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Mr. DANIEL K. INOUYE (USA). - Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen. May I have the privilege of greeting you with the world's most beautiful word of greeting. On behalf of the American delegates assembled here and the people of the sovereign State of Hawaii, I say to you "Aloha".

Several years ago, while serving as a member of the Legislature of Hawaii, I had the great privilege of meeting a distinguished parliamentarian from an Asian country. During our conversation, this gentleman asked me a most shocking question. He asked me whether the people of Hawaii were ready to revolt against the United States. After I enquired as to the reason for this question, he replied that he was under the impression that Hawaii was a colony of the United States. Naturally, I proceeded to inform him that we in Hawaii were not only happy, but privileged, to live under the flag of the United States and that we enjoyed the rights and privileges extended to all American citizens. I also reminded this gentleman that the United States, from its very inception, advocated self-government and self-determination for all peoples. I am certain that our brothers and sisters from the Philippines will agree with this.

Throughout her history, our Nation has opposed government by dictation and government by tanks, rifles and machine guns. On August 21, 1959, Hawaii became the fiftieth State of our great Nation. This act on the part of the United States was an eloquent demonstration of her desire to extend self-government and self-determination to all peoples. On July 4, 1960, a new star — the fiftieth star — was added to our glorious flag. On this great occasion, many of our Government leaders remarked that Hawaii would have the great opportunity of serving as a bridge of understanding between the East and the West. This year, the Congress of the United States established in the State of Hawaii the Centre for Cultural and Technical Interchange between the East and the West. At this East-West centre, thousands of students from Asia and Africa will work and study with other thousands of American and Western students. At this centre, we hope to establish good understanding of our problems, to establish mutual respect for each other and to develop solutions for peaceful living throughout
the universe. We are earnestly endeavouring to understand and appreciate the problems, the cultures and the philosophies of the peoples of Africa and Asia. We hope that, at the same time, these peoples of Africa and Asia will begin to understand Americans much better.

In closing, may I, on behalf of the American delegation, thank our friends from Japan for their many courtesies and expressions of friendship. This year, as you know, is a very significant year. It marks the undredth anniversary of the first American diplomatic mission to the Japanese. During the past 100 years, we have had a few moments of trouble and turmoil. We hope, however, that the coming 100 years will be an ear of great understanding, of mutual respect and of strong friendship between Japan and the United States of America.

Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen. At this time, I have the great honour of conveying to you a message from the President of the United States of America, Dwight D. Eisenhower. The message reads as follows:

"On behalf of the people of the United States, I take great pleasure in extending my warmest best wishes to the parliamentarians now convened in Tokyo for the 49th annual Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. It seems particularly fitting that the meeting should be held in Tokyo, since Japan is this year observing the 70th anniversary of its own parliamentary system.

The United States, as a free, democratic nation where human values are held in the highest regard, is profoundly interested in any organization dedicated to the extension of democratic institutions and to the achievement of a secure world where there will be peace with justice for all.

The deliberations of the Inter-Parliamentary Union are of vital importance. It provides a forum where men of different cultures and different backgrounds can meet and discuss the crucial issues of our time. In this way, they achieve better understanding, and better understanding is essential if the nations of the world are to live in peace and freedom.

We support wholeheartedly the work of the Inter-Parliamentary Union."
Events of Hawaii's 1954-55 political season will long be remembered in the Islands and, by right, deserve at least as much attention throughout the United States as the Territory's hula dancers, ukeleles, and flower leis. Beyond affording a modern example of America's ever-active melting pot, these happenings advance further substantial reason for immediate Statehood. Should such status remain beyond reach, they at least argue convincingly for an end to "restricted democracy" in territories of the United States. America's responsibility to its own citizens can never be taken lightly.

Last November a brilliant political eruption, rivaling Mauna Loa's mightiest efforts, shook the island chain. The hard crust of 50-year Republican dominion over Hawaiian politics finally gave way, and Democrats were authorized to organize their first legislature in territorial history. Subsequently, representatives of substantial new majorities tangled with historically dominant social and economic power groups in a legislative battle so dramatic that it staggered the imagination of even seasoned political observers.

Today, inexperienced and frustrated Democrats ruefully admit that November was largely an empty victory. Republicans, with a governor appointed by a Republican President and barely enough senators to sustain a veto, have erased at least the immediate effect of election tallies and Democratic legislation.
More significant than partisan conflict, however, is the fact that popular will in Hawaii today lies prostrate because of the area's territorial status. It would remain so even if party labels during the past year had been reversed. Serious persons of both parties correctly believe that this constitutes a basic and important problem for the entire nation. As citizens of the United States, much as they regret pointing out that this results from their being a part of Twentieth Century Colonialism, Hawaii's people would be less than American were they to ignore or suppress the truth.

Prelude to Political Cataclysm

No one can be certain exactly where or when Hawaii's biggest political story began. World War II was undeniably a powerful catalyst. The war years in Hawaii transformed the area from an idyllic, slow-moving island retreat into a modern, bustling community of half a million persons. New faces and unparalleled prosperity stirred erstwhile timid groups and caused imaginative enterprise to seep from all segments of Hawaii's unique melting pot. Many veterans of the war remained in the islands.

