

I also oppose statehood for Alaska. Some Senators have asked on the floor of the Senate why the junior Senator from Texas and other Senators who are opposed to statehood for both Territories should have voted to tie Alaska to the Hawaiian bill. I have explained, and I wish to repeat, that, in my opinion, geographically Alaska is situated better for statehood than is Hawaii; that actually, in my opinion, a better case was made for the admission of Alaska; and that I do not believe it would be fair to admit Hawaii and not admit Alaska as a State at the same time. Of course, I was motivated in my vote, further, by the fact that it might be possible, by tying the two Territories together, to cause the defeat of the entire measure in the House of Representatives.

But I wish to repeat, Mr. President, that many Senators who are opposed to the entry of the two Territories as States voted as they did because it was felt that if Hawaii were admitted, Alaska also should be admitted at the same time.

The four reasons for my opposition to Hawaiian statehood are as follows: First, the nearest Hawaiian Island is more than 2,000 miles from the west coast of the United States. I believe it would be a bad precedent to admit to the Union an island Territory which is noncontiguous to other States, and which forms no part of the American continent.

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

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the Senator from Texas observes, as I do, that there are now on the floor only 1 Republican Senator and only 3 Democratic Senators. In view of that, does the Senator from Texas recall the number of Senators who were in attendance at the time hearings were held on Hawaiian statehood, and the number of Republican Senators who were present?

Mr. DANIEL. I may say to the Senator from Florida that at times, I think, only the chairman or the acting chairman was present, especially when we had before the committee witnesses who testified with respect to the influence of the Communists upon the economy and the political life of the islands.

Members of the Senate who would jump to investigate communism anywhere else in the United States, or in any of its Territories, seemed not to want to go into the matter in Hawaii. Yet I will say frankly that I have not seen evidence of so much Communist domination of the economy or political life in any part of the United States or its Territories as I have seen with respect to Hawaii.

The Senator from Florida is correct; very few members of the committee were present to hear the testimony. It simply seems that the people of the United States have taken it for granted that it would be desirable to admit the two Territories as States. It would be so nice. It would do so much good for the people who want to have their Territories become States.

The political platforms of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties have said it would be all right to admit the Territories as States, and we seem to take it so much for granted that I feel the entire trouble is that a great many Members of the Senate have not gone into the facts and have not heard the evidence which some of us are trying to bring out on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished junior Senator from Texas is making a very able speech and is bringing out some very important facts. I wonder if he would agree to a unanimous-consent request that I be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum, without his losing the floor, so that other Senators may be present to hear what the distinguished junior Senator from Texas is saying.

Mr. DANIEL. I appreciate the desire of the senior Senator from Texas, and I will yield for the purpose he has suggested, although I may say that I am afraid that too many Members of the Senate are not interested in hearing a discussion of the issue. Nevertheless, I appreciate the efforts of my distinguished colleague, and I should be glad to afford an opportunity to other Senators to hear my remarks.

Mr. President, I yield for the purpose suggested by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one other question?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator from Texas have any idea where other Senators are getting their information on which they expect to base their votes, if they did not attend the hearings and if they do not listen to the debate? Does the Senator know where they are getting their information?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes. Some of our colleagues get their information from the platforms of the parties.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does not the Senator agree that the bill now pending is probably one of the most important measures which will be considered by the present Congress, and that if once favorable action is taken, it cannot be undone; once we get a new State into the Union, we can never get it out; and that we would set a precedent which would forever after plague us? Yet our colleagues are not concerned with hearing debate on this important question. Does not the Senator think that is a sad commentary?

Mr. DANIEL. I agree with the Senator that if we admit into the Union a non-contiguous island Territory which is not within the continental limits of this country we will be setting a precedent with respect to other Territories and islands. The Republican platform states that that party is in favor of ultimate statehood for Puerto Rico. The Virgin Islands, Guam, and many other of the island Territories will ask for statehood.

The second point which I shall bring out in a few moments by citing facts

and figures is that every Senator who votes for statehood for the two Territories will be voting to give up one twenty-fifth of his State's and his people's proportionate representation on the floor of the Senate, and to bring in new Senators who can cancel out the votes of any four Senators present on this floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President—

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum without the Senator's losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

|             |               |              |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Anderson    | Hill          | Monroney     |
| Barrett     | Ives          | Payne        |
| Bush        | Johnson, Tex. | Purtell      |
| Butler, Md. | Kefauver      | Smathers     |
| Daniel      | Kerr          | Smith, Maine |
| Duff        | Knowland      | Watkins      |
| Ellender    | Lehman        | Young        |
| Gillette    | Malone        |              |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of the absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LENNON, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

WILHELM ENGELBERT—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 106)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accom-

panying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

*To the United States Senate:*

I return herewith, without my approval Senate bill 153, a bill for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert.

This measure would grant the status of lawful permanent residence in the United States to Mr. Engelbert upon payment of the required visa fee.

Mr. Engelbert is a native and citizen of Germany who was born in Dortmund, Westphalia, on July 27, 1905. He entered the United States illegally on December 31, 1926, as a deserting seaman, with the intention of remaining here permanently.

