

of Alaska's famous airline owners; and John Butrovich. Butrovich is a Territorial Senator, and knows more about the financial and fiscal affairs of Alaska than almost any man in Alaska. He is currently chairman of a special committee appointed by Governor Mike Stepovich to examine into the Territory's finances and to plan for the future expansion of Alaska as it becomes a State.

Last, but by no means least, were two publishers: Robert Atwood of the Anchorage Times and C. W. (Bill) Snedden of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner. Atwood is the chairman of the statehood commission—Snedden is a member of that commission. These two men worked, silently and effectively, in their chosen field—the news field. They got the story of the statehood fight out to the Nation. They worked with the great newspaper chains of this country—the Hearst papers, the Scripps-Howard papers—and they worked with every news medium they could find, including the very important local daily and weekly newspapers. All of us were aware of this work—it was in the American backyard—and it was effective.

I note that the Senator from Minnesota said that we would be happy to welcome the gentlemen to whom he gives so much credit to this body. I hope that we will welcome whoever the Alaskans desire to send to this body as their chosen representatives. Alaskans are not electing lobbyists this time—they are electing Senators. Alaskans have not had the privilege of sending voting representatives here before—and for myself, I hope that Alaskans inquire thoroughly into the qualifications of the people they elect to vote for them. How do the candidates feel about foreign affairs? How do they feel about high taxes? What do they believe should be the role of the Federal Government as opposed to State governments? How do they stand on national issues—Iraq, communism, foreign aid, and the other problems which beset this body continually? These are but a few of the questions Alaskans, I hope, will ask of those who seek election.

The Alaska statehood battle was won by bipartisan forces. As a Republican, I am pleased that our party representatives voted overwhelmingly to admit Alaska. In this body our vote was 33 to 7—better than 4 to 1—in favor of Alaska. We voted for statehood for Alaska because our party pledged statehood to Alaska in its 1956 platform. We voted for statehood for Alaska because a Republican President, a Republican Secretary of Interior and a Republican Governor urged us to do so. We did this despite the fact that Alaskans have elected Democrats in the past, and, in fact, elected Democrats to come to Washington to lobby for statehood.

But we do not discount the effect of those Democrats—nor the effectiveness of Delegate BOB BARTLETT in the statehood arena. What we do not approve is a one-sided, partisan, review of the statehood movement.

If these people really did do the job by themselves—why did they not get statehood during the last administra-

tion? If they were so effective, why did it take the leadership 18 months to bring the Alaska bill before the Senate during this Congress? I think I can state why, Mr. President. It took the combined efforts of every proponent of Alaska statehood to achieve this victory: the Alaska Republicans and the Democrats; the Republicans and Democrats in the House; and both parties in this body. I feel confident that Alaskans know and realize this is so. They respect and are grateful for the leadership of our President and his effective Secretary of the Interior, as well as the leadership of both political parties in the Congress.

If I had to assess any one reason why the Alaska statehood bill passed during this Congress, I would assert that it passed because both parties wanted it to pass. Let me recall that in the 83d Congress the Hawaii statehood bill, which has traditionally been first on the calendar because Hawaii has been an organized Territory longer than Alaska, was passed by the House and sent to this body for action. Notwithstanding repeated assurances that the Alaska bill would also be considered, by an almost strict party-line vote Democrats joined the Alaska bill to the Hawaii bill. The result is well known—this shotgun wedding ended in early annulment when the House refused to act on a joint bill. So, this year, by not pursuing the same tactic seized upon by the Democrats as the minority party in 1954, Republicans proved their adherence to their party pledge for immediate statehood for Alaska. There is no doubt that the victory was bipartisan. However, Hawaii's defeat in 1954 and her unfortunate position today is something that we are very willing to have the Democrats claim—or at least acknowledge as their responsibility.

I hope we can get on with this statehood business. Our job is only half done. Hawaii waits on the doorstep while we are greeting and congratulating her little sister. Are we to leave the impression that Hawaii, which has been an organized Territory since 1900, is less deserving of statehood than Alaska, which achieved an organized status in 1913? Do we want Americans to believe that our party pledges on statehood are valid only for Alaska—but meaningless when applied to statehood for Hawaii? Are we prepared to leave the impression with Hawaiians and with the world that the people of Hawaii, who first petitioned their Queen to ask for statehood in 1854—104 years ago—are to be left out in the cold?

