

Inouye's campaigns: 1962: Speakers' Kit

Senator Daniel K. Inouye Papers
Campaign files, Box CP7, Folder 8
<http://hdl.handle.net/10524/62331>

Items in eVols are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

UHM Library Digital Collections Disclaimer and Copyright Information

Fact Sheet Introduction

The whistle will blow October 7 for the start of the 30-day drive for an Inouye victory in the general election in November.

This will not be a tea party. It will be a tough, hard fight and none of us can afford to let down for a minute.

We're up against a candidate known for his hard campaigning and we don't intend to sell him short. He has launched a drumfire attack against Dan and his "made in California" campaign has plenty of money and brains behind it.

Enclosed you will find a series of fact sheets for your information and use in the campaign. These have been carefully researched and documented. More such information will be on the way to you within a few days.

Every person that you can acquaint with the facts in this campaign is another possible voter for our candidate. And be sure to get this word to the opposition whenever and wherever you can.

Dan will make his position clear on every major issue in this campaign. He will show that he is not a rubber-stamp--that he has not sold Hawaii short. He will show that he is a fighter, a leader and the only man who can best serve Hawaii and our country. He will show that his opponent is a right-wing conservative voice of the past--a past that is long dead in the land.

Know The Opposition

Ben Dillingham is the one man who stands between Dan Inouye and a six-year term in the U. S. Senate.

Our battle with him centers around two main points:

1. Political ideology--progressive Democratic legislation in the domestic field coupled with an effective foreign policy as opposed to anti-social measures in the form of right-wing conservative legislation and a return to near-isolation or a dangerous "let's fight" foreign policy.
2. Dan's record in the Congress as a representative of the people of Hawaii.

We'll provide all the information you need to back up Dan's position on those two main points. But let's take a look at Dillingham's record.

His eight years in the State Senate show a shocking lack of confidence in the people of Hawaii and their elected representatives.

The record shows that Dillingham actively fought to:

1. Deny the people of Hawaii the right to choose their representatives in the U. S. Senate although he now seeks to be their voice in that powerful body of men.
2. Deny the people of Hawaii the right to choose their representatives in the U. S. House of Representatives.
3. Deny the people of Hawaii the right to elect their own Governor.
4. Deny the people of Hawaii the right to administer and control their own lands.
5. Deny the people of Hawaii the many economic gains generated by the Admission Act--gains which we might have enjoyed years sooner had it not been for the anti-Statehood fight actively led by Dillingham and his father.

Dillingham's anti-Statehood remarks, his mockery of the Territorial Legislature, his claims that the Democratic House of Representatives was dominated by the ILWU in 1955, all provided death-dealing ammunition for anti-Statehood foes in Washington and may well have tipped the scales against Statehood because it swayed the fence-sitters on the issue against the people of this state.

Rep. Leo O'Brien, D-New York, a onetime veteran New York Times newsman, and longtime supporter of Statehood for Hawaii, gave Dillingham full credit for the defeat.

Rep. John R. Pillion, R-New York, a longtime foe of Statehood, used Dillingham's attacks against Statehood and the Democratic House to bolster claims that the 1955 legislative session--which marked the beginning of progressive Democratic legislation in the islands--was a "Communist holiday". Pillion went beyond that to warn of the dangers of a "Communist police state" in the islands.

Only two men in that entire Legislature stood against Statehood. Both were Republican senators and one was Ben Dillingham.

In that year of 1955, Dillingham told the world that if it were not for the Republican governor whose veto stood between the Legislature and chaos: "We would be closer to a satellite of the Soviet Union than a territory of the U. S. and I'm not kidding."

Dillingham said, "We are not ready for Statehood now. Maybe in ten or fifteen years; with a little luck, in eight years. But not now."

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, a conservative Republican voice in the community, took Dillingham to task in an editorial:

"Let's make one thing awfully, awfully clear. We don't believe our Legislature is dominated by ILWU leadership."

The editorial went on to say that ILWU leaders had had too much influence in the Legislature, but that this was vastly different from saying that ILWU leaders dominated the Legislature as a body. And it wound up with this comment on Dillingham:

"As for the senator's changing his stand on Statehood, why we would have to know where he stood in the first place before we could comment on that."

Perhaps one Democratic senator summed it up best when he said of Dillingham's position: "One would surmise that anytime a Hawaiian Legislature is controlled by other than Republicans it would mean control by Socialists or Communists."

Dillingham's thinking has not changed. He raised socialist and communist bugaboos in 1955 and he is doing it again in 1962.