Between 1926 and the outbreak of World War II in 1939, the alien did nothing to regularize his status in the United States. In fact, according to the record set forth in the committees' reports upon this bill, his actions indicate clearly that he thought of himself as a German and showed his allegiance time and again as that of a German national.

After the United States entered World War II, Mr. Engelbert was interned as an enemy alien. He remained an internee until July 1, 1948. In due course a warrant for his deportation to Germany was issued in 1943. This warrant, issued on grounds of illegal entry, was outstanding at the time of his release from alien enemy proceedings. Applications for reconsideration and reopening of the deportation hearings have been denied by the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Although it appears that to a certain extent Mr. Engelbert's motives in becoming a member of the Nazi Party, registering for service in the German Army, equipping himself with German money to defray the cost of a trip to Germany, and other acts demonstrating allegiance to Germany, may have been dictated by a desire to assist his mother and to obtain legal entry into the United States, the fact remains that he did nothing to regularize his status for some 12 years. Furthermore, from 1939 until the end of World War II there is nothing in the record of this case to indicate that Mr. Engelbert showed real willingness to accept the responsibilities of a permanent resident of the United States. On the contrary, he sought repatriation to Germany during the war and it was not until after victory had been assured in Europe in 1945 that he withdrew his application and requested adjustment of his immigration status.

Under these circumstances, I see no basis for setting aside the requirements of the immigration law.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1954.

**MRS. MARGARETH WEIGAND—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 105)**

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying

bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

*To the United States Senate:*

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (S. 502) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand.

Kurt F. Weigand, the son of Margareth Weigand and a German citizen resident in the United States, was interned in 1942 as an enemy alien. Following his release from parole in 1945, he died in Fargo, N. Dak., by accidental drowning. Owing to his coverage under the Social Security Act, his mother, a resident and citizen of Germany, became entitled to a lump sum death benefit award. The amount of the award was vested in the Attorney General by Vesting Order 17973, dated May 31, 1951, which was issued in accordance with the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act. This bill would provide for the return of the amount so vested to the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand. Mrs. Weigand was alive at the date of issuance of the vesting order.

Section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, in general prohibits the return of property or interests in property vested from nationals of Germany or Japan unless such nationals are eligible for return under the provisions of section 32 of the act. Mrs. Weigand did not file a claim under section 32 for return of the amount vested, and the record contains no indication that she would have been eligible for return. Her ineligibility would disqualify her successors in interest. If ineligible, the enactment of the bill would authorize the transfer of the property to the beneficiaries of her estate contrary to existing general law.

Moreover, even if these beneficiaries were eligible for the return of the property, this bill would bestow a preference on them by setting aside the claims procedures prescribed by general law. There is no apparent reason for singling out the beneficiaries for preferential treatment of any nature.

The reasons urged in support of this measure would equally apply to the cases of thousands of other enemy nationals whose property in the United States was vested pursuant to the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1954.

**NEW MEXICO SENATORIAL ELECTION CONTEST**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I announced to the Senate that I intended to propound a unanimous-consent request with respect to the New Mexico senatorial election contest. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement was read for the information of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement

be read again for the information of the Senate now that we have had a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will state the proposed unanimous-consent request.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Ordered.* That on the calendar day of Tuesday, March 23, 1954, at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate, upon any amendment or motion, if any, proposed to the resolution (S. Res. 220) recommending that no Member of the Senate was elected from the State of New Mexico in the 1952 general election, and upon the said resolution.

*Ordered further.* That the time between 12 noon Monday, March 22, and 5 p. m. Tuesday, March 23, be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the said resolution and controlled, respectively, by Mr. BARRETT and Mr. HENNINGS.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the benefit of Senators who were not in the Chamber when the subject was previously discussed, I should state that it was the desire of Senators on the other side of the aisle and of Senators on this side of the aisle that the Senate may have a period of more or less uninterrupted debate on the subject, inasmuch as the seat of a Member of the Senate is involved. Under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement 2 days of debate on the contest would be provided, with the time to be equally divided.

It was also the desire on the part of Senators on both sides of the aisle that a day and hour certain be set for the debate and the vote so that Senators who intend to leave the city would have advance notice of the consideration of the resolution, and could arrange to return to the city, or would not make engagements which would take them away at that particular time.

So far as I am concerned, I wish to do everything possible to comply with the desires of Senators on the other side of the aisle, and I have told them that if Tuesday is not satisfactory I would be perfectly willing to agree to Wednesday, Thursday, or any other day.

In fairness to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], whose seat is involved, and in fairness to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I believe a specific date should be set.

Of course, it is true that on Monday I could move to displace the unfinished business and to take up the resolution, and following its disposition I could move that the Senate return to the consideration of the unfinished business. That, however, would not fix a date and hour certain, for the debate and the vote, unless subsequently a unanimous consent agreement were entered into. That would mean that Senators would not know until next week on what day or hour the New Mexico election resolution would be taken up.

It is entirely immaterial to me, because I expect to be here all of this week and all of next week, and for the balance of the session. However, I know that some Senators must attend to official business out of the city and that other Senators have important engagements which must be met, and which have been