation and talking to people in every section of the country I could find to talk to.

I thought the gentlemen might be interested in that.

Mr. WITHROW. Yes.

I would like to say this for the record in case I might be misunderstood: I voted against statehood for Alaska because I felt very keenly that these 48 States were sacred property and we should not go out and take in that which was not contiguous to us. Of course we have established the precedent now, and I, in all probability, will go along with statehood for Hawaii, providing I can be assured in my own mind and my own conscience that these people want statehood.

Mr. BURNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. BURNS. I would like to point out to the gentleman, just for information, that in the last general election in Hawaii some 155,000 voters cast their ballots. The Commonwealth Party had a candidate for Delegate, and there was a Republican and a Democratic candidate. The candidate for Delegate on the Commonwealth ticket was a very estimable gentleman, a fine gentleman of good standing and out-

standing integrity. He got less than 2,000 votes out of the 155,000 cast.

I think that well indicates the choice of the people of Hawaii, because they had a chance to express themselves for a man who was of good character and integrity.

Mr. MASAOKA. I think we ought also to add for the record, however, that the Delegate from Hawaii on his own right attracted a lot of votes, and the record of the gentleman from Hawaii is so outstanding in favor of statehood that every vote for him could be counted as a strong endorsement for statehood.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WITHROW. That is all.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Powell?

Mr. POWELL. I would like to also congratulate Mr. Masaoka for his very fine statement. I think what he said is very important. While not a primary reason for granting statehood, it will be of inestimable value in the relations of the United States with southeast Asia to know that people of descent from that area are now citizens of our country—their country. And if there is any communism of any importance in Hawaii, granting of statehood to Hawaii will sort of pull the rug from underneath their own propaganda and will help our propaganda in southeast Asia against communism.

Mr. MASAOKA. Thank you.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Cunningham?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Sisk?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I simply would like to add a little further to my introductory comments of a while ago. Of course, we, in my district, are very proud of this gentleman, Mike Masaoka, not only for the very outstanding war record he has compiled but his record of citizenship in the defense of the American way of life not only in this country but throughout southeastern Asia, and the great work he had contributed to selling the American way of life. I am deeply impressed by his statement this morning and am very happy to have him with us.

Mr. MASAOKA. Thank you.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Ullman?

Mr. ULLMAN. First, I want to congratulate Mr. Masaoka for a most outstanding statement. A few moments ago, however, when you referred, Mr. Masaoka, to the Japanese-American citizens in various States, I think you made a very important omission when you failed to mention the State of Oregon.

In my district in Malheur and Hood River Counties, we have a very large community of Japanese-Americans, and I want to confirm what has been said here—there are no finer citizens than the Japanese-Americans.

Today the Japanese-American citizens are welcomed on an equal basis, and looked up to by every segment of the community. They own some of the finest farms anywhere in the world.

They have assumed a position of leadership in the community, and I consider them among the most outstanding citizens in my district. I am certainly proud to welcome you here before this committee.

Mr. MASAOKA. Thank you, Mr. Congressman.

I might add this: That what Japanese-Americans have been able to achieve here in the United States under statehood is simply an indication that, as great as the contributions of Japanese-Americans to Hawaii have been under Territorial status, the greater it will be when statehood is granted to them.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wonder if the committee would bear with me at this point. We have some matters which should go in the record. Then we will proceed.

We stated yesterday that the report had not yet been received from the Department of State. We have the report from the Department of State, and it is favorable.

Without objection, that will be made a part of the record at the place the other departmental reports were put in.

We also have a number of statements that people wish to present.

I might explain to the committee that we do have a number of people from Hawaii who are more than willing to testify, but all of them, virtually all of them, were people who testified only a few months ago. And in the interest of expediting the bill itself, they have expressed a desire to submit only statements and not take a great deal of the time of the committee, which I think is very considerate and very wise on their part.

I believe the Delegate from Hawaii has a number of statements which he would like to offer for inclusion in the record following the completion of the questioning of the witness now testifying.

Mr. Burns?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, I do have. I have a statement from the Governor. As you indicated, the thought of the people in Hawaii was it would be better to submit the statements for the information of the committee rather than in person and take the time of the committee.

I have the statement from the Governor of Hawaii, which is an overall statement, and I have copies which I will give to every member present.

I have a statement of the board of health submitting the latest statistics on the population figures of Hawaii.

I have a statement from the president of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce; a statement from the president of the Hawaiian Electric Co.; a statement from the president of the Hawaiian Telephone Co.; a statement from the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, which is the association of all of the sugar planters of Hawaii for the record, and a statement from the Pineapple Growers Association of Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, the several statements mentioned by the Delegate from Hawaii will be included in the record at the point specified.

Mr. BURNS. One other, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I have a statement from the department of public instruction.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, that too will be included. Does that complete it?

Mr. BURNS. I think it does.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Doctor Taylor?

Mr. TAYLOR. In addition to the ones Delegate Burns just mentioned, we have one from Mr. William H. Heen, vice chairman of the Hawaii Statehood Commission. We have one from Mr. William S. Richard-

son, chairman of the Democratic Party of Hawaii. They are both sympathetic to the legislation and urge prompt enactment of it.

We have one from the U.S. Flag Committee in opposition to the granting of statehood for Hawaii and one from James M. Thomson, Gaylord, Clark County, Va., also in opposition. I would like to make them available to the chairman if he wishes to peruse them.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The U.S. flag committee, as I understand it, is located on Long Island, N. Y.?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is right, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If any other persons from Hawaii or elsewhere have statements that they wish to include in the record, they will be accepted, of course.

I want to emphasize again that we are not suggesting to anyone that he or she not testify. We are following this procedure for the reasons I explained and at the request of some of the people who have travelled quite a considerable distance to help their cause along.

Judge SAUND?

Mr. SAUND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to congratulate Mr. Masaoka for the very fine and eloquent statement he has made. Last summer I had the honor to be a guest speaker at the biennial convention of the Japanese-American Citizens League, and I had the opportunity there to meet the representatives of the Japanese-American citizens from all over the United States. What I saw and what I got from the convention will always remain a bright spot in my memory.

I have never seen a better organization or a group of more enthusiastic or more loyal American citizens.

The respect in which that organization is held in the United States was attested to by the fact that the two United States Senators from Utah were speakers on the same platform with me.

I can say this: Mr. Masaoka truly represents the people of his ancestry in the United States, because I found out there in what esteem and affection he is personally held by his fellow men. If there is any similarity between the Japanese-ancestry citizens in Hawaii and the people who live in Imperial County, among whom I have lived for the last 30 years, I can say, Mr. Chairman, that those people will contribute in a big way to make a better Republic than we have today.

Mr. MASAOKA. Thank you, Mr. Saund.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. McGinley?

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Masaoka, I do not wish to classify our different races of Americans by cold statistics, but I think it is a legitimate question. I do not find the statistics here before me. I would be interested to know about how many people we are talking about of the different races represented there, including your own people of Japanese ancestry. If you know in round figures, how many are there within the total population of 635,000, or any other figures concerning a breakdown in racial ancestry?

Mr. MASAOKA. I wonder if Delegate Burns would have more accurate information on that.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGINLEY. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I believe yesterday at the hearing there was a table inserted in the record, on the motion of the gentleman from Florida, showing those figures. They were accepted with the understanding that we also put in the record that they were all American citizens.

Mr. MCGINLEY. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind. There is no use fooling ourselves. We know that a great deal of the opposition to statehood, even though it may be covered by something else, talk about communism and so forth, will be the so-called mixed races. I think this committee, when it goes to the floor and we have this bill up for discussion, has to be prepared to meet that discussion.

I think it is unfortunate we have to do it, because when we discussed the Alaska bill we of course did have in the record the number of Eskimos and Indians in Alaska. That was a different problem. We did not at any place in our record have the number of people of German, Irish, English, or other ethnic background.

Nevertheless, I think the gentleman is being very practical in suggesting what he has suggested because we know that is one of the things we have to fight.

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to go to the record for these statistics, but I think I represent some of the new members who have not been tuned in on this before. I merely bring up some of these things that probably are well known to the senior members as an indication we want to be as well informed as anyone else when this does come to the final stage.

Mr. MASAOKA. If I may add this, unfortunately the Congressman from Texas is not here, but members of the 442d Regimental Combat Team were all made honorary Texans by the great State of Texas. This was when Texas was the largest State in the Union.

It all developed out of one of the better-known skirmishes of World War II. In the early part of October 1944 the 1st Battalion of the 36th Infantry Division from Texas was isolated by the German enemy, completely cut off. About seven other regimental combat teams were ordered to the rescue without success. The Japanese-American combat team was pulled out of another sector and ordered to try to effect the rescue of what had been known as the Lost Battalion of World War II.

I recall when we went into the line our companies averaged something like 206 men per company. When we effected the rescue after 9 days we averaged less than 50 men per company. Three of our companies had less than six men each. And I was among those that lost a brother in that particular action.

We had casualties of over 2,000 in rescuing what was left of a Texas battalion of about 300 men.

For this action the men of the 36th Texas Division gave us a memorial plaque, which is unprecedented, I think, in the history of American warfare. And the people of Texas, in spite of the fact that we are Americans of Japanese ancestry, conferred upon us what I think they considered to be their greatest honor—citizenship in the State of Texas.

I simply point that out to indicate that when the facts are known and when one fights it is not so much the color of the hair or the slant of the eye that counts as the color of the blood. And when the supreme test was made the color of the blood of the Americans of Japanese ancestry, who constitute one of the larger groups in Hawaii, was just as red as that of any American from Texas, from Brooklyn, California, or anywhere else.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Rivers.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment, as an American who has lived in Alaska during most of his life and who has not yet had a chance to vote for a President, I think I especially assimilate the witness' eloquent remarks, and I think that I have a special insight into the feeling of how good it is to be a full-fledged American. Mr. Masaoka, I commend you upon your very eloquent presentation.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Burdick?

Mr. BURDICK. No questions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Burns.

Mr. BURNS. I would like to join in the compliments. I know particularly, Mike, Mr. Masaoka, your affinity with the people of Hawaii, and I appreciated your very stirring report upon their contribution to the United States of America.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much indeed.

Mr. MASAOKA. Thank you, sir.

(The statements referred to previously follow:)

**STATEMENT OF GOV. WILLIAM F. QUINN OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 86TH CONGRESS, IN SUPPORT OF PENDING BILLS PROVIDING FOR THE ADMISSION OF HAWAII AS THE 50TH STATE**

Mr. Chairman, members of this honorable committee, my name is William F. Quinn, Governor of Hawaii since September 1957 and resident of the Territory for the past 12 years. I am grateful for this chance to make a statement in support of Hawaiian statehood. Our people are grateful for the action of this committee in giving early consideration to our cause. Enthusiasm and anticipation are mounting and intensifying as we sense that this year may be the year of the Island State. A great majority of Hawaii's people join in my prayer that statehood be granted in this session of Congress.

Past records of this committee abound with testimony on the moral, political and economic fitness of Hawaii to be a State. Statements supplementing earlier testimony of our desire for statehood, and bringing descriptions of various facets of our society up to date will be filed with this committee.

In this statement, I shall give you a broad picture of the economic conditions of Hawaii and some of the fiscal and economic projections which our legislature will consider in adopting a budget for the next biennium. They portray a mature, expanding and healthy economy. Our becoming a State will accelerate the expansion.

**ECONOMIC ACTIVITY**

1957 and 1958 were years of high economic activity in the Territory despite the mainland business recession in the latter part of 1957 and the first half of 1958 and the prolonged sugar strike in the spring of 1958.

In 1958 unemployment both in absolute terms and in percent of civilian labor force was less than it has been any year in the previous decade. Personal income increased at a slightly lower rate in 1958 than in 1957 because of the sugar strike and the decrease in some areas of Federal activity in the Territory. The volume of construction in 1958 was almost 25 percent above that in 1957, which was itself over 20 percent above that in 1956.

For the next biennium it is expected that economic activity will continue at high levels. In calendar year 1959 the Territory should enjoy a very high level of prosperity with the revival of prosperity on the mainland, the continued high level of construction activity and the expansion of the tourist trade. It is estimated that total personal income in Hawaii in 1959 will be in the neighborhood of \$1,121,000,000. For the entire 1959-61 biennium it is estimated that personal income will be increasing at the rate of 5 percent per year. Various tables of pertinent data about our economic activity are attached to this statement as appendix I.

The role of the Territorial government in broadening Hawaii's economic base is already plotted and underway. We are:

1. Developing a pattern of land-use planning that will provide sites for tourist development and industrial development with adequate transportation and water facilities.

2. Engaging in research and development on mineral and other natural resources of Hawaii—bauxite mining, timber research and development, inshore and offshore fishing, diversified agriculture.

3. Expanding tourist promotion activities and increasing recreational facilities.

4. Insuring a growing and stable supply of goods, services and agricultural products for civilian and military consumers.

5. Promoting economic growth in all areas through governmental credit agencies and coordination of private development activities with major governmental capital construction programs particularly in water development and road construction.

In capsule summary, Hawaii is a solvent enterprise with an expanding future.

#### POPULATION

The Territorial board of health estimates our total population as of July 1, 1958, to be 626,000 (of which the civilian population is 576,000), an increase of 4.4 percent over the population on July 1, 1957.

For the next biennium it is assumed that net migration in either direction will be small. The conditions which would lead to large-scale outmigration do not appear to be present. Although the mainland economy is in a period of recovery, it is still substantially below full employment levels and may not reach full employment levels for at least a year. This should discourage any large-scale outmigration from Hawaii so long as the Territory's economy remains at the current high levels. On the other hand, we do not expect large-scale immigration because the number of military dependents will not increase as much as it has in the current biennium. However, should we become a State at the beginning of the next biennium we would anticipate an increase in the numbers moving from the mainland because they want to live in Hawaii.

#### LABOR FORCE AND EMPLOYMENT

Between 1954 and 1957 average monthly employment increased by 14,000 according to the Bureau of Employment Security while unemployment fell by 4,000. For the next 3 years, employment increase is projected to be 5,000 and unemployment is expected to remain constant. Most of the increase in employment is expected to occur on Oahu.

#### PRICES

During the first 6 months of the current biennium the Honolulu consumer's price index rose at the rate of 11 percent a year following the imposition of higher tax rates and higher minimum wage rates. Since then prices have risen more slowly; the September 1958 price index was only 1.7 percent above the December 1957 price index. Over the period 1950-57 prices have moved upward at the rate of 1.5 percent per year and the budget projections assume that for the next biennium prices generally will be 3 percent above the June 1958 price levels. In many areas, however, the Honolulu consumer price index is inappropriate, and in these areas special consideration was given.

#### FINANCIAL ASPECTS—GOVERNMENT OPERATION

Revenue estimates for the current and succeeding biennial indicate substantial surpluses over expenditures. Heavy emphasis has been placed on budgeting capital and operating funds in 1959-61 for education and economic development. The capital program includes roads to open new areas; water for new developments; creation of parks, beaches, small boat harbors, and the restoration of historic sites. Both our territorywide public school system and the University of Hawaii will be substantially expanded and enriched.

I shall be quick and eager to provide additional information that you might require about our qualifications or aspirations for statehood.

Thank you very much.

WILLIAM F. QUINN, *Governor of Hawaii.*

JANUARY 23, 1959.

	1955-57	1957-59	1959-61
<b>Receipts:</b>			
General fund.....	\$129,980,746	\$176,173,184	\$191,530,090
Special and other funds.....	73,106,210	84,118,251	87,769,696
Bond fund.....	53,500,000	55,000,000	49,000,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>256,586,956</b>	<b>315,291,435</b>	<b>328,299,786</b>
<b>Payments:</b>			
General fund.....	125,871,184	160,660,682	191,521,003
Special and other funds.....	73,854,943	86,450,223	87,769,696
Bond funds.....	44,089,354	48,000,000	81,424,968
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>243,814,481</b>	<b>295,110,905</b>	<b>360,715,667</b>

NOTE.—Excludes funds not covered into Treasury.

### APPENDIX I

#### Personal income in Hawaii

(Millions of dollars)

Calendar year	Total income	Government wage and salary disbursements		Private wage and salary disbursements				Other income
		Civilian	Military	Total	Sugar and pineapple	Diversified manufacturing	Other	
1950.....	689	133	71	307	87	19	202	179
1951.....	796	159	99	340	94	23	224	197
1952.....	864	170	125	360	96	25	239	209
1953.....	889	177	129	371	97	25	248	212
1954.....	893	169	129	373	95	29	249	222
1955.....	952	177	145	392	94	29	269	238
1956.....	1,024	187	165	415	93	30	292	257
1957.....	1,098	200	173	453	91	37	325	272
1958 preliminary.....	1,150	210	170	480	-----	-----	-----	290
1959 projected.....	1,210	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1960 projected.....	1,270	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

#### Per capita personal income

	Total personal income (millions of dollars)	Per capita personal income (dollars)	Population, July 1	
			Total (thousands)	Civilian (thousands)
1950.....	689	1,403	491	471
1951.....	796	1,586	502	473
1952.....	864	1,721	502	465
1953.....	889	1,740	511	473
1954.....	893	1,717	520	481
1955.....	952	1,731	550	501
1956.....	1,024	1,787	573	523
1957.....	1,098	1,821	603	552
1958 preliminary.....	1,150	1,840	625	576
1959 projected.....	1,210	1,890	640	590
1960 projected.....	1,270	1,940	655	605



*Civilian labor force employment and unemployment*

Monthly average	Labor force	Employment		Unemployed as percent of labor force
		Total	Total covered	
1951.....	191,698	183,400	96,022	4.3
1952.....	194,068	185,644	98,477	4.3
1953.....	193,141	186,599	100,996	4.9
1954.....	197,375	185,616	99,156	6.0
1955.....	199,278	189,352	125,379	5.0
1956.....	204,075	195,085	132,360	4.4
1957.....	207,563	199,851	143,739	3.7
1958 preliminary.....	210,000	198,000	149,000	3.6

*Business activity—Volume of retail sales; volume of construction*

[Millions of dollars]

Annual totals	Retail sales	Construction
1950.....	467.8	64.7
1951.....	555.8	89.2
1952.....	548.7	91.4
1953.....	574.5	89.9
1954.....	572.8	88.2
1955.....	625.0	89.3
1956.....	663.0	105.5
1957.....	712.8	129.3
1958 preliminary.....	723.0	160.0

*Volume of loans of commercial banks and trust companies*

[Millions of dollars]

Loans outstanding—	All loans and discounts	Mortgage loans	Personal consumption loans	Other loans
Dec. 31, 1950.....	167.1	77.4	11.1	56.5
Dec. 31, 1951.....	192.1	105.9	14.4	71.8
Dec. 31, 1952.....	187.8	107.2	15.3	65.3
Dec. 31, 1953.....	190.9	108.6	19.3	65.0
Dec. 31, 1954.....	197.6	109.0	22.8	65.9
Dec. 31, 1955.....	206.6	114.1	21.3	71.2
Dec. 31, 1956.....	218.4	117.1	24.8	76.6
Dec. 31, 1957.....	249.7	127.2	34.8	87.7
June 30, 1958.....	271.3	136.6	37.1	97.6

*Territorial government receipts 1950 to 1958; 1959-61 projected*

[Millions]

Fiscal year	Total receipts				General fund receipts	
	Total	Tax	Borrowing	Other receipts	Tax	Nontax
1950.....	87	44	13	30	37	10
1951.....	99	49	18	32	41	9
1952.....	90	53	11	26	44	7
1953.....	87	53	2	32	44	10
1954.....	98	53	6	39	45	9
1955.....	93	54	6	30	46	9
1956.....	111	58	15	38	49	13
1957.....	145	64	38	43	53	14
1958.....	160	80	28	42	69	7
1959 preliminary.....	160	90	19	61	78	9
1960 projected.....	183	93	35	55	80	17
1961 projected.....	165	98	15	55	82	17

## EXPLANATORY NOTES

*Personal income.*—Data through 1957 are estimates of the Office of Business Economics, USDC; 1958 preliminary estimates were made by the Territorial bureau of the budget based on civilian wage base reported to Tax Office, and military payroll figures reported to Bureau of the Budget; 1959 and 1960 projections were made by Budget Bureau.

*Population.*—Total population data including resident military population through 1957 are estimates of the Office of Business Economics; 1958 estimates, 1959 and 1960 projections are by the Budget Bureau. Civilian population data through 1958 are estimates of Territorial bureau of health statistics; 1959 and 1960 projections are by Budget Bureau.

*Civilian labor force, employment and unemployment.*—Data through 1957 are estimates of the Territorial bureau of employment security. Covered workers include all workers eligible for unemployment compensation, both workers covered by the Territorial unemployment security law and Federal employees covered by the Federal law; 25,000 Federal civilian employees have been covered since January 1955; approximately 14,000 agricultural workers have been covered since July 1, 1957.

*Business activity.*—Data through 1957 are from Hawaii Employers Council Research Report No. 714; 1958 was estimated on basis of 10 months' data available. These figures represent the current tax base of the general excise tax plus the reported sales to the Federal Government which are exempt from the general excise tax. Data are lagged 1 month to represent the month during which the transactions occurred.

*Volume of loans of commercial banks and trust companies.*—Data are reported by the Office of Bank Examiner.

*Territorial government receipts.*—Data from 1950 to 1957 are compiled from annual statements of the comptroller of Hawaii. Total receipts include general fund, bond fund, and special funds receipts. Projections for 1959-61 are Budget Bureau estimates of tax and nontax receipts based on current tax laws.

---

TERRITORY OF HAWAII, BOARD OF HEALTH,  
*Honolulu, January 23, 1959.*

Hon. LEO O'BRIEN,  
*Chairman, House Territories Subcommittee, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.*

(Through Hon. John A. Burns, Delegate from Hawaii.)

DEAR SIR: At the request of Hon. John A. Burns, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, I am submitting the population statistics of the Territory of Hawaii for the period July 1, 1950, through July 1, 1958.

Our estimates of the civilian population data for the Territory were prepared using the migration-natural increase method. Data on civilian migration to and from the Territory were provided by each carrier. Military population figures are not included in these estimates but civilian dependents are, July 1:

1950-----	471, 447	1953-----	473, 214	1956-----	523, 359
1951-----	472, 602	1954-----	481, 386	1957-----	551, 537
1952-----	465, 325	1955-----	500, 976	1958-----	575, 771

Very truly yours,

RICHARD K. C. LEE, M.D.,  
*President, Board of Health.*

---

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF HONOLULU,  
*Honolulu, Hawaii, January 22, 1959.*

Hon. LEO W. O'BRIEN,  
*House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'BRIEN: The Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu is one of the first organizations in Hawaii to have taken a firm stand in support of statehood for Hawaii, and, as you bring this legislation before the 86th Congress, I want you to know of the chamber's continuing enthusiasm for statehood.

Our officers and board of directors want you to know of their desire to be of

any assistance required in getting prompt action by the Congress to make Hawaii the 50th State.

Through a number of methods over the years, and particularly since the war, the chamber has received from its 3,000 members numerous indications of their desire for State government. As long ago as January 1946, the entire membership was polled and the response was overwhelmingly in favor of statehood for the islands.

For several years it has included in its annual program the objective to stimulate the passage of the statehood bill by Congress.

At its first meeting in 1959, the board of directors approved the naming of a special committee on statehood and directed it to send its members to Washington to call on Members of Congress. The objective is for our top business leaders to relay in person to as many Congressmen as possible, while this legislation is being considered this year, the absolute necessity for the growth and development of Hawaii to bring Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State.

Your committee's interest in this is much appreciated, as is your own personal leadership in this most important national and international legislation.

The business community of Hawaii thanks you for your continuing efforts in its behalf.

Sincerely yours,

J. DICKSON PRATT, *President.*

---

#### STATEMENT OF MR. L. A. HICKS, PRESIDENT, HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC CO.

The Hawaiian Electric Co., which supplies electrical energy to over 100,000 customers on the island of Oahu, anticipates a capital expenditure program for the years 1959-63 of approximately \$57 million.

It will be necessary for the company to raise approximately \$37 million through the sale of bonds, preferred stock and common stock. In the 5 years just past, 1954-58, Hawaiian Electric spent \$38.4 million for capital expenditures and raised a total of \$26.8 million through the sale of securities.

Early in 1957 a group of security analysts visited Hawaii to look at the properties of Hawaiian Electric. At that time, we were told that statistically the bonds of our company were comparable to that of an AA rated security but because of our location in a Territory they were rated as A.

During the course of our financing, we have consistently found that the company was paying a premium for its money over and above even an A-rated security. This has resulted in the payment of an additional premium for funds secured. The price we have paid for our bonds has been more comparable to a BAA security than an AA security. We feel that statehood for Hawaii will go a long way to remove this present inequity.

Previous to 1940, Hawaiian Electric was able to obtain its financing in the Territory of Hawaii. As the capital expenditures necessary to meet plant expansion increased, first bonds and later preferred stock financing were carried out with the assistance of New York and San Francisco financial houses. We believe the time will soon come when the company will have to seek a wider distribution for its common stock in the mainland markets.

Presently, in excess of 90 percent of the \$35 million of bonds the company has outstanding are held by mainland investors, mainly insurance and trust companies. In excess of 50 percent of the preferred stock of the company is now held outside the Territory of Hawaii. Already in excess of 10 percent of the common stock of the company is held outside of the Territory.

It is our feeling when Hawaii achieves statehood the prices that we have to pay, not only the face rate of our securities, but the price we pay in underwriting fees should also be more comparable to those paid by similar mainland utilities.

For example, on the 3d of October 1958 we had occasion to sell \$3.5 million preferred stock on the New York market. We were required to put a face rate on this stock of 5.75 percent. This was 0.95 basis points above a company with AA rating issued 2 weeks earlier and 0.65 points above another similarly rated utility issued 3 weeks later. The underwriting commission we paid amounted to 3.25 percent of the issue whereas the underwriting commissions for the other companies were 0.70 percent and 1.73 percent, respectively.

It is felt that as soon as Hawaii becomes a State we would experience a decrease in the cost we have to pay for our outside funds and also a reduction in the cost of the underwriting commissions we pay.

The Hawaiian Electric Co. showed an increase in kilowatt-hour sales of 8.7 percent in 1958. This is approximately double the percentage increase for the whole of the United States. It is anticipated that our sales will increase an additional 10 percent this year. This attests to the strength of the economy of our service area and accentuates the need for our capital expenditure program, as previously outlined.

It is our hope that we will be able to do the necessary financing for this expansion as a utility operating in a State rather than a Territory.

HAWAIIAN TELEPHONE CO.,  
Honolulu, T.H., January 22, 1959.

Hon. LEO W. O'BRIEN,  
House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'BRIEN: The management and directors of Hawaiian Telephone Co. unanimously believe that Hawaii should be granted statehood at the earliest possible date in this session of Congress.

Although it hardly needs repetition, our feeling comes partly from our firm belief that the citizens of Hawaii are entitled to all the privileges and benefits of American citizenship just as we have shown our ability and willingness to carry out the full responsibilities of this citizenship.

Hawaiian Telephone Co. was organized in 1883 under the laws of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and our corporate existence has continued for nearly 76 years up to the present. We are a fully independent telephone company—not part of the Bell System nor any other corporation. Over 80 percent of the common stock of this company is held by residents of Hawaii.

We now provide telephone service on the six principal islands of the Hawaiian group, as well as interisland telephone and telegraph services. Our facilities are connected with the Bell System and other independent telephone companies on the mainland by means of both radiotelephone facilities and a submarine telephone cable owned jointly by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Hawaiian Telephone Co. By way of interest, the telephones in the city of Honolulu were converted to automatic dial operation in 1910, some 49 years ago. By mid-1957, all telephones on all islands we serve were provided with automatic dial service. We have continued to keep abreast of the latest developments of the telephone industry and have provided all modern communication facilities to the people of Hawaii.

Our belief that Hawaii is fully prepared for statehood is further strengthened by the fact that the overall economy of the islands and the conduct of business here fully meets the highest American standards. With specific reference to Hawaiian Telephone Co.; the following facts relative to our postwar growth indicate the measure in which this company has served and is continuing to serve the community needs of Hawaii.

Telephones in service Jan. 1, 1946.....	54, 734
Telephones in service Jan. 1, 1959.....	176, 750
Total plant in service Jan. 1, 1946.....	\$12, 885, 669
Total plant in service Jan. 1, 1959.....	\$68, 797, 000
New capital raised, both debt and equity, during the period Jan. 1, 1946, to Dec. 31, 1958 amounts to approximately.....	\$43, 000, 000
Transpacific calls during 1946.....	89, 454
Transpacific calls during 1958 (estimated).....	329, 000
Interisland calls during 1946.....	153, 766
Interisland calls during 1958.....	380, 432
Number of employees Jan. 1, 1946.....	977
Number of employees Jan. 1, 1959.....	1, 735

The directors of Hawaiian Telephone Co. have already approved capital expenditures for growth and improvement of our system amounting to approximately \$10 million for the current year 1959, and it is expected that approximately an equal amount will be spent for expansion and improvements in each of the years 1960 and 1961.

