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 for statehood—organized by the Anchorage Times and C. W. (Bill) Snedden of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner. Atwood is the chairman of the statehood commission—Snedden 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. They were the very important local daily and weekly newspapers. All of us were aware of this work—it was in the American background—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 he will welcome the Alaskans who desire to send to this body as their chosen representatives. Alaskans are not electing lobbyists this time—they are electing Senators. Alaskans are electing democratic voting representatives here before—and for myself, I hope that Alaskans inquire thoroughly into the qualifications of the people they elect to vote for. 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 in State affairs? How do they stand on national issues—Iraq, communism, foreign aid, and the other problems which beset this body continuously? 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.

Do we 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 administration? 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 for the Senate; 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, 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 83rd Congress the Hawaii statehood bill, which has traditionally been first on the calendar because Hawaii has been an organized Territory longer than Alaska, was voted down, was reintroduced, and went before 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, in a sense the 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. I 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. We have not yet begun to do the other thing, which is the most important thing, door to door 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 1912? 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 earnest manner in which we supported Alaska’s achievement. We know that the issues involved in the question of statehood must be treated differently. But we do not want to make it appear that the question of statehood for Hawaii was so easy as it was for Alaska. We Republicans pledge statehood for Hawaii, but we also should prove that we want to give Hawaii the same rights and privileges as the other states.

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 markets which are followed by 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 management 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 adjudicated. 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, as follows:

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record his complete statement.

The EDITOR: Naturally, everyone expects substantial amendments to be made in the Eygptian-Russia deal at the Suez invasion. To the EDITOR: Naturally, everyone expects substantial amendments to be made in the Suez invasion. To the EDITOR: Naturally, everyone expects substantial amendments to be made in the Suez invasion. To the EDITOR: Naturally, everyone expects substantial amendments to be made in the Suez invasion. To the EDITOR: Naturally, everyone expects substantial amendments to be made in the Suez invasion.

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

Incidentally, it would not be amiss at this time—when we who always attach the highest possible value to the expression of our principles—nevertheless, find the United Nations somewhat tepid in its enthusiasm over our unilateral action to recall that the national orgamy of moral self-righteousness in which we wallowed, in the U. S. 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 him back to his base in Egypt, which we wallowed, in the U. S. N., too, as well as at home, at the time of the Suez invasion.

The other matter concerns Israel.

If we and our usual partners, the British, French, and all other Europeans, Russians and Fascists (apparently the only aspect of Iraq that 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 him back to his base in Egypt, which we wallowed, in the U. S. N., too, as well as at home, at the time of the Suez invasion.

Israel has the right to exist, to be independent, to be Jewish. Let us hope that it will not become nothing but a refugee camp, let us hope that it will not become a state that 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 him back to his base in Egypt, which we wallowed, in the U. S. N., too, as well as at home, at the time of the Suez invasion.

The other matter concerns Syria. Syria has the right to exist, to be independent, to be an Arab state. Let us hope that it will not become nothing but a refugee camp, let us hope that it will not become a state that 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 him back to his base in Egypt, which we wallowed, in the U. S. N., too, as well as at home, at the time of the Suez invasion.

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 world, therefore, must learn to accept the first step toward fruitful partnership 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 beyond the superficialities of Iraqi politics which showed at the surface of Nuri es Said and cohorts (apparently the only aspect of Iraq visiting our State Department), it would discover just what Morris described. Outside