Technological progress breathed new life into the basic sugar and pineapple industries. This, in turn, gave birth to the initial organization of labor. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, concentrating on the basic industries and shipping, became strong almost overnight. American Federation of Labor affiliates found progress slow but substantial in other less concentrated enterprises.
General economic progress quickened. After a lull, military activity increased as the uneasy truce in Korea became a hot war. The tourist industry took root in a fertile environment. Small businesses cropped up in new and often unusual fields. Hawaii, already/community filled with youth, became even younger. Every aspect of life sparkled with new energy, initiative, and hope.

Most significant politically was the fact that large numbers of Hawaii's young war veterans, confident that they had honorably carried more than Hawaii's share on the recent battlefields of war, began or continued their formal education. Many of them journeyed to the mainland for professional training in law, medicine, business, and teaching. By 1950, they were gradually returning home, and a goodly number, for a variety of usual reasons, determined to devote their talent and energy to public service.

Youths of Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, and other extractions knew better than many the basic challenge of World War II. They reasoned well that the ideals of democracy had not been achieved on battlefields alone, but had been developed and sustained by constant work and community service. And, in a more practical vein, they wanted an advanced standard of living as much as any other. As these young people returned, deeds followed decision. Most were aware that they were breaking new ground and seeking opportunities in fields heretofore almost exclusively filled by persons of haole (Caucasian) extraction. But, was there any legitimate reason why these youngsters should not follow their destiny in an integral part of the United States?
Many older persons already well-established in leading community positions applauded this development; others objected. Yet, even most objectors and skeptics could not in good conscience erect insurmountable barriers, although some tried and even today remain firm. They realized that, in spite of misgiving, the trend was established and not necessarily unfavorable for economic development.

**New Faces Enter Politics**

Against this backdrop, in August 1954, several of these young, well-trained veterans, most of them attorneys, decided to offer their services to the voters of the Territory. They filed for public office. Almost in direct ratio to the racial, age, economic, and social composition of the population these amateur politicians decided to follow mainland political patterns and filed for seats in the 30-member territorial House of Representatives. Reasons for running were generally those given throughout the country by young persons seeking public office for the first time. But, these youths carried with them an unusual amount of idealism and exceptional qualifications, if not experience.

Over three-fourths of those filing for legislative posts chose to run under the aegis of the Democratic Party. Here was the party of opportunity, old in name but very young in terms of possessing a local organization worthy of the name. Ranks of the Republicans were filled with incumbents. Successful protest against long-established policy positions would be long in coming within the G.O.P. In the Democratic camp, existing party
leadership, though lacking unity, welcomed them, and the newcomers knew that they could soon carry their new ideals and ideas to the voters. This they determined to do. Moreover, although this choice gave them few, well-organized precinct clubs and only token financial support, they believed, with seeming great naivete, that they could probably win a few legislative seats. They hoped, also, gradually to breathe additional life into their new party.

Veteran political observers gave the hopefuls a chance for considerable success on islands other than Oahu (Honolulu), but calculated their chance for significant victory on Oahu, with its heavy corps of Republican incumbents, as remote.

The amateurs faced a staggering campaign task, particularly on Oahu with its 110,000 voters and its lengthy list of candidates. They decided, individually and often in groups, to let their qualifications speak for themselves and to concentrate on a jam-packed program of new ideas that had been carefully drafted in 1952. (Obviously, they could not compete with Republicans on the basis of in-office experience.) Generally, "the boys," as the hopefuls were often dubbed, waged a vigorous yet inexpensive grass-roots campaign.

The over-all Democratic program was top-heavy with promises, but, notwithstanding, gave evidence of considerable thought about pressing public problems. It was a platform combining protest with considerable utopian imagination. Over and over again, in
hundreds of places throughout the Territory, "the boys" called for a "New Deal-type" program which included:

1. A thorough revision of the Territory's tax laws (which they labelled as "heavily regressive," primarily because of an across-the-board two per cent compensation-dividends tax).

2. Enactment of measures to promote small business and greater home ownership. (Home ownership in Hawaii is substantially less than mainland averages.)

3. Revision of the Territory's land laws to make larger quantities of fee-simple land available for homes and truck farms.

4. Increased support for public schools and the University of Hawaii in order to accommodate increased enrollments and extend opportunities.

5. Increased salaries for teachers and government employees, upward revision of the minimum wage law, and revision of a much-criticized classification plan for government workers.

6. County home rule, in order to relax unusual controls maintained by the Territory over local units of government.

7. Additional social legislation to care for handicapped persons, to increase low payments to welfare cases, and to expand slum clearance programs.

8. A "new" approach to the drive for Statehood.

Campaign Capers

As the general election campaign got underway, Democratic legislative candidates found numerous allies among powerful and well-organized pressure groups. The Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, with some 9,200 members, was thoroughly dissatisfied with the treatment its membership had received at the hands of the 1953 Republican legislature and was more than anxious to vote the "rascals" out of office. The Hawaii
Education Association and its powerful ally, the Parent-Teachers Association, reasoned that a new and fertile political field could be opened if new faces were given political office. Dissident organized Republicans were also eager to replace several incumbents of the House of Representatives who had formed a coalition with minority Democrats in order to organize the 1953 House in a manner repugnant to a majority of the Republicans. And this was not all.