We believe that Hawaiian Telephone Co. has served Hawaii well during the 76 years of its operation. In particular, it has also served the Nation in times

of peace as well as in times of war. At the end of 1942, after the first year of World War II, Col. C. A. Powell, signal officer of the Signal Corps in Hawaii, wrote to Mr. Alvah A. Scott, then president of our company, a letter in which he expressed "for all the Signal Corps personnel of the Hawaiian department sincerest appreciation for the splendid cooperation and valuable services rendered by your organization during the past year." Mr. William C. Avery, who became president of this company in 1944, served as a committee member of the board of war communications in 1946 and he received a letter from Charles R. Denny, chairman of said board, extending to him "sincere gratitude and commendation for your service as one of the committees whose assistance made the work of the board possible." Also, in May 1946, Mr. Avery received a certificate from the War Department expressing its appreciation for service in a position of trust and responsibility and "for furnishing communications facilities within the strategic islands of Hawaii during the period of national emergency which contributed to the establishment of the world's greatest communication system."

For these, as well as many other reasons, our company fully endorses statehood for Hawaii and urges the Members of Congress to act favorably on the statehood measure now before Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. ATHERTON, *President.*

HAWAIIAN SUGAR PLANTERS' ASSOCIATION,  
Honolulu, T.H., U.S.A., January 28, 1959.

Relative statehood for Hawaii.

Hon. LEO O'BRIEN,  
*Chairman, House Territories Committee:*

Hawaii's sugar industry is in favor of immediate statehood for Hawaii.

The industry is composed of 27 plantation companies which produce a total of over 1 million tons of raw sugar annually. These companies provide year-around employment for about 17,000 men and women with a total payroll of about \$56 million. The companies are owned by 14,000 individual stockholders, some 70 percent of whom live in Hawaii. Invested capital in the industry is estimated at about \$200 million.

The foregoing statistics are cited to show that underlying the sugar industry's endorsement of statehood is a record of solid accomplishment and long identification with Hawaii's economic, social, and political development.

It is felt that under statehood opportunities for continued progress in this as well as other industries would be strengthened. We are also confident that the general economy of the islands is sound and fully capable of supporting whatever enlarged governmental responsibilities statehood would impose.

While the sugar industry is interested in economic implications, its support of statehood is influenced more profoundly by complete acceptance of the following principles:

1. By every reasonable test of good citizenship and Americanism the people of Hawaii have demonstrated their competence, maturity, and their capacity to exercise enlarged political responsibilities, not only in the best interests of Hawaii but in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

2. Having faithfully fulfilled their obligations as taxpaying Americans for more than 50 years and having impressively demonstrated their patriotism by unequalled valor and sacrifice in World War II and the Korean war, the people of Hawaii have proved their loyalty beyond question.

3. Hawaii's record of political and legislative accomplishment at the municipal and Territorial level is evidence that as voters of a new State the citizens of Hawaii would send to the Congress Senators and Representatives who would competently fulfill their responsibilities to the State and to the Nation.

4. Admission of Hawaii as a State would strengthen American relations with anti-Communist peoples of the Pacific, and would encourage eventual growth of trade and commerce with friendly nations in that area.

For the foregoing reasons Hawaii's sugar industry is firmly in favor of statehood now.

A. G. BUDGE,  
*President, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.*

**PINEAPPLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF HAWAII,**  
*Honolulu, Hawaii, January 22, 1959.*

**HON. LEO O'BRIEN,**  
*Chairman of the House Territories Committee,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: The Pineapple Growers Association is the trade association for the pineapple companies in Hawaii. All of the pineapple grown and processed in Hawaii is produced by companies who are members of this association, as follows:

Baldwin Packers, Ltd.  
California Packing Corp.  
Grove Farm Co., Ltd.  
Hawaiian Canneries Co., Ltd.  
Hawaiian Fruit Packers, Ltd.  
Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd.  
Kauai Pineapple Co., Ltd.  
Libby, McNeill & Libby  
Maui Pineapple Co., Ltd.

Pineapple is an important part of the economy in the Hawaiian Islands. The companies listed above have 8,200 year-round employees and during the peak summer season of harvesting and processing employ 15,400 additional workers. The Hawaiian pineapple industry has 75,000 acres under cultivation, producing annually some 30 million cases of fruit and juice. Practically all of the fruit is processed since it is impossible to market more than a small part of the crop as fresh fruit in Hawaii or on the U.S. mainland. Eighty-five percent of the U.S. mainland's canned pineapple and juice comes from Hawaii and the sale of this pineapple brings some \$115 million annually to the Territory.

The pineapple industry has supported statehood for Hawaii consistently. A resolution to this effect was passed unanimously by the board of directors of this association on January 7, 1946. Again on January 7, 1948, prior to the visit of Senator Guy Cordon, who came to study the statehood question, the board of directors of the association passed unanimously a resolution in favor of statehood, a copy of which is attached hereto.

The industry's position is the same today, and we present this letter and the attached resolution as evidence that the companies who make up the pineapple industry in Hawaii are in favor of statehood and earnestly desire the early passage of legislation which would grant this Territory the full rights and duties of a State.

Sincerely yours,

**R. L. CUSHING,**  
*Executive Vice President.*

Whereas the House of Representatives of the 80th Congress of the United States on June 20, 1947, passed H.R. 49, a bill introduced by Hon. Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and be admitted as a State in the American Union; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have maintained orderly and efficient government and have demonstrated their loyalty and devotion to the United States of America and have discharged all the obligations of American citizenship; and

Whereas the people of this Territory have shown their qualification for self-government and their right to statehood in accordance with the fundamental principles upon which American Government is founded; and

Whereas the financial condition of the Territory is sound; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have, by their vote at a plebiscite in true American democratic manner, clearly expressed themselves as being in favor of statehood; and

Whereas there is justification for the belief that the people of this Territory should be accorded the right of voting representation in the Halls of Congress, together with other inherent rights of full citizens of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Pineapple Growers' Association of Hawaii unanimously favors the immediate admission of Hawaii into the Union of the United States of America as a State, with all the rights, privileges, and obligations incident thereto.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,  
HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION,  
*Honolulu, January 23, 1959.*

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*U.S. Representative from Colorado,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Although 5,000 miles from the Washington scene, the people of Hawaii feel that they are there on the sidelines watching every dramatic move that is being made in their behalf to achieve statehood for Hawaii.

We are thrilled over the play-by-play accounts which are reaching us almost daily concerning the rapid progress being made to push the Hawaii statehood bill (H.R. 50) to final passage at an early date.

No doubt the opponents of the bill will resort to every type of parliamentary maneuver to prevent its passage, but we are confident that the proponents, under the able leadership that has been displayed, will not be outmaneuvered.

Respectfully,

HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION,  
By WM. H. HEEN, *Vice Chairman.*

---

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,  
HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION,  
*Honolulu, January 23, 1959.*

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*U.S. Representative from Colorado,  
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Hawaii Statehood Commission has been informed that an attempt might be made by opponents of the Hawaii statehood bill to include a provision to grant home rule to the District of Columbia, to grant statehood to Puerto Rico, or to otherwise confuse the main purpose of the bill.

This is to advise that at a meeting of the commission on January 20, 1959, it was unanimously voted to ask you to oppose any attempt that might be made to amend that bill so as to include in it matters that are not germane to the primary object of the bill—the granting of statehood to Hawaii.

Respectfully,

HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION,  
By WM. H. HEEN, *Vice Chairman.*

---

DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF HAWAII,  
TERRITORIAL CENTRAL COMMITTEE,  
*Honolulu, T.H., January 23, 1959.*

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: The Democratic Party of Hawaii reiterates its complete endorsement of statehood for Hawaii at the earliest possible moment and respectfully requests your committee to report the bill favorably.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON, *Chairman.*

THE U.S. FLAG COMMITTEE,  
JACKSON HEIGHTS,  
Long Island, N.Y., January 23, 1959.

Re: Statehood for Hawaii.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: We wish to register our opposition to any bill for making Hawaii a State. There are many reasons for this, among which are the following:

It is too far from the United States.

It has been publicly rated as extremely procommunitistic.

The natives, which represent, the largest percentage of the population, have little knowledge of our constitutional form of Government and of our American habits, customs, and heritage.

Sincerely yours,

THE U.S. FLAG COMMITTEE,  
\_\_\_\_\_, Secretary.

STATEMENT OF JAMES M. THOMSON, GAYLORD, CLARKE COUNTY, VA., FORMER  
PUBLISHER OF THE NEW ORLEANS ITEM

Please record me as opposing Hawaii statehood.

The southern third of our Nation (South and border States) is violently upset over segregation and the race question. The Negro problem upsets Washington, D.C., where, with suffrage, our National Capital would have Negro government.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell is quoted as advocating a Negro mayor for New York City, where Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and foreign-born constitute a majority of the electorate.

Hawaii's population is about half Japanese. As an American State, Hawaii would serve to channel into the continental United States an unlimited number of Japanese. These Japanese are a very able people—very industrious, and willing to work for dimes while our people demand and get dollars. Why complicate our race problem as well as our labor problem? Why turn over the continent which our British and North European ancestors conquered, developed, and civilized along its historic lines to alien races?

We all see what trouble race mixture is already causing us. Once we let down the bars to Asia's teeming millions, our Anglo-Saxon civilization is gone.

JAMES M. THOMSON.

STATEMENT BY FORMER CONGRESSMAN BERNARD W. KEARNEY

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Hawaii is ready for and entitled to immediate statehood.

I base this assertion upon several trips to the islands, where I was impressed by the loyalty and patriotism of the people and their complete ability to handle the responsibilities of statehood.

We have given statehood to Alaska. Every test applied to that new State is more than met by Hawaii.

For many years I was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. From that background, I do not hesitate to say that the people of Hawaii are capable of controlling the communism which does exist there and that they will be able to do so even more effectively if we give them the sinews of statehood.



## LETTER FROM TOM B. SHUSTER, STUDENT

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., *January 26, 1959.*

Subject: Hawaiian statehood.

Representative TOM MORRIS,  
*United States House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to hear your opinion about Hawaii becoming a State. How are you going to vote for Hawaii for statehood bill?

Also, I would like to express my opinion about Hawaii becoming a State. I think Hawaii should become a State because it has earned the right to vote in the elections and because they are taxpayers.

I am 10 years old and in the fifth grade.

Sincerely yours,

TOM B. SHUSTER.

---

STATEMENT OF THE UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE ON HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice wishes to register its support for H.R. 50 to admit Hawaii to statehood at this session of Congress.

The fellowship believes that the convincing arguments used so successfully to bring Alaska into the Union are equally pertinent to the admission of Hawaii.

In its position of world leadership, the United States can ill afford to withhold complete democracy to the people of Hawaii. The United States has never believed in taxation without representation. The only way to assure the Hawaiian citizens that we still believe in this concept is to pass H.R. 50.

The Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice urges the House Interior Committee to report favorably on this bill.

J. RAY SHUTE,

*President.*

Mrs. A. POWELL DAVIES,

*Chairman, Legislative Committee.*

---

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO HAWAIIAN ADMISSION BY WILLIS A. CARTO

Mr. Chairman, when the income tax, 16th amendment, was passed, its promoters solemnly promised that it would never take more than 2 or 3 percent of the income of any taxpayer. However, a precedent had been established with its passage. That precedent was that it became possible for Congress, by majority vote, to confiscate up to 100 percent of a man's income if it desired to do so. Forty-six years later we realize this truth. Few realized it in 1913. A prophet then would have been ridiculed.

The admission of Hawaii would establish another precedent. This precedent would be that land or islands unconnected with the American continent and inhabited by people of radically differing backgrounds from the majority of Americans are eligible to become a State.

Gentlemen, this is a road with no ending. This is the road to world government. It is the highway through the gradual watering down of the idea of American nationality and nationhood to a meaningless, characterless, cosmopolitan universality. It is a violence to American sovereignty. It is suicide.

There is a question which American statesmen must come to grips with before it is too late. After Hawaii what? Puerto Rico? Panama? Guam? the Virgin Islands? Why not, then Ghana? or San Marino? Reasons can be found for the admission of all of these. What is the point at which we stop?

Many of the people of these countries desire to become an American State.

The Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín, does. Immediately after Congress passed Alaskan admittance, he wired to the Governor of Alaska:

"My sincerest congratulations to the Alaskan people for this victory in getting statehood through the principle of self-determination. The people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, who also benefited from this principle, wish the people of Alaska lots of happiness in their new status."

Governor Marín apparently is not only in favor of statehood for Puerto Rico but he believes that it is a matter of right if it is desired by the people of Puerto Rico.

The admission of a new State is a serious matter. It is not properly a matter of emotion nor of wishful thinking. Nor is it a matter of "earning," for statehood is not a reward to be presented as a proud parent would give an all-day sucker to a well-behaved child.

Admission must always be a matter of principle. This principle is that the issue requires calm deliberation in the light of national interest. There can be no other approach to the matter without disaster. Statesmen must calmly decide that admission of an area is in the national interest or opposed to it, and this is the sole criterion. Only national interest is concerned. This and nothing else.

Hawaiian statehood clearly has nothing to recommend it as far as this Nation's interests are concerned and each and every argument brought forth for it is specious when viewed in the clear light of national interest.

For instance, one of the arguments is that admission is necessary for national security. This is an obvious fiction. The same was said for Alaska, but after Congress favored Alaska the Washington magazine, U.S. News & World Report, revealed that opposition from high military officials was one of the factors which had slowed down its march through Congress. Now one does not need to be a military genius to perceive that a Territory is much easier controlled in the event of national emergency than is a sovereign State.

Another argument is that the step of statehood has been promised by the officials of two political parties. But, gentlemen, only Congress can promise the will of the Nation, and Congress has made no promise. It is only in totalitarian states, like Communist Russia or Nazi Germany, where a political party can make promises in the name of the government.

In addition to the question of national interest there is a very important constitutional issue involved. Admission of Hawaii, to be legal, would clearly require an amendment to the Constitution, without which Congress would be acting devoid of constitutional power to so act, and admission would be null and void. Let me read the appropriate portion of the Constitution, the preamble:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the General Welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

This is where we derive the name of our country, and the name is the United States of America.

The 20 volcanic islands in the North Pacific Ocean making up Hawaii are not part of the American Continent. This is a geographical fact.

To properly admit Hawaii would require a constitutional amendment changing the name of this Nation to, perhaps, the United States of America and the North Pacific Ocean, or to the United States of Anywhere. The latter would probably be preferable because we could then retain the initials U.S.A.

We are in danger of making a cataclysmic turn in American history. We are at the point where we may remain Republic with clearly defined boundaries or soon become a meaningless conglomeration, an "empire" if you like the term, with our boundaries changing with the whims of pressure groups and the cast of fortune.

I do not begrudge Hawaiians the right to petition for admission. It is their right to do so and I, as a citizen of the Nation they admire, am flattered at their high opinion of my country. But I protest at the insane hysteria which has been excited in Congress by the platoon of well-paid lobbyists who are promoting this for their own selfish ends. Is Congress really going to capitulate so easily to the wiles of the professional pressure artists? What has happened to statesmanship?

This is a question, I submit, which has not had a reasonable discussion. I do not believe that the honorable Congressman have yet had the opportunity to understand both sides of this momentous question. I think that the hysteria over this measure which is now in existence is a totally artificial thing, uncondusive to calm discussion and inimical to the best interests of the country.

I pray that the honorable Congressmen will allow themselves to perceive the true road ahead, the one leading through the tempest of pressure and misinformation which blows so loudly around them. I address my plea to those lonely men—those statesmen who can stand against the wind when they see it blowing in a perverse direction.

I speak to those few "unpopular" men who are remembered.

---

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS & BUTCHER WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA,  
Chicago, Ill., February 2, 1959.

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs,  
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'BRIEN: We should like to inform you of the complete support of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL-CIO) for H.R. 50, which would grant statehood to Hawaii. It is highly commendable that the subcommittee is considering this legislation in the very first month of the 86th Congress. We hope that this speed will be maintained and that our Nation will shortly have Hawaii as its 50th State.

We recall that in convention after convention of first, the AFL, and then, the AFL-CIO, the delegates of our union have voted, together with representatives of other unions, for resolutions calling for Hawaiian statehood. Putting these resolutions into practice, the American labor movement, represented by officials of the AFL-CIO, have urged congressional committees and individual legislators to bring Hawaii into the Union as a full-fledged partner of our States.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL-CIO) is a labor union with 350,000 members in meat markets, packinghouses, and other food and allied industries in every State of the United States and in Hawaii. We want to see a strong and prosperous Hawaii, in which labor fully shares both in the work of building the area's strength and prosperity and in receiving the benefits which come from such economic development. We pledge that our unions will work vigorously to achieve both these goals.

We firmly believe that the economic growth of Hawaii must be supported by the granting of statehood to the islands. Equality with other States will provide Hawaii many important and well-deserved benefits. Getting its fair share of Federal aid for economic and social programs, now provided by legislation, is just one outstanding example of that.

Statehood for Hawaii would certainly be in the interests of our entire Nation. In terms of the U.S. foreign policy, defense efforts, and economic growth, statehood is not only desirable, it is absolutely necessary. We firmly believe the existing States of the United States would benefit every bit as much from Hawaiian statehood as would Hawaii.

Quite frankly, we can see no reason in the world why Hawaii should not quickly become a State. The legislation which the subcommittee is considering should have been on the statute books long ago. Hawaii has more than earned the right to statehood. By any test, whatsoever, be it economic strength, size of population, extent of education, or others, Hawaii has more reason to be a State than some of our long-existing ones.

On behalf of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, we would like to join in the testimony previously presented by our parent organization, the AFL-CIO, which is the spokesman for American labor. We strongly support H.R. 50 and we urge it be enacted quickly so that Hawaii may speedily become our Nation's 50th State.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. LLOYD, *President.*  
PATRICK E. GORMAN, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

OFFICE OF COUNTY CLERK, COUNTY OF KAUAI,  
Lihue, Kauai, T.H., January 26, 1959.

Subject: Request for Hawaiian statehood in 1959.

Hon. LEO O'BRIEN,  
Chairman, House Territories Subcommittee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As directed, we enclose herewith certified copies of resolution No. 29 (1959) of the board of supervisors of the county of Kauai, T.H., touching upon the marginal subject.

Very respectfully,

J. K. BURGESS, Jr.,  
County Clerk, County of Kauai.

**RESOLUTION NO. 29—REQUEST FOR HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD IN 1959**

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is politically, economically, and socially qualified for statehood, said qualifications having been fully examined by many congressional hearings on Hawaiian statehood; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has adopted a proposed State constitution and is prepared to assume immediately all the obligations of statehood; and

Whereas statehood is the most cherished aspiration of the people of Hawaii and the admission of Alaska as the 49th State adds unbounded hopes to Hawaii's aspiration for statehood: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kauai,* That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to grant statehood to Hawaii during this session of Congress; be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; to the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House; to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Senate majority leader; to the Honorable Leo O'Brien, chairman of the House Territories Subcommittee; to the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen, Senate minority leader; to the Honorable Charles A. Halleck, House minority leader; and to the Honorable John A. Burns, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Introduced by:

A. C. BAPTISTE, Jr.,  
Chairman and Executive Officer.

RAYMOND D. SOUZA,  
Supervisor.

GEORGE H. TOYOFUKU,  
Supervisor.

LOUIE GONSALVES, Jr.,  
Supervisor.

RAYMOND X. AKI,  
Supervisor.

TSUNETO KUNIMURA,  
Supervisor.

CHIYOZO SHIRAMIZU,  
Supervisor.

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK, COUNTY OF KAUAI, T.H., LIHUE, KAUAI, T.H.

**CERTIFICATE**

I hereby certify that hereto attached is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 29 which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kauai at a meeting held on January 23, 1959, by the following vote of the board:

For adoption: Aki, Gonsalves, Kunimura, Shiramizu, Souza, Toyofuku, Baptiste—total, 7.

Against adoption: None.

Absent and not voting: None.

Dated at Lihue, Kauai, T.H., this 23d day of January A.D. 1959.

J. K. BURGESS, Jr.,  
County Clerk, County of Kauai.

## RESOLUTION No. 29—REQUESTS FOR HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD IN 1959

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is politically, economically, and socially qualified for statehood, said qualifications having been fully examined by many congressional hearings on Hawaiian statehood; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has adopted a proposed State constitution and is prepared to assume immediately all the obligations of statehood; and

Whereas statehood is the most cherished aspiration of the people of Hawaii and the admission of Alaska as the 49th State adds unbounded hopes to Hawaii's aspiration for statehood: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kauai*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to grant statehood to Hawaii during this session of Congress; Be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, to the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House, to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Senate majority leader, to the Honorable Lee O'Brien, chairman of the House Territories Subcommittee, to the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen, Senate minority leader, to the Honorable Charles A. Halleck, House minority leader, and to the Honorable John A. Burns, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Introduced by:

A. C. BAPTISTE, Jr.,  
*Chairman and Executive Officer.*

RAYMOND D. SOUZA

*Supervisor.*

GEORGE H. TOYOFUKU,  
*Supervisor.*

LOUIE GONSAVES, JR.,  
*Supervisor.*

RAYMOND X. AKI,  
*Supervisor.*

TSUNETO KUNIMURA,  
*Supervisor.*

CHIYOZO SHIRAMIZU,  
*Supervisor.*

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK, COUNTY OF KAUAI, T.H., LIHUE KAUAI, T.H.

## CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that hereto attached is a true and correct copy of Resolution 29 which was adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Kauai at a meeting held on January 23, 1959, by the following vote of the board:

For adoption: Aki, Gonsalves, Kunimura, Shiramizu, Souza, Toyofuku, Baptiste—total, 7.

Against adoption: None.

Absent and not voting: None.

Dated at Lihue, Kauai, T.H., this 23d day of January A.D. 1959.

J. K. BURGESS, Jr.,  
*County Clerk, County of Kauai.*

THE 442D VETERANS CLUB,  
*Honolulu, T.H., February 6, 1959.*

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*U.S. House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: The 442d Veterans Club, comprised of former members of the 442d Infantry Regimental Combat Team, which was engaged in active combat in Italy and France in World War II, firmly believes that the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as a State in the Union would enhance immeasurably the prestige and dignity of the United States as the bulwark of

democracy in the family of nations. It reiterates its endorsement of statehood for Hawaii and respectfully requests your support on actions granting the Territory of Hawaii immediate statehood.

Very truly yours,

FRED S. IDA, *President.*

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has continued in the status of an incorporated Territory of the United States for nearly six decades; and

Whereas, as such Territory, the people of Hawaii have been relegated to an inferior status as compared to their fellow citizens of the 49 States; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have proven themselves in every conceivable way that they are anxious and capable of governing themselves as a sovereign State of the United States; and

Whereas this proof has been manifested time and again, and continuously, both in times of foreign conflict and in times of peace; and

Whereas Hawaii has stood as a military bastion in the Pacific and a showcase of democracy and international goodwill; and

Whereas the 442d Veterans Club, comprised of former members of the 442d Infantry Regimental Combat Team, which was trained in Mississippi and was engaged in active combat in Italy and France in World War II, firmly believes that the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as a State in the Union would enhance immeasurably the prestige and dignity of the United States as the bulwark of democracy in the family of nations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the 442d Veterans Club,* That it reiterates its endorsement of statehood for Hawaii; and be it further

*Resolved,* That every Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, is hereby respectfully requested to take appropriate action in granting immediate statehood to Hawaii; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Members of the Congress; and the Honorable John A. Burns, Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

Respectfully submitted.

THE 442D VETERANS CLUB,  
FRED S. IDA, *President.*

TOGO NAKAGAWA,  
*Executive Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF HAWAII, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

A RESOLUTION

Whereas the Senate of the United States, on the night of June 30, 1958, passed the Alaska statehood bill by the decisive vote of 64-20, thus completing congressional action on the bill which had previously passed the House of Representatives;

Whereas the passage of the Alaska statehood bill helps pave the way for similar legislation for Hawaii;

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars have for more than 20 years consistently supported statehood for Hawaii, and repeatedly at national conventions, have passed resolutions attesting such support: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the appropriate officials of the Department of Hawaii Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States,* That we hereby pledge the support of this organization through continued and increased efforts to achieve statehood for this Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Department of Hawaii, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, call on our fellow comrades and sisters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its auxiliaries of the continental United States

(now including Alaska) to work for early passage of the Hawaii statehood legislation.

Adopted this 1st day of July 1958.

HARRY L. CHANG,  
*Department Commander.*

Attest :

JOHN H. CHUNG, Jr.,  
*Department Adjutant.*

---

(CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, 1959 REGULAR (GENERAL) SESSION

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Introduced by Messrs. Busterud, Marks, Mulford, Bruce F. Allen, Britschgi, Crawford, Cusanovich, and Z'berg, January 12, 1959

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 2—RELATIVE TO STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has for many years sought to become a State of the United States with full privileges of statehood and first-class citizenship for its peoples; and

Whereas this recognition was recently granted to Alaska, and both political parties have recognized that every consideration of fairness demands that the people of Hawaii receive the same status in our Nation; and

Whereas Hawaii has long since fulfilled all the requirements for statehood, and no valid reason remains for postponing its entry into the brotherhood of the United States; and

Whereas the people of California feel especially sympathetic to this proposal of statehood for the islands, because of the volume of travel and commerce between the west coast and Hawaii which have so increased in recent years: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress and the President of the United States are respectfully memorialized to enact at this session of Congress such laws as are necessary for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii to statehood in the United States; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.*

---

NEBRASKA STATE LEGISLATURE,  
*January 19, 1959.*

Hon. DONALD F. MCGINLEY,  
*House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR DON: I am enclosing herewith a copy of Legislative Resolution 5 which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 69th regular session on the 15th day of January 1959.

Very truly yours,

HUGO F. SRB, *Clerk of the Legislature.*

LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA, 69TH SESSION

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 5

Introduced by David D. Tews, 15th district, Stanley Portsche, 19th district

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is vital to the defense of the United States; and

Whereas said Territory has greatly contributed to the economic and cultural life of the United States; and

Whereas the people of said Territory have demonstrated their maturity, responsibility, and willingness to accept in full, and ability to discharge, the responsibilities that accompany citizenship in one of the States of the United States; and

Whereas not only principles of fairness, but also considerations of mutual benefit to said Territory and the States of the United States demand that said Territory be granted immediate statehood: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled*

1. That the Members of Congress are hereby memorialized to grant immediate statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,  
*President of the Legislature.*

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 5, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 69th regular session on the 15th day of January 1959.

HUGO F. SRB,  
*Clerk of the Legislature.*

---

TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE, STATE OF NEW MEXICO

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 5

INTRODUCED BY ANDERSON CARTER, ALVA J. PARKER, JAMES B. PATTON, AND JACK CAMPBELL

A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of these United States to extend the fullest rights, duties, and blessings of statehood upon Hawaii by admitting her to the Union of the United States of America

Whereas over 99 percent of the pupils in the public schools of Hawaii are citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the half million people of the islands include among their members large numbers of three great racial groups who speak five of the great languages heard around the world; and

Whereas members of nearly 50 language and racial groups and subgroups have long been associated together in amity and mutual esteem in the public schools of the Territory; and

Whereas as long ago as 1851 the islanders secretly petitioned these United States to be taken under our protection; and

Whereas the islands of Hawaii were annexed by joint resolution of Congress in 1898 and established as a Territory by law in 1900; and

Whereas the people of the Territory have amply demonstrated their capacity for self-government and self-reliance; and

Whereas the people of the United States must demonstrate to the world that our published ideals of liberty, fraternity, and equality are in truth a living creed to which we adhere: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to admit Hawaii to statehood without delay; and be it further*

*Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the members of the New Mexico delegation to the U.S. Congress.*

ED V. MEAD,  
*President, Senate.*

HAL THORNBERRY,  
*Chief Clerk, Senate.*

MACK EASLEY,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives.*

ALBERT ROMERO,  
*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*



Mr. O'BRIEN. I understand that Mr. George D. Riley is now in the room.

Mr. George D. Riley is legislative representative for the AFL and the CIO. Mr. Riley.

### STATEMENT OF GEORGE D. RILEY, AFL-CIO LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. RILEY. Thank you for identifying me, Mr. Chairman.