We Republicans stand ready to offer our support for Hawaii in the same manner we supported Alaska on the question of statehood. Just as Alaska's achievement was not the victory of one party, nor of one group of men, so will Hawaii's final victory be a bipartisan effort. Men of the caliber of Dr. A. L. MILLER, LEO O'BRIEN, JOHN SAYLOR, ARTHUR WATKINS, JAMES MURRAY, THOMAS KUCHEL, FRANK CHURCH, and many others who fought hard for Alaska, will, I am certain, fight just as hard for Hawaii. Our minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], has long been an ardent advocate of statehood

for Hawaii and Alaska. Hawaii's Governor, Bill Quinn, as youthful and as energetic as Mike Stepovich, is likewise dedicated to statehood for his Territory. Unfortunately, the Delegate from Hawaii does not appear in the forefront of the Hawaii statehood action this year.

All we need to achieve statehood for Hawaii now is the same type of cooperation from the majority leadership in both Houses of Congress that we received on the Alaska bill. I feel certain that this cooperation will be tendered when the majority gets around to feeling the pulse of the Nation. Americans everywhere demand statehood for Hawaii.

Let us join together when the job is finished—when both Hawaii and Alaska are admitted—and thank the good Lord for the freedom we enjoy—for the freedom which gives us the power to openly debate the merits of equal political status and for the freedom to admit into our Union full and equal partners—not puppets or satellites.

When we have done that, I think we may well look the world in the face and say to the whole world that there is no territory which is a part of this great country which we have refused admission into the Union for any reason whatever—no matter what reasons other peoples may assign. Unfortunately, the reasons which the Reds, the Communists, the Russians, and their satellites will assign are reasons which are not true, but they are reasons which cannot be answered readily. We in America will take our greatest step forward in one of our great tests to prove that this is really a country where all people are created equal, and retain equal rights, if we admit Hawaii to statehood this year.

We are Americans, and every American can rightfully claim some of the credit for our acting in accordance with the principles and precepts of the heritage we received from our forefathers.

METHOD FOR FIXING WAGE RATES FOR EMPLOYEES OF PORTSMOUTH, N. H., NAVAL SHIPYARD—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 114)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) 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 Armed Services, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 2266, "To provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard."

Existing law and practice governing the setting of wage rates for Department of Defense wage board employees has provided that the Department, in each of the various labor market areas, will follow the wage pattern set by private industry. This has been a most satisfactory arrangement from the standpoint of the Government. It has been generally fair and equitable to the affected

employees and has also been acceptable in the industrial community.

S. 2266 would provide for a departure from this basic pattern of determining wage rates by requiring the Secretary of the Navy to establish hourly rates of pay for all per diem employees of the Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard equal to the rates paid to employees of similar classification at the Boston Naval Shipyard.

Approval of S. 2266 could have broad and far-reaching implications on the entire Federal wage structure, for it would serve as a precedent for combining labor market areas in proximity to one another. On the other hand, it is alleged that inequities exist with respect to the wages paid at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. I have directed the Secretary of the Navy carefully to review this entire situation and to make such adjustments in the wage rates at this shipyard as his review indicates are warranted.

Such wages should not, however, be adjusted by legislation. To do so could ultimately lead to the deterioration of the present wage board system.

For the above reasons, I regret that I find it necessary to return the bill without my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 4, 1958.

THE SITUATION IN LEBANON AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from a very distinguished citizen of my State, Harry L. Turtle dove, on the Lebanon situation; I also ask unanimous consent to have certain other items dealing with the Middle East situation printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of July 21, 1958]

IRONIC

To the Editor: American troops are now in Lebanon, we are told, to protect American lives and, to use Mr. Eisenhower's words, "to assist the Government of Lebanon to preserve its territorial integrity and political independence."

This would suggest that American lives in Lebanon are somehow more valuable than American lives in, say, Cuba—not to mention Iraq. More important, it raises again the question of the Cairo-Moscow threat in the Middle East. Sad experience has shown—first in Syria, then in Lebanon, now most dramatically in Iraq—that violation of territorial integrity plays little or no role in Colonel Nasser's and his Russian friends' plans. Why would it when they can so successfully subvert these hollow states from within without risking military intervention?

Of course, the Egyptians and Russians have aided and abetted the Lebanese rebels—although if the U. N. reports are to be taken seriously the border-crossing question seems to have been exaggerated in this country—but does anyone seriously believe that we have not been just as actively, though perhaps not as successfully, aiding and abetting President Chamoun? It is this miscomprehension of the nature of the Egyptian-Russian threat that made the Eisenhower doc-

trine as irrelevant at the time of its much-touted passage as it is today in Lebanon.

What therefore seems to be our real concern is the political independence of Lebanon. Following the somewhat less than clarian call—never submitted to his democratically elected Parliament or to his people—of President Chamoun our Armed Forces have entered his country to protect its political independence. Is it being naive to wonder what government other than that of Chamoun—or of someone equally committed to our point of view—will now satisfy our test of independence? Or to wonder how long such a government will survive once American troops are withdrawn, if indeed they are withdrawn?