The powerful International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union was waiting and ready to back most Democrats against Republicans who seldom ceased efforts to embarrass and discredit their organization. American Federation of Labor affiliates were also anxious to support a slate more friendly to labor's cause. Even organized community associations outside metropolitan Honolulu were attracted by Democratic "home rule" promises and were willing to extend hopeful assistance. And, most surprising, the Republican Honolulu Advertiser seemed intrigued with the qualifications of young hopefuls and gave only passive help to Republican incumbents.

All of this support lifted Democratic hopes well out of the usual dark dungeon of despair. While Republicans, by their own later admission, waged an orthodox and smug campaign, Democrats campaigned with seeming unlimited energy. Their leaders and speakers issued challenge after challenge, formal and informal, to the Republican candidates. "Let's debate the issues," they said.
Finally, one evening a week before election day, a Republican team led by territorial party chairman, Samuel P. King, son of Governor Samuel Wilder King, appeared, by surprise, at a Democratic rally in a suburban (Republican) Honolulu community and said, "We are ready to debate." Startled by the switch in Republican strategy but unabashed, Democratic rally officials permitted Chairman King to take over as moderator of the debate, with radio microphones wide open.

King opened the Republican case by referring to the "issues," saying, "The issues to me are the campaign of smear and hate the Democrats are putting on against the Republicans -- a vicious campaign of name-calling." Then he read a paragraph from a Communist Party pamphlet which he said suggested that the Communists "fight out the issues" in 1954 through the Democratic party machinery.

Legislative candidate Daniel K. Inouye answered for the Democrats. The young, well-known veteran, who lost an arm in World War II, did not pull any punches. He chided King for suggesting that Democrats were Communist and compared Communism to tuberculosis "... the germs of which are present in each body. If we keep our bodies strong, there is no need to fear it. So it is with the community." He referred to official reports on slum conditions in Hawaii and continued, "What has the Republican Party done to eradicate these seeds? You were given a good example tonight. They scream and call you Communists. They cite their loyalty oath and program against subversives. These
things don't wipe out Communism. They must go after the
conditions that breed Communism."

When the evening's oratory died away, Democrats beamed
and felt their "debate the issues" strategy was paying off.
Republicans tried to explain in the Honolulu press what really
happened that night. Democrats simply rebroadcast a transcription
of proceedings.

On election night, Democrats waited hopefully. Only a
few ventured to predict victory, even though the support they
had received and public acceptance exceeded their expectations.
Tired, perhaps none seriously pondered the possibility that
organized forces of negativism might win an election for them,
but ultimately jeopardize enactment of the positive features of
their detailed legislative program.

Election Victory for Democrats

Election results were conclusive. Democrats could hardly
believe their eyes. Their candidates for the House of Represen-
tatives had won 22 of the 30 seats, including five of the six seats
in Oahu's Republican stronghold. In the Senate where only seven
of the seats were at stake, they won five posts and had nine of
the 15 positions. The only sobering note was the fact that the
new majority lacked the one senate vote needed to override
possible vetos by Republican Governor King. Many, however,
reasoned that, given evident Republican disunity, this might
prove to be no serious obstacle. Whatever future problems,
Democrats had a majority that was larger than recent Republican
Moreover, the election revealed change beyond the shift in party control.

The composition of the newly elected legislature was strikingly different from previous assemblies. The Caucasian absolute majority was no longer in evidence. The House was unusually young. Economic groups varied as never before. And, mirabile dictu, the legislature was nearly a perfect microcosm of Hawaii's diverse and varied population. With respect to formal education, members were, of course, far above the population average. Twenty-one House and nine Senate members claimed University degrees. Two out of every five legislators were attorneys. A sociologist who might wish the legislature to reflect accurately the racial extractions of Hawaii's people would not be disappointed. Japanese and Caucasian groups were present in almost exact proportion to their community-wide representation. Lesser minority groups, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Hawaiian, were also represented.

Eighteen persons under 40 years of age prepared to select chairs in the House as testimony of the Territory's young populace. The average age of House members was 40. In the Senate, the average age was 50, and three were under 40. Eighty-five per cent of both houses were born in the Islands (a figure well above the percentage for the entire population). Sixteen House members and six Senators were war veterans. All but three lawmakers were married. Occupations varied from that of clerk to one of the wealthiest businessmen in the Islands. Most were established persons with substantial incomes, but
several House members had very modest means and by most orthodox political standards would not have seriously considered seeking a $1000-a-term (two years) office.

The relaxation of certain political tensions often tend to tighten others more latent. Post-November Hawaii offered no exception. Social, economic, and racial groups, poorly and often unrepresented in earlier legislatures, viewed the election results with restrained pride and astounding humility. Most groups and individuals that lost power positions responded in like manner. A few groups and individuals became prophets of doom. More than a few privately changed their minds about "immediate" Statehood for Hawaii. Wealthy Senator Ben Dillingham publicly stated that he no longer favored "immediate" Statehood. He gave as his major reason the powerful influence of the I.L.W.U. over island politics. (Local leaders of the union are currently appealing conviction for violation of the Smith Act.) The question of racial bloc voting again became a "hot topic" of political conversation.