The AFL is now, as it has been in the past, on record for statehood for Hawaii, just as it was on the record for statehood for Alaska. I have a brief statement, and I would appreciate it if it may be included in the record.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE D. RILEY, AFL-CIO LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 50 AND RELATED BILLS ON HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The AFL-CIO continues to give full support to the proposition of statehood for Hawaii, as was stated at the AFL-CIO convention 2 years ago:

"Justice demands that the people of \* \* \* Hawaii, American citizens, be given the same rights and privileges that are enjoyed by those in the 48 States. They are at present deprived of any real representation in the U.S. Congress, and of the right to vote for President. Governors not of their own choosing have broad powers over their local affairs. Although they are deprived of these rights of citizenship, they must meet the obligations of citizenship, for they are not excused from taxation and military service."

The AFL-CIO has consistently endorsed Hawaiian statehood, just as it did Alaskan statehood. More than a century ago, Hawaii, at that time a kingdom, started negotiations with the United States for statehood. As the years passed, the bonds between Hawaii and this Nation grew closer and tighter until annexation in 1898.

During the present century, pleas and petitions have been directed to the Congress in a steady succession and, by the time of the outbreak of the Pacific war in the early 1940's a plebiscite had shown a 2 to 1 majority supporting desire for statehood. World War II interfered with further attention to the issue, but not for long.

The Republican national platform has declared that, "We favor immediate statehood for Hawaii." The Democratic platform for 1956 called for "\* \* \* immediate statehood for the Territory." Apparently there has been no change from the two previous announcements. In addition to the platform planks on the subject, there have been many messages to the Congress containing the proposal that Hawaii be admitted as a full-fledged member to the family of States.

With the exception of three or four sessions of the Hawaiian Legislature, starting as early as 1903, petitions have come to the Congress from Hawaii calling for admittance into the Union.

Further strengthening Hawaii's claim is the fact that this is an incorporated Territory, which fact is pointed to by statehood adherents as establishing a right to statehood as contrasted to claims which might be set up by unincorporated territories.

Some 20 congressional hearings have weighed the fitness of Hawaii for statehood while the House has passed statehood bills in 1947, 1950, and 1953. There apparently remains little unsaid on the subject. As recently as 1956, the President has used the following words in Hawaii's favor:

"Statehood, supported by the repeatedly expressed desire of the islands' people and by our traditions, would be a shining example of the American way to the entire earth."

The argument that the Hawaiian Islands are hundreds of miles from the mainland has now been discredited in the admittance of Alaska which is not contiguous to any of the other States. The United States has tried repeatedly to make showcases of democracy in and along the vast Pacific Basin in nations under other flags. In the Hawaiian Islands, already under the American flag,

we have been remiss in making the same effort where the attempt will count for most and through a minimum of energy to accomplish the same results.

Hawaii's finances are solvent, supported by substantial resources in industries and in terrain, assuring a strong economy among an industrious, loyal, honest people. Hawaii pays into the U.S. Treasury amounts in excess of that paid by nine of the present States by a population greater than four existing States.

For these reasons and for others well known to this committee, the AFL-CIO supports the provisions of H.R. 50 and other bills intended to bring about the same result—statehood for Hawaii.

**Mr. RILEY.** There is a slight comment I would like to make. It seems to me, and I believe I am representative of my organization, that the people of Hawaii have all responsibilities of citizenship but lack a great deal of having the rights of citizenship.

Here now, after some 55 years of agitation, let us hope that this is the year the Congress will act, now that there has been the clearance in the case of Alaska and the precedent has been well established.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Thank you very much, Mr. Riley.

Are there any questions? Mr. Sisk?

**Mr. SISK.** I am very happy Mr. Riley is before us this morning.

I would like to welcome you, Mr. Riley. You may not have these figures, but in view of certain discussions about labor and labor organizations in Hawaii, can you tell me offhand what the total membership of the AFL-CIO in the islands is at the present time?

**Mr. RILEY.** In the islands, or in the entire Federation?

**Mr. SISK.** No; in the islands.

**Mr. RILEY.** I don't have it, but I would be very pleased to supply it. I wouldn't want to give you a guess, because it wouldn't be an educated one, but I will come up with it and include it in a letter to you, which you may, if you wish, include in the transcript. It is a perfectly good question. I am glad to have it.

**Mr. SISK.** I know we had the experience last fall of being out there and of meeting a Mr. Nichols, Charles Nichols, out there, representing the building trades. And I think some 2 years ago when he went out there they had about 150 members.

In the entire islands today it numbers over 2,600 in his particular craft, alone, which I think shows a very definite increase in the number of members.

**Mr. RILEY.** I am sure we have a sizable number. I would be very glad to supply it to you.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** If the gentleman will yield, wasn't the gentleman told by Mr. Kaiser while he was there that the workers from that union were among the finest workers he had ever encountered anywhere in his extensive activities?

**Mr. RILEY.** And I might say our membership is not confined entirely to the Caucasian race, by any means. We take skills where they are to be found and where they have a desire to be union members.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Are there any further questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Riley.

I think I should announce at this time, before some of the gentlemen may have to go elsewhere, that we will continue this hearing at 2:30 this afternoon, at which time Mr. Seaton, the Secretary of the Interior, will return.

We have heard all the scheduled witnesses this morning; but I hate to lose any time. I know we have a gentleman in the room who

might be able to give us some information on this labor problem that the gentleman from California raised. He is Mr. Ralph Beck, vice president of the Hawaiian Telephone Co. He is prepared, I understand, to testify orally on labor relations. He has some statistics for the record. They are in his hotel. Perhaps they could be inserted following his testimony at a later date.

Is Mr. Beck here?

#### STATEMENT OF RALPH BECK, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE HAWAIIAN TELEPHONE CO.

Mr. BECK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I say, before you make your statement, several questions have been raised here this morning which indicate the principal arguments against statehood. The gentleman raised the question whether the people want it, a very important question. Then we had the question of the mixed races, a question which I don't think would be raised against the bill in this committee, but we know it will be raised elsewhere, either openly or behind some other excuse. And we also know that if the House discussion follows the pattern of the past, we are going to hear very sweeping statements.

We are going to hear, for example, that you have in Hawaii a labor union controlled completely, dominated, by Communists, and that those leaders can deliver people in that union politically and in every other way, and that we have a State where we will actually have Communist control.

That is not my statement, I emphasize. But I know—I have learned it by heart—that it will be made on the floor of the House. That is why I think whenever we have a witness here who has had contact with labor, who is, as you are, a personnel manager, you can have something very important to contribute in that field.

I am not suggesting the line of your testimony. I am only suggesting what we may have to encounter later on.

You may proceed, Mr. Beck.

Mr. BECK. For the purpose of the record, my name is Ralph Beck, Jr. I was born in Sioux City, Iowa. I was educated in California, having graduated from the University of California in 1936. Immediately after graduating from the university, I went to Hawaii.

I have been associated with the Hawaiian Telephone Co. since 1941. I am currently vice president of that company.

The labor relations work in that company is under my direction, as well as several other areas of the particular business. I am currently a member of the board of governors of the Hawaiian Employers Council, which, as the name implies, is an employers' association. I have been a director and am at the present time, of other Hawaiian corporations and have served as a director of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu.

I am a member of the Coast Guard Appeals Board, where I have access to confidential information. I have served as a member of mediation boards appointed by the Territory of Hawaii in labor disputes.

I have been identified with the management phase of labor relations in Hawaii since before World War II. I am on a very friendly

basis with many of the labor leaders in Hawaii. I know them quite well.

Our particular company was organized by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in 1943, and I have been the spokesman for our company in every one of our contract negotiations since that time.

I am familiar with the Communist question that you mentioned in Hawaii. I do not think that it is anything that should bar statehood. I think the problem is greatly overemphasized and far less effective than is popularly thought.

I might explain about unionism in Hawaii to those of you who perhaps have never been there. During World War II, Hawaii was under the direction of a Military Governor, and as such, employees in vital industry, which included agriculture, were actually frozen to their job. Hawaii, as you know, during World War II, was the bastion of the Pacific for training and staging purposes as well as for other military designs.

There were huge construction projects of airfields and other installations of that type for the military, and by and large the people who worked on those projects were from the mainland United States, working at considerably higher wage levels than our local people, who were frozen to their jobs in the essential industries I mentioned. It was a sore spot insofar as local people were concerned, and as a result they were eager for organization by labor unions immediately after the cessation of hostilities. That proved to be correct, and within a year most of the main industries in Hawaii found themselves unionized.

I want to substantiate what Mr. Masaoka mentioned to you this morning. I think he gave you a very clear picture of our islands and our people there.

I work with people of Japanese ancestry. They are my associates in my business. They are my friends. And having lived there since 1936, I think I know them quite well.

As an example, I have a man that works on my particular staff that enlisted as a private in the 442d Combat Team and received his honorable discharge as a captain. He is highly respected and highly regarded as one of our key executives.

My company has approximately 1,750 employees of all races and ethnic origins. We work together very well, as I think the history will show over the past number of years.

So far as communism is concerned we do have Communists in Hawaii. They have been identified by various congressional committees. But in my judgment having worked with people of various labor unions, not only from the standpoint of my company, but other companies, and having had access to information about virtually every labor negotiation and strike in Hawaii, that Communists are far less effective, as I said before, than is sometimes thought.

The statistics you referred to are the number of man-days lost by labor strikes and disturbances in Hawaii percentagewise as compared to the mainland United States.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

RESEARCH DEPARTMENT,  
HAWAII EMPLOYERS COUNCIL,  
August 1957.

RESEARCH REPORT: STRIKES AND WORK STOPPAGES, UNITED STATES AND HAWAII

This report shows the number of work stoppages, the total man-days lost and the man-days lost as a percent of total available working time from 1945 to date for the United States and Hawaii. Data for the United States are from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and data for Hawaii are compiled by the research department of the Hawaii Employers Council.

(NOTE: See RR-677 for definition of work stoppage terms used by Hawaii Employers Council with deviations from BLS definitions noted and RR-679 for a listing of the stoppages occurring in Hawaii.)

*United States*

Year	Number of strikes	Man-days idle	Man-days idle as a percent of total available working time
1945.....	4,750	38,000,000	0.47
1946.....	4,985	116,000,000	1.43
1947.....	3,693	34,600,000	.41
1948.....	3,419	34,100,000	.37
1949.....	3,606	50,500,000	.59
1950.....	4,843	38,800,000	.44
1951.....	4,737	22,900,000	.23
1952.....	5,117	59,100,000	.57
1953.....	5,091	28,300,000	.26
1954.....	3,468	22,600,000	.21
1955.....	4,320	28,200,000	.26
1956.....	3,825	33,100,000	.29
1957.....	3,673	16,500,000	.14
1958.....	1 3,400	1 23,500,000	1 .2

*Hawaii*

Year	Number of strikes	Man-days lost	Man-days lost as a percent of total available working time
1945.....	10	8,922	0.03
1946.....	25	1,911,195	5.63
1947.....	23	95,481	.26
1948.....	12	120,856	.33
1949.....	9	244,212	.72
1950.....	34	49,493	.15
1951.....	19	149,397	.42
1952.....	32	66,232	.20
1953.....	19	96,332	.29
1954.....	18	38,435	.12
1955.....	20	25,917	.08
1956.....	22	18,480	.06
1957.....	32	15,762	.05
1958.....	1 25	1 1,152,244	1 3.35

1 Preliminary.

Mr. BECK. They indicate that for the past 14 years, 9 of those years were far less, percentagewise, labor disturbances and man-days lost due to strikes, than throughout the mainland United States.

My source for that is a research study from the Hawaii Employers Council, who in turn drew upon the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics, for additional information.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, the statistics mentioned will be made a part of the record at the conclusion of your testimony.

Mr. BECK. Thank you.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have just one question. The total labor force, as I understand it, in Hawaii, is about 210,000. Is that correct, in your understanding?

Mr. BECK. That is correct. It is approximately that.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Then about 90 percent of the labor force in Hawaii does not belong to the ILWU?

Mr. BECK. Ninety percent of the labor force, the 210,000? I would say it would be approximately 10 percent that belong to the ILWU.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Ten percent; but very close to 90 percent do not?

Mr. BECK. That is correct.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The labor union with which you have dealings, the one you mentioned in your testimony—is there any evidence of Communist domination in that union?

Mr. BECK. No. At no time. It is an AFL union, now with the AFL-CIO. At no time have we had any trouble so far as communism is concerned with our union. And I think that the various intelligence agencies that have the information for your use would substantiate my statement. But I know the leadership of this union and many of its members personally, Mr. Chairman, and I know the union leaders' backgrounds. I know our employees very well. And we have never had any question about any Communist domination of the union that is recognized by our company.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Then as a prominent citizen and employer of Hawaii, let me ask you this question: Do you believe that what Communists there may be in Hawaii—and unfortunately I suppose there will be Communists most anywhere you want to look—do you believe that they exercise a dominant role in electing or defeating public officials and in approving or disapproving matters submitted to the electorate?

Mr. BECK. No; I do not.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Have there been some recent instances where they might have attempted to exercise such control and where they were repudiated?

Mr. BECK. Yes. There have been. I don't think that communism is any more effective in Hawaii than it is in any part of the United States, that is of similar size and population.

Mr. SAYLOR. What was that statement, Mr. Beck?

Mr. BECK. It is not any more effective in Hawaii than in any place in the United States.

It is true that the unions, and in particular the ILWU, have endorsed candidates for politics, sometimes without the candidate's permission. Sometimes it has been repudiated. Sometimes it has not. But insofar as electing their own candidates is concerned, one of the most outstanding examples occurred last fall, in our elections. The top representative of the ILWU on the island of Kauai was defeated in his bid for the local house of representatives.

It is my personal opinion, but substantiated by men who are in the labor relations field, that labor unions cannot deliver the vote at the polls, whether they say so or not.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** I have just one final question.

In addition to your Hawaiian background, you have a background on the mainland. You were born here and educated here?

**Mr. BECK.** Yes, sir.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** And I assume in your capacity as a high official of the telephone company, you frequently visit the mainland?

**Mr. BECK.** About three to four times a year.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Do you know of any place, any large community or area, where the communism which does exist is under a brighter spotlight, more talked about, and the persons identified with communism or suspected of identification with communism, are better known, than in Hawaii?

**Mr. BECK.** I would agree with that, Mr. Chairman, as a very correct statement. In addition to the various committees that are identified with the Senate and the House of Representatives and our Congress here, that have made investigation trips to Hawaii, we have our own Territorial commission on subversive activities. We have the Hawaii Residents Association, which is known locally over there as Imua, I-m-u-a. That is a Hawaiian word that means "forward."

Those committees and those organizations have exposed communism in Hawaii, and the individuals that have been identified as Communists are well known in the islands.

There has been a Smith Act trial over there, in which seven were convicted and subsequently appealed and were acquitted on appeal.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** I think those are all the questions that I have, except that I would like to make one observation of my own, if I may. I don't think that there is any member of this committee that would want to admit to the Union any area which was dominated by Communists or where there was an overwhelming number of Communists.

I can state this as the simple truth, that the committee which went over to Hawaii last fall was determined not to be put in the position of standing on the floor of the House and advocating statehood for a Communist-dominated area, of saying on the floor of the House that there was no communism, and having the limb sawed off from underneath us.

So if you were there at the time we visited, I think you will agree that we looked right down the barrel of the Communist cannon. And while I wouldn't say it was exactly a popgun, we discovered, to our satisfaction at least, that the people there talked more about the Communists they had or suspected and were more determined to keep them in check than any place I ever visited. There were regular radio programs blasting away at the Communists. It seemed to me that they were just like moths caught in the glare of a huge spotlight.

We also were informed by people whose responsibility it was to keep their eyes on those people that they were falling off in numbers; that the apparatus, such as it was, had been crippled, and badly crippled, by these trials you mentioned.

It was my considered judgment, and I can only speak personally, that Hawaii has the matter completely under control and that statehood would give them additional weapons, if they needed them.

**Mr. BECK.** I think you are very right. And if I may add just one more statement to that effect: Since I had the pleasure of meeting you and Mr. Sisk and Mr. Berry while you were in Hawaii this fall, I might say that prior to your trip the Honolulu Record, which is

popularly to be considered a leftwing paper in Hawaii and has been largely supported by ILWU, has now gone out of business. It is defunct. The ILWU English language daily radio broadcast has been off the air for some time. I think there are various reasons for that. One in particular that I would like to mention is that I cannot help but feel, from the people I know in the ILWU movement, that the experience Russia had with the satellite countries and the Hungarian revolution, had a great deal to do with the thinking of those who had leftwing tendencies there.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes, surely.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Beck, you said—or did I misunderstand you—that the Communist radio had been off the air for some time?

Mr. BECK. I didn't use the word "Communist," Mr. Haley. The ILWU, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which has been accused of being Communist dominated, had for years a daily radio broadcast in the English language as well as in Japanese and in Ilocano, which is a Filipino dialect. The English commentator has been off the air for several months.

I say that is significant, as well as the fact of the Honolulu Record going out of business because these two propaganda arms no longer exist there. How long that will be, I don't know.

Mr. HALEY. In addition to the radio broadcast, didn't the International Longshoremen's Union also have a newspaper?

Mr. BECK. Yes.

Mr. HALEY. How many?

Mr. BECK. The International Union's headquarters in San Francisco publishes a newspaper they call the Dispatcher. In Hawaii, the local unions of the ILWU have their own paper, which is called the Reporter.

Mr. HALEY. Just one newspaper, then, controlled by the International Longshoremen's Union?

Mr. BECK. It is their own paper, sir. Anybody can subscribe to it, as far as that is concerned, but it is not like our daily press. It is basically union news to their membership.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Beck, would you know of your own knowledge how many members the International Longshoremen's Union has in Hawaii, approximately?

Mr. BECK. Most of the sugar industry bargaining unit are union members. There are approximately 15,000 employees in sugar, including management. I am using the word "approximately," because I don't have the figures before me, but they are fairly accurate.

About 65 percent of the employees of the bargaining unit in the pineapple industry belong to the ILWU.

Mr. HALEY. Approximately how many would that be?

Mr. BECK. It would be less than sugar. I would have to say somewhere around 12,000, perhaps. I can get that figure for you, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Would the gentleman yield?

We were told both by the union and management over there that the total membership of the ILWU was approximately 23,000 in all the islands.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman has said there is approximately 15,000 in the sugar industry and approximately 12,000 in the pineapple in-



dustry. How many are in the Longshoremen's Union that operates on the docks and so forth?

Mr. BECK. I think on the several islands where there are ports, approximately 2,000, sir, but you can't add all these figures together. Some are not members of the union. The ILWU does have contracts with other companies outside of the industries mentioned here.

Mr. HALEY. Is there any other group that is controlled, to your knowledge, that belongs to the International Longshoremen's Union, that you know of?

Mr. BECK. Employees of other companies?

Mr. HALEY. Other than the sugar industry, the pineapple industry, and the dockworkers.

Mr. BECK. Oh, yes, sir. They do have contracts with other companies.

Mr. HALEY. What others?

Mr. BECK. One I know about personally is Love's Biscuit and Bread Co. That is a large baking company that serves all the islands.

Mr. HALEY. The ones you are talking about now are in small groups?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALEY. There would be no large group?

Mr. BECK. That is correct.

Mr. HALEY. Approximately how many do you think are in these small groups?

Mr. BECK. This would just be a guess. I can get the information for you. But I would suggest perhaps 2,500 to 3,000. At the very most, it would not exceed that.

Mr. HALEY. This International Longshoremen's Union is the same organization that Mr. Bridges is head of on the States side? Is that correct?

Mr. BECK. That is right.

Mr. HALEY. It is also the same organization that is controlled by, or at least its chief officers are the officers that have been indicted, tried, and convicted by, the courts of Hawaii. Would that be correct?

Mr. BECK. Some of them have been. But there are other officers that have never been accused of being Communists.

Mr. HALEY. Who, then, are the men who are active in this organization and reputedly control it, who have been convicted and are now awaiting sentence on appeal?

Mr. BECK. They were acquitted by the Ninth Court of Appeals, sir, and the case is closed.

Mr. HALEY. They were convicted, though, in the original instance by a court over there, and that was some 4 or 5 years ago?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Was that conviction by a Hawaiian court in Hawaii?

Mr. BECK. By a Federal court in Hawaii, yes, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Was that a jury trial?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. With Hawaiian residents on the jury?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Beck, would you have any idea as to the number of votes cast in the last general election in Hawaii?

Mr. BECK. I believe Mr. Burns mentioned this morning approximately 155,000.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder, Mr. Burns, if you have that accurately?

Mr. BURNS. I do, sir.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder if the gentleman could supply it for the record.

Mr. BURNS. I will, sir.

(The information follows:)

The official tabulation of the results of the votes cast of the Territorial election held Tuesday, November 4, 1958, attested by the secretary of Hawaii, Hon. Edward E. Johnston, shows:

Total registered voters-----	175, 317
Total votes cast-----	154, 293

Total Democratic-----	81, 915
Total Republican-----	67, 609
Total Commonwealth-----	1, 268

Mr. HALEY. So even based on the 155,000 votes that were cast in the last election—the figures you gave me, Mr. Beck, I realize, are just your best knowledge. That totals 32,000 votes. Now, based on that, do you think that this International Longshoremen's Union has a large amount of control, or a reasonable amount, or any control at all, as to this election of men to public office in Hawaii?

Mr. BECK. This is strictly my own opinion, Mr. Haley. As I mentioned previously, labor unions publicly indicate that they can control the vote. Labor leaders tell me privately quite the contrary. It is my personal conviction that no union can dictate to their membership how to vote in the privacy of the polling booth. And I don't believe that the ILWU is any more effective in that respect than any AFL-CIO union is.

Mr. HALEY. Well, they have been effective to this degree, have they not, Mr. Beck: That any time that they have called a strike in Hawaii, they have tied up the entire islands economically? Isn't that true?

Mr. BECK. No, sir. As an example, we had a 128-day sugar strike in 1958, and by no means did that tie up the entire economy of the islands.

Mr. HALEY. Let me ask you this: When the men on the docks have called a strike, they have been very successful in tying up the economic situation in the islands, have they not?

Mr. BECK. That was in 1949 that we had an approximately 6 months' strike on the local waterfronts. At that time, and toward the termination of that dispute, a special session of the Territorial legislature was called by the then Governor, and a special piece of legislation known as the Hawaii Dock Seizure Act was passed, by which the government would operate the various island ports in the case of a labor dispute.

Since 1949, that law has not been used. It was used, however, to settle the dispute in that year.

Mr. HALEY. You speak of the last strike?

Mr. BECK. The big waterfront strike?

Mr. HALEY. Then what kind of strike did they have, Mr. Beck, in Hawaii just prior to Christmastime in 1954?

Mr. BECK. I don't recall, sir.

Mr. HALEY. You were there in 1954, were you not?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir, I was. Just prior to Christmas in 1954?

Mr. BURNS. Will the gentleman yield?

I think it is 1956, if the gentleman please.

**Mr. HALEY.** Well, I was in Hawaii in 1954, I believe in November or December, and as I recall it now, you had a situation, whether it was on the mainland or whether it was in Hawaii, where all the ships coming in there were tied up, and you were trying to bring Christmas trees or something into the island of Hawaii, and you couldn't move one ship.

**Mr. BECK.** I think that, Mr. Haley, was a strike that started on the west coast of the United States.

**Mr. HALEY.** But it spread out there, didn't it?

**Mr. BECK.** Yes. So there was no control insofar as Hawaiian employers were concerned.

**Mr. HALEY.** So when you say you haven't had a strike on the dock since 1949, you are in error, are you not?

**Mr. BECK.** No, sir, I don't think I am. I mean, from the definition and connotation of those words, Mr. Haley, I mean a strike that was started in Hawaii and led by the Hawaiian labor leaders. We have had sporadic stopwork meetings and walkoffs in our various island ports since 1949. But I mean an extended labor dispute.

**Mr. HALEY.** A stopwork or walkoff or anything else still to all intents and purposes stops anything from moving, does it not?

**Mr. BECK.** Yes, sir; just like the port of New York.

**Mr. HALEY.** In 1956, you had another situation out there, did you not, that pretty much tied up the islands?

**Mr. BECK.** A strike in Hawaii in 1956?

**Mr. HALEY.** I don't know whether you want to call it a strike or a walkout or a sitdown proposition, or what, but didn't you have something then which again tied up the transportation systems and so forth of Hawaii?

**Mr. BECK.** I would have to refresh my memory, sir, as to whether it was similar to the 1954 dispute you were talking about.

**Mr. HALEY.** Maybe the Delegate could enlighten the gentleman from Florida.

**Mr. BURNS.** I think the gentleman from Florida in this instance is referring to a political demonstration that was called for by the present day ILWU in 1956 in connection with the visit of the Senate Internal Security Committee.

**Mr. HALEY.** So then we have a situation where the International Longshoremen's Union or whatever you have got out there, simply because an investigating committee of the United States Senate was out there, didn't like that, so they tied up the facilities of the entire island, simply because men were out there investigating the internal security of those islands. Is that right?

**Mr. BECK.** No, sir. In 1956 the Senate Internal Security Committee did hold investigations in Hawaii. It is true that in particular the ILWU did demonstrate against the committee; but by no means—and that is why I answered in the negative to your question—did it tie up all the facilities in Hawaii. That is a statement that is far too sweeping, sir.

**Mr. HALEY.** It tied up a substantial part of the islands, did it not?

**Mr. BECK.** No, sir. I don't mean to contradict you; but companies like my company, the Hawaiian Electric Co., all of the other utilities in Hawaii, were operating. Almost all businesses were operating. Very, very few people attended this demonstration that occurred in

the palace grounds. But by no means did it stop the economy of Hawaii.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Beck, you are the vice president of Hawaii Telephone; is that right?

Mr. BECK. That is right.

Mr. HALEY. Do you have any direct negotiations with the International Longshoremen's Union? You deal with the CIO or the AFL, or what?

Mr. BECK. Our company is organized by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which is an AFL-CIO union. That is the only contract we have with a union. We operate on six islands. Communications within those six islands, between those islands, and also we are sharing as a partner with A.T. & T. an interest in the transpacific telephone submarine cable that was installed in 1957.

Mr. HALEY. I believe your statement was that you had had no trouble with the electrical union that you deal with. Is that correct?

Mr. BECK. I said it in connection with the subject of communism. That is true. We have never had any suspicion, nor have any public agencies, about the leadership in our union. I know them well.

Mr. HALEY. I am glad to hear that.

The gentleman wanted me to yield, I believe.

Mr. SISK. I simply wanted to say to my colleague with reference to the question of the 1956 tieup, I know we all abhor very much anything in connection with a political strike. And due to that fact, of course, the committee looked into it very carefully. We found that particularly on the island of Hawaii, no one went off. They all refused to go off the job. And in all other islands, I think there were only a small percentage of the men that participated.

I just wanted to clarify that. I believe my chairman will bear me out.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

I would like to ask Mr. Beck: The power of any particular union to cripple the economy of the islands would be just as devastating to the islands and to the mainland whether Hawaii was a State or a Territory; is that not correct?

Mr. BECK. That is true, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Part of the United States?

Mr. BECK. That is true.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Beck, do your employees enjoy a 25 percent differential? Are they paid over and above what they would receive in this country for the same type of work?

Mr. BECK. No, sir. That is true with Federal employment in Hawaii, but insofar as private business is concerned, we don't follow that at all.

Mr. ROGERS. I mean: Is your pay scale the same as it is in this country, or is it about 25 percent higher?

Mr. BECK. In my company, which I think is representative of the major employers in Hawaii, about half of our pay rates are on a par with similar occupations throughout the mainland telephone industry. The other half are approximately 15 to 16 percent below. This latter group are our craftsmen.

Mr. BURNS. Would the gentleman from Florida yield for 1 minute?

I will read those figures into the record at this point.

Mr. HALEY. What figures does the gentleman have?

Mr. BURNS: I have the official tabulation, result of votes cast, election held Tuesday, November 4, 1958. I will read the total registered votes cast. The total registered voters, 175,317. Total votes cast, 154,293.

Mr. HALEY. I might say that is a compliment to the people of Hawaii. In percentage they seem to do much better than States here on the mainland. I hope if and when you get statehood, you will continue to do that.

The gentleman wanted to say something?

Mr. BECK. I was going to make the same statement you just made. I think that percentagewise our voting population is probably greater than many of the States where people exercise their franchise.

Mr. HALEY. Maybe the gentleman from Hawaii can answer this: What is the voting age limit in Hawaii, and what is its qualifications?

Mr. BECK. By age, it would be 21, and the second qualification would be residence in Hawaii for a year or longer and American citizenship.

Mr. HALEY. One year?

Mr. BECK. Yes. And the ability to read and write.