It might provide some needed clarification of American thinking if our action is not rationalized in pseudo-legal and moralistic terms but judged for exactly what it is: An act of desperate expediency, taken in the face of grave risks, in order to keep Lebanon from going the way of Syria and Iraq.

Expediency is, of course, a dirty word in this country; we enjoy believing that it is the sort of thing practiced only by immoral foreigners—that is, those foreigners we don't happen to like at a given moment. But the regrettable truth is that any nation, no matter how high-flown its public moral pretensions, reacts in whatever way it considers necessary to protect its vital interests once it is convinced, rightly or wrongly, that those interests are at stake. We did so with success in Guatemala, the Russians with savage brutality in Hungary, the British and French with ineptitude at Suez.

Incidentally, it would not be amiss at this time—when we who always attach the highest motives to our own international actions, nonetheless, find the United Nations somewhat tepid in their enthusiasm over our unilateral action in Lebanon—to recall the national orgy of moral self-righteousness in which we wallowed, in the U. N., too, as well as at home, at the time of the Suez invasion.

Nothing has happened, before or since, that has so strengthened the position of Colonel Nasser as our behavior at that time. It is at the very least ironic that we—who helped turn the colonel's military defeat at Sinai into a victory for him—must now send our own troops into the Middle East in order to prevent him from scoring still another victory at our expense.

HARRY L. TURTLEDOVE.

MORSE'S ATTITUDE

To the Editor: Naturally, everyone expected Senator MORSE to say "I'm agin it," with regards to our intervention in Lebanon. However, if our senior Senator had some member of his family in that troubled area, perhaps he would change his mind (which he often does).

VERNE M. SOLEY.

RAINER.

WRETCHED STATE

To the Editor: It is a wretched state of human affairs and moral decadence when a country's leaders sink to such a depth as to value someone else's oil more than its own citizens' blood.

CARL SCHNOOR.

[From the Chicago Daily News of July 28, 1958]

LIBERAL AT LARGE—SUBMITS HIS PLAN FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Harry Barnard)

Having recklessly sent troops there, America now cannot avoid coming up with a positive policy for the Middle East.

In this regard, we put ourselves on the spot. The Russian move for a summit meeting, which may turn out the one good result of our impetuosity, was but a turn of an already twisting screw.

A positive Middle East policy calls for much more than just stability. Nor is it enough to add the goal of keeping out communism, without a program for meeting the very conditions which make communism possible.

In the Middle East, as elsewhere, where we seek stability, a social revolution—mainly leftward—is going on.

There will be no stability until this revolution runs its course.

If we are smart, also true to our ideals, we will go along with it, hoping to guide it, even encourage it.

First of all, our policy should include a definite stand, sincerely proclaimed, against all vestiges of colonialism. Many of these remain in the Middle East.

For example, England still has a protectorate over Kuwait, a patch adjoining Iraq, from which alone one-third of all Middle East oil comes.

From Kuwait, British and Americans extract a quarter of a billion dollars a year on a 50-50 basis with its sheik. This vestige of imperialism should go.

If we and our usual partners, the British, extract oil from Arab soil and labor, it should be as managers or, at the most, junior (very junior) partners, not as owners or even lessors.

Those 50-50 oil deals, seemingly so fair in an accounting sense, should not be permitted by our Government. They should be out—forever.

The take of private operators should be related closely, and fairly, to managerial service (and then only if the service is wanted) and not, as now, to ownership in one form or another.

"Middle East wealth for Middle East people" (to support needed social reforms)—that should be our basic principle. This is not followed by deals private operators make with assorted kings, sheiks, and even presidents, most of whom exploit their own people and are but window dressing for artificial states that cannot stand except as we or England prop them up.

We should insist that the British, Dutch, French, and all other Europeans, Russians included, adopt this policy. Then we, not the Russians, become the champions of Middle East progress.

This calls for self-denial. It calls for placing social welfare above shortsighted military policy which, in view of the new weapons, is unrealistic at the root anyway.

If we do this, then we not only win the friendship of the Arabs. We also win the right to advise them on two matters much more important than incidental political situations in Iraq, Lebanon, and Jordan, or the activities of the Russians.

One such matter concerns Nasser, who operates much too much like Hitler. The Arabs won't listen to our warnings about Nasser—nor will he—unless we convince them of our good intentions.

The other matter concerns Israel.

Israel has the right to exist, or there is no moral conscience in the world. The Arabs must learn to accept Israel as the first step toward fruitful friendship that ought to replace the destructive antagonism that now exists.

Through the United Nations, we can and must insist upon this, but again only because sympathy for legitimate Arab aspirations gives us that right.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

A REPORT ON IRAQ

If an inquiring mind wanted to penetrate beneath the superficialities of Iraqi politics which showed at the surface of Nuri es Said and cohorts (apparently the only aspect of Iraq visible to our State Department), it would discover just what Morris described. Outside