Pre-Session Legislative Problems

Newly-elected legislators had little time to spend pondering the sociological implications of the election. After all, this was the legislature the voters had elected. Senators and representatives had a mountain of work ahead. Freshmen, in particular, knew they had to get started immediately.

For years, the territorial budget had been out of balance, and the financial picture was darker than ever. The fact that
over-all taxes were relatively high in Hawaii and educational needs were exceptional added to the financial problem facing the Twenty-Eighth Legislature. What could government do to further promote the tourist business in Hawaii? Could government more actively assist in the development of new industries? Most freshmen were especially eager to implement fully their ambitious party platform. The legislative session was due to get underway in February, and barely three months were available to solve leadership problems and work out the many details of program and procedure.

Leadership selection in the Senate was automatic. Veteran Democratic incumbents William H. Heen and Herbert K. H. Lee became President and Majority Leader, respectively. A high degree of party cohesion had proved its worth to Senate Democrats in the 1953 session and gave promise of remaining strong in 1955. Partisans in the House, however, faced a series of complexities. Thirteen of their 22 members were serving their first terms. The choice for Speaker narrowed to two men, Charles E. Kauhane, a veteran of five sessions, and O. Vincent Esposito, with experience in two earlier sessions. Both were representing the same district on Oahu. Freshmen were not enthusiastic about either man, but were hardly willing or able, had they been willing, to gamble all on an inexperienced leader. Kauhane, the more skilled practical politician, waged an aggressive campaign for support among outside-Oahu Democrats. Oahu's freshmen struggled with indecision. Finally they agreed to Kauhane's selection, but, fearful of his brand of "personality politics," they sought as part of the
bargain to establish a policy committee designed to restrict his powers. Oahu's thirty-year-old Daniel K. Inouye became Majority Leader.

Esposito, prophetically, was more pessimistic than the newcomers about the admixture of Kauhane's "boss-type" tactics and the "party program ideals" of the first-termers. Party Chairman John A. Burns, instrumental in reaching the compromise that elected Kauhane, was full of confidence in the ability of the freshmen to handle any situation which might develop.

Whipping the party platform into detailed and proper legislative form proved no less difficult than leadership selection. Caucus work sessions, indicative of the zeal of the new legislators, revealed that members were far from agreement over crucial parts of the program. Not all members had espoused every major platform plank; some had underlined and pledged their utmost to the entire platform. Outside-island members were less familiar with thinking that had gone into the platform than were Oahu representatives. Freshmen found the gap between the "promise" and the "policy" often unbelievably large. On occasion, they discovered the task of providing flesh for the skeleton of the platform to be extremely difficult.

Long hours of work brought basic decisions and permitted the early introduction of party measures in both houses. But, as individuals, many Democrats were less than confident that pre-session caucus decisions were wise and workable. Bill drafts, hastily drawn, were often in poor form, and several were not well understood even by majority leaders. Objective observers,
knowledgeable of pre-session activity, were inclined to award "A" for effort to Democrats, but wondered whether so many party bills would, in significant numbers, survive the gruelling grind of a 60-day session.

A week before the session opened on February 16, Democratic strategy was public property. They would be ready with over 30 party measures, covering virtually all segments of the party's platform. Hard work and prompt action would place major legislation on the governor's desk by mid-session, they said. This would give them ample opportunity to override probable gubernatorial vetoes. Lacking strength to override the governor, they would, at least, pin-point responsibility for failure on the Republicans; at best, this course would result in their program becoming law. Public pronouncement of this strategy echoed throughout the Territory. Veteran legislative observers were skeptical to a man, but were willing to admit that the new legislators might pull off a "second miracle."

Republican strategy was equally obvious, but was advanced with less fanfare. "Let the Democrats make the mistakes. The Governor is a veteran office-holder and politically wise; our senators will solidly hold the line and sustain vetoes by the Governor," they said. Privately, they calculated the ambitious public strategy of Democrats would fail. They could afford to play a waiting game.

Prolonged Legislative Combat

The organization and procedure of Hawaii's legislature parallels that followed by a typical state legislature. Opening
day, however, is unique. As legislators take their seats in Iolani Palace, which once comforted Hawaii's royalty, unrivaled pageantry and beauty are apparent everywhere around the seat of territorial government. The fragrance of countless flower leis and sweet tunes from ukuleles fill the air. Hula dancers in colorful attire crowd the chambers of both houses and delight lawmakers as much as interested tourists and residents. Oratory seeks to compete with the environment. Whatever the problems facing lawmakers, the show must go on. Democrats were not to be outdone by the many previous shows staged by Republicans.

Usually the first two or three weeks of a session are dull and drab in sharp contrast with opening day festivities. Such was not the case in 1955.