Mr. HALEY. Those are the only necessary qualifications?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. Would the gentleman from Florida yield at that point?

I would like to say the qualifications in Hawaii are identical with those of Pennsylvania, and we are very proud of them in Pennsylvania.

Mr. HALEY. Well, I might say to my distinguished friend and able colleague from Pennsylvania that the same qualifications prevail in my State, and I think generally.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you mean they have John Saylor in Hawaii, too?

Mr. SAYLOR. I hope they do. I might say John Saylor has a lot of friends in Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Saylor?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Beck, I have just a few questions.

You stated that in your opinion the people who are known Communists in the Territory of Hawaii do not dominate the ILWU or any other union of which you have knowledge. Is that correct?

Mr. BECK. Could you repeat the latter part again, please?

Mr. SAYLOR. That the known Communists in Hawaii do not dominate the ILWU or any other union that operates in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. BECK. I think that would be a correct statement, sir, if you would put it this way: A known or identified Communist would be one that would have been exposed by a congressional investigating committee. The majority of the membership of the ILWU are not Communists.

As an example, I know very well the president of the sugar workers' union. I worked with him on a plantation in Hawaii from 1936 to about 1941. He has never been, to my knowledge, identified as a Communist. I know his father. I know his brother, who works on the management side of California Packing Corp. I know his sister. I haven't access to the confidential information that Government agencies do, but they have never identified him as a Communist. And he is a person elected by the membership.

**Mr. SAYLOR.** If the members who are known Communists do not dominate by number, in your opinion do the known Communists in Hawaii or the fellow travelers that might be associated with them, play such a dominant role that they might control the entire membership of their union?

**Mr. BECK.** I don't think so, sir.

**Mr. ROGERS.** Would the gentleman yield for just one inquiry?

What do you mean by "known Communists"? Could you define that term?

**Mr. BECK.** I used that term, and perhaps Mr. Saylor agrees with me, because he didn't correct me, that a known Communist would be one exposed and identified by a congressional investigating committee.

I do not have access to information beyond that.

**Mr. ROGERS.** Isn't it a practice, though, of the Communists in their infiltrating efforts and devices and schemes, to keep as many from being exposed as possible? And the fact is that their effectiveness rests primarily upon the secretness of their activities insofar as affiliation with the Communist Party is concerned?

**Mr. BECK.** Yes, that is true. In the Senate interior security hearings there in 1956, I think you will find testimony from the chairman of the Territorial Subversive Activities Committee that there are approximately 100 Communists, identified Communists, in Hawaii, out of a total population of over 600,000.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Will the gentleman yield?

I think we can bring that figure a little more up to date, indicating some progress. The information we received—and it was from the highest sources, the most informed sources—was that there were about 25 now.

**Mr. ROGERS.** Would the chairman yield for just one further observation?

**Mr. SAYLOR.** Yes.

**Mr. ROGERS.** Is it not a fact that if you number the number of people who are actually identified and known Communists, you could have found but very few in some cities and some countries that have already been taken over by Communist governments? The fact is that they are like termites; they are eating where you are not looking.

**Mr. SAYLOR.** That is true, Mr. Rogers, even in Texas.

**Mr. BURNS.** Mr. Beck, in connection with the trial of those familiarly referred to as the "Hawaii Seven," is it not a fact that a member of the executive committee of the Communist Party was the chief witness, a gentleman by the name of Jack Kawano, who had been active in the organization of the union?

**Mr. BECK.** Yes, sir.

**Mr. BURNS.** Is it not a fact that he offered his full services and cooperation to the FBI?

**Mr. BECK.** To the best of my information, that is correct.

**Mr. BURNS.** So as late as 1952 we had a person who was part of the executive committee in Hawaii give the full information he had at his command to the FBI and to our internal security forces, and he testified in a public trial?

**Mr. BECK.** And was so publicized in our local press.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Would the gentleman yield for a clarification or correction of the record?

We had some addition a moment ago and we came up with 32,000 members of the ILWU. In the first place, our figures are different. We got about 23,000. But I will not dispute that. Then we went on from there and had a vote of 154,000, and we were to assume for the record that 32,000 or more of those votes were cast by ILWU members. Is it not true that some members of the ILWU cannot vote and that some others did not vote?

Mr. BECK. I am sure that both statements are correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. And is it not a fact that the ILWU is roughly 10 percent of the total labor force in Hawaii?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Beck, I think you stated that there were two papers that the ILWU had, one which was published on the mainland, called the Dispatcher, and the other that was published in the islands, called the Reporter.

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. Is it true that the Dispatcher, which is published on the mainland, is still circulated in Hawaii?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. And the Reporter has not been published for some period of time?

Mr. BECK. No, sir; it is still being published, sir. I think you are confusing it with the Honolulu Record, which suspended publication early last fall.

Mr. SAYLOR. That was another?

Mr. BECK. That was largely supported by the advertising given to them by the ILWU.

Mr. SAYLOR. Do you know who published the Record?

Mr. BECK. The editor's name was Koji Ariyoshi.

Mr. SAYLOR. And where was it printed?

Mr. BECK. In Honolulu. They had their own printing plant.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is all. Thank you, Mr. Beck.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Unless there is an objection the following statements and resolutions in support of statehood for Hawaii will be made a part of the record at this point: Letter of John C. Elliott of Los Angeles, Calif.; telegram of the Jamestown Junior Chamber of Commerce, Jamestown, N. Dak., and the resolutions of the Rugby (N. Dak.) Junior Chamber of Commerce; the Hakalau (T.H.) Parent Teachers' Association; the General Assembly of the States; the Western Governors' Conference; and the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines.

(The statements follow:)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 28, 1959.*

HON. DALIP S. SAUND,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR JUDGE: I can't imagine anything likely to be less necessary than that I should write you urging your strong support for Hawaiian statehood just now when the matter is in your particular committee. However, I know that Members of Congress do like to receive letters from their supporters on such matters and so I am writing this.

I feel very keenly about the issue, and I think that statehood for Hawaii is long overdue. I have spent quite a few years in the Pacific islands and can think of no single step that this country could take at this time that would have

a better effect on the peoples in that particular region. Hawaii, with its rich and varied mixture of racial, cultural, and religious elements, has a great deal to offer as an American State, and the quality of the Representatives and Senators Hawaii would be likely to send to Congress would, I think, meet with your entire approval. I am, though a citizen of California, a property owner and taxpayer in the Hawaiian Islands, and even though I imagine statehood will bring, in time, an increase in taxes there, I am more than willing to face this prospect in view of what I believe to be the larger benefits we will all receive as Americans when Hawaii becomes a full partner.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. ELLIOTT.

---

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *January 13, 1959.*

Hon. DON SHORT,  
*House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*

At the last regular meeting, the Jamestown Junior Chamber of Commerce voted in favor of accepting Hawaii for statehood and we urge your support in passage of the bill. Would you please channel this information to the committee now handling Hawaiian statehood.

JAMESTOWN JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
BOB LEWIS, *President.*

---

RESOLUTION

*Be it resolved by the Rugby Chapter of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, of Rugby, N. Dak.,* That the proposed admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the United States of America, has the full support and backing of the Rugby Chapter of the Junior of Commerce; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the 86th Congress of the United States be urged to give its favorable consideration to the admittance of Hawaii in the year 1959, and that the secretary of the Rugby Junior Chamber of Commerce be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Honorable William Langer and the Honorable Milton Young, Senators from North Dakota, and to the Honorable Quentin Burdick and to the Honorable Don Short, Representatives from North Dakota.

Dated at Rugby, N. Dak., this 20th day of January 1959.

WM. C. PATERSON, *President.*

Attest:

PHILLIP P. LYSNE, *Vice President.*

---

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii since its annexation as an integral part of the United States in 1898 has proved itself politically, socially, and economically qualified for admittance into the sisterhood of States; and

Whereas the desire of the people of the Territory of Hawaii to achieve immediate statehood has been, and still is, the fervent aspiration of every resident of said Territory; and

Whereas the national administration and the Democratic and Republican Parties of the United States of America have repeatedly asserted their beliefs that the Territory of Hawaii is qualified for statehood; and

Whereas this association and its 177 members feel that statehood could bring much joy to our members and childrens: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Hukalau Parent Teachers' Association,* That the 86th Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, respectfully requested to grant the Territory of Hawaii immediate statehood; and be it further



**Resolved**, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Delegate from Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, and the chairmen of the congressional House and Senate Committees, respectfully.

HAKALAU PARENT TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION,  
WAICHI OUYE, *President*.  
(Mrs.) JANET KURISU.  
JACK Y. OUYE, *Legislative Committee*  
*Chairman*.

Unanimously adopted this 19th day of November 1958, at Hakalau, T.H.

Mrs. JANET KURISU, *Secretary*.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATES, 14TH BIENNIAL MEETING, CHICAGO, ILL., DECEMBER 5, 1958

## STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Whereas by tradition, precedent, and every reasonable test, Hawaii is qualified to be admitted as a State of the United States, and the people of Hawaii should no longer be denied the status to which they have steadfastly aspired: Now, therefore, be it

**Resolved**, That the 14th Biennial General Assembly of the States hereby pledges its wholehearted support of the aspirations of Hawaii and recommends the early passage of statehood legislation by the 86th Congress of the United States; and be it further

**Resolved**, That the Secretary of this Conference is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and the following leaders of the 86th Congress: The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION, WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, HONOLULU, T.H., NOVEMBER 23-28, 1958

## STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

By tradition, precedent, and every reasonable test, Hawaii is qualified to be admitted as a State of the United States. The people of Hawaii should no longer be denied the status to which they have steadfastly aspired.

Therefore the Western Governors' Conference hereby reaffirms its support of the aspirations of Hawaii and recommends the early passage of statehood legislation by the 86th Congress of the United States.

The secretary of this conference is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, and the following leaders of the 86th Congress: The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION ACTED UPON BY THE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL AND TERRITORIAL AIRLINES IN CONVENTION AT HONOLULU, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1958

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is vital to the defense of the United States; and

Whereas the Territory has contributed greatly to the economic and cultural life of the United States; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has been an integral part of the United States for 60 years and has during this time admirably fulfilled the obligations and responsibilities of statehood but has been denied the rights and privileges of statehood; and

Whereas the President of the United States, the Departments of State, Defense, and Interior, and both the major political parties have endorsed statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress passed Hawaii statehood bills in 1947, 1950, and 1953, and the Senate passed the combined Hawaii-Alaska Enabling Act in 1954: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines, assembled in Honolulu, T.H., this 6th day of November 1958, That it endorse, and it hereby endorses, immediate statehood for Hawaii; and be it finally*

*Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Vice President of the United States.*

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I make this statement for the benefit of the members: We will resume at 2:30 this afternoon, at which time the Secretary of the Interior will be back on the stand.

We will start to hear the opposition tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 2:30 p.m. of the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. O'BRIEN. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be in order for a continuation of the hearing on H.R. 50 and kindred bills relating to statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

The Secretary of Interior, Mr. Seaton, is here, and I believe on yesterday we had almost completed the questioning. I believe at the moment the gentleman from Alaska, Mr. Rivers, was asking some questions.

It is nice to have you back again, Mr. Secretary.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. FRED A. SEATON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—Resumed

Secretary SEATON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Rivers, you may proceed.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Secretary, I was endeavoring to develop a point in regard to protecting the interests of the United States against subversive activities; and after having covered one other phase, I had reached that point. I believe I asked if it were not a fact that the Federal Government would still have the basic jurisdiction in Hawaii after it became a State as concerns subversive activities.

Secretary SEATON. Congressman Rivers, I believe that is correct, particularly in view of a rather recent Supreme Court decision.

Mr. RIVERS. Yes. And I again point up that granting statehood to Hawaii would in no sense decrease the power of the United States to protect itself against communism or other subversive activities.

Secretary SEATON. No, sir. It should enhance it.

Mr. RIVERS. You would agree with me on that?

Secretary SEATON. I would, sir.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, that is all.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Burdick?

Mr. BURDICK. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Delegate Burns?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Secretary and thank him very much for his most excellent statement as well

as for his contribution to the solution of the overall problem of a couple of years ago. I have not had the opportunity to do that publicly.

The work of the Secretary of the Interior has materially contributed to the admission of Alaska and to Hawaii having an opportunity on its merits to be heard and considered by the Congress.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Did all members of the committee have an opportunity to ask any questions they desire to ask?

Mr. SISK I believe was not here.

Mr. SISK, do you have any questions?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions. I would make this comment. I am very happy to have the opportunity of seeing the Secretary again. I wish him a happy New Year.

I understand he made an excellent statement before the committee yesterday in support of Hawaiian statehood, which I am very happy the committee had an opportunity to receive. That is all.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I believe all the members did question, but Mr. Rogers has one more question, I believe.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, outside of the right to vote, the voting privilege, would you mind documenting for the record those things that you think statehood would bring in the way of benefits to Hawaii, if it were granted?

Secretary SEATON. Outside of the right of suffrage?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, based on the experiences of the other Territories of the United States after they became States, with particular reference, let us say, to Arizona, New Mexico, and Alaska, the more recent ones, I would believe that the economy of the Territory of Hawaii would receive a considerable acceleration, because it is perfectly evident that that did occur in both Arizona and New Mexico, and we are now experiencing that same thing in Alaska.

The number of inquiries which have come into my own office concerning opportunities to move to Alaska, to engage in various activities, from agriculture all through the spectrum of industry, are still numbered in the hundreds per month. The other offices in the Department of the Interior are having the same experience, or more so, and I have been advised recently that the new Alaska State government is almost snowed under with those inquiries.

I think you would have a very considerable population increase, certainly up to the ability of Hawaii to absorb more people, because again in the case of Arizona-New Mexico, if I remember correctly, and I should like to check the record on this point, within the decade following admission their population increases were in the magnitude of two and a half to three times.

The contribution which Hawaii then could make back to the other 49 States would, of course, be accelerated in turn.

If I may return for a moment to the matter of the inquiries which we are receiving even now as to opportunities in Alaska or how you get there, whether you can homestead, whether you can invest, and that sort of thing, I am told, here, that we are still getting about 6,000 a month in the Department of the Interior, which is some measure, at least, of the intense interest people have in Alaska. And the fact that those inquiries are in a volume which so greatly exceeds the ones that

we got as a Territory indicates the psychology which affects people when the Territory does become a State.

Now, that, certainly, again, has been the case in the matter of the availability of risk capital. I suppose, to be candid, it might be rather difficult to detail exactly why risk capital shrinks, is it were, from an incorporated Territory of the United States, in comparison to the way it uses that same Territory when it once becomes a State. But the record is crystal clear on that point. A great deal more risk capital is made available.

Mr. ROGERS. On the economic item that you relate, is it not also a fact, Mr. Secretary, that the new State of Alaska is trying to prevent too many people from coming up there, because they will get too many people on the boat and might sink it economically?

Secretary SEATON. Well, Mr. Rogers, I was not aware of that, in the sense that Alaska was resisting attempts of people to move to Alaska who had any possible chance to be able to carry their part of the burdens of citizenship in Alaska. I must say I am not aware of any such attitude on the part of the new State.

Mr. ROGERS. You mean from a risk standpoint?

Secretary SEATON. No; I mean people coming up there who want to hold a job in the first instance. Whether they can, cannot be determined until they try; but I do not know of any attempt on the part of Alaska to keep anyone out of there, though they might welcome some more than others.

Mr. ROGERS. I thought it had been said that the people who wanted to go up to Alaska and do great things had better look into the situation very carefully before they did it; that all the good-paying jobs were filled.

Secretary SEATON. In that case, I certainly must agree with you. If anyone has the illusion that he can go to Alaska and his mere presence there will assure his financial success and happiness and prosperity, of course that is not true. I thought you were referring to the ordinary scheme of immigration.

Mr. ROGERS. The point Alaskans pointed out to me was that the situation of too many people coming in too short a time can cause damage to the economy just as quickly as it can help the economy.

Secretary SEATON. I could not argue that point with you.

Mr. ROGERS. Because you cannot absorb those people, sometimes, as fast as you need to.

That is the situation that the continent of Australia is faced with right now. And it is entirely possible, in my way of thinking, that the same thing can happen to the Hawaiian Islands if they try to increase the population too fast; because the economy just will not support so many people.

Secretary SEATON. I would not argue that point with you, Mr. Rogers. I think that would be perfectly true of Hawaii and Alaska and any other State if they tried to increase the population faster than the regular economic processes and social processes could absorb them.

What strikes me as being important is that here is Alaska, an incorporated Territory of the United States these many years. The mere granting of statehood greatly accelerated the interest of other Americans in moving to Alaska. And I said that to you in response to a question. You asked me what I thought would be the result of statehood.

Now, whether they all go in there and whether they all, or part of them, succeed or do not succeed when they get there, is, of course, an entirely different question.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, speaking of the economic situation, if we assume that you are correct in your evaluation and that the economy will be stepped up and helped, would that same fact not be true if this Territory became a Commonwealth, rather than a State?

Secretary SEATON. Well, I should not want to try to give you a specific answer to that question, Mr. Rogers, because I do not know. I would doubt it.

Mr. ROGERS. Do we not have proof of that, though, in Puerto Rico? And let me say this, Mr. Secretary, while we are on that. We just had lunch with the Governor, and he assured us that Puerto Rico is not seeking statehood.

Secretary SEATON. We have that for the record.

Mr. ROGERS. He says they are satisfied with Commonwealth status.

Mr. ASPINALL. He also said he was sure they were not seeking independence.

Mr. BURNS. Would the gentleman yield?

I would like to point out for one thing, as a matter of the cost to us in Hawaii, that our Hawaiian Electric Co. in selling bonds on the bond market of the United States finds that statistically their bonds are comparable to those of a double-A rated security, but because they are in a Territory, they were rated as an A. And then they have to pay premiums, so actually they are almost rated as a BAA, which runs our cost of doing business and runs our cost of living up quite a bit. And that would be changed under statehood.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you mean if statehood is granted, Hawaii will voluntarily relinquish the 25 percent differential in Federal salaries?

Mr. BURNS. We would not voluntarily, off the bat, relinquish it, no. When our cost of living goes down, I am sure it will go down. We do not get 25 percent; we only get 20. It is based on the difference in cost of living between Washington, D.C., and Hawaii.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, we have talked about economics. What other benefit will Hawaii get by statehood?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, I think I have covered, at least in general, the main economic advantages. I should like to repeat, if I may, that I think certainly the biggest advantage to Hawaii and to ourselves in granting statehood would be the fact that we have then given to the Hawaiians the one final and the largest privilege of American citizenship, bearing in mind that Hawaiians for many, many years have been carrying all of the responsibilities of American citizenship. As new responsibilities have ensued through a process of evolution or congressional action, they have been applied to the Hawaiians. They have fought in all the wars, paid all the taxes. They have complied with all the laws of the United States. And the one great thing which has been denied them all this time has been the right of suffrage and self-determination.

And I mean specifically by that, they then would be in a position to elect or choose their own judiciary, which we Americans hold to be one of the main principles of citizenship. They would have their own Governor and their own legislature and their own State program, and they could be represented, as I said yesterday, in the House of

Representatives by a Representative with a vote. And the same thing would be true in the U.S. Senate. They would be represented by two Senators in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS. Is what you say, though, not true about the District of Columbia?

Secretary SEATON. To some extent, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. As a matter of fact, Hawaii has more rights than the District of Columbia, because the District of Columbia does not vote for its own local governing authorities.

Secretary SEATON. I did not intend to appear here as an advocate for a vote for the District of Columbia. But the record is clear: As a Member of Congress I voted for home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROGERS. But to sum this up, then, the two main benefits that in your opinion would flow from changing the status of Hawaii from Territorial to statehood status would be the right of suffrage and the possible economic benefit?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, sir; those would be the two main benefits. But the one to me, at least, so greatly outweighs the other in the true scale of human values that I should not like to have them considered as equal in importance.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, let me ask you this one further question. I have always heard that Hawaii was a beautiful, lovely place, as a matter of fact that it was a paradise, or just short of paradise in any event. And I was out there, and I think I would agree with you on all those sales points that have been made. And I wonder: What is your position on need for a 25- or 20-percent differential in Federal salaries in the islands if it is such a nice place to live?

Secretary SEATON. Well, Mr. Rogers, I think I should have to agree, I think, with you that Hawaii is nothing less than or short of a paradise so far as climatic conditions are concerned and the attitude of the people there and the way they make you feel at home and that sort of thing; but I think I should have to say in the same breath that the enjoyment of the climate and that sort of thing does not go very far toward paying the grocery bill. And the Congress of the United States, in its own wisdom over a period of many, many years, has seen fit to grant or allow to be granted to Federal employees who are located in different points far removed from Washington, D.C., let us say, certain extra allowances for living costs.

If we were to get into that question, I should like to ask the permission of you and the chairman to make a study of it and present it to the committee as a part of the record; but I do not quite, in my own mind, put the two together, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. As a matter of policy, though, Mr. Secretary, do you not think that if Hawaii enjoys these benefits that you have enumerated, they ought to give up the 20 percent differential in Federal salaries? If they are going to assume statehood and be on an equal basis?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Rogers, I do not consider the increased cost of living allowance as a benefit necessarily to Hawaii. I think you have a human quotient in between. I consider the extra living allowances as having been granted in the wisdom of the Government to people, employees of the Government, if you please, who, in the judg-

ment of the Government need that extra money in order to pay the differential between the living costs in Hawaii or Alaska or wherever it happens to be and the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROGERS. There is no differential in the States.

Secretary SEATON. Well, that is true, sir. But there is a differential, so far as I know, in all or most all, if not all, of the Territories and possessions of the United States. And I think originally one of the reasons was the extra inducement to get people to uproot themselves from their friends and families, churches, schools, and so on, and move out there.

The question of whether it is justified or not, sir, I am not prepared to debate. I did not originate it to begin with.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes; I understand. But I was just wondering if it was understood that if these benefits were going to be gained by statehood, then whatever benefits were being enjoyed because of Territorial status ought to be leveled off and weighed out.

The reason that so many of these differentials in salaries have occurred is because of the Territorial status of these places. And I can appreciate the need for it in many instances. But when a Territory assumes statehood, it seems to me that they ought to be on an equal basis, because the cost of living in California is a great deal higher than it is in many places that I know of in the South and in the Southwest, as far as that is concerned. And I am sure the same thing is true as to many parts of the country, insofar as towns and cities are concerned.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Would the gentleman yield?

I might say that the Members of Congress who visited Hawaii have rather cheerfully accepted the higher per diem allowance granted us. At least I did. I only speak for myself.

Mr. ROGERS. I did not know they granted that to Congress.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BURNS. If the gentleman will yield, that applies every place outside of the continent.

Mr. ROGERS. Outside of the continent? Would you mean you are going to let the continent divide us on something like this?

Mr. BURNS. You have done it, sir. I have not.

Mr. ROGERS. That is all, Mr. Secretary. Thank you very much.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Secretary, there were some questions addressed to you yesterday, and I wondered if it were time you cared to answer some of them, or to amplify in any way your original statement to meet the questions that were raised.

I feel just a little bit embarrassed, knowing how busy you are, in bringing you back to this second visit; but the gentleman from Florida indicated he had some questions he wanted to ask, and unfortunately, he was not able to be here this afternoon. I leave it entirely to you, Mr. Secretary. If you want to stand on what you have said so far, or if you have some additional information you would like to submit to the committee, it would be appreciated.

Secretary SEATON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that invitation, and I think, particularly out of respect to the gentleman from Florida who asked these questions, I should like to amplify my answers at this time, if I may, for the record. And we will furnish any other additional information, of course, which you or any other member of the committee wants.

Now, as I recall them, those questions dealt mainly with the question of the status of Puerto Rico. And as the chairman has informed me today, that is no longer a debatable question.

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I interrupt at that point?

I wish that was true.

Secretary SEATON. You mean as to statehood for Puerto Rico?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes. I think we will hear more of it from the Rules Committee and on the floor.

I might say in that connection that between 65 and 70 bills have been introduced in the Halls of Congress for statehood for Hawaii. I know of not one introduced for statehood for any other non-State area under the flag.

Mr. ROGERS. Would the gentleman yield?

The picture about the great benefits of statehood has been painted so beautifully here I thought we might want to force it on Puerto Rico.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think we would be very satisfied if we gave statehood to the last incorporated Territory under the American flag.

Mr. Secretary?

Secretary SEATON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think another question was asked in the context of the economy of Hawaii as to the total amount of the Armed Forces expenditures there and the Federal Government contribution in the way of costs of various projects.

I think we established yesterday for the record that the latest figure we had from the Department of Defense was that the Armed Forces expenditures in Hawaii in fiscal 1958 were in the magnitude of \$308 million, and that the gross national product of the Territory for that same fiscal year was about \$2 billion.

A further question was asked, as I remember it, either by Mr. Haley or Mr. Rogers, as to what I thought would happen if the Armed Forces were to pull out of Hawaii.

In the first place, as I am sure the two gentlemen would agree, that is not likely, to put it mildly, to happen in the foreseeable future; but if it did at some time in the future, I think we would have to admit, to be frank, that the economy of Hawaii would suffer a dent, whenever that should take place.

In that same connection, though, while it is perfectly true that the dollars expended by the Armed Forces multiply themselves in effect as they go through the various facets of the economy of Hawaii, it is also true that a considerable portion of those expenditures are expended here rather than there for the purchase of materials and that sort of thing, architectural services, contractors' services, and what have you; so that it would be a fact that 100 percent of that expenditure of some \$308 million would not funnel itself directly into the local economy.

I do not think I need to proceed further on the point, which I tried to establish yesterday, because it is a fact that the military expended those funds in Hawaii in fiscal 1958, prior to that time, and of course, will in the future, primarily as an investment in the security of all of the 49 States. So it was actually only in a secondary sense that those expenditures involved a contribution to the Hawaiian economy, although I, of course, do not deny the beneficial effect they had on the economy.

Thank you very much for letting me finish the sentence.



**Mr. ROGERS.** On the point you made, Mr. Secretary, about the expenditures being made in this country: The results of those expenditures, of course, go to Hawaii and are beneficial to the economy, are they not? I mean even though the money may be spent in this country, what that money produces in the way of results will find its way to Hawaii?

**Secretary SEATON.** Not necessarily. Some does, money expended in Hawaii by military personnel, and so on.

But I was thinking in terms like these. There is not now a steel manufacturing industry in Hawaii. Portland cement, all kinds of construction materials, are purchased here and shipped to Hawaii. There is no civilian shipyard in Hawaii. Those ships are built in this country or elsewhere. All that sort of thing. The pay to the people involved in carrying all the materials over there originates here, in the main is spent here.

**Mr. ROGERS.** Is that not also true in regard, we will say, to the foreign aid program? It is my understanding that only \$1 out of every \$4 finds its way to the foreign country; that three-fourths of that money is spent in this country.

**Secretary SEATON.** I cannot speak specifically to that, Mr. Rogers, and I would not question your figures.

**Mr. ROGERS.** The Foreign Affairs Committee is where I got my information about that. But the point is simply this, that it not only helps their economy, but it helps ours.

**Secretary SEATON.** I think generally that is perfectly true.

**Mr. ROGERS.** But it would not detract from the actual aid it is to the Hawaiian economy, any more than it would detract from the aid given to Spain or anywhere else.

**Mr. CHENOWETH.** I did not get the figures on the ratio of the expenditures to the total economy.

**Secretary SEATON.** In 1958 it was reported to us by the Department of Defense, Mr. Chenoweth, that the Armed Forces expenditures in the Territory of Hawaii amounted to \$308 million. I pointed out that, of course, not all the \$308 million actually was expended in Hawaii, just to clarify the record. I contrasted that with the fact that the gross product for the Territory of Hawaii, the figure that would compare to our gross national product, let us say, for the United States, the 48 or 49 States—that that gross product for the same fiscal year was \$2 billion.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Mr. Secretary, is it not fair to assume, as long as the so-called cold war continues, that there will be a substantial defense installation in Hawaii?

**Secretary SEATON.** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think that I would answer with an affirmative to that, particularly bearing in mind that there was a very substantial Defense Establishment in Hawaii before the cold war or even before the most recent of the hot wars.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** And to follow that up, if the cold war ended, while it would hurt the Hawaiian economy to some extent, it also would hurt the economy of many parts of the United States. I was thinking of my own area, where the General Electric Co. has hundreds of millions of dollars in defense orders which are translated almost immediately into jobs for people of my area. We would be hurt pretty badly if the spending for defense was reduced drastically.

So the problem that is raised here in connection with Hawaii is a problem that is general to the whole country. In fact, we would be more apt to maintain a large defense installation in Hawaii even with the end of the cold war than we would be in other parts of the country.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Would the gentleman yield?