The fact that more than two out of three people in Hawaii voted for Statehood in Hawaii as early as 1940 meant nothing to Dillingham.

Yet in 1956 he conceded that the 1955 Legislature "was as true a cross-section of Hawaii as you will see." Now he claims he can best represent the true cross-section of the people of Hawaii.

What is the evidence to show that Dillingham has developed a more mature, responsible view since 1955?

As Oahu Republican chairman in 1959, he made a vicious attack on the Legislature, calling it "the sorriest, most despicable and shameful in the long history of Hawaii." He called the elected members "a bunch of bullies....tyrants....arrogant" and said some of them were on their way to becoming "the same kind of dictators" as "Hitler and Tojo and their kind."

To back up these charges he cited an example: Democratic legislation which sought to bar the Oahu Railway and Land Co. (a Dillingham subsidiary) from getting a quitclaim deed to ten acres of Iwilei land which it had obtained in a grant from King Kalakaua to be honored as long as the company operated a railroad on the Island of Oahu.

"I challenge that donkey leadership down at the Legislature to match the record set by my family," he sneered.

During those years between 1955 and 1959, Dillingham voiced his opinion on other subjects.

He compared people to rabbits in a Senate committee discussion on the need for more schools, later apologized to irate listeners.

He charged that a bill to make November 11--Veterans Day--a legal Territorial holiday to honor veterans was a "disgrace" and showed signs of "moral decadence" in the community.

He charged that Civil Service was a "Frankenstein monster" and, later, "a threat second only to the Communist threat."

And what of the "new" Dillingham in 1962.

He was first to raise the racial issue in the current campaign when he charged that Dan tried to limit the number of Nisei candidates to assure success at the polls.

He said the people of Hawaii must "prove we are worthy of Statehood by showing our maturity."

He said that, as a state, Hawaii was "not yet what I could honestly call a 'blue chip.'"

He and his committee broke faith with the Japanese Junior Chamber of Commerce by violating an agreement not to publicize details about negotiations on a Dillingham-Inouye debate.

Dillingham says he proposes leadership that recognizes "human dignity and individual liberty." There is not one shred of evidence in his record in public life to support that statement. As we all know, freedom is possible only if one respects the freedom of others.

But perhaps we should let the candidate describe himself in his own words. In the past two years he has described himself as follows:

"I'm a conservative."

"I'm a conservative liberal."

"I'm a liberal, but not a damn starry-eyed liberal."

"A Jeffersonian Democrat."

A seasoned political reporter saw Dillingham early this year as the Hawaiian counterpart of Barry Goldwater.

And then there's this view of Dillingham by Republican U. S. Senator Hiram Fong, who, as Speaker of the House in 1951, had this to say about Dillingham's record after four years in the Legislature:

"Senator Ben Dillingham in the past four years has been guided by one thought and one thought alone. That is to wax richer and richer by setting the policies of the Legislature and pushing laws that will benefit his pocketbook.....I ask you ladies and gentlemen of this House (it was a major floor speech) as to whether Senator Dillingham has any other values aside from monetary gain....?"

But this is 1962. We must not forget the past. But has this leopard changed his spots?

He wants to cut federal spending--but where? In Hawaii--where federal spending is the No. 1 "industry," with a payroll topping any two other industries combined?

In the Pacific--where the Dillingham Corp. has shared in millions upon millions spent on national defense installations?

He is for a sound foreign policy--a sound fiscal policy--against big government.

As a businessman he has always walked in the shadow of his father and brother. He has never held one of the truly top posts in the business empire. His ventures into small business have met with failures.

The end of the world for Dillingham came in the Thirties and he longs to return to the "lovely" past of the pre-Roosevelt era.

Of the U. S. today he said:

"These seeds of decadence were planted by that incredible Harvard graduate, Franklin Roosevelt, who put himself above the people. He opened the floodgates that threaten to destroy the basic aspects of our Republican form of government...."

Let this, then, be his epitaph:

Meanwhile, let's go out and win an election for Dan.

DAN INOUE AND THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Here in Dan's own words are his comments on his relationship with the Kennedy administration:

My record will show that to a great extent I have supported the administration on most measures. I have supported these programs, not because of the dictates of the administration, and I should point out that the administration has never dictated to me.

I supported these programs because I believed in them.

I believe in federal aid to education.

I believe in medicare--the health care for the aged program.

I believe in foreign aid.

I believe in a strong defense.

I am not a politician who will oppose measures merely to create an aura of independence around me--opposition for the sake of opposition.

I feel that the present administration is doing a good job--the programs are worthy of support.