Democrats kept things lively after opening day as they sought to effect a "few changes," which unfortunately omitted organizational change that might have been prompted by party realignment. First, Democrats decided Republicans should sit together in proper parliamentary fashion on the left of the presiding officer rather than to sit, as previously, grouped about the chambers by legislative district. Then, House Democrats discovered that this gave Republicans the coolest seats in the chamber and decreed that Republicans should pay the price of defeat and occupy the "hot" seats. Next, as House Republicans sought out their office assignments, they found themselves placed in what they termed attic quarters -- wholly unsatisfactory, they charged. In the face of such discourtesy to his party, the governor could not sit idle. He ordered temporary buildings
moved to the Palace grounds to accommodate House Republican leaders, in particular. Speaker Kauhane, feeling his authority too, determined that Democrats needed these buildings more, but, in the face of rising public discussion of the "dog houses," relented and allowed space for the Republicans.

Horseplay seemed the early order of business, but behind the scenes bills were reaching the hoppers in record numbers. House floor activity was further enlivened as Republican veteran Robden Portens caught numerous Democratic parliamentary errors and seemed to delight in a tactic that was often obvious heckling. In turn, he received bitter invective which aided his cause. Further, by refusing a committee post and moving from committee to committee as an "observer," he dramatized the fact that Democrats did not allow Republicans to choose their own committee assignments.

Normalcy might have finally prevailed had not cracks in the earth opened on the volcanic Big Island (Hawaii), endangering life and property. This called for an investigation, and most legislators packed their bags for an on-the-spot inspection. Work proceeded at a snail's pace, while Republicans chided Democrats who had severely criticized a 1954 Republican-sponsored "junket" to Washington on behalf of Statehood. And, this was not all. A supposedly secret report to the legislature on subversive activities was read publicly by an I.L.W.U. radio commentator before most legislators had received copies. Who was responsible for the leak? Democrats, sensing a Republican administrative blunder, determined to find out, and, in the best Washington
fashion, lost more valuable time investigating this episode. Meanwhile, observers began to ask, "Where are the deeds to back up the ambitious time-table of the Democrats?" Republicans waited patiently.

As days ticked off, only joint Senate-House budget committees could report substantial progress. Finally, after much delay, major committees got down to work, and public hearings began on major aspects of the Democratic program. Lobbyists descended in droves upon the halls of the Palace. Democratic proposals to develop further governmental assistance for the tourist industry, to force large land estates to sell rather than to lease their land, to give control of police and liquor commissions to the counties, and to extend unemployment compensation to agricultural workers met serious opposition from groups able to hire lobbyists and send protesting experts. These experts found an unusually attentive and conscientious group of law-makers. New legislators publicly urged groups to send spokesmen to them and, in turn, found themselves swamped with witnesses, many of whom had little new to offer. As committee hearings dragged on, one observer noted that the hearings, often conducted by the young attorneys, usually turned into law school seminars. Doubts about the practicability of their program gradually crept into the minds of House Democrats in particular.

Hard work was now the order of business. Long days became even longer as committees sought facts, figures, and opinions. Perhaps no other legislature in the Territory had ever applied itself so diligently. While most House members plowed through
stacks of bills and hearings, Senate business, by contrast, proceeded at a near normal pace.

Not all House members had their faces in reams of reports and hearing transcripts. House Speaker Kauhane, with several members of his immediate family on the House payroll, had special work to do. He managed to get a new civil service code through the House that even Senate Democrats publicly warned would end the civil service effort in Hawaii. As bills slowly came from committees, chairmen were often surprised that Kauhane referred them back to committee for further study or to special select committees. An increasing number of new measures also went to such select committees, all managed by members politically close to him. An occasional protest proved insufficient to alert his lukewarm supporters who in selecting the Speaker had planned a policy committee to restrict his authority. And, horror of horrors, no policy committee had been operating.

Midway in the 60-day session, no party bills had passed to the desk of the governor. By the 50th work-day, the last day on which Democrats could avoid pocket vetoes by the governor, only two major party measures had reached the chief executive. These two measures, which proposed to return control of the police and liquor commissions to county government, were promptly vetoed. Attempts to override the veto failed as Republican senators voted together to sustain the governor. In brief, Democratic plans to force the governor's hand early in the session had failed. The governor now held "life and death" power over all measures sent to his office.
As the session approached the 60th day, business in the House became more hectic. Closed-door Democratic caucuses were fraught with dissension. Kauhane with five close supporters and one partisan who claimed "independence" of factionalism felt the full fury of the 15 other Democrats who, on occasion, seemed determined to unseat the Speaker and risk unfavorable publicity to their party. Whatever the reasoning of the 15 "rebels," as they were called, they found that they lacked the power, namely the 16th vote, to throttle effectively or unseat the Speaker.

Republicans determined to support the status quo, a position which they believed to be politically wise.

The stalemate revealed a situation which prevented either the Kauhane group or the 15 "rebels" from obtaining their wishes without important concessions to the other faction. Floor activity was highlighted with bitter invective and, of course, delay. Angered by the actions of the "rebels," which were well-recorded in the Honolulu press, Kauhane hurled charges of a "second Pearl Harbor" and "The Diet" at the "rebels," many of whom were of Japanese extraction. Resultant tensions made constructive progress extremely difficult.