As I get it, then, the military contribution to the economy of Hawaii is only about 12 or 15 percent or something like that?

Secretary SEATON. I have not computed those mathematics in my mind. It is \$307 million to \$2 billion.

Mr. CHENOWETH. \$300 million to \$2 billion? Do you remember how that ratio compared to the ratio in Alaska? Isn't the participation much smaller in Hawaii than it is in Alaska?

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Chenoweth, I am not at the moment prepared to give you that, but it is simply a guess, and if it turns out to be wrong—and I may very easily be wrong—I would like to correct the record. I would guess that Alaska in recent years has received a greater total, certainly percentagewise, of its gross product, than has Hawaii. That would be, of course, for reasons beyond the control of anybody. Those are just reasons of necessity because of certain situations.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In other words, the military in economy is not as important to the economy of Hawaii as the military is to the economy of Alaska. That is the impression I have.

Secretary SEATON. That I think is a very fair statement. And, of course, if we take what Mr. Rogers said a few minutes ago, when he made a comparison between our mutual aid programs abroad, as to the dollars that generated here as against the dollars that went over there, if we took that same ratio, then, in the further discussion of this \$307 million total defense expenditure in Hawaii, we would arrive at a figure of about \$75 million, which was actually expended in Hawaii out of the total of \$307 million, on your ratio of 1 to 4.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Only \$75 million in cash is actually spent there?

Mr. SEATON. That would be a generalized ratio.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The percentage, then, would be very considerably smaller, would it not?

Secretary SEATON. Well, yes, that is true, because the gross product of Hawaii so greatly exceeds the gross product of Alaska as of today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, another question that was asked yesterday was the amount of total Federal grants in contributions to the Territory of Hawaii. The latest figures we have for that, again, apply to the fiscal year 1958, and in that fiscal year the total of about \$22 million, a little short of that, was involved for Hawaii. In that same fiscal year, as we pointed out yesterday, the total Federal taxes paid by the residents of Hawaii was \$166 million.

It is rather interesting, if I may take a moment to make a few comparisons, that the total grants in contributions of Hawaii in that \$21,900,000 amounted to about \$28.67 per capita for the population of Hawaii.

You compare that with the per capitas for some of the States of the Union, and you find these results: Wyoming, \$89.44; New Mexico,



Mr. O'BRIEN. Perhaps if I might make a suggestion, the States that you have enumerated give the picture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder why the Secretary did not select New York?

Secretary SEATON. May I relieve the mind of Mr. Anderson? The ones we cited were all in excess of Hawaii on the per capita grant. That is why we named those.

Mr. ANDERSON. You have listed all of those?

Secretary SEATON. All of those to our knowledge which are in excess. We will recheck those. If we have left out any, we will be glad to add them.

Another question was asked me, and I will deal with it briefly. It was whether any States of the Union have had State legislature un-American activities committees or special State activities charged with responsibility for gathering for the legislature information concerning un-American activities. You will remember, I am sure, we made reference to the very fine progress which has been made in that direction by the Territory and the people of Hawaii. And we find on research that the following States have had at one time or another similar organizations. Those States include California, Washington, Ohio, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and, sir, Texas, through a special division of the Texas rangers.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would not think, Mr. Secretary, that that committee would have very much to do in Texas.

Secretary SEATON. I would agree with the chairman. I would not think so.

Mr. ROGERS. They did not. They merged that with a crimes commission. They had a lot to do with that. So they just worked it all together.

Mr. BURNS. I would like to point out, Mr. Secretary, for the record, at this point, that in 1941 on January 1, there was set up in Hawaii in the Honolulu Police Department an espionage department of a lieutenant and four men to do your internal security investigations at that time, in preparation for the approaching conflict involving all our various nations, too. Hawaii has been participating for a long time in the field and participating most actively.

Mr. ROGERS. Let me say this one thing. Back in 1947, I believe, we had in Texas a Communist secretary of the Communist Party in Texas who lived down at Houston. And she came before the legislature and asked to be allowed to testify before a committee in the State legislature. There was a hot time in the old town that night. [Laughter.]

So we have everything in Texas.

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Chairman, there was a further question on the discussion of California, which is the 31st State to enter the Union, and, in fact, was not then contiguous to the land mass of the other States. And that was true of the case of California. It was also true of the case of Louisiana at the time it joined the Union. California was in 1850, Louisiana in 1812.

There was roughly a thousand miles between California and the States which were then farthest west in the family of States. There was no railroad, because the first railroad was not completed coast to coast until 1869.

In fact, I was a little surprised, I must confess, to discover that the first railroad bridge across the Mississippi was not constructed until 1856, 6 years after California entered the Union.

There were more than 50 peace treaties which were negotiated between the Federal Government of the United States and various Indian tribes in the area of years between 1853 and 1856, which, of course, followed the admission of California.

Some of our most readable history, anyhow, if not the most important, in a military way, was written about the battles with the Indian tribes in that area between the other States of the Union and California, and that continued up until the late 1880's.

During the period we are discussing, which is a period roughly from 1850 to 1860, a decade after the admission of California, the only major route for commerce between the Eastern States and California was, of course, by sea.

Bearing in mind the fact that the Panama Canal was not open until 1914, it is perfectly obvious that the only route was around Cape Horn.

That meant simply that a distance of more than 13,000 nautical miles was involved in travel from Washington, D.C., to San Francisco, and the trip took from 90 to 100 days, if indeed the trip was finally consummated.

It was not until 1898, as a matter of record of history, that the United States became a recognized naval power. And that was after the Spanish-American War.

At the time that California was admitted, we had less than 50 naval vessels in our entire fleet. And, of course, today we are dealing, as the committee all knows, with a Navy of over a thousand ships and almost three-quarters of a million men.

We made reference yesterday to the travel time between Washington or New York and Honolulu, and I think we can sum that up by saying it is a fact that not only can military personnel but also commercial travelers today have breakfast in New York and be in Honolulu in ample time for dinner, which is one of the reasons that I said in my prepared statement yesterday that the question of travel to Hawaii was no longer a point of any great consideration.

Mr. ROGERS. May I make an observation about that, since I did raise the question?

When was Louisiana granted statehood, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary SEATON. 1812, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. I was thinking that was before Texas. But the point I was making is not the travel distance; because insofar as travel is concerned, you pointed out that you could have breakfast in New York and lunch in Honolulu. Well, it has been determined that at the speed we are going now, you could have breakfast in New York and breakfast in Honolulu.

Secretary SEATON. That is entirely within the realm of possibility.

Mr. ROGERS. And it will undoubtedly come in our lifetime.

But my point had to do with the political aspects of it insofar as the division of sovereignty is concerned, and the jurisdiction over the Territory. And I think in all of the cases that you pointed out, the United States did have jurisdiction, and inclusive jurisdiction.

We had war situations with the Indians, it is true; but we did have exclusive jurisdiction over that land mass. And any foreign power

that would have invaded that land mass between California and the United States or the land mass between Louisiana and the United States as States would have violated our sovereignty.

Secretary SEATON. Yes. I agreed with you yesterday on that, Mr. Rogers, and I agree again.

I will say, as I said yesterday, that while we had exclusive jurisdiction all right, the question of being able to enforce the jurisdiction was at times highly debatable.

As a matter of fact, even in wartime, if you compare the casualties in the transfer of personnel from the continental United States to Hawaii and back, comparing that to what happened in the period when we were transferring personnel by land or by sea from the other States to California, you will find that the casualties even in wartime were much lower in percentage to thousands of people transferred than in the other case.

Mr. ROGERS. There is no question about the travel time.

Secretary SEATON. Safety, we were discussing yesterday.

Mr. ROGERS. I was at a dinner the other night, and the toastmaster introduced a man from Louisiana, and he made some very derogatory remarks about Texas, and said that if the Alamo had a back door, there wouldn't have been any Texas. And the toastmaster got the floor and he said, well, the fellow was mistaken; the Alamo did have a back door. That is where Louisiana got its start. [Laughter.]

Secretary SEATON. Well, if the gentleman please, I would rather stay out of that colloquy.

As a matter of passing historical interest, it is a fact that Louisiana was the first State admitted to the Union from any territory outside the original area of the 13 States.

The other question which I was asked, if I may turn to that, was the question of references in the party platforms as to statehood for Puerto Rico. And I am assuming from what I have heard that it would not be necessary to go into that, although I would be very glad to do it if the chairman or a member of the committee wished.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not think it would be necessary. I think it is pretty much an academic question.

Secretary SEATON. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that covers the additional information which occurs to my mind at the moment, in relationship to questions which were posed yesterday.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would say, Mr. Secretary, that we appreciate your gathering that information. And I know that with short notice it was something of a monumental task. I believe it will round out our record very well and leave very few, if any, dangling questions. We are very grateful to you.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, might I ask two or three questions of the Secretary?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Surely.

Mr. ANDERSON. There seems to be a general feeling that Hawaiian statehood has an excellent chance of passage in the current calendar year. Would you agree with that?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, sir, on the basis of what I think I know of the temper of the Congress, I would. I certainly hope it is so, sir.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the fact that Alaska was admitted last year have any bearing on this optimism?

Secretary SEATON. Yes, sir, in the sense that I would agree with the President when he said that if statehood were denied to Hawaii now, particularly since Alaska has been admitted to the Union, it would border on the unconscionable.

Mr. ANDERSON. And also in your statement yesterday you indicated that the admission of Alaska had disposed of a number of questions that would otherwise be raised against the entrance of Hawaii.

Secretary SEATON. That was my opinion, particularly as to the non-contiguity question.

Mr. ANDERSON. In view of this fact, and after many years in which joint Alaskan-Hawaiian statehood bills, or even joint efforts to pass the two went down to defeat, do you think it was perhaps good strategy last year to keep them completely separate and make sure that the Alaskan bill was passed and that Alaska was to be admitted as a State first?

Secretary SEATON. Well, I never criticize success after it has occurred, but I will say this, that no one in the administration, certainly not the President or I, made any effort whatever to couple the bills. We did make what we thought were proper efforts to undertake the admission of Hawaii immediately after the admission of Alaska. We had precedents for that, at least, in the sense that several times before when one question was discussed for statehood for Alaska or Hawaii, statehood for one or the other was immediately considered. And we were very bitterly disappointed that that turned out to be impossible.

Now, I do not want to criticize anyone's motives. I do not have that intention at all. But I will say that had Hawaii been admitted into the Union last year, I would have been even happier than I am going to be if it is admitted this year; because to me, and I have always said this, it is a moral question. And I think that the sooner a moral question is settled, the better off we all are, not only the people who were residents of the Territory but all the rest of Americans who do enjoy the full blessings of citizenship.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that you will recall that in the previous session the Alaskan bill and the Hawaiian bill were kept separate for a considerable period of time near the closing days when in the other body, I believe, they were hooked together.

Secretary SEATON. Yes, they were, by a distinguished Member of the other House who bears the same name as you do and belongs to the same political party. And I am sure he thought he was doing the right thing when he did it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think you will agree that that pointed up the necessity to keep them far apart.

Secretary SEATON. There was never any quarrel about keeping them apart, Mr. Anderson. The difference of opinion came when many Members of the Senate wanted to press for admission of Hawaii to statehood immediately following the admission of Alaska.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do you think that would have been possible in the time that remained after Alaskan statehood was granted?

Secretary SEATON. If you are asking my personal opinion, now, yes, sir, I do.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Would the gentleman yield?

I have been listening to this colloquy with a considerable amount of interest, because I was involved to some extent in the strategy which

was finally used. I would like to say first that when the strategy was decided upon, the Secretary of the Interior was most cooperative in keeping the bills separate and in urging upon members of his own party to vote for Alaska without waiting for Hawaii, because that was the only way Alaska could get through at that time. Where the difference arose was after the Alaska bill went through. I know that a great many people felt that the climate had been created and that with a whoop and a holler we could have put Hawaii through.

I know that a great many people, a number of people, came over from Hawaii and urged that.

I just want to say that whatever responsibility I had in opposing that, and I did oppose it, was based strictly upon an honest belief that there was a strong possibility that the Hawaii bill would fail somewhere along the line in the closing hours of the session, and that when we returned to it in January of this year we would still be wearing a black eye, if you will, a psychological black eye, of a recent rejection by the Congress. But I must add that in this whole matter there was a sincere difference of opinion.

And I think that whoever was right, whoever was wrong, the fact that we created, established a 49th State, a 49th star, means only one thing to Hawaii; it means that Hawaii will be the 50th star instead of the 49th. And I have always liked round numbers, myself. I also believe that it will be the last State admitted to the Union. Of course, I am attempting to speak for history, now.

Secretary SEARON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my thanks to you, sir, for what you said about my conduct in the matter of Alaska-Hawaiian statehood, and I certainly would join you, sir, in saying that the difference of opinion was a sincere one among sincere people. There is no question about that.

Mr. Anderson asked me whether I thought in my own opinion it could have gotten through. You have said, and I have agreed, that is debatable. Of course, no one will ever know. But I do remember that the House debated the Alaska bill for less than a week, and it went through. The total time elapsed from the time Alaska was brought before the House until the date of passage was 5 weeks. And it was on that and on some other circumstances that I based my crystal ball gazing that it could have gotten through.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am a whole lot more interested, if you please, in adding Hawaii now as the 50th State than I am in debating even on the friendliest of terms the question of what might have been, because what might have been is no longer within the ken of mortal man; and I would hope we could get this job done in this session of the Congress.

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I agree that that is the major problem. And I have an idea that when—I will not say “if”—when Hawaii becomes a State, I hope this year, the celebration in Hawaii will be just as great as though it was the 49th State rather than the 50th.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I point out to the Secretary that he is counting from the time that the Alaskan bill went to the floor. Are you not overlooking the little matter of the Rules Committee. Do you not think that since the bill happened to be in this committee and would have had to go from here before the Rules Committee, in making an estimate of the possible time that the Hawaiian bill could have gone through, you ought to take into account the length of time that the Alaskan bill lay in the Rules Committee?



Secretary SEATON. Well, taking that into account, sir, I would still repeat that I believe it could have gotten through. But, Mr. Anderson, I must say, with the permission of the chairman, that as he very well knows, I was thoroughly aware of the strategy and means which members of this committee undertook to take the bill directly to the floor, and I think the chairman would agree that I was as helpful with him as I could be, to the point, I must say, where there were some people with rather unhappy feelings, who were not in support of the proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii?

Mr. BURNS. I wanted to point out, if you please, Mr. Chairman, that the answer to the question, the answer to everything that we have done, the answer to the Secretary's contribution in the, shall we say, Seaton line in Alaska, is the acceptance into statehood of Hawaii at the earliest possible moment. And that is the solution to the whole problem, all the way. I think it answers all the questions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I thank you, too, Mr. Chairman, for your contribution to our colloquy.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, some question has been raised here about the permanence of the military income in Hawaii. I would say that it is as permanent as any military income of any part of the United States. It certainly is one of our most important forward bases, and as long as we need a Defense Establishment of any kind, we are going to need forces in Hawaii, and income will result from it. And no one is more conscious of it than those of us in California who sweated out the first days of Pearl Harbor, when the attack came first in Hawaii, and we thought the next would be the Californian shore.

I think we would sort of welcome the idea of having Hawaii as the new front of any possible war of the future.

I would also like to say that we in southern California are in competition, very definite competition, with Hawaii, as far as tourism is concerned, with our waving palm trees and Bougainvillea, and so forth, that we have, but we welcome that competition, and we would rather have it as a State than as a Territory, I assure you.

Mr. BURNS. We like the tourists from your area, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. There is a very genuine feeling toward Hawaii. I know we would welcome statehood.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Someone asked what would happen if they reduced the military facilities in Hawaii. I think what would first happen would be a tremendous holler from California.

Any further questions?

Mr. Secretary, again I want to thank you, not only for your original statement, but for your clarification of some of the matters which were raised. You have contributed magnificently to our record.

Secretary SEATON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. We are going to hear the opposition, if any, tomorrow. Is there anyone in the room who desires at this time to speak in support of statehood for Hawaii?

I might say I forgot to thank Mr. Beck for his contribution this morning. I think he had no idea that he was going to be in that chair as long as he was, but Mr. Beck performed very well.

Are there any other persons?

I realize that we have a number here who favor statehood for Hawaii, but they have contributed or will contribute statements. If anyone desires to be heard, we are very happy to hear from them.

We have a little time here. On the other hand, it is my impression that the proponents have established a rather complete record here. When we combine the oral testimony with the statements which have been included for the record, that is certainly true.

So if no one cares to be heard at this time, the hearing will be adjourned until 9:45 tomorrow, when we will hear the opponents.

(Whereupon, at 3:38 p.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 9:45 a.m., Wednesday, January 28, 1959.)

# STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

---

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 9:30 a.m., in the committee room, New House Office Building, Hon. Leo W. O'Brien (acting chairman of the committee) presiding.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be in order.

We will get the hearing started without waiting for more members because we have distinguished Members of the House here who are very busy men and who would like to get away.

Our first witness this morning is Hon. Francis Walter, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Walter, it is a great pleasure to have you with us this morning.

## STATEMENT OF HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify briefly on behalf of the measure under consideration.

I am going to direct my remarks solely to the so-called Communist menace because, as I understand it, every other phase of this entire question has been considered very carefully.

Several years ago the Committee on Un-American Activities conducted hearings in Hawaii. We filed a report which, of course, speaks for itself.

From what I understand, not only from conversations with people that I have confidence in, but from a more recent visit to Hawaii, I find that conditions are not as bad—if it is possible to treat a matter of this sort by degree—as they were at the time of the hearings.

I am convinced that, had the circuit court of appeals acted more promptly in considering the appeal of the convicted Communists, perhaps the situation would be much better today than it actually is. However, that is beside the point.

I cannot help but feel that the domination of labor unions by Communists could not continue if there were reposed in the good people of that community the degree of responsibility that comes from statehood. Suffice to say that the situation is not dealt with adequately today.

You perhaps know the situation of the labor unions in Hawaii—completely dominated by a hard-boiled Communist group. There is no question about that. And it just seems almost nauseating to me to

find that when negotiations were conducted over a labor contract several years ago the man sitting on the side of labor was a man under conviction, who had been sentenced to a term of imprisonment and on whom a large fine had been imposed because he was part of the conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States through force and violence.

Now, the people in Hawaii are responsible people. The leaders in that community are unusually high type persons. They are a proud people and they do not like this situation. Given the kind of machinery that will come to them in the event that this legislation is enacted into law, I predict that within a very short time the grip on the entire economy of the island, which is now in the hands of Communists, will be broken. Otherwise I despair of anything better happening, of there ever being any improvement whatsoever.

It seems to me, in view of what happened at the last session—I am not going to presume to tell you what you ought to do. But it would be very difficult to explain why we would fail to treat this group of people differently from the people of Alaska.

I hope that the reasons that I have stated will add to the reasons for the enactment of this legislation.

People are prone to minimize the menace of communism. Only yesterday we found one of our colleagues attempting to minimize the work of a committee of the House. I am not speaking in defense of the Committee on Un-American Activities. As you know, I did not seek the position as its chairman. As a matter of fact, I was one of 42 men who stood up and were counted on the question of whether or not there should be such a committee, and I am now in the very anomalous position of being a chairman of a committee whose erection I opposed.

Nonetheless, I feel that this menace has to be dealt with adequately, promptly, or else it is going to increase to the point where it cannot be dealt with.

So that I feel, with respect to Hawaii, that here we have a very critical area, completely dominated by Mr. Bridges' union, sitting right on our lifeline. And we ought to take these steps in the name of the security of the United States to give this people the opportunity for self-government that they seek.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Walter.

I might say that certainly no one would ever accuse you of being soft toward communism.

I would also say that your views coincide rather squarely with the views of three of us who went to Hawaii last fall. I assume it was suspected because we favored statehood that we would find there was no communism in Hawaii. We found there was. We were very much concerned about it.

We also found what you stated this morning, that the people there are tremendously aware of it, tremendously concerned about it, and want to do everything they can to eradicate it.

I might say that I think your statement that the security of the United States would be enhanced, increased, if we gave them statehood, is one of the most significant statements that has been made in this record to date. I am very grateful to you.

Mr. Aspinall.

**Mr. ASPINALL.** Mr. Chairman, I have no questions to propound of our colleague. I am glad that he has taken of his time to come over here and give to us some of his knowledge.

Of course, I would make this observation: That there are Communists, in my opinion, in every State of the Union. Some of them are idealist Communists, who perhaps are not dangerous to our national security. Some of them, however, are dangerous to our national welfare.

I doubt very much if Hawaii today is in too much different a position as far as Communists than our States, but they are in a little bit different position as far as the security of the Nation is concerned because of the place where they operate.

**Mr. WALTER.** Of course, the thing that seems so tragic to me is, after the revelations of the Committee on Un-American Activities that came in connection with our endeavor to draft legislation, that those people, who not only are Communists but were convicted and are under sentence, should be still running the labor unions. And the labor unions, being tied together the way they are, they control completely the economy of those islands.

**Mr. ASPINALL.** Of course, Mr. Walter, communism is not only in labor unions. Out in my State and in the State to the south of me I think we could find Communists who are in a different position than in labor unions. Their activities, perhaps, are a little bit more known to the federal and local authorities than they would be if they were in labor unions.

**Mr. WALTER.** Yes; we found some in the university in your State.

**Mr. ASPINALL.** Yes, of course. That is exactly right.

I am very glad you saw fit to come over here and state that in your opinion, if we would give to the people of this area the responsibility of statehood, they would be in better position to combat whatever influence there is over there at the present time than they will be if they continue under their present status.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** Are there any other questions?

**Mr. ROGERS.** Mr. Walter, I understood the opponents of statehood were going to be testifying this morning. I understood you to say you are for statehood.

**Mr. WALTER.** Yes, sir.

**Mr. ROGERS.** There are one or two questions I have. Of course, we disagree on that.

There has been a lot of testimony here about identified and known Communists. It seems that every time reference is made to Communists in a hearing, it is prefaced by an adjective—"known" or "identified" Communists.

Do you feel that the Communist menace in Hawaii is limited or confined to the known or identified Communists?

**Mr. WALTER.** Of course not. It is the same as everywhere else. We have there some people out in front. Back of them the Communists who are not known, who wittingly or unwittingly aid in the cause, and then we have those dupes that are selected to disseminate propaganda, scientists, in newspapers and things of that sort. We have these various categories.

The people that I was talking about, like this man Hall—

**Mr. ROGERS.** Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Who is the head of the labor movement in Hawaii.

Mr. ROGERS. You made reference to the fact that this bunch has a throttlehold on the economy, or words to that effect. Do you feel that at the present time the Communists have such control in Hawaii—let's say effective control in Hawaii—that they could throttle that economy out there if they desired?

Mr. WALTER. I do not think there is any doubt about it because, after all, Mr. Hall can give the orders to stop the shipping and within 2 weeks' time people are hungry. That is how easy it is, in my judgment, and knowing how that union operates, it is just a one-man order and that is the end of it. The members of the union have absolutely no voice in their affairs.

Many of them do not realize—many of them are not the best informed people in the world or the most intelligent and they do not realize that they are being used, that their hard-earned dollars go to pay high salaries to agents of Moscow.

Mr. ROGERS. And the reason for that is the fact that the Hawaiian Islands, being islands, have an economy that is subject to control by shipping in the sealanes, is it not?

Mr. WALTER. Very largely; yes sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Is not that same thing true, or would not that same thing be true, Mr. Walter, with regard to Alaska if we were blocked from crossing Canada in order to furnish supplies to Alaska?

Mr. WALTER. Of course.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. I think that is one of the reasons why I voted against statehood for Alaska, if that is what you are driving at.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Walter, those things of which the gentleman from Texas spoke, the controlling by certain people of the economy, is not that just as serious to them and to us while they are a Territory, the difference being that if they were a State, in your opinion, they could control these things better?

Mr. WALTER. That is it exactly.

Mr. ROGERS. That is the point I was coming to. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had always understood that the Federal Government had a great deal more power than the States, especially in recent years, and I am wondering how you base your conclusion, Mr. Walter, that statehood status in Hawaii would furnish them with a weapon or weapons that are not now present for combating this menace.

Mr. WALTER. Well, in the first place, the officials in the Islands are appointed. They are not answerable to the electorate as you and I are. And if it is a State, then they are answerable to the electorate. So that unless they would act, then I am sure that they would be removed from their position.

Mr. ROGERS. Is not the legislature elected out there?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, the legislature is elected, of course.

Mr. ROGERS. The Governor is actually the only one who is appointed.

Mr. WALTER. No; the Governor is not the only one appointed; the prosecutor and judges and so on are also appointed.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. But insofar as statehood status is concerned, is there any reason in your mind why you think statehood would put them in a better position to combat communism?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. I could spend a lot of time on that, but I understand all of that has been gone into, and I wanted to, for the purpose of saving time, devote my remarks just to this one phase of the question.

Mr. ROGERS. What I am talking about is the method of fighting communism. The conclusion has been made here a number of times that, if statehood were granted, it would put the people of Hawaii in a better position to combat Communists.

Insofar as the communistic menace is concerned, if that could be established in my mind insofar as that part of it is concerned, I would change my mind about statehood for Hawaii. That is the reason I am asking the question.

Mr. WALTER. I am disturbed at the Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case, which struck down the statute in my State, depriving us of the ability to prosecute known Communists. And actually, in another decision, the Supreme Court has done effectively the same thing with the Smith Act. So that by striking down the statutes in the State, and then the Smith Act, the Supreme Court has made us powerless to combat communism anywhere. This is no accident.

But it seems to me that, if it is a State, they are going to be able to enact legislation that can deal with this very vexatious problem, and they would be forced to do it by the people.

Mr. ROGERS. The thought that was in my mind, actually, Mr. Walter: No matter what powers they had to enact their statutes out there, the Supreme Court could fix it so that it would be mere words and would not be enforceable. So I could not convince myself it would add to the ability of the people to combat communism.

I have always said that the ability to combat communism, both in Hawaii and Alaska—of course, in Alaska it never did show up, as I understand it, as it did in Hawaii—but in both places that the Federal Government was in a better position of strength to fight that, and that is the reason I was asking the question.

If there is something that I do not know, I would like to know it.

Mr. WALTER. Has it not been the gentleman's experience that local law enforcement is always more effective where there is a will to enforce the law than Federal law enforcement?

Mr. ROGERS. That has been my argument with civil rights legislation, but I am not getting anywhere.

Mr. BURNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. BURNS. If you are not getting anywhere, are you ready to give up and give us a chance to try local self-government?

Mr. WALTER. I assure the gentleman on many occasions I felt like saying, "What is the use?" But I am sure it would make too many people happy.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am sure you mean the wrong people.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman knows just who I am talking about.

Mr. ROGERS. That is all.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Are there further questions?

Mr. HALFY. Mr. Chairman, I might say that I do not know of a Member of the Congress that has done more than the witness has to fight Communists in this country. Many times it must have seemed to him a kind of a hopeless situation, and I do not know of any man in the Congress that I have a more high regard for his opinion than I do the witness before us.

I think he has done a wonderful job against terrific odds.

If I could convince myself, Mr. Walter, that the granting of statehood to Hawaii would do anything to resolve this Communist situation in Hawaii, I will assure you that I would be out there fighting for statehood. I have not been convinced, even in view of the fact that I do hold a high regard for the gentleman's opinion.

The chairman made reference just a little while ago to a report that was made by three members of this committee, the chairman, of course, being the chairman of that subcommittee that investigated the situation in Hawaii.

I would call this report to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and ask him, at his leisure time, to look over it and see if he agrees to some of the findings that were made by this committee, based on his own experience and wide knowledge of communism.

I would ask the gentleman if he agrees with this statement:

We find less interest in communism in the University of Hawaii than in most of the mainland colleges, particularly in the East.

Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. WALTER. I have no way of telling. I just have never studied that question.

Mr. HALEY. It also says there are about 25 identified Communists in Hawaii. Would the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. WALTER. I think that is a very low number. I think I could give you the names of a hundred within an hour if you would be interested. I do not think that makes any difference. The important thing is the leadership.

Mr. HALEY. I agree with the gentleman there, but I am trying to convince myself in my own mind if the granting of statehood to Hawaii would do anything to clean up this situation.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that, in the event this legislation is enacted into law, there will be a great feeling of pride? How long it will last, I do not know. How long it lasts with a person who becomes a citizen of the United States, there is no way of telling. With some people it never ends. With others it ends the moment they cease to receive benefits.

But it seems to me that the moment these people have this responsibility imposed on them the best people in the community are going to put their best foot forward and they are going to try to eliminate those things that for too long they have been criticized for tolerating.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman spoke a little while ago about the stranglehold that certain groups had on this island. Do you believe, Mr. Walter, that statehood would do something to bring about a more healthy condition in that situation?