However, there have been times when I have opposed administration programs. One of the most important cases on record is the Sugar Act where I sincerely believed that some of the administration proposals were not in the best interests of Hawaii or the nation.

And let's not forget that although I am a Democrat, I supported major administration proposals by President Eisenhower--a Republican--85 per cent of the time. I felt that many of the Republican President's proposals were adequate and in the best interests of the United States.

When I felt that some of President Eisenhower's programs were not in the best interests of our country, I voted against them.

It should be noted that many Republicans have gone "down the line" for President Kennedy's programs. Does this make them poor Republicans or Republican yes men for a Democratic administration?

Of course not!

These people are just exercising their prerogatives as representatives and doing what they believe to be in the best interests of the United States.

THE SUGAR ACT

Of all the laws passed by Congress this past year none was more important to Hawaii than the Sugar Act.

Congressman Dan Inouye played an important role in drafting this vital legislation.

Not only is this law important to Hawaii's \$150 million sugar industry and the industry's 13,500 employees and their dependents, but it affects Hawaii's basic economy.

Each one of the 27 sugar companies in Hawaii and the people and businesses in the plantation communities depend directly and indirectly on provisions of this law.

Until the new act was passed, amending the old, there was no assurance that the industry would have the long-range stability which this type of agriculture requires.

In commenting on the Sugar Act, C. Hutton Smith, past president of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, said in his 1961 annual report:

"The importance of this legislation to Hawaii can not be over-emphasized. It must encourage and protect our domestic growers by providing for reasonable production goals, insuring equitable prices for sugar."

In reference to Congressman Inouye, Mr. Smith also said this:

"We are especially pleased that Representative Inouye is on the House Agriculture Committee. He knows Hawaii intimately, and is completely conversant with our problems in sugar. We know he will continue to work diligently for Hawaii."

Dan Inouye lived up to this confidence in the work he did this past year as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Because he "did his homework" he became one of the most informed men in Congress on the complexities of sugar legislation. In recognition of his knowledge of the problem, he was named to the House-Senate conference committee when the crucial time came to work out differences between the two branches of Congress. Eleven committee members who had more seniority were passed over to give Dan a seat at the conference table.

He was successful in obtaining amendments which put Hawaii in a more favorable position than it was formerly under the old law which gave Hawaii's sugar beet competitors the advantage.

2. THE SUGAR ACT

The federal government, through the Department of Agriculture, controls production and marketing of sugar in the United States.

Along with other domestic producers, the sugar companies in Hawaii receive government payments of 35 cents per 100 pounds of sugar produced. The cost of these payments by the government is offset by a tax on refined sugar.

This arrangement enables Hawaii and other domestic producers to compete with foreign areas where workers are much lower paid and where sugar can be produced at lower cost.

But under provisions of the old law, Hawaii was given an unrealistically high quota by the Department of Agriculture. More often than not Hawaii was unable to meet the quota and sugar beet growers, competing in Hawaii's mainland market area, were permitted to produce--and to receive compliance payments for--the difference between what Hawaii produced and the quota limit.

Under the new law, which Dan helped frame, Hawaii has a more realistic quota, and if the islands should not meet the quota, the deficit would not be assigned to the beets but to foreign areas.

In supporting this measure, Dan opposed the Administration's version of the bill because he did not believe it would be fair to Hawaii as the law which was finally passed.

The new law extends to December 31, 1966, with respect to Hawaii, other domestic areas and the Philippines, and to December 31, 1964, with respect to foreign countries.

This gives Hawaii's industry the opportunity to plan ahead and make new improvements and investments with some assurance of stability under the law.

The new Sugar Act is an extremely complicated piece of legislation and this report merely underscores some of the features which were of major importance to Hawaii.

PUBLIC WORKS

No one knows better than Congressman Daniel K. Inouye how vital federal public works projects are to the State of Hawaii because our state needs economic development projects--especially on the Neighbor Islands.

He paid special attention to Neighbor Island needs during his terms of office. Here is the record of appropriations which Dan was able to get House approval for while he has been in Washington:

1962

HAWAII

\$600,000 Hilo Harbor tidal wave seawall protection study. This is the first step in a project which may ultimately cost \$25 million or more. No one needs to be reminded that Hilo must never again bear the heavy losses in lives and property which it has endured in recent years.

\$200,000 - Wailoa Stream Flood Control project study.

\$20,000 - Kawaihae Harbor channel deepening study.