Meanwhile the Senate wrestled, in particular, with an omnibus tax revision proposal. For a few days it appeared a sales tax would become a part of the measure. Large pressure groups, including the Hawaiian Government Employees' Association and the Hawaii Education Association, joined with groups such as the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce which had backed a sales tax at earlier sessions. The sales tax, however, appeared contrary to
the Democratic program, and, when Republicans placed what seemed to Democratic sales tax advocates an exorbitant price for their support, the Senate passed the plan without a sales tax. Generally, the omnibus bill was in line with the party's platform and called for a sharply graduated income tax to replace the 2 per cent compensation-dividends tax, a new hotel room tax, and increases on other taxes. Since the I.L.W.U. had continued to oppose the sales tax while other groups had relented, Republicans openly charged senate Democrats with following the I.L.W.U. "line." Senator Dillingham led the attack. His announcement that he was not opposed to Statehood climaxed his charges.

As the clock approached midnight on the 60th day, the biennial budget bill had barely cleared the House, and the tax program was stalled. For reasons best known to themselves, Democrats had not officially requested the Governor to extend the session as the Organic Act allows. Some were convinced it was poor strategy to ask; others were convinced the request would be denied in any event. So, the clocks in both houses were stopped on April 29, and legislators continued work for some 28 days, all officially belonging to the 60th legislative day.

During May, Democrats wrestled with Democrats. Friction in the House increased. When the Senate grew impatient with House progress, the furor increased to a roar. Tempers became short as Democrats sought frantically to end an embarrassing situation. An example of this occurred when the Hawaii Congress
of Parents and Teachers (P.T.A.) reminded legislators that its membership of 58,000 would not forget in coming campaigns if funds appropriated for schools fell short of their requests.

This drew angry retorts from legislators. House Majority Leader Inouye told a reporter, "It is very surprising that an organization such as the P.T.A. would stoop to blackmail." These harsh words, coming from a young "rebel" leader, undoubtedly caused public confidence in the demeanor of legislators to dwindle.

The electorate became increasingly restive.

Incident followed incident. On May 11, Kauhane, acting on his own, asked Governor King to grant a formal legislative extension. King refused, saying he could not perjure himself by back-dating a formal extension. House quarrels grew in intensity. Kauhane and his supporters struck out with new boldness. He announced that the Governor's "no new tax" suggestion was superior to the proposal of senate Democrats. A Kauhane backer publicly questioned the legality of the session with the clock stopped and threatened to ask the attorney general for a ruling. He did not carry out his threat, but it caused consternation among House "rebels," who seemed to forget for awhile that this sort of thing had happened frequently on the mainland and in Hawaii. The threat served the "war of nerves" purpose well.

The "rebels" again met and sought ways of confining or ousting Kauhane. As they searched for a solution, Kauhane ordered the House clock started and threatened to end the session. This would have killed virtually all of the Democratic program. The
"rebels," lacking the votes and fearful of Kauhane's threats, ceased their efforts to shackle him.

On May 19, House Democrats voted themselves three weeks per diem pay (such pay had stopped on April 29). Republicans watched with delight. Then open warfare broke out between Kauhane and Senate President William Heen.

Kauhane lashed out vigorously at Heen, charging Senate leadership with "bottling up" the I.L.W.U.-backed bill to provide unemployment compensation for agricultural workers. He was angry too because some House "rebels" met with senators to discuss the general situation. Kauhane was apparently seeking to open the dikes to a full-fledged and not unusual House-Senate quarrel. "I told a senator I felt the House is the judge of its own business and the Senate should not interfere. By their meeting (House "rebels" and senators), am I to believe that the rebels are accepting dictatorship by the Senate? Is the Senate going to dictate to this house? I told the senator that Senate President Heen should be a bigger man. He should not listen to petty gossips and should consider me as the Speaker."

Heen replied firmly but with restraint to Kauhane's official notes. Yet, the deadlock remained. The Senate languished while the House stalled. Public indignation grew.

Finally, on May 25, Senate leadership issued a dramatic ultimatum to the House to pass the long-delayed omnibus tax measure by midnight. The House met the deadline; Kauhane had relented. A second senate ultimatum forced the House to speed up work on the budget. On May 27, the senators stayed in their
chamber and vowed if the House stopped work, the Senate would adjourn sine die. After letting the House clock run to 11:58 P.M. and a series of exchanges between House and Senate leaders, Kauhane allowed the budget measure to come to a vote. The Senate had achieved what House "rebels" could not. Kauhane was found to be bluffing. He was, after all, unwilling to let the session die with most major bills pending. However, before accepting defeat, he issued another bitter public attack against Senate "dictatorship" and added strange words for a party leader. "I pray the day when the people will rise up in protest against this great Democratic party because then it will be my turn to say I told you so."

While the Senate and House quarrelled over the tax and budget measures, other party bills gradually passed final hurdles. With the passage of the two fiscal giants, remaining party measures were cleared; a few failed. At 1:30 P.M. on May 27, the legislature adjourned, after a four day, day-and-night, marathon session.