Mr. WALTER. I hope so. I know that there has been no change since the time that the people first became aware of what the stranglehold actually amounts to. I hope that this will improve conditions. It certainly will not make them worse. It couldn't be.

Mr. HALEY. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that because it has continually been denied before this committee, or the testimony has been: No Communists in Hawaii; there are 25, or there is less than that. And it has continually been denied that the labor unions out there, some of the leaders of which you say have been convicted and probably should be in jail—that they do have a stranglehold on the



islands. It has been denied. I say that they do and that they exercise that at their whim.

As a demonstration of that, in the last few years, on numerous occasions they have exercised that stranglehold. When a committee of the Senate was out there investigating this same thing just a few years ago they exercised that.

Again, in 1954 they exercised that stranglehold.

If statehood for Hawaii will do anything to alleviate that situation, I would be willing to vote for statehood.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman has made some reference to a report which the subcommittee made. I think, if the gentleman will examine it very carefully, he will find we did not brush anything under the rug, that we stated—perhaps not as completely as the distinguished witness did in his presentation—but we stated the existence of these things. We deplored the existence of these things.

But we also said the important question was whether the communism which exists can and will be controlled, and we believe it can and will be because of the desire of the people in the islands generally to control it.

I might point out, too, that on these convictions and the subsequent freeing of these seven people we have mentioned here, that where the machinery was under the control of the people of Hawaii there were convictions and the reversal came in a court over which the people of Hawaii have no control.

Mr. WALTER. That was a precedent in another case. That is what happened.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman from New York is getting around to what some of us have contended for a long time: That if you leave control in the communities and States, we would be better off.

In regard to the report, Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to find fault with the report, but I know this: That approximately 4 years ago the Congress of the United States, the House, refused statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN. And Alaska.

Mr. HALEY. And nothing has happened in the intervening time that I can see that would change that situation, except this: A public relations job has been done on the Congress of the United States, a snow job on the people of America. If you can show me one thing that has happened that would justify statehood for Hawaii over 4 years ago, I would like to see it. It just seems that certain groups and interests have—I might say it has been a good job, because they have been working—

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. So I may point out to the gentleman that the same Congress 4 years ago refused statehood to Alaska and thereafter had the good sense to reverse itself. And we are hoping they will do the same with Hawaii.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, that is the opinion of the gentleman from New York. Whether it is good sense or not I do not know. I doubt it sometimes.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, the gentleman is not intimating someone has done a job on me, are you?

Mr. HALEY. No, they have not done a job on you. You are a little too tough. But there has been a job done, and it is a disturbing thing, I think, for people to see how the Congress can be swayed by emotional things rather than by facts. I have not seen any facts to overcome anything that the Congress did 4 years ago.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALEY. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I know of no man who is more aware of the Communist situation in Hawaii than the witness we have this morning. No one can say he is soft toward communism and you yourself described him as tough.

Mr. HALEY. That is right.

Mr. O'BRIEN. And knowing the facts, this gentleman says he is going to vote for statehood for Hawaii.

I might say, if the gentleman will yield further, that one of the men who signed the famous Eastland report in 1956, a distinguished former Senator, was, as recently as last year, circulating a petition for immediate passage of Hawaii statehood.

Mr. HALEY. That is the thing that disturbs me—these former Senators and former people who were in the various Houses, suddenly change their position when they get out. I do not quite understand it.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ROGERS. I received a Christmas card from Dorothy Lamour. I did not know she was Hawaiian.

Mr. HALEY. That is part of the snow job, yes. I might say that it is a good snow job.

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I say, if the gentleman will yield further, that if Hawaii depended upon Hawaiians' votes in Congress to get the bill through, they would never get it through because they have not a single vote. They have to depend on outside, whether it is Dorothy Lamour or Leo O'Brien does not make any difference. They are both citizens.

Mr. HALEY. I would say the gentleman from New York has done a job on getting statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. BURNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I am going to yield the floor. I want to apologize to the witness for taking his time.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask unanimous consent that the testimony I gave before the Senate committee on May 21, 1950, be made a part of the record in my statement?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thank you very much, Mr. Walter. I appreciate your taking your time.

(The information referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM  
PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I am Francis E. Walter, a Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania.

Several weeks ago, after a resolution was presented to the House of Representatives from the Legislature of Hawaii requesting an investigation of the infiltration of communism in Hawaii, the Committee on Un-American Activities conducted a very lengthy investigation. Preliminary to the hearings, our staff, together with the FBI, Naval and Military Intelligence, went over the files and

records pertaining to this subject. As a result of the examination made by these investigative bodies, we reached the conclusion that at no time were there more than 160 Communists in Hawaii.

Senator TAYLOR. In all of Hawaii?

Mr. WALTER. In all of Hawaii. That was the maximum strength. The maximum was reached some time in 1946. We have reached the conclusion that since that time the Communist strength has dwindled to the point where today there are no more than 90 Communists in all of Hawaii.

This group is led by militant Communists, who are native Americans sent to Hawaii from the United States.

For the most part the Hawaiian Communists don't know what it is all about. The field is very fertile for the activities of that sort of a group. The workers' conditions were not good, with the result that, as these trained Communists found their way into Hawaii and infiltrated into the labor movement, and into the Democratic Party—I am ashamed to say, but I do say quite frankly—they found the type of people who, for economic reasons, were willing to follow leaderships that could offer them more than they had.

The labor movement is dominated by a handful of well-trained Communists who were quite successful in either recruiting people who became Communists subsequent to the time that the agitation started, or Communists who were members of various racial groups, who were given positions of importance in the union. As an example, a man working in the sugar fields, a leader in a certain racial group, found one morning that he had been elected to an executive committee of the union when, as a matter of fact, there had been no election and he had not been a candidate for anything, but the leadership selected that man—and that is a typical case—because of his influence with a certain racial minority group or in a particular industry.

Senator TAYLOR. You mean they elected him to this important office and then put the pressure on him, or made it attractive for him to become a Communist?

Mr. WALTER. In the case I have in mind this man was not a Communist until after he had been selected. Then he was taken to a meeting, which he thought was a union meeting, but it was actually a Communist meeting, and he subsequently received a Communist card.

Now it is quite significant that a large number of these people came before our committee and quite frankly admitted that they had become Communists in some manner or other, unwittingly usually. Many of them broke with the Communist Party when they saw that they were actually in an international movement and not merely members of an organization that was set up for the purpose of endeavoring to improve the lot of the workers.

I believe that as the result of the investigation the Committee on Un-American Activities held the members will continue to decrease. While there are 90 today, it is my guess that before the end of this year there will not be over 40 Communists left in all of the islands. The people are aware of what the situation is. The people realize full well that they have been duped and, for the most part, they do not care to be associated longer with that sort of movement.

Now as to the infiltration into the Democratic Party, that too is understandable. In certain sections of Hawaii the Democratic Party was not strong, was not organized, so it was a comparatively simple matter to select somebody in a particular area in Honolulu, have him elected as a committeeman, and then, of course, in that manner endeavor to obtain control of the party machinery. They succeeded, I believe, in electing four or five Communists or fellow travelers to those positions.

Senator BUTLER. Congressman, on the same theory, could we assume that it will be comparatively easy for the real Democrats to recapture control of their party organization?

Mr. WALTER. I don't think there is any question about it, Senator, because now the people realize just exactly what communism is, just what it means to the islands, and with the spotlight on these people, I am fairly convinced that the decent Democrats will clean house.

Senator BUTLER. Did you get any report on the Territorial convention, the Democratic convention, there Sunday?

Mr. WALTER. Well, I know what happened, but, after all, the time was too short for the people who are opposed to this group to organize.

Senator CORDON. What did happen, Congressman?

Mr. WALTER. I understand the leftwing group retained control, and I am certain that is due to the fact that the people who should have control of my party, and who ultimately will have control of it, have not had an opportunity to organize.

Senator TAYLOR. Mr. Congressman, I have devoted a great deal of thought to this question of Communists representing themselves as being what they are not, and getting into other political parties. I have been wondering if it would be a good idea—and, of course, it may not even be constitutional, as far as that goes—if the Congress could pass a law that any political party could ask of a candidate to be a member of that party, that they had taken an oath that they were not a member of any other political party or organization, and attach a penalty to it if they misrepresented.

Mr. WALTER. You would have the same situation that they have in England, where the coal miners are not represented at labor conventions because the head of a coal-mining union happens to be a Communist.

Senator TAYLOR. Then if the political party wanted to protect itself from infiltration, whether it be the Democrats from being infiltrated by the Republicans, or Communists, or Progressives, or any other cross mixture, there would be some way for them to do that. I have been thinking it might be an excellent idea.

Senator ECTON. Are you afraid of Republican infiltration into the Democratic Party, Senator?

Senator TAYLOR. I am very much afraid of it in Idaho this next election.

Mr. WALTER. Well, that is something that does not disturb us Pennsylvania Democrats. The Republicans have never attempted to infiltrate our party.

Senator CORDON. May I make one or two inquiries, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TAYLOR. Yes.

Senator CORDON. Congressman Walter, you stated in the opening portion of your remarks that your committee reached a conclusion that the high tide of communistic infiltration in the Hawaiian Islands occurred in the year 1946, at which time there were, however, not over 160 Communists in the islands.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. That at the present time there are not over 90 Communists?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Senator CORDON. When you mention Communists, do you include the so-called sympathizers, the fellow travelers?

Mr. WALTER. No, I do not; because it is very difficult to draw the line of demarcation. I have been charged with being a Communist myself because I have been for rent control. As a matter of fact, 2 years ago I was charged with being a Communist on the day I was elected vice president of one of the biggest banks in Pennsylvania. That was because of my position with respect to the measures that was under consideration. Of course, you can't draw the line. I mean card-carrying Communists. The people, in some manner or other, became members of the Communist Party and were assigned to various cells of the Communist Party.

Senator CORDON. How did you reach your conclusion as to the number?

Mr. WALTER. As a result of the investigations made by the committee staff working in conjunction with the FBI, Naval Intelligence, and Military Intelligence.

Senator CORDON. Would you say that your estimate is reasonably accurate as an estimate or a count, rather than, perhaps, reasonably accurate as an educated guess?

Mr. WALTER. I think my estimate of 90 is excessive, and my guess is as of today it does not exceed over 60, because almost hourly these people are leaving their associations. It was very interesting to us to hear one witness after another testify he had gotten out of the Communist Party because his wife had found out what communism was, and it influenced him into breaking ties with that group.

Senator CORDON. Did your subcommittee have reported hearings?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. Will these hearings, or a transcript, be available by any chance to this committee?

Mr. WALTER. They will, of course.

Senator CORDON. I think it would be most helpful if we could have access to them.

Mr. WALTER. All right.

Senator CORDON. Now the next question, Congressman—and here I realize that, to a very great extent, it is a matter of opinion, but even so, you have had

considerable experience in this particular field of subversive activities and you have a trained staff who had even more experience in the field—what is your view as to the extent of the influence which the card-carrying or non-card-carrying but true Communists, international conspirators, have among the people of Hawaii?

Mr. WALTER. I think that the rank and file of the people, because of the splendid press in Hawaii, have now become aware of the fact that communism is a worldwide conspiracy. I think they recognize it today for what it actually is. I don't believe that 6 months ago they knew what it was, but I do think that they understand it now, and given the opportunity they will put their own houses in order. As the best proof of that I would like to point out to you the fact that two members of the constitutional convention were deprived of their seats because of their connection with the Communist Party, which certainly indicates to me that that group is bound and determined to take appropriate action to see to it that subversives have no voice in the government.

Senator CORDON. Did you have an opportunity to have access to the information of the Armed Forces intelligence and the FBI?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir.

Senator CORDON. And, of course, an opportunity for oral discussion with the representatives of both agencies located in the islands?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir; and for months before the investigation was held we were in frequent consultation with the representatives of the several agencies charged with the responsibility of our security. We were furnished with the kind of information that made it possible for us to unmask the whole conspiracy out there.

Senator CORDON. Well, they had both been very kind to me when I was there, as was Governor Stainback. I was interested in knowing just what cooperation you had. Did your investigation, or that of your staff, go beyond Oahu to the other islands?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir. We brought witnesses from the other islands to Oahu, and they testified.

Senator CORDON. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is all. I would suggest that at the appropriate time a request be made, through Congressman Walter, for a copy of the transcript of the hearings of his committee.

Mr. WALTER. Consider it as having been made. You will be furnished with a transcript.

Senator TAYLOR. All right.

Senator BUTLER. Mr. Walter, I telephoned you the other day and made the same request, personally.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. I appreciate the conversation I had with you at that time, without any particular specification, but your committee seemed to confirm what I had in my report last year in substance.

Mr. WALTER. Your report was quite helpful as a guide to us when we started. Thank you, Senator.

Senator TAYLOR. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to have permission also to incorporate a statement in the record by Congressman Walter made to the press.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be received by the committee.

(The statement is as follows:)

[From Honolulu Star Bulletin, April 10, 1950]

**"REPRESENTATIVE WALTERS SAYS ISLAND ABLE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM**

"Representative Francis E. Walter (Democrat-Pennsylvania) called Hawaii the Gibraltar of the Pacific in an opening statement, noting that the committee has no desire to hurt either statehood or the labor movement.

"The purpose of this investigation," he said, "is to determine the extent, the character and the objects of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "There is no greater power than the power of public opinion and if as the result of these hearings there be a public disclosure of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, this committee believes that the integrity, character, and loyalty of the people of these islands, of all races and creeds, is such that communism will find no haven here and that it will promptly be eradicated by an informed public opinion."

## "TEXT OF STATEMENT

"The text of Representative Walter's statement follows:

"Pursuant to statutory authority and in response to requests embodied in a joint resolution of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and in resolutions of certain civic organizations, which resolutions were referred by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to this committee, the Committee on un-American Activities of the House of Representatives opens its hearings today in Honolulu on the subject of communism.

\* \* \* \* \*

"This committee from time to time has investigated un-American activities of Fascist, Nazi, and other totalitarianisms designed to overthrow by force and violence the democratic form of government under which we live.

"The Communist conspiracy in many forms, including that of espionage by foreign agents, has been brought to light in investigations conducted by this committee.

"With the revelation of Communist infiltration in education, entertainment, government, labor, and other fields of endeavor, this committee has devoted much of its time in the past few years to the subject of communism.

## MANY INVESTIGATIONS

"These investigations have been conducted in numerous cities and States on the mainland, the latest being in the western part of my own State, Pennsylvania. It is the duty of this committee to expose communism wherever found within its jurisdiction.

\* \* \* \* \*

"The purpose of this investigation is to determine the extent, character, and objects of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii.

\* \* \* \* \*

"There is no greater power than the power of public opinion, and if as a result of these hearings there be a public disclosure of Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, this committee believes that the integrity, character, and loyalty of the people of these islands, of all races and creeds, is such that communism will find no haven here, and that it will be promptly eradicated by an informed public opinion.

"In approaching its task, the committee cannot be unmindful of the fact that Hawaii is our Gibraltar of the Pacific—a vital link in the security of our west coast.

## "RED PEARL HARBOR

"Nor can we be unmindful of the aggressive designs of Soviet imperialism in the Pacific area. Our hearings should alert Hawaii and the entire American Nation to the dangers of a Red Pearl Harbor.

"Anticipating, from our experience in other important investigations, the smear campaign which will be directed against this inquiry by the Communist slander apparatus and its supporters, I wish to clear up certain possible misconceptions at the outset.

\* \* \* \* \*

"It will be said that the facts sought out at these hearings will injure the campaign for statehood in Hawaii. Our hearings will in no way involve the merits of this proposal. Speaking for myself as an individual Member of Congress, I wish to make it plain that I am a strong advocate of granting immediate statehood.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Other members of our committee have taken a similar position in the House of Representatives. But this matter is outside of the specific purview of our present inquiry.

"If loyal citizens expose the machinations of this subversive organization during the course of this investigation, then the menace, if one exists, can be fought by the people in their own way, and those favoring statehood will owe a great debt of gratitude to those who assist in such an exposure.

"It will also be alleged by the Communists and their apologists that we are motivated by a desire to injure the labor movement. Nothing could be further

from the truth, as will be demonstrated by any impartial review of the investigations conducted by this committee.

\* \* \* \* \*

“Make no mistake about it. The Communists will shriek from the very house-tops that the present inquiry is directed against persons of Asiatic descent, that we are interested in promoting racial discrimination.

“ROBINSON'S STATEMENT

“They would have you forget that it was before our committee on July 18, 1949, that Jackie Robinson, that famous second baseman of the Brooklyn Dodgers made his ringing statement which echoed all over the United States. Let me recall a few words from that memorable statement :

““I and other Americans of many races and faiths have too much invested in our country's welfare for any of us to throw it away because of a siren song sung in bass. I am a religious man. Therefore I cherish America where I am free to worship as I please, a privilege which some countries do not give. And I suspect that 999 out of almost any thousand colored Americans you meet will tell you the same thing.”

“Today we are confronted with a new menace—the menace of totalitarian communism, which would destroy our democracy and lead us all down the road to slavery. This menace must be pitilessly exposed for what it is.

\* \* \* \* \*

“It is my firm conviction that the people of Hawaii will leave no stone unturned to unmask this hideous conspiracy.

\* \* \* \* \*

“It is quite possible that Communist cunning has succeeded in misleading some people in Hawaii just as it has misled some people elsewhere in the United States with their glorious but false promises. They should not be victimized for such mistakes.

“But you cannot win people and hold them in any part of the world with lies. Sooner or later truth will triumph right here in Hawaii, elsewhere in the United States, and in foreign countries. We have arrived at the inevitable day of reckoning for the Reds.

“EXPERIENCE WITH REDS

“As one who has had some experience with the methods of the Communists, I know that they will not hesitate to resort to any and every method of terrorism to prevent exposure.

“Red gangsters can be expected to act true to form. Let me issue this stern and solemn warning, however.

\* \* \* \* \*

“I shall not hesitate to invoke all the power at my command as chairman of these sessions against any individual or individuals who attempt to interfere with the duly authorized functions of this congressional committee.

\* \* \* \* \*

“The citizens of Hawaii have written a noble page in American history during the last war against totalitarian fascism. They have faced death with unflinching heroism and self-sacrifice.”

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I say at this point that a question was raised yesterday about the membership of the ILWU and the number of members of the ILWU who actually voted. We have the information this morning.

The membership of the ILWU is 21,546, approximately 40 percent of whom are noncitizens, and with other disqualifications, a guess of 50 percent eligible to vote would be nearly correct.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Surely.

Mr. ROGERS. What do you mean by 40 percent are not citizens? Not citizens of the United States?

Mr. O'BRIEN. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS. Who are they?

Mr. BURNS. If I may answer that, basically they are people of Filipino ancestry.

Mr. ROGERS. Filipino?

Mr. BURNS. Right.

Mr. ROGERS. Where is their country? To whom do they owe allegiance?

Mr. BURNS. They are nationals of the Philippines and permanent residents of Hawaii, permanent residents of the United States. Approximately 10 percent of our total population is alien.

Mr. ROGERS. Ten percent?

Mr. BURNS. Right.

Mr. ROGERS. Is that 10 percent of 635,000 or 575,000?

Mr. BURNS. 575,000.

Mr. ROGERS. The reason I asked that, the Secretary of Interior gave the chamber of commerce figures, I believe, as 635,000.

Mr. BURNS. That is the total in round figures.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, may I make a unanimous consent request in view of the figures you have given on ILWU?

I have in my hand this morning in answer to a question which I directed to Mr. George D. Riley yesterday with reference to the total membership of the AFL-CIO in the islands, a letter from him this morning which I ask for unanimous consent to be made a part of the record, or at least that portion of the letter having to do with the figures in which he states that on the Department's own figures for 1957 the AFL-CIO had 10,000 members in the islands.

That was the 1957 report. There has been a substantial increase since that time, but unfortunately we do not have the latest figures.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, that will be made a part of the record.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question on the subcommittee report?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. In which you said:

We also were told that no proof exists of Soviet espionage contacts on the part of Communists in Hawaii.

Who told you that?

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I answer that question in this way: While we were in Hawaii we consulted with the top law enforcement officials in the Federal Government and the Territorial government. We were told that by those people.

If I sound a little vague, it is not an accident because we obtained certain information from high places that we agreed was for our own information, and that we would not quote those sources.

May I say to the gentleman that he knows the three men who were there. I can assure him that the information to which he refers was not something we picked out of the air but was given to us by people in a position to know. And if they do not know, no one knows.

Mr. ROGERS. I was not questioning the fact that you were told that. The question that is in my mind, in view of the testimony of the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, is whether or not the persons who told you that knew what they were talking about. I can't evaluate that unless I know who told you.



Mr. O'BRIEN. May I put it this way: that the people most alert to any contact with Soviet espionage people, the ones who are responsible for ferreting out those things, were the ones who told us that.

Mr. ROGERS. Would you say that they were connected in any way with the CIA?

Mr. O'BRIEN. CIA?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. No.

Mr. ROGERS. Our CIA?

Mr. O'BRIEN. No.

Mr. ROGERS. Why would they be afraid to be identified?

Mr. O'BRIEN. They are not afraid to be identified. Rightly or wrongly, your committee agreed to keep their identity secret.

Mr. ROGERS. Why did they ask to have their identity kept secret?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Because they did not want to be put in a position of taking a stand for or against the statehood matter. They did not feel it was their province.

Mr. ROGERS. They did not mind taking a stand for or against communism?

Mr. O'BRIEN. They did not take a stand for or against communism. They only told us what they knew about communism. I assure you they were not favorable.

Mr. ROGERS. Were not favorable toward communism?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. How were they on statehood?

Mr. O'BRIEN. We did not ask them their stand on statehood.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not want to badger the question, but it seems to me, if people give out information that they have proof there is no espionage contact insofar as the Soviet Union is concerned, and there are obvious agencies in these areas, and according to the testimony of the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, there is a lot more going on over there than this committee has learned so far, and I am wondering if the chairman can get in touch with those people and get a release from them so we could identify them. I would like to have them in here as witnesses.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think we will have shortly a more detailed report in favor of statehood for Hawaii from the Department of Justice. Now I would think the Department of Justice would have a considerable knowledge of what is going on in the field we have been discussing.

Mr. ROGERS. I would not want to substitute the Department of Justice for the people who told you this in Hawaii because I and the Department of Justice do not see eye to eye on a lot of things, even though we bear the same name.

Mr. O'BRIEN. You mean the Department of Justice disagrees with the gentleman, too?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the concern of my colleague from Texas on this matter. I think maybe it is a little unfortunate that we were out there and who did sit in with the top law enforcement officers, both of the Territory and of the Federal Government, wherein

we gained this information, were not any more free to explain the details.

But I want to join with my chairman in the fact that these were facts given to us by the top law-enforcement agencies of both the Federal Government and the Territory.

Mr. ROGERS. As I read this, information you got was there was no information.

Mr. SISK. No; I do not think so.

Mr. ROGERS. That is what it says. It says, "We were told that no proof exists." That is the reason why I cannot understand why anyone would be afraid to be identified after holding himself out as an expert on a subject as important as this, and give his word that no proof exists of any connection between Soviet Russia and the espionage agents which might be in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows very well with whom we talked.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, no. The gentleman sure does not. He sure does not. I do not have any idea to whom you talked. It was not Dorothy Lamour, was it?

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I tell the gentleman with whom we did talk?

Mr. ROGERS. I mean, I would not want you to violate a confidence.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I assure you I am not.

Mr. ROGERS. Unless you get a complete release, because it would be very embarrassing on the House floor.

Mr. O'BRIEN. We talked with people at the Territorial and Federal level who have the fullest knowledge of what is going on in that particular field. That was military and civilian as well.

Mr. ROGERS. That is the thing that there is suspended animation on. You state a conclusion that you talked to a man who knew what he was talking about. I think that the Members of the Congress ought to know the name of that man so they could make their own evaluation of it.

A lot of people say, "I talked with Mr. Allen Dulles, head of the CIA, and because he is head of the CIA he ought to know about what he is talking." But for some reason he did not know about a lot of things that have been happening in Iran and in Russia and everywhere else he is supposed to know about.

If my information is right, there are 10 requests for congressional inquiries as to what has been going on down there behind those cloaks and daggers. I do not know whether it is true or not.

The thing I am talking about is this: I have the greatest admiration for your ability to weigh a man's ability and knowledge, but I would like to hear it myself, too.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I can understand the gentleman's feeling for wanting all the knowledge available, but I am afraid we cannot at this time tell you the exact persons who gave us this information. I hope that you will take our collective word for it that we received it, or we would not have put it in the report.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not say that. I will take your word for it and will make an affidavit right now that you received it.

The only thing I am worrying about is who you received it from, because you and I might differ on their ability.

If the gentleman will release me—I may not do it—to bring this up on the floor of the House if necessary, I would appreciate it.

Mr. SISK. Will my colleague yield further?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. SISK. These people did not set themselves up as experts. These people were the top people with the responsibility of control and know about communism. As I am sure my colleague knows. I do not think we intimated they claimed to be experts other than the fact they probably are the most expert and most knowledgeable of anyone we have in that field in connection with Communist espionage.

Mr. ROGERS. This says, "We were told no proof exists."

When I was a boy I was told there was a Santa Claus and later on I developed some doubts about that situation. This report says that you were told no proof exists. I do not doubt you were told that, but I do think that the Congress ought to have the right to know who did the telling.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. I like that Santa Claus reference because I wonder if my colleague followed the pattern his own chairman set when his own children came along and hesitated to deny to a younger one that there was a Santa Claus.

Mr. ROGERS. They were all right up to a certain time. Now they are questioning me on everything.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Perhaps we can clear up the whole matter in the gentleman's mind. The information did not come from Santa Claus. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROGERS. I reserve the right to bring the matter up on the floor.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Surely.

Our next witness is Mr. Poage of Texas.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. W. R. POAGE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I do not want to come as an opponent of statehood for Hawaii. I noticed in the newspaper that you had gotten down to opponents. But I thought this might be a good time for one who—

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will be kind enough to yield, if you would, as an opponent, there would be two of us here this morning.

Mr. POAGE. Well, you might get me as an opponent.

I would like to keep the attitude of having the right to make up my mind after I hear a further discussion of some of the matters that are being discussed, because I recognize there is a whole lot to be said in favor of Hawaiian statehood, and I have voted for it. I recognize that there is a whole lot to be said against statehood at this time.

I recognize that basically that many of the people of the United States supported statehood for Alaska last year and will support statehood for Hawaii this year for the same reason.

We are finding the whole world subject to a wave of demands of local government and the abolition of what we have come to call colonialism. I think there is an awakening all over the world and a feeling that people should run their own affairs—at least all over the world except in the United States itself.

Of course, as has been well brought out here this morning, there is probably a wave in exactly the reverse here in the United States, a great many people wanting to run the affairs of everybody else and wanting to run the affairs in States where they do not live, and wanting to run affairs that do not concern them whatsoever, that has to do only with self-government.

They are wanting to destroy local self-government within the now constituted United States and to establish it elsewhere.

It seems to me it might be the better thing to adopt a uniform policy and recognize local self-government everywhere, including the Southern States of the United States. I think they are entitled to as much local self-government as other parts of the world are entitled to.

Of course, we have been denied that for a long while and apparently are going to continue to be denied it.

The one thing that concerns me, the one thing that might lead me to oppose this Hawaiian statehood is if I got the feeling this was really more of an effort to wipe out local self-government in the United States than it was to extend local self-government abroad. If, in fact, this effort is one simply to get two more votes in the Senate to deny local self-government in the United States, then I do not think that it is a worthy effort.

If the whole effort is to give local self-government in the Hawaiian Islands, I think there is a great deal of merit to it.

It is sort of hard to distinguish just exactly what is behind everybody's motives. I am sure that many individuals have a mixed emotion about the matter. But I am quite certain, and I am sure the members of this committee recognize that actually this effort is not simply one to give local self-government to Hawaii, but just as truly it is an effort on the part of some to take local self-government away from a number of existing States. I do not know how to separate them.

I will be glad to listen to the arguments as time goes on. And if I can separate them and can convince myself it is truly an effort to give local self-government to Hawaii, I am going to vote for that local self-government.

If I become convinced it is primarily an effort simply to pack the U.S. Senate to create votes to destroy local self-government in my home, then obviously I am interested in my people enjoying local self-government, too.

But, apart from that, it seems to me that if we are making a clear-cut effort to apply local self-government where it does not exist, to give the advantages of statehood to every American citizen, if we are seriously interested in wiping out vestiges remaining of colonialism in our American form of government, then definitely we ought to expand the limits that you place in this bill on the State proposed.

