
**PROVIDING FOR THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF
HAWAII INTO THE UNION**

AUGUST 30, 1957.—Ordered to be printed under authority of the order of the Senate of August 29, 1957

MR. MALONE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted the following

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany S. 50]

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported S. 50 favorably to the Senate, and is expected to report S. 49 the same. I voted in committee against these bills to provide statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and submit herewith for consideration by the Senate the reasons for my opposition.

Since first elected to the United States Senate, I have consistently voted against Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood mainly because this Nation has never granted statehood to any noncontiguous territory; and it is not conceivable to me that at this time we could ever have a homogeneous people through the acceptance of offshore areas widely separated from the mainland, where perhaps not over 1 percent of the inhabitants would ever visit the mainland. In these noncontiguous areas, a great bulk of the people have no direct knowledge of life and conditions in the United States, and because of this their ways of life are different from ours. Consequently, they are much more vulnerable to infiltration by the exponents of ideologies and theories which are contrary and dangerous to the American philosophy of life and government.

In Hawaii, the Communist-infiltrated International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union is all-powerful. The political life of the islands is controlled and dominated by this union and through Hawaiian statehood, Moscow, in effect, could achieve representation in the United States Senate.

The acceptance of a noncontiguous territory like Hawaii or Alaska—and they would all be clamoring for admission if we granted the privilege to one—would result in a disruption of the balance of power in our legislative form of government. It is entirely within the realm

of possibility that a group of Senators, representing a way of life not in accord with ours, could easily control a balance of power in the United States Senate. Hawaii has one three-thousandths of the population of the United States, and if admitted to the Union would be given one forty-ninth of the total vote and power in the Senate. If Alaskan statehood which is also before the Senate is approved, both the Territories would be given one twenty-fifth of the total vote and power in the Senate.

In denying statehood to these noncontiguous Territories, I do not propose that we keep them as subject colonies. In 1953 I introduced a self-government bill for Hawaii and a similar bill for Alaska was introduced by the late Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska. I have introduced in this Congress S. 35 and S. 36 to provide for the election of a governor and for the adoption of a constitution, approved by the Congress of the United States and by the people of the Territory involved, for both Hawaii and Alaska. The bills also provide for the appointment of the justices of the supreme court of the Territories by the governor and with the consent and advice of the senate of the Territories in each case.

Senate bill 36 provides that the people of the Territory of Hawaii may organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption and specifically states that such a constitution shall provide a republican representative form of government and shall include a bill of rights subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States.

I believe that is the proper step in government for all Territories of the United States which are of sufficient size and importance to merit such self-government.

The commonwealth status that my bill provides does not impose second-class citizenship upon the residents of Hawaii. Quite the contrary; they would be almost completely independent. They would govern themselves and they would have from \$135 million to \$140 million a year that now goes into Federal taxes, to improve an economic system which has been operating in the red for some time. As a self-governing state freely associated with the United States, using the same postal system and with the courts of law associated with our Federal courts, as our State courts are at the present, Hawaii could develop to the full extent of its capabilities through the foundation of new industries to utilize its reservoir of skilled labor and the same situation may be made applicable to Alaska.

I was 1 of 5 Senators who visited Puerto Rico in 1947. The question of statehood for that area was just as hot then as the Hawaiian and Alaskan question is now. At that time we recommended against statehood and suggested complete autonomy, subject, of course, to the provisions of the United States Constitution. This was done and in 1952 Congress approved the Puerto Rican constitution.

Today, after 7 years of self-government, Puerto Rico has raised itself from a situation once described by our committee as unsolvable because it was ridden with disease, slums, and poverty, to a standard of living reported to be the highest in the Caribbean. Puerto Rico has not forgotten statehood by any means, though its government is working very well and the people are not complaining.

If we admit Hawaii and Alaska to the Union, we will be establishing a precedent that will be used by other noncontiguous and island areas

as support for their statehood arguments. I should like to emphasize strongly that our own independence of thought and action is involved. Our own independence to determine the course which the United States wishes to pursue in national and international policy is indelibly linked to what we do with the Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood bills.

It has been argued that the way to stop wars is for the United States to take in many outside areas, foreign nations or states, and that by taking them into a "United States of the World" and giving them representation on the Senate floor we would stop the incentive for wars. Many international organizations, believing as they do that the sovereignty of this Nation should be sacrificed to a world organization, are sincere in their advocacy of even European nations being admitted as States.

Once we had relinquished the rule that we shall not take into the Union any territories outside the North American Continent, what reason could we give, once a precedent was established in Hawaii and Alaska for not granting similar statehood to the Philippines, Okinawa, Samoa, Guam, and many others? The French people started the practice of admitting their colonial areas' representatives to their Assembly many years ago. The resulting instability of that body should make other countries wary of the practice.

We are dealing with a much wider question with broader implications than those who support these bills would have the Senate believe. I am firmly convinced that once we break the precedent on noncontiguous areas, there is no stopping place. We must remember that granting statehood to Hawaii is an irrevocable act and once it is done it cannot be undone.

Congress must proceed with the utmost caution and with the fullest deliberation of these issues which affect such a radical change in the structure of our Government and our external relations.

GEORGE W. MALONE.

○