Last-minute speechmaking gave evidence of remarkable rapprochement in the House of Representatives. Kauhane was humble. "I have tried to do a good job," he said. I would be the first to admit I made mistakes. And I would be the first to ask your forgiveness and indulgence." His bitter critics, the "rebels," replied in kind. "Looking at the score again, I say you will not go down as a two-bit politician. I am sure you will go down as a great politician," said one "rebel." Another observed, "This has been a wonderful and interesting experience . . . . We believe in different ways of doing things, but our
purpose is the same." But, he added, "I am making a full and complete break with politics." Majority Leader Inouye criticized (as did other Democrats) the Republican Honolulu press and summed things up. "You are of the old school and you have had 15 idealistic, naive and earnest Democrats. I can see the conflict. Let us forget the hard words. We have heard 'Pearl Harbor' and the 'Diet' mentioned. Very unfortunate. But we freshmen would like to have the people know that Americanism is not a matter of color, skin, or blood." Kauhane accepted a gift of a silver coffee server from House members before he and others went off to catch up on sleep.

Hiram Fong, veteran Republican and Speaker of the 1953 House of Representatives, expressed well the Republican mind. "If the Republicans had been asked to write the script for the Democrats so they would foul up everything, in their wildest imagination they could not have written a script like this."

Achievement and Failure

As legislators returned home, a few Democrats mustered the energy to call public attention to the fact that they had passed most legislation necessary to effectuate their ambitious program. Others, discouraged by the prospect of wholesale vetoes, went home feeling that most of their troubled labor had been in vain. The 13 freshmen Democrats in the House were, as a group, very weary with the frustration of the 88 day session. A few seemed to get their "second wind." For example, one freshmen observed a week before the end of the session, "I will not run
I am thoroughly disillusioned with people and government. I have found myself forced to compromise myself against principles, a thing in private life I would never do. I'm disgusted." By adjournment day, he changed his mind. "Old politicians never die," he said. "They just smell that way. It was with that thought in mind I said to a reporter last week I would not seek reelection, that I was thoroughly disillusioned with people in government, and had been forced to compromise with principle. But as I realize the accomplishments of the session I somehow begin to like that political smell."

Ironically, it was the Republican Honolulu Star-Bulletin and not Democratic law-makers that breathed a bit of hope into the lungs of discouraged grass-roots Democrats. The paper ran a full page story on the Democratic record and a headline, "Record Shows Democrats Kept Most of Party Pledges."

Notwithstanding dispute and seemingly endless delay, Democrats did succeed in passing over 80 per cent of their ambitious program. Their omnibus tax measure, which substituted a graduated income tax for the compensation-dividends levy and provided a new hotel tax and other tax increases, promised to balance an expanded budget. New agencies were established to integrate governmental assistance to the tourist business and to stimulate the development of new private industries. Additional funds were appropriated for education, and University of Hawaii tuition fees were reduced. Labor benefits emerged from several measures. One bill increased minimum wages to 75¢ throughout the Territory; others raised unemployment and workmen's compensation
benefits (now well above those in most states), and provided a "little" Bacon-Davis Act. Several long-range measures to encourage land ownership and general economic development were adopted. Partisans were especially proud of their civil service and "home rule" legislation. This included a "model" civil service code and wage increases for civil service workers and teachers. "Home rule" bills lifted flat dollar ceilings on county property taxes, removed territorial control over police and liquor commissions and over county attorneys, and authorized the creation of a Charter Commission for Honolulu. A long-delayed, comprehensive insurance code revision was finally sent to the governor.

On the other side of the ledger, legislative action in a number of areas fell short of Democratic campaign promises. No significant legislation relating to Statehood was passed. No party bills concerning the rights of individuals and the control of crime and delinquency were introduced. A "closed" partisan primary measure, promised by Democrats, failed to pass its initial hurdle in the House of Representatives. And, beyond an extension of the existing urban redevelopment program to the entire Territory, no legislation relating to slum clearance was sent to the governor. Bills to extend unemployment compensation to agricultural workers and to enact a much heralded Maryland-type land law which would have forced real estate lessors to grant purchase options on long-term (15 years or more) leases failed to pass.
At least three major mistakes served to blur legislative accomplishment. First, a clerical error appeared and threatened the measure granting salary increases to civil servants and teachers. Although the governor signed the measure, a pending court test may well sustain the attorney general's opinion that the law violates provisions of the Organic Act. Second, through an oversight, the legislature failed to appropriate funds for the decennial publication of the newly completed Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1955. Third, the House of Representatives in clearing up its business found that its funds were exhausted. As a result, the Speaker was forced to seek additional money from the governor's contingent fund, severely slashed by the legislature, in order to pay final bills and provide for the typing of the journal. These errors, duly reported in the daily press, increased public resentment against prolonged legislative activity and heightened Democratic embarrassment.

A Rash of Vetoes

Early Democratic fears that the governor would veto key measures in their program were fully justified during the month following adjournment. When the governor had finished his review, 71 bills (17 per cent of the measures forwarded to him) were dead, most of them dying for the lack of his signature.

Of overriding significance was the fact that the governor had literally "ripped the heart" out of Democratic accomplishment. Never, during 20 consecutive years of Republican legislatures and Democratic governors, had a governor so completely demolished a
legislative program. Now, with the situation reversed for the first time, objective observers became worried over the prospect that a new and perhaps dangerous precedent had been set by the incumbent governor. Governor King seemed unperturbed. He disagreed with the Democratic program and backed up his stand with a record number of vetoes.