The United States has other islands in the Pacific Ocean. The Hawaiian Islands are not the only islands in the Pacific Ocean where American citizens are in a stateless status.

It does not seem to me to make good commonsense to bring in a State at this time involving most of the citizenship and most of the Territory of the vast Pacific and leaving a few small islands and a few small patches of people around still in a stateless status.

It seems to me that the least we can do is to solve this thing and to include in the Territory of the new State all of the territory that be-

longs to the United States in the Pacific Ocean that is of a stateless status at the present time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield at that place?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, surely.

Mr. ASPINALL. You are speaking of only one island—

Mr. POAGE. I am speaking of all American islands.

Mr. ASPINALL. Only one of the islands you are talking about has citizenship—go on.

Mr. POAGE. I am talking about Samoa, as well as Guam and Johnson Island. I am talking about all of the American islands.

Mr. ASPINALL. They are nationals. In Guam the residents the full citizens.

Mr. POAGE. You are talking about citizenship?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, I am talking about citizenship.

Mr. POAGE. All the more reason for dealing with Samoa, with Johnson Island, with the rest of the islands that are American territory. I know the gentleman disagrees with me, but I hope the gentleman will let me express my views.

Mr. ASPINALL. But they are not incorporated Territories. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. POAGE. I understand they are not Territories. They are territories of the United States, however.

Mr. ASPINALL. No, they are not incorporated Territories of the United States. That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. POAGE. I am not talking about the legal status; I am talking about the geographical situation. They are the territory of the United States. They are owned by the United States. We claim sovereignty. The United States flag flies there. They are the territory of the United States and American boys give their lives to defend them. They are the territories of the United States.

Their people are entitled to the same respect that the people of Texas and Hawaii are entitled to. They are a part of the United States. They are some of the last vestiges of pure colonialism. And if the United States is going to make the great step, then I think it is commendable on the part of this committee to recognize it.

But that is exactly the point I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman of the full committee. That is exactly the point I am trying to get at—to try to determine whether this committee is really trying to wipe out colonialism, to bring about local government, or are you simply trying to get votes in the United States Senate to wipe out my liberties?

If you are going to keep these islands, to hold them as a threat, and when you need two more votes in the United States Senate, you are going to create the State of Guam, and at some later date are going to create the State of Samoa, then I think the whole thing is a fraud.

If, on the other hand, you are sincerely and seriously trying to wipe out the vestiges of colonialism, which I recognize as well as any of us do is not a thing that properly fits into the American system of government, if we are actually going to wipe it all out, let's do it.

The point I am trying to make to the committee: Let's not do a part of the job here. Let's do the full job. Let's provide that these people will become citizens, not only of the United States, but of a State in the United States.

Mr. WESTLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. POAGE.** Sure.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** Do you confine this just to the Pacific?

**Mr. POAGE.** I do, because I know no way of creating a State in the Pacific and putting Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands in, if that is what you are talking about, and putting them in that State.

I think it would be such a strained situation to try to put something over here in the West Indies into a State that has its capital in the middle of the Pacific Ocean and most of its citizens over there. I think it would be rather ridiculous.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** Are you making the point these other areas should be included in the Hawaiian statehood bill?

**Mr. POAGE.** All of the islands of the Pacific; yes, sir. I think you have to deal differently with our positions in the Caribbean Sea, which is another problem. But it can be solved and it can be dealt with.

I am only asking you to deal with this problem. I am only asking you not to keep this thing something that is going to come back up here at a future date.

I know that these people have a proper right to aspire to American citizenship. That is why I voted for Hawaii, Mr. Burns, some years ago, because I know when Hawaii was annexed to the United States, whether it was legally binding as an obligation or not, I know that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate told them they would be made a State. I know American officials have led them to believe they would be a State. And I believe in keeping the obligations of the U.S. Government.

I fully agree with the idea that all of these people that we claim sovereignty over ought to be American citizens. But, if it is unwise to step up the movement of those who live in Samoa and the Johnson Islands at the present time into full citizenship, let us at least put in this bill provision for the admission of these areas into the State of Hawaii at a future date. Let us not preclude the things at this time.

Let's do not say that we have now created this State and that these other islands are later going to have to come through the same process and create two more U.S. Senators or six more U.S. Senators.

**Mr. BURNS.** Will the gentleman yield one moment at that point, if I may?

**Mr. POAGE.** Surely.

**Mr. BURNS.** And if the people of Samoa want to build their own culture and their own society and their own decision in the same way as Puerto Rico is trying to do in a commonwealth status with self-government, as an affiliated part of the United States with self-government, would you deny them that right to do so?

**Mr. POAGE.** I would. I would not affiliate anybody, Puerto Rico or anybody else, with the United States.

My own view—and I am merely expressing my own view—is that you are either fish or fowl or good red meat and not something else. You are either a good American citizen or you are not.

I would make everybody who wants the privileges of American citizenship accept the obligation of American citizenship, and I would not extend the privileges to anybody, regardless of where they live, unless they are willing to accept the obligations of American citizenship.

I think our so-called commonwealth status is something that avoids obligations and confers privileges without corresponding obligations.

Mr. BURNS. Then the gentleman would divorce them entirely and then let them go on their own?

Mr. POAGE. I would let them go on their own, anyone who wants to.

Of course, we in the South fought a war for that and we lost that one and are likely to lose another. We always believed and still believe if anybody wants out, let them get out and go on their own.

I would gladly say to anybody in or out of the continental United States, go your own way if you do not like the union you are in.

But I know the gentleman will not agree with me on that. But I would be perfectly willing to let any of these people, who would prefer to, go somewhere else.

I think General de Gaulle set a splendid example in the French union in telling the French colonies, "If you do not want to adopt this constitution, go your own way."

I think we might well profit by that example and do the same thing. But at least we should make provisions. At the very minimum this bill should contain provisions for the admission of those areas into this State, and unless you put it in here now, gentlemen—I mean in all seriousness—unless you put it in here now, it is not going to be there, and there is never going to be any way of bringing them in as states.

You may say maybe there is some way, but I ask you, where have we ever brought new territory into a State? You do not do it. And what you are fixing now is probably for a much longer period of time than you have in mind. You are fixing it permanently. You are setting the course and the policy of the United States possibly for hundreds of years and you are not only setting our policy, you are setting the example that the world is going to judge us by.

If we are going to get any advantage of passing this kind of legislation in the forum of world opinion—and I think we should if we are going to do it—we are going to have to take care of the rest of these people in the Pacific, else all of the anti-American propaganda is not going to point to the fact that you gave citizenship to 600,000 Hawaiians or statehood status, it is going to point to the fact that you denied to 72 people on some atoll out in the Pacific the same thing.

It is going to point to the very small group that did not attain citizenship, and it does not make any difference how small that group is, so long as we legally deny citizenship to the small group, so long as we say the United States of America, just because we are big and powerful are going to crush you and hold you, giving you neither independence nor statehood. I know we are going to be subject to criticism.

But now do not think that our antagonists are not going to be able to make exactly the same sort of case out of the people who are on Guam. But if you will include those people, maybe just include Guam momentarily in the area, make them a county—they can come to Honolulu to attend their State government just as easy as most of us formerly could go to our State capitals. We created counties in the United States. There are just a little over 3,000 of them in the United States. They were created in order that people might be able to go into their local county seat and transact business.

In my area they average 30 miles square, because that was as far as a man could drive his team in and back in a day.

Today we do not need counties that small. Today it is easier to go from the most distant island in the Pacific to Honolulu than it was to go from the north end of Potter County down to Amarillo, the county seat, some years ago.

It is not an impractical thing to have courts at Honolulu for these people in these distant islands. It is not an impractical thing for them to have their legislature there. It is not an impractical thing for them to come in and have their seat of government there.

If you will but include those who are now ready in the new State and make provision for the admission of those others at some time when you think they are ready, you will have taken a lot of the propaganda value away from the Russians that they now enjoy because of our failure to give statehood status to these people of the Pacific.

But if you confine your action simply to the people on the Hawaiians, you are not helping us a bit from the international standpoint.

I do not mean to say that should be the reason for not going on with it, but I do mean to say that you will have failed to capitalize on an opportunity that the United States has.

Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Mr. Poage, for your views in the matter.

I might say that in my activities in connection with statehood I never thought very much about creating additional U.S. Senators who would take a liberty away from existing States.

In fact, I might point out that a number of people were surprised when the brand new Senators from Alaska voted as they did on the cloture matter in the Senate.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. We have been watching that and, as I said, I am watching this thing. I want to know what is behind it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes. I think you would find the two new Senators from Hawaii, if they spring from the kind of people we met over there, would not be anxious to take liberties away from the rest of us.

I might say also that my interest in statehood developed from the fact there were exactly two incorporated Territories under the American flag who did not have statehood and which were able and willing, in my opinion, to handle statehood.

Now we have just one, just one—Hawaii. It is the only one left. And it is the only incorporated Territory we still have. It is the only area I know of outside of the present 49 States which wants and is capable of supporting statehood.

But I do think that the suggestion we tie some of these other places into the proposed new State is interesting. I am not too familiar with the debates at the time the original 13 started to become the 49, but I suppose there were people who suggested at that time that we take all of these vast territories not included in the 13 and make them States simultaneously. I do not know.

But I think we might have a great deal of difficulty if we tried to sweep up all of the islands in the Pacific and make them one State.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire what difficulty would confront us? I cannot see any.

Mr. O'BRIEN. A little practical difficulty in the first place. I think it would multiply the opposition to statehood.



I will yield at this time to Mr. Aspinall who wants to point out something in connection with Guam.

Mr. ASPINALL. Not especially Guam.

Guam at the present time, of course, is an area where citizens of Guam are full citizens of the United States, and their Government operates as an unincorporated territory. But at the present time it is a military base more than anything else and will continue that way for some time.

But as far as Samoa is concerned, American Samoa came to us after the Spanish American War because of the value of the harbor at Pago Pago.

The people of American Samoa are not even ready to consider statehood. I was the last Member of Congress, so far as I know, to be in American Samoa. That was in 1954.

There is a possibility that some of these days New Zealand, having control of Western Samoa, that American Samoa might be relinquished to their brothers of Western Samoa because of our inability to handle them as my colleague would have them handled.

They are not citizens, they are nationals. It is true some of them have served in our Armed Forces. And they make good soldiers. When I went to Samoa in 1954 I took 17 members of the military from Hawaii down to Samoa. They had not been home for a visit, some of them, for 4½ years, because of the lack of transportation into that area.

As far as the Trust Territory is concerned—and I refer to that great area as far distant from one part to the other part as it is from Maine to California, Kwajalein, Yap, Truk, and all of those islands in between—we have no right to even think at this time of giving them statehood because they are operated under a mandate coming from the United Nations.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that. I did not suggest you incorporate the Trust Territory.

Mr. ASPINALL. Let me suggest to my friend, that I would be the last one in the world to think that American Samoa at any time should ever come in as a single State. I would be the last one in the world to think that Guam should ever come in as a single State. I would be the last one at this time to even think that the Virgin Islands should come in as a State. I would be the last one to even contemplate statehood as such for Puerto Rico at the present time, because there are many problems that have to be solved in those areas before we begin to think about statehood.

But here we have an area that came to us by mutual agreement, and after it came to us we made it an area which has had the right to look forward to the status of statehood. That is all we are doing as far as Hawaii is concerned. The question now is, Are they ready?

I think my colleague from Hawaii, Delegate Burns, who is more familiar perhaps with Guam than any of the rest of us, would substantiate what I have just said.

Mr. BURNS. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say also—and I know how my colleague feels about it—there is no attempt on the part of anybody that I know of to just bring Hawaii into the United States of America in the relationship of full sisterhood in our Union just to get two more Senators. That just is not a part of it.

My feeling is that the people in Hawaii, if they are given this privilege, this benefit, will cooperate with us in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives in the disposition of the matters that come before us just the same as Senators from Florida or Senators from Washington or Maine. They are not out to pit one part of this country against the other.

I think my colleague will know that I am pretty sympathetic toward the position which he has in his mind.

Mr. POAGE. Could I suggest to the chairman of the committee that, while he is out of the room, Mr. Westland asked me some questions that I think bear upon exactly the same thing you are bearing upon. I suggested them, and I think properly I should have done so earlier, that it may well be that there is no occasion to bring in Samoa and the Johnston Islands at the present time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Johnston Island is close to the trust territory.

Mr. POAGE. When did Johnston Island become part of the trust territory? We had it long before the war.

Mr. ASPINALL. We have never recognized it other than what might be—

Mr. POAGE. The Japanese never had it.

I agree thoroughly with the gentleman that Samoa may want to go to New Zealand. Personally, I have no objection if it does.

I said, also while you were out, that General de Gaulle had set a very good example in letting these people make their own decision, and if they want to go somewhere else, I would be perfectly glad to see Samoa go with New Zealand. But at least put in this bill authority so that these transactions can take place at a future time without us being subjected to the possibility of coming up here on it again.

While I know the gentleman from Colorado is not trying to pass the bill simply to get two votes into the Senate, I know there are people in the United States—and they are not a few—they are a great many in the United States—that are interested in this solely as to the effect it will have upon civil rights. And I know the gentleman knows that, and it is utterly futile to say it is not involved in this thing.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is the first time in 10 years of hearings—

Mr. POAGE. Certainly the gentleman knows most of them are not as frank as I am.

I voted for it and I may vote for it this time. You know there are plenty of people that are going to vote for this bill, and that is the reason some of them are going to do it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Let me finish. I was just going to say, after 10 years of study of this bill I have never had a single one approach me and state that he had such thoughts in his mind.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly not.

Mr. ASPINALL. Or never implied that such was in his mind as far as—

Mr. POAGE. But they have approached me and told me, not only that it was in their mind, but it was the determining factor.

Mr. ASPINALL. Proponents of the bill who actively support the bill in Congress have told you that?

Mr. POAGE. No. You said nobody had approached you with that in their mind. No, opponents of the bill, because they are frank to talk about what they are doing, whereas a lot of people will not

talk about what they are doing. Maybe they are smarter than we are. Maybe they are much more effective. Obviously they are. Maybe we ought to not talk either. Maybe we ought to stay under the table and refuse to bring out the real facts. But I know these are involved.

I hope it is not the determining factor. I think there are more important factors.

I think, as I stated, again while the gentleman was out, it is important that the United States show to the world that we are not maintaining colonies over the world, that we are abandoning this colonial system. I think that is one of the great benefits of this bill. I think it is one of the great talking points in favor of this bill.

But I know full well that this bill cannot be effective from that standpoint unless you include all of the people over which the United States has dominion and denies statehood status.

Mr. ASPINALL. Let me ask my friend, would you bring in Okinawa at the present time?

Mr. POAGE. No, because Okinawa is not the territory of the United States. It is just like talking about the trust islands. It does not belong to the United States.

Mr. ASPINALL. The only one that really belongs to the United States, outside of Guam, would be Samoa.

Mr. POAGE. All right. If only Samoa, just bring Guam in now and make provision that Samoa can either come in or get out of the United States. But make provision now.

All I am asking you is, do not leave this thing to be resolved at a future date. Do the thing now. Complete your job, gentlemen. That is all I am asking you. Do not bring us just a part of the job done. Bring us the full job. Everybody knows you have got to deal with Guam. Let's deal with it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does my colleague know of any precedent in the admission of any State of the Union where, since the original 13 banded themselves together, there was any provision to bring in another area?

Mr. POAGE. No, sir. And can the gentleman show me where it has ever been done? That is exactly the point I made a while ago. I do not know there is any provision it cannot be done but I know from history that it has not been done.

Can the gentleman cite to me one example of where the United States has either increased or decreased the size or area of any State in the United States except the grasping by power, sheer power, taking away from the State of Virginia half of her territory?

Mr. ASPINALL. That was done, as my friend knows, under the emotions of war.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly it was.

Mr. ASPINALL. An entirely different reason.

My friend also knows in the great State of Texas there is a provision that Texas could divide, if the Congress was willing, and come up with from one to five different States.

Mr. POAGE. Wait, wait. I do not not know that. I always had been taught that and I had believed that, and I thought that was true, because it is perfectly true that the Congress of the United States agreed

to that. But the Congress of the United States also made a bunch of other agreements at the same time about our public lands and repudiated them. The Supreme Court of the United States held we did not have any agreement. So I do not suppose we have got any agreement on that either.

I suppose that, if the Court decision as to the tidelands is valid, the same decision is also valid as to that part of the agreement. I do not know why that part of the agreement should be sacred and the other part should be ignored.

Mr. ASPINALL. Of course, my friend will agree with me that the question of tidelands was a debatable question. I do not know whether or not we decided that correctly when we passed the bill. I perhaps have some doubts as to the rights that were and the rights that were not involved.

But, my friend, outside of the so-called tidelands dispute, Texas owns all of its public lands except those which it has seen fit to place under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, and we are the only State in the Union that ever paid our preexisting debt, too. The Federal Government paid all the rest of them.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am very friendly to Texas. I am very friendly to them and consider it a great part of the Union.

But I still would like to have the precedent—and there is none to refer to at this time—where peoples who might want to come into the relationship of statehood with an area that is being considered at the present time as a distinct and single area, a single unit for statehood classification.

Mr. POAGE. I know no reason why Guam should not come in at the present time. But the committee members are unquestionably better informed on that than I am. If there is any reason why it should not be included as a county at the present time, then at least make provision for inclusion at a future date.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. Surely.

Mr. ROGERS. Speaking of the lack of precedent, we are moving in a direction here, in admitting Hawaii to statehood, that has no precedent whatsoever.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. I say "we are." The people who are fixing to make it a State.

The precedent is to take a Territory in as a part of the United States that is separated by land and water over which we do not have exclusive jurisdiction, a place that is itself divided into eight parts, separated by the high seas, over which we do not have exclusive jurisdiction.

It has never been done before in the history of this country.

Mr. WESTLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman probably doesn't know there is an area called Point Roberts which happens to be in my district and the only way to get to it is either to go by water or else through Canada. And generally you have to go through Canada not once, but twice, through customs to get to it. Perhaps it is a rather small precedent.

Mr. ROGERS. It is not a State.

Mr. WESTLAND. It is part of the State of Washington.

Mr. ROGERS. But it is not a State.

Mr. WESTLAND. It is part of the State of Washington.

Mr. ROGERS. The major body of that State is tied on.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman one question, if I might.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Surely.

Mr. BURNS. I do not know whether the gentleman from Texas remembers that back a few years an effort was made to include the island of Palmyra in Hawaii, and because of that inclusion Hawaii did not pass. As a matter of fact, it did not get reported out of the committee.

Now in the gentleman's desire to bring self-government to the people of Hawaii, in which he believes very deeply—and I want to acknowledge that and to thank him for it—we would not want to prejudice the bill by adding some of these other things.

Mr. POAGE. I would not want to prejudice your bill. But I am not promising to vote for it.

Mr. BURNS. I know, but you will be fair.

Mr. POAGE. I do not want to prejudice your bill. I think it is a much better bill if it makes provisions to settle this thing rather than to hold out prospects that 5 years from now we will go through the same thing again.

Mr. BURNS. It will be a little longer than 5 years. But I wanted to point out it did happen before. There was an effort to include some of the other islands in Hawaii and because of that the bill died.

Mr. POAGE. Where were they made?

Mr. BURNS. In the Congress. It died in the committee in the Senate.

Mr. POAGE. They were not made on the floor of the House.

Mr. BURNS. No. It was in the bill in the committee. I wanted to point out what happened. I changed it in the bill in 1957 when I came in because of that, in agreement with others, and left it out.

Mr. POAGE. What was the objection there?

Mr. BURNS. Eight hundred miles of ocean between the various parts of the State.

Mr. POAGE. What is the status of Palmyra Island? I thought it was British.

Mr. BURNS. It is a possession of the United States.

Mr. POAGE. I thought it was British. Was there a dispute about the ownership?

Mr. BURNS. No, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I do want to ask one or two questions. I think they are very important in view of the matter brought up by Mr. Poage.

Mr. Poage, you heard the argument that, if we do not let Hawaii in, we are forcing the people to remain in the status of second class citizenship, have you not?

Mr. POAGE. I have heard that stated.

Mr. ROGERS. If we let Hawaii in and yield to that argument, then we are admitting that the people who live on these other islands that you tell about are in second or third class citizenship and are going

to remain that way because there is no door provided for them to come in as a State in the Pacific. Is that right?

Mr. POAGE. I think that is exactly true, and I think it puts us in a terribly bad position in the eyes of the rest of the world.

I happened to visit, as the gentleman from the Panhandle did, some of the so-called less-privileged countries of the world this last fall and I think that we all recognize the tide of nationalism is running strong, and, as a corollary, the tide of anticolonialism; that the people of the world have been led to believe, whether rightly or wrongly—and I am inclined to believe it is rightly—that people ought not to be held as possessions of anybody, that people ought not to be held as property rights of any nation, no matter how great they might be.

But if we continue to hold certain islands, no matter how small, Palmyra or anybody else, if we continue to hold a half a dozen people out here as the slaves, as the property of the United States, we are subject to exactly the same kind of criticism being heaped so generously upon so-called colonial powers of Europe.

Mr. ROGERS. That is exactly what happened when they told us in this country a long time ago we could not be half free and half slave. If we follow the policies that some say we are following, we are adopting the policy insofar as the Pacific is concerned that these people in Hawaii are going to be free and the others are going to be slaves?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS. If you want to follow that argument out.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Just a minute.

Now the argument has been advanced so many times with regard to Hawaii that it is an incorporated Territory. Now is there any difference, in your opinion, Mr. Poage, in a human being whether he lives in an incorporated city or lives out in the country?

Mr. POAGE. No, I do not think any great nation has the power to grab him and call him their property simply because he does not happen to be an incorporated territory, when it is solely within the power of that great nation to determine whether it is an incorporated or unincorporated territory.

Mr. ROGERS. And the point you make so far as our moving into this new political area—and that is what it is, a brandnew political area—if we do not take in these other islands in one State with Hawaii or make provision to take them in on an equal status, the propaganda machine of our enemies is not going to stop any more than it stopped when we granted the Philippines freedom. Is that right?

Mr. POAGE. It certainly did not stop there and it will not stop here. I realize we are not going to stop it no matter what you do. But I think you can take a great deal of their propaganda away from them if you will simply make provision to include these other areas and peoples.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, I will yield now.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman leaves me somewhat confused. Are we to understand that, if this committee and Congress sweeps up all these islands in the Pacific and ties them onto the Hawaiian kite, the gentleman from Texas will support the bill?

Mr. ROGERS. I would want a few days to think about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. POAGE. I just might do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think, Mr. Poage, you might. But I was just curious.

Mr. ROGERS. I would want to see the bill after it was prepared.

But I think the point Mr. Poage is making is exactly right; that we must assume the premise, however, which I do not assume in the first instance, that these people are second-class citizens. As a matter of fact, I think they have a great deal more privileges in many instances than we in this country do, especially in regard to that differential in pay of the Federal employees. The people in the Territory want to get statehood but they do not want to give up any of the fringe benefits they got by virtue of having not been a State.

If we are going to do this—I am against doing any of it. But if we are going to do it, we might as well go whole hog or none. There is not any use in doing a half-way job. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Poage.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have here a letter to the gentleman from Colorado on the question of statehood. I think it is a practice where we get letters to make them a part of the file. Is that correct, Mr. Aspinall?

Mr. ASPINALL. According to whether or not anybody wishes to make them part of the record.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this letter from Mr. Hamilton A. Long is of sufficient importance that it should be made part of the record at this time.

Mr. ROGERS. Reserving the right to object, may I see it?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Surely.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a question. I have a statement from Congressman Dulski of the 41st District of New York which, if there is no objection, I would like to have inserted in the record.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is that in favor of statehood?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record where we have statements from other Members of Congress.

Mr. ROGERS. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, the letter of Hamilton A. Long, New York City attorney, will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The letter follows:)

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY CLUB,  
New York, N.Y., January 25, 1959.

Subject: Hawaii statehood, opposed.

HON. W. N. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, House Insular Affairs Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ASPINALL: In lieu of a personal appearance to testify against the admission of Hawaii as a member of the United States, kindly include in your committee's record of hearings this statement by me.

The accompanying information will serve to identify me adequately for present purposes—a member of the New York Bar and writer on constitutional subjects, and so forth.

Of the points which might be urged against Hawaii's being made a State, I'll mention one only in order to keep this statement short. It is, however, of fundamental importance and should be decisive, in leading your committee to decide in the negative.

This is that, once the United States of America departs from the principle of limiting States to those situated on the continent of North America, then there

will be no fundamental line of demarcation to serve as a brake on admission of various other foreign territories from time—for instance, just to indicate possibilities, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Cuba, at their own urgings if and when they might decide it to be to their advantage and in keeping with their people's wishes. Such indefinite expansion, even as a looming possibility, in the composition of the States composing the Union, would be of the essence of imperialism.

History proves that imperialism—notably indefinite expansion of territory constituting part of the homeland—has been the route to doom of great countries and peoples throughout the centuries; at least one of the major contributing factors. This is the very antithesis of traditional Americanism.

Such expansion of an imperialistic nature, over the decades and generations to come, cannot but aggravate the already acute condition confronting America's national defense program, with Soviet Russia possessing potential power dominance today over all Eurasia and vicinity, which commenced on V-E Day in essence and will continue for the foreseeable future because America has no power to alter this deplorable condition. Inclusion of offshore areas as integral parts of the United States of America cannot benefit, but will injure, sound national defense in various ways—the more included the worse the injury.

Your committee's decision in this instance will make or break the situation constituting precedent in this connection; hence the great importance of this pending decision—on the basis of principle apart entirely from the meritorious character of the people of Hawaii and sentimental considerations. Hawaii's admission should be denied.

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON A. LONG.

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have it with me at the time, but I would like to offer a resolution in favor of statehood that was passed by my State legislature as part of the record; if the chairman feels it advisable to put such in the record.

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I suggest that any Member of Congress who desires to make a statement for or against statehood shall have the privilege within a reasonable time to submit it for the record. And if there is no objection, any member of this committee or any Member of Congress may submit a resolution which has been adopted by their State legislature for or against statehood.

Are there any other witnesses here in opposition to statehood?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Fair would like to testify this morning.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mrs. Fair, would you give your full name?

#### STATEMENT OF MRS. JOSEPH FAIR, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mrs. FAIR. I am Mrs. Joseph Fair from Philadelphia, Pa., 46th district.

I do not represent anyone in particular but myself, and for that particular reason I decided last night, after hearing a late newscast that this was the first day to give opposition to the particular bill, to do so.

Personally I am not in favor of statehood for Hawaii for several reasons. I would like to take this opportunity to enumerate them.

First of all, I feel as though these particular islands, which we know as Hawaii, are right now of particular interest to us because of the admission of Alaska as the 49th State. I feel as though we feel because this has happened Hawaii should also have the same privilege.

I do not know whether this is politically inspired by 1 of the 2 parties or not—the feeling if Alaska is admitted, surely Hawaii.

I feel as though statehood is not the only alternative for self-government in the Hawaiian Islands. I feel that the Hawaiians them-



selves should have an opportunity before this bill has been presented to decide whether or not they prefer statehood to independence of government.

I feel that there is a bit of nationalism that is in evidence in these islands, and for that reason I think that this bill should first be more or less put off until this particular aspect is presented to the peoples themselves.

Secondly, I feel that, if these islands should be presented as the 50th State, it makes us as a United States, appear that we are trying to ask for a geographical absurdity. There is so much distance between the continental United States and the islands, which we have no control over, and for that reason I feel as though there are certain aspects which would take place in the islands, such as an appeal within the courts there to the U.S. court of appeals, or to the U.S. Supreme Court. This particular type of appeal would make it almost impossible for the persons in question to come to Washington, D.C., in order to see that justice may be done.

Another reason why I object to the admission would be that this puts an international label upon the United States as an imperialistic nation. This is a new way of acquiring territory.

We know some years ago there was probably within most of our thinking that the sun never set on the British Empire. Britain, of course, is our mother country. For that reason it looks as though the sins of the mother, or the sins of the parents, are being inherited by the offspring.

Because this has happened some years ago, it is now being denied because these territories that Britain has acquired are eventually gaining independence. And I feel as though we are following that same course of action, causing peoples of our colonial territories to be unhappy and more or less giving the United States the particular label as a colonial and imperialistic type of nation.

That is another reason I feel that Hawaii should not have statehood at this time. Not only at this time, but I do not feel it should ever have statehood. I feel that Hawaii should be an independent nation like the Philippine Islands. I believe they were our territory at one time.