MOLOKAI

\$3,200,000 - Molokai Irrigation Project. Now in its final stages of construction, this project will provide precious water to a large section of West Molokai for the first time in history, making diversified farming possible on a wide scale. It is hoped that this area will ultimately become the "breadbasket" for populous Oahu, cutting imports of fresh fruits and vegetables from the West Coast to a minimum.

MAUI

\$17,000 - Kihei Flood Control project study.

OAHU

\$60,000 - Honolulu and Barbers' Point Harbor study projects.

STATE OF HAWAII

\$100,000 - Hawaii Coastline study project to select small boat harbor project sites. This study will help aid Oahu and all the Neighbor Islands.

* * * * *

1961

OAHU

\$50,000 - Barbers' Point Harbor project feasibility study.

2. PUBLIC WORKS

\$10,000 - Honolulu Harbor channel study.

\$6,000 - Waikiki Beach erosion study.

\$5,000 - Kawainui Swamp reclamation study. The City & County of Honolulu recently voted to acquire this area and will soon be seeking sizeable federal appropriations to reclaim this land and convert it into a beautiful park.

* * * * *

The following project studies have been authorized but are still awaiting budgeting action:

Hawaii - Lava Flow Barrier.

Maui - Maalaea Bay Deep Harbor.
Kahoma Stream Flood Control.

Oahu - Kahaluu Harbor.

Projects previously authorized where funds have now been made available for studies by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers:

Kauai - Nawiliwili Small Boat Harbor.

Lanai - Manele Bay Small Boat Harbor.

Molokai - Kaunakakai Harbor.

EAST-WEST CENTER

The East-West Center on the University of Hawaii campus is a top priority project on Congressman Dan Inouye's program--now and in the future.

During his terms of office, the House of Representatives has approved appropriations totaling \$21.6 million for the East-West Center program. These were appropriated as follows: 1960 - \$10 million; 1961 - \$3.3 million; 1962 - \$8.3 million.

About 1,000 students will be enrolled at the East-West Center by 1966-67 and Dan hopes to help it grow through the years.

Remember that this Center is a Democratic project, a brainchild of John A. Burns, the present Democratic candidate for Governor, and Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. It is a positive accomplishment which shows the Kennedy administration's faith in Hawaii and its people in its program to advance the cause of international understanding and world peace.

A House subcommittee found this year that the progress made at the East-West Center has been "rapid and praiseworthy."

Hundreds of Asian students and senior scholars will leave this institution to go to other schools on the U. S. Mainland or to return to their homelands, carrying with them a well-rounded knowledge of the U. S. and its democratic institutions.

Is this the kind of federal spending the opposition wants to cut--spending aimed at the enhancement of human relations, bridging the gulfs of human understanding?

Congressman Inouye said, "The East-West Center is one of the great steps forward taken by our nation in recent years. I am very proud to have played some part in the creation and advancement of this remarkable institution which has received so much well-deserved praise throughout the free world.

"Should we ever lose sight of the need for such an educational facility, then we have lost touch with the very freedoms we live and fight for."

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Congressman Dan Inouye had to battle in the House of Representatives to secure a \$6 million land grant college aid appropriation for the University of Hawaii. His bill asked for \$36 million in lieu of a land grant to the University of Hawaii matching grants given other state colleges and universities since the Morrill Act of 1862.

The Eisenhower administration opposed this grant on the grounds that Hawaii had waived it under the terms of the Statehood Act. The Governor was reluctant to support it because he doubted the grant could be included in the Hawaii Omnibus bill and because he feared it would burden that bill with too many controversial items.

Although a \$6 million grant was included in the Omnibus bill, Congressman Inouye still had to battle for the allocation of the funds. The money is invested by the State of Hawaii and the University receives the interest which averages just under a quarter-million dollars a year.

The bulk of these funds is now being invested in the College of Tropical Agriculture. Use of part of the money to endow professorships is now under consideration by the Board of Regents. Another portion is being used to finance engineering research conducted by the College of Engineering.

All this adds up to a stronger university able to provide a better education for our children and to make valuable contributions not only to the State of Hawaii but to peoples throughout the Pacific Basin.

HIGHWAYS

How many of you realize that highways costing more than \$300 million are being built and will be built in Hawaii in this decade from 1960 to 1970?

More than \$240 million of this amount will come in the form of federal aid from Washington. For every \$90 from the federal government, the State must put up \$10 in matching funds. Most of these federal aid funds were not available to Hawaii until 1960 when the Congress included Hawaii in the Interstate Defense Highway System.

Until this point in time, Hawaii paid its full share of federal gas taxes without receiving the same benefits accorded other states.

Congressman Inouye introduced the bill to make these funds available. The proposal was