Vetoes killed the new omnibus tax program and every significant phase of the long-range land bills. Only the act permitting the creation of a Charter Commission for Honolulu became law, out of the four major "home rule" measures pushed through by Democrats. These included the bill permitting an increase in county real property taxes. Measures relating to forest land and the development of water resources were not allowed to reach the statutes. Legislation to integrate governmental assistance to the tourist industry also went into the waste basket. Included in the rash of vetoes were other measures of less general import, such as (1) a new licensing procedure for safety engineers, (2) a Foreign Affairs Training Program for the University, (3) a request that Congress grant the University of Hawaii title to its lands, (4) tax exemptions for property of major labor unions, and (5) legislation to enable water suppliers to floridate water.

All in all, the governor, undoubtedly feeling that Democrats were at a political disadvantage because of public reaction to quarrel and delay, measured his steps well. He seemed intent upon setting the stage for a 1956 reenactment of the 1954 election campaign. Few persons, whatever their
political faith, could avoid noticing the obvious political implications flowing from the pattern of the governor's concurrency with the legislature. Whatever his reasons, the governor signed the expanded budget bill, but quickly issued orders to his administrators that ten per cent across-the-board cuts in expenditures would be required and only essential positions should be filled as vacancies occurred. He also signed major bills relating to education and labor.

Stagnate Democracy

Today, after a bombastic year, a political lull hangs heavy over Hawaii, allowing politicians a much-needed opportunity for some beachcombing at private occupations. Here and there, of course, a local political headline of general interest appears. Meanwhile, the citizenry is regrouping its thoughts after sustained bombardment. Unfortunately, events most likely to remain uppermost in the minds of voters have done little to disabuse them of general disgust with "politics and politicians" or to calm their frustration over clear realization that new public policy does not, even in a democracy, instantly spring from a mere counting of votes.

Election year 1956 promises to revive events of the 1954-55 political season; only the elements of surprise and novelty will be lacking. Battle-lines are already well-drawn. Democrats will need to win again, even more conclusively, in order to transform promise into reality. Republicans, under the leadership of an energetic, young plantation executive, are
busily regrouping and will seek ardently to develop the new strength necessary to hold the line against reform, forestalled now only by a friendly governor and a single senator. All the while, the 70 per cent of Hawaii's voters who claim independence of party are quietly deciding whether to force somehow improved political behaviour or to "pass the buck" disgustedly to former leaders, whatever their political party, less eager for new programs.

Such a challenge to political party, public personality, and voter is basic to democratic procedures. And, as decision has inevitably emerged from similar situations, the process of meeting such a challenge has historically accounted for much of the strength evident in our form of government.

However anxious to reach such decision, citizens in Hawaii cannot accept their 1956 challenge with freedom comparable to that of mainland voters. Realization that the 1956 presidential election, with its victor appointing Hawaii's governor, may do more to decide what transpires in Hawaii thereafter than local desires, introduces an unusual and stifling complexity. Ramifications of this have already created serious frustration. Levels of public apathy have heightened. Many persons, though still intensely desirous of Statehood, have lost their enthusiasm and merely return a wan smile when someone mentions renewed effort. In short, Hawaii's populace continues to wrestle not only with problems similar to those in each of the 48 states but also with Twentieth Century Colonialism.
No thinking person could suggest that Hawaii's many political problems, well illustrated by recent events, would be magically solved by allowing the Islands to elect their own governor or by a grant of Statehood. Obviously, a governor and a legislature of opposite parties would remain a strong possibility. However, the fact remains that a governor, appointed by the President, has just yesterday negated virtually all acts of a legislature elected by an overwhelming majority of voters. If allowed to elect their own governor, Hawaii's voters would be able, within two years, to correct or continue the impasse as they might choose. As territorial citizens, Island voters are denied this choice. Only the American people and their Congress can remove this barrier to Hawaii's political progress.

The issue is far deeper than a Republican or a Democratic position. Throughout history, there is overwhelming evidence to indicate that people act responsibly only as they possess responsibility. Desirous of Statehood, even local Democrats, beset with the agonizing problem of wholesale vetoes by a Republican governor, failed to pass a resolution asking Congress to allow Hawaii to select its own governor. They held back because of a common belief that such action might damage and further delay the statehood cause. It may be pointed out, too, that an appointive Democratic governor could very well follow Governor King's precedent were Republicans again in possession of a legislative majority.

Pending affirmative action on Statehood, and the case for this is well documented in congressional records, Congress, the
President, and American citizens everywhere have a clear-cut responsibility to remove the restrictions they continue, even by inattention, to impose upon democracy in Hawaii.

Congress can in 1956 allow Hawaii to elect its own governor. Persons throughout the Free World know today, better than ever before, the retarding and sometimes fatal effects of applied colonialism. The American people and their leaders can ill-afford to be complacent.

Daniel V. Tuttle, Jr.
Honolulu 14, T. H.
September 15, 1955