Another reason I feel that the Hawaiian Islands should not be a State, or the 50th State, is because there should be an amendment to the Constitution that should put a limit on the number of States that are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Government. I feel as though it should be limited to the continental United States.

In this particular way, if it is not, we are allowing ourselves to make even West Germany one of the States. I think it is similarly true, there is so much political unrest at this time, it is not a good time to be deciding on this particular issue.

Another reason I feel that we should not let this be another State is because this expresses favoritism. I think the witness before me sort of expressed the same feeling that I had on this idea of admitting Hawaii and leaving out other territories.

I think there should be a proposal made whereby, maybe on a yearly basis or some particular type of planning—whereby these particular types of territories could be gradually given a progressive plan that would insure independence of government.

Another thing that I think is very important in considering this bill is that we seem to put a great premium on American citizenship. It is a good thing. We probably enjoy more privileges in the United States than any other person in the world under any form of government. But I feel as though we should not fall into the sin that was so commonly attributed to Hitler's Germany: to be an Aryan or to be a German was of unusual importance to them. It gives us another label of being the superior race or, we will put it, superior citizenship. And I do not think we want that to permeate our thinking in the international situation.

We do not want to do that because we have just fought a war where many of us have lost our dear ones, in order to make the world safe for democracy. And if we should be so careless now as to fall into the same rut which we as a people fought against—we will say the very unhappy situation in Europe and in the Pacific—to insure these rights, then I think that we should not be guilty of these particular errors.

Another reason I feel I object to this is because I feel that the Hawaiians themselves are a group of people who are not just limited to the native population. There are many people there from the other Pacific islands, as well as from the Orient, and their cultural aspects, or cultural traditions are so different from ours that there would be a conflicting opinion of preserving the English type of tradition over and above theirs.

We feel as though we all like to have public approval of what we do. And if at Christmastime it happens that we all use Santa Claus and they do not feel it is part of their way of life—maybe it is the religious aspect—we are adding an extra conflict into our national situation within the States.

I feel that, on the basis of what I have said, which is just my own personal opinion, we should take great consideration on this particular bill because once it is passed, we have set up a pattern that cannot be undone unless by majority rule of the States or in the House that this particular pattern will be more or less erased from the books; that we do not want to start a new type of situation in the world in which we can just put our brand on any particular country or any particular territory that may be important to us because of a communistic menace today.

I feel as though within a few years from now, maybe a decade or maybe 20 years, communism will not have the same reception that it has today. That is one of the ways in which I feel we have to combat communism within the islands. I do not think that is the best means of deciding at this particular time to make Hawaii the 50th State of the Union.

I think that covers what I have to say.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Fair, for the views you expressed as an individual citizen and for being interested in these matters enough to come and testify before a congressional committee. I want to commend you for it.

I do want to point out, however, that the people of Hawaii are citizens now. There is no Nordic complex involved here; that the residents of Hawaii, if they so desire, could move to the mainland and run for President of the United States, although, lacking statehood, they cannot vote for the President of the United States. So they are

citizens now. They are an integral part of the United States. We are not dealing now with some foreign colony.

As for the question of independence, they have had repeated votes over there. In fact, in the last election the able gentleman who was carrying the banner of the Commonwealth Party I believe got about 1 percent of the votes. There is not any question in the minds of the committee, even the opponents of statehood, I am sure, that the people of Hawaii want statehood.

But, nevertheless, I want to commend you again. I think it is a very fine thing when a citizen of our country feels strongly about something and comes down here and testifies.

Mrs. FAIR. May I ask you a question? I wanted to find out if the Hawaiians had ever been allowed to determine whether or not they would want to be an independent nation rather than an independent State?

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I put it this way: They voted repeatedly on matters which led inevitably to statehood—in other words, the departure from independence, and the vote in each instance has been overwhelming.

Anyone desiring independence, while they did not have that straight question, would vote against statehood or would vote against adopting a constitution which would lead to statehood. I would be very, very much surprised if more than a handful of people in the Hawaiian Islands would favor independence. I think they might regard it with horror. I do not know.

One of these bills that we have before us has a built-in plebiscite. Personally I do not think that is necessary, because last year when we were considering the Alaska bill there was a very serious question in this committee and on the floor of whether the people of Alaska actually wanted statehood.

So we put in a provision that before it could become effective they must vote affirmatively to accept statehood. When the votes were counted, it was about 5 to 1 for statehood.

I think it would be a larger margin in Hawaii if there were a plebiscite.

Mr. BURNS. May I, for the information of the lady, point out that in 1893 a provisional government conducted negotiations with the Harrison administration for the admission of Hawaii into the Union or as a part of the United States; but in 1898 a treaty was made between the United States and the Republic of Hawaii, an actual free and independent nation recognized by the sovereign nations of the world.

The treaty was consummated between the administration of President McKinley and the people of the Republic of Hawaii and as a result of that the Newlands resolution was adopted by the Congress of the United States, annexing Hawaii in accordance with the terms of this treaty.

So that you had a free nation come in and ask and be accepted as a part of the United States.

Mrs. FAIR. I know there are a number of U.S. people who were born here and have gone over there to live. Is there any difference made between the actual people of English or European ancestry in Hawaii voting in favor of this and between those who are actually of Hawaiian or Asiatic ancestors?

Mr. BURNS. Absolutely none.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Are there any further questions?

Mr. ROGERS. Let me ask the lady one question. You say you live in Philadelphia?

Mrs. FAIR. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. How long have you lived there?

Mrs. FAIR. For a number of years, since I was a child, off and on.

Mr. ROGERS. How did you know where to come to testify? You say you heard it over the radio in Philadelphia?

Mrs. FAIR. I heard it over the radio last night. I am here in the District for a few weeks and I heard it over the radio last night late, about 2 o'clock this morning. I have never had an opportunity actually to express myself on this other than in private groups, and so, for that particular reason, I thought I would wait until the House telephone operator got on duty so she could direct me where to go.

Mr. ROGERS. So you called the operator and asked her?

Mrs. FAIR. Yes. So she told me to talk to Dr. Taylor, I believe it is. As a result of my conversation with him, here I am.

Mr. ROGERS. In accordance with what the chairman said, I think you should be commended. I have had some people complain to me that the statements about hearings being held never tell a person where to go or how to find out where to appear and many times citizens are reluctant to push their way in. I think it is very interesting for you to call the operator and have her tell you what to do.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If the gentleman will yield, it demonstrates the ingenuity of the people from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions because the witness has made a very clear and very distinct statement.

You are a citizen of Philadelphia and of the United States; is that correct?

Mrs. FAIR. That is right.

Mr. ASPINALL. Let me ask you, where did you get your interest in the matter of statehood for Hawaii and the interest that you have in the people of Hawaii. How did that come about?

Mrs. FAIR. I think it started long before I was 21, that I could vote.

Mr. ASPINALL. I may say you do not look any older than that today.

Mrs. FAIR. I am 34.

When I left Philadelphia, and I lived in Washington for awhile, I became very impressed with the fact that you could not vote here because, from my 21st birthday, I had always voted in Philadelphia, and when I went out from the convent I did vote.

Coming here, I found that was not a privilege of the residents of the District of Columbia. But I understand Hawaii has that privilege, do they not, that they can vote for the President of the United States?

Mr. ASPINALL. No, they cannot. That is one reason for this bill.

Mrs. FAIR. I know there were certain aspects of citizenship which I probably have enjoyed, such as voting locally and in the national elections. For that particular reason I think I worked with the polls in Philadelphia and I have always really been interested in politics and labor unions, such things like that.

Mr. ASPINALL. Because of one statement that you made about the matter of nationalism and its effect, and the inference or implication

which I received and which I think may be wrong, I want to clear it up in my own mind.

As far as citizenship in the United States or so-called world citizenship, your interest is in United States citizenship as part of world citizenship, rather than world citizenship as opposed to United States citizenship? Do you understand what I mean?

Mrs. FAIR. Yes, I believe I do. I feel world citizenship is really not of my interest. I do not think that world citizenship is the issue right now. I think United States citizenship is not really a part of world citizenship at this particular time because of the fact that the international organizations, as yet, do not represent the world, but more or less a part of the world.

I feel as though until each country has had the opportunity to be recognized as a nation or not, we actually cannot say we have world citizenship. But I was thinking of United States citizenship more or less from a national point of view.

I do not know if that answers your question or not.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, I think so.

Mr. RIVERS. Would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. I wanted to say that Hawaii was incorporated into the Union when it was granted an organic act about 1900. Is that right?

Mr. BURNS. Right.

Mr. RIVERS. And that the Supreme Court has held that an organized Territory, once brought into the Union as an organized Territory, becomes inseparable, incorporated into the Union; and that there is no power in our Government to give away or to cede it to another country, or to grant it independence.

The Philippines had been just a possession, never incorporated into the Union. So we were at liberty to give the Philippines independence, but Hawaii can no more be severed from the Union now that it has been incorporated into the Union all of these years than the Southern States could secede.

Mrs. FAIR. In other words, they really do not have the alternative as I proposed?

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mrs. FAIR. Of being either an independent nation or one of the United States?

Mr. RIVERS. That is correct.

Mrs. FAIR. So just one alternative, continuing the same status quo or being one of the United States?

Mr. RIVERS. That is right. They must remain, you might say, a colonial area or be given full-fledged participation in the Union. And that is what the Hawaiians want.

Mrs. FAIR. I see.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Fair.

Are there any other witnesses in opposition to the bill?

I might say, before closing the hearing, Mr. Lorrin Thurston, who is the chairman of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission, has been faithfully in attendance at all of these hearings. He has not testified, I think, largely because he wanted to expedite the matter, but he played a very important part in rounding up a number of statements that we have in the record. We are very grateful to you, Mr. Thurston.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Aspinall.

Mr. ASPINALL. Do you know of any person, no matter where that person is residing, who desires to appear here in opposition?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I have received no communications in writing or by telephone beyond those that we already have in the record. I have received from no member of the committee the name of anyone who wants to testify in opposition who has not already been heard.

There is no desire, first, on the part of the committee to shut off the opposition or to give it a limited time. We heard all of the witnesses here who wanted to be heard. If it so happens that the great volume is in favor of statehood, that is not the fault of the committee. We have been here as a forum all week, ready to hear anyone. So we must conclude that all of the people who wanted to be heard in opposition have been heard. Certainly no one has been refused.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one more question of Mr. Thurston?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Do you know of any new material, Mr. Thurston, either for or against statehood, which has not been presented to this committee, which should be presented to us before we adjourn the hearings on this bill?

#### STATEMENT OF LORRIN THURSTON, CHAIRMAN, HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION

Mr. THURSTON. I do not, Mr. Aspinall.

I would like to say, Mr. O'Brien, we greatly appreciate the thoroughness with which the committee has investigated the cause of statehood for Hawaii to the completion of the record which will, I believe, run close to 7,000 pages. To the best of my knowledge, every subject possible relative to statehood for Hawaii has been included in the record.

We are deeply grateful for the opposition which has been brought up which has helped to bring more of the truth onto the record.

For me to attempt to name any of the hundreds of people in the House and in the Senate and in the private citizenry who have contributed to the cause of statehood would be utterly impossible for fear of overlooking one.

We believe the record for Hawaii is complete. We stand ready, if any questions do arise, to do our best to furnish you with truthful answers, should they not be in the record at the present time.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have a unanimous consent request that the former hearings held by this committee and all of the hearings held by the Senate committee in the matter of Hawaiian statehood be made a part of the files in this bill.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SAYLOR. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we have under your guidance and jurisdiction given an opportunity to all the folks in America who are interested in the cause of statehood an ample opportunity to appear and be heard.

As you have stated, if the record indicates an overwhelming volume of testimony in favor of statehood, it merely reflects the thinking of the American people and the polls that have been taken from time to

time of the American people who are overwhelmingly in favor of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

I feel that not only the people of the Territory of Hawaii but the people of the United States are deeply indebted to you for the fair manner in which you have conducted these hearings, giving all persons the opportunity to appear and testify.

I look forward to your successful carrying on of the fight for Hawaii statehood on the floor, just as you so masterfully did in the cause of Alaska last year.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think he modestly underplays his own part in that great endeavor and the one that lies ahead.

I would like to say this: I am also very grateful to the members of this committee who were opposed to statehood. They have asked in the last few days some rather sharp pointed questions, but they have not attempted to filibuster, if I may use that word. They have cooperated in progressing this bill to the point where we can send it on quickly to a larger forum.

It is the hope, I am sure, of everyone on this committee that we will have a decision one way or the other of whether Hawaii would be a State before the end of the first session of the 86th Congress.

Tomorrow morning at 9:45 we will start marking up the bill. I would emphasize to the members of the committee that it is most important that we have a quorum here during that procedure. That quorum, I believe, is 16 members.

I have been impressed by the fact, throughout most of these hearings we have had a quorum of the full committee. I especially want to commend the interest of the new members of the committee. I know they have many, many problems at the beginning of a session in getting around and getting acquainted with their various staffs. I personally appreciate very deeply their attendance here.

I hope that when the bill gets to the floor they will put their modesty behind them and join in the fight; and it will be a fight, I am very sure.

So the hearings are formally ended and the committee will meet at 9:45 tomorrow morning to start marking up the bill.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the full committee was adjourned.)





## HAWAII STATEHOOD

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The committee met, subsequent to executive session, in the committee room, New House Office Building, Hon. Leo W. O'Brien, acting chairman of the committee, presiding.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move favorable passage of H.R. 50, as amended.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Second the motion.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that H.R. 50 be sent to the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs for more complete hearings and further consideration.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Does the gentleman from Texas offer that as an amendment to the motion by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS. No.

Mr. O'BRIEN. You have heard the motion by the gentleman from Texas that H.R. 50 be submitted to the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs for further consideration.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Do we not have two motions here?

Mr. O'BRIEN. This is a substitute, a priority motion.

Mr. ASPINALL. As a matter of parliamentary practice, the motion by the gentleman from Texas under the rules of the House has priority. It is the motion before the committee.

Mr. ROGERS. In order to qualify, do I have to be opposed to the bill? [Laughter.]

Mr. O'BRIEN. You have heard the motion by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a rollcall.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman has demanded the yeas and nays. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Texas will vote "aye" and those opposed will vote "no."

The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Anderson?

Mr. ULLMAN. No by proxy.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Aspinall?

Mr. ASPINALL. No.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Baring?

Mr. BARING. No.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Berry?

Mr. SAYLOR. No by proxy.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Burdick?  
 Mr. O'BRIEN. No by proxy.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Chenoweth?  
 Mr. CHIENOWETH. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Collier?  
 Mr. COLLIER. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Cunningham?  
 Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Aye.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Edmondson?  
 Mr. EDMONDSON. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Haley?  
 Mr. HALEY. Aye.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Hosmer?  
 (No response.)  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Langen?  
 Mr. LANGEN. Aye.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. McGinley?  
 Mr. MCGINLEY. Aye.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Morris?  
 Mr. MORRIS. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mrs. Pfof?  
 Mrs. PFOST. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Powell?  
 Mr. POWELL. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Rivers?  
 Mr. RIVERS. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Rogers?  
 Mr. ROGERS. Aye.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Rutherford?  
 Mr. RUTHERFORD. Aye.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Saund?  
 (No response.)  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Saylor?  
 Mr. SAYLOR. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mrs. Simpson?  
 Mrs. SIMPSON. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Sisk?  
 Mr. SISK. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Udall?  
 (No response.)  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Ullman?  
 Mr. ULLMAN. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Westland?  
 (No response.)  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Wharton?  
 Mr. WHARTON. Aye.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Wilson.  
 Mr. WILSON. No.  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Withrow?  
 Mr. SAYLOR. No by proxy, and Mr. Westland votes "no" by proxy.  
 Mr. O'BRIEN. May I have my name called please?  
 Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. O'Brien?  
 Mr. O'BRIEN. No.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, before the vote is announced I would like to examine the proxies.

Mr. O'BRIEN. On this rollcall, the yeas are 6, the nays are 21, 3 not voting. The motion by the gentleman from Texas is not agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I request a rollcall on my motion.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman from Colorado moves that the bill as amended be reported favorably and requests the yeas and nays. The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Anderson?

Mr. ULLMAN. Aye by proxy.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Aspinall?

Mr. ASPINALL. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Baring?

Mr. BARING. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Berry?

Mr. SAYLOR. Aye by proxy.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Burdick?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Aye by proxy.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Chenoweth?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Collier?

Mr. COLLIER. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Cunningham?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Edmondson?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Haley?

Mr. HALEY. No.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Hosmer?

Mr. SAYLOR. Aye by proxy.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Langen?

Mr. LANGEN. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. McGinley?

Mr. MCGINLEY. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mrs. Pfof?

Mrs. PFOF. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Powell?

Mr. POWELL. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Rivers?

Mr. RIVERS. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Rogers?

Mr. ROGERS. No.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Rutherford?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. No.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Saund?

(No response.)

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Saylor?

Mr. SAYLOR. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mrs. Simpson?

Mrs. SIMPSON. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Sisk?

Mr. SISK. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Udall?

Mr. ASPINALL. Aye by proxy.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Ullman?

Mr. ULLMAN. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Westland?

Mr. SAYLOR. Aye by proxy.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Wharton?

Mr. WHARTON. No.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. Aye.

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Withrow?

Mr. SAYLOR. Aye by proxy.

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I have my name called please?

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. O'Brien?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Aye.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, may I have my vote changed from "aye by proxy" to "aye by voice vote"?

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman votes "aye."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, how I am recorded?

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Hosmer is recorded as voting "aye by proxy."

Mr. HOSMER. I will vote "aye" myself.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?

Mrs. ARNOLD. Mr. Berry is recorded as voting "aye by proxy."

Mr. BERRY. I will vote "aye" myself.

Mr. O'BRIEN. On this rollcall the yeas are 25, the nays are 4, 1 not voting. The motion is agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I ask unanimous consent that a clean bill be introduced, sponsored by the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Brien; by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Saylor; and by the Delegate from Hawaii, Mr. Burns; that a report be written on the O'Brien bill with direct reference to the Saylor and Burns bills, and appropriate reference in the report be made to the bills introduced by Mr. Saylor and Mr. Burns and those who have introduced primary bills during this session of Congress.

Mr. O'BRIEN. You have heard the motion. Is there any discussion? It is a unanimous consent request.

Is there objection?

The Chair hears none and the request is granted.

I ask unanimous consent that the following bills be tabled: H.R. 324, H.R. 801, H.R. 954, H.R. 959, H.R. 4406, H.R. 1800, H.R. 1833, H.R. 1917, H.R. 1918, H.R. 2004, H.R. 2328, H.R. 2348, H.R. 2476, H.R. 2795, H.R. 3084, H.R. 3304, H.R. 3437, H.R. 3685, and H.R. 888.

Without objection, these several bills will be tabled.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Aspinall.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. The Chair would like to make a short statement, knowing the members are curious, on what steps will be taken from now on. Of course we will have to play it by ear to a certain extent because we are moving into strange territory.

Personally I am confident that the bill will be placed in the main legislative stream today, will be passed, and passed quickly.

Personally I believe we have an excellent chance of getting a rule, which we were not able to get for Alaska. I hope so, because I have a high respect for the Committee on Rules, and I would hope they would give us the rule so we could move quickly and in a more orderly way than if we had to resort to the other method.

Nevertheless, there is a rule of reason, and we feel that, if it becomes apparent we are not going to get a rule or if it is going to be too long delayed, we will have to, under the authority given to us by the committee under the rules adopted at the beginning of the session, follow the procedure that we did with the Alaska bill. I hope that will not be necessary.

Personally I would hope—I am an optimist, I know—that we would be able to have a vote on the House floor on the Hawaii statehood bill by the Easter recess. If not by then, certainly immediately thereafter.

If that comes about and the vote is favorable, while we cannot and should not predict what might happen in the other body, I think it is obvious to all of us that would give the other body approximately 4 months remaining in this session to act upon the Hawaiian bill.

I personally am confident, as I said in the beginning, because of the overwhelming majority in both Houses favoring Hawaiian statehood, that Hawaii will be the 50th State before this session of the Congress ends.

Mr. ASPINALL. At the beginning of the consideration of this bill the chairman suggested that we would request the present acting chairman and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs to write the report, see that it is filed. The Chair at this time suggests that a week is sufficient time in which to prepare the report, and that those who oppose the bill have until a week from today in order to get their report ready if they wish to file a minority report with the majority report.

Then the chairman of the full committee at that time will request a hearing before the Rules Committee, and from that time on we will proceed—the chairman is generally in agreement with the timetable that the acting chairman has stated.

Timing in consideration of legislation is oftentimes as important as the merits of the bill. We do not intend to jeopardize the passage of this bill by any ill timing that might be desired, that some people might wish. With the statement made by the acting chairman in which he has set the goal of those who support this bill, we will proceed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. O'BRIEN. May I say to the chairman of the full committee as I relinquish the gavel, our business having been completed, that I want to express my gratitude to you sir, for permitting me to preside over a matter which I believe will be historic.

As I have said repeatedly here, the very fact you did it is the measure of the man and indication of the deep kindness that he has at all times.

Mr. ASPINALL. Thank you.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, you were speaking of the rules. Is it the plan of the chairman to see that full and complete debate on this bill is provided for on the floor?

Mr. ASPINALL. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS. Would that not be better insured if you went without a rule?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I reply to my colleague, we shall follow the rules of the House if it is possible to do so, and only use those unusual rules if it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. While we were in executive session on this bill some very kind things were said about two of the principal architects of this bill and its forward movement, and I would like to take this opportunity while we are here in public hearing and on the record in public hearing to express my personal appreciation and admiration for the work done by the Delegate from Hawaii, Hon. John Burns, who has certainly demonstrated statesmanship and legislative ability in his handling of this bill, and to the gentleman who has presided over the hearings, who I think has won the esteem of all members of this committee for his fairness and for his great statesmanship.

I also think great credit is due to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Saylor, for his constructive contributions throughout the consideration of this bill and for the great ability which he has brought to its consideration.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma permit me to repeat something else said in executive session? I think we should pay tribute to the distinguished members of this committee who actually opposed statehood and voted against reporting this bill, who, in our marking-up of executive session contributed constructively to the building of a better bill. I think that is quite a thing for people who want to see the bill defeated but at the same time want to make sure that if we pass a bill it is the best possible bill. And the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas contributed substantially in that direction.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. This is the third time that the chairman of our full committee, Mr. Aspinall, and I have sat in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and have seen the full committee report out a Hawaiian statehood bill. The first two times we were unsuccessful in our attempts to convince the other body that they should adopt our legislation, or similar legislation that could be worked out in Congress, and I certainly hope that this third time is the charm. If we succeed in getting a rule from our great Rules Committee and having the merits of the clean bill debated on the floor of the House, I might say to my good colleague from Texas that I would hope the Rules Committee gave us ample time so that anyone who was in favor of or against this piece of legislation could have a full opportunity to speak their piece and to tell why they were either for or against the bill. Then when the bill is marked up in the House, if there might be any changes that the House saw fit to make in the working of its will, that those changes be made.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS. May I have some idea about the length of debate in the minds of those who will present this to the Rules Committee?

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my good colleague from Texas, I think we took 4 days for the Alaska statehood bill, and that was under a provision wherein each one of the Members of the House had an hour.

Mr. ROGERS. I am talking about the future, not the past.

Mr. SAYLOR. Since we ran out of time on requests by those who were in favor of or opposed to the bill in 4 days, I certainly feel 4 days would be ample time to debate this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Do I gather now the gentleman is committing the chairman of the committee to request the Rules of Committee to grant 4 days?

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman from Texas well knows the gentleman from Pennsylvania cannot commit the chairman of this committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to anything.

Mr. ROGERS. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me to ask the chairman?

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to say a few more words. The gentleman can get his own time.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The gentleman does not yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. The people of Hawaii, but for the untimely death of one of the early kings, would have been a State long before many of the present States of the Union, and I certainly hope that before the 1st session of the 86th Congress is completed the Congress will have worked at its will, will have passed the Hawaiian statehood bill, and that it will be forwarded by the President to the Governor for action in the Territory at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is there any further discussion?

Mr. HALEY. I move we adjourn.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. HALEY. Yes.

Mr. BURNS. May I have the opportunity of expressing my deep appreciation for the personal compliments and for the courtesy and graciousness of the members of the committee in the consideration of this bill. In my judgment the bill was considered thoroughly, every word gone over carefully, and the committee certainly dedicated their time, energies, and ability to it. I want to express my deep appreciation and express the deep appreciation of the people of Hawaii for the expeditious consideration of this matter and the graciousness of the committee.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m. the committee adjourned.)

COMMITTEE NOTE.—Subsequently, H.R. 4221, a "clean bill" incorporating the amendments adopted in executive session to H.R. 4221, was introduced for reporting to the House. A copy of the bill is as follows:

[H.R. 4221, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of this Act, and upon issuance of the proclamation required by section 7(c) of this Act, the State of Hawaii is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, is declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States*

in all respects whatever, and the constitution formed pursuant to the provisions of the Act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "An Act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor", approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949), and adopted by a vote of the people of Hawaii in the election held on November 7, 1950, is hereby found to be republican in form and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and is hereby accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) At an election designated by proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii, which may either be the primary or the general election held pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, or a Territorial general election, or a special election, there

shall be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following propositions:

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

"(2) The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the Act of Congress approved \_\_\_\_\_, and all claims of this State

(Date of approval of this Act).

to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States.

"(3) All provisions of the Act of Congress approved \_\_\_\_\_

(Date of approval of this Act)

reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants or lands or other property therein made to the State of Hawaii, are consented to fully by said State and its people."

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

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

The Governor of Hawaii is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said propositions to the people. The return of the votes cast on said propositions shall be made by the election officers directly to the secretary of Hawaii, who shall certify the results of the submission to the Governor. The Governor shall certify the results of said submission, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(c) If the President shall find that the propositions set forth in the preceding subsection have been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii, the President, upon certification of the returns of the election of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 of this Act, shall thereupon issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President, the Territory of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted into the Union as provided in section 1 of this Act. Until the said Territory is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial office in, under, or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the Territory of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in, under, or by authority of the government of said State and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representative in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representative shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 8. The State of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to one Representative until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representative shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That such temporary increase in the membership shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the Act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13), nor shall such temporary increase affect the basis of apportionment established by the Act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat.

761; 2 U.S.C., sec. 2a), for the Eighty-third Congress and each Congress thereafter.

**SEC. 9.** Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the terms of office of the district judges for the district of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) the first sentence of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and". The second sentence of the same section is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and", "six and", and "respectively".

**SEC. 10.** Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

**SEC. 11.** Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be six years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be six years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

**SEC. 12.** No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution of said State or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceeding shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses. The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

**SEC. 13.** Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District

of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out "Hawaii and" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit", and by striking out the words, "Supreme Courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, as amended is further amended by striking out paragraph (4) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (5) and (6) accordingly;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "United States district courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided*, That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *And provided further*, That service as a judge of the district court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in office as a district judge for the district of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act;

(e) section 92 of the Act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the Act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), as amended, are repealed;

(f) section 86 of the Act approved April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(i) section 91 of title 28, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island"; and

(j) the Act of June 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 217; 48 U.S.C., sec. 644a), is amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,".

SEC. 15. All Territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this Act or by the constitution of the State, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as provided in section 4 of this Act with respect to the Hawaiian Homes

Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States. As used in this section, the term "Territorial laws" includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii) all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to its admission into the Union, and the term "laws of the United States" includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provision of this Act.

SEC. 16. (a) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, (1) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and used for Defense or Coast Guard purposes: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as have been heretofore or hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 17. The next to last sentence of the first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251), as amended by section 19 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 350), is amended by inserting after the word "Alaska" the words "or Hawaii".

SEC. 18. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States or possessions or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports.

(b) Effective on the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(1) the first sentence of section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1156), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory" the words "the State of Hawaii, or":

(2) section 605(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1175), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory" the words "the State of Hawaii, or"; and

(3) the second paragraph of section 714 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1204), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory" the words "the State of Hawaii, or".

SEC. 19. Nothing contained in this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, or to terminate nationality heretofore lawfully acquired, or to restore nationality heretofore lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.

SEC. 20. (a) Sections 101(a)(36) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 170, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(36)) is amended by deleting the word "Hawaii,".

(b) Section 212(d)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188, 8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(7)) is amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the word "Hawaii," and by deleting the proviso to said first sentence.

(c) The first sentence of section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 239, 8 U.S.C. 1421(a)) is amended by deleting the words "for the Territory of Hawaii, and".

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be held to repeal, amend, or modify the provisions of section 305 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 237, 8 U.S.C. 1405).

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

SEC. 22. If any provision of this Act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word, or the application thereof in any circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word in other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 23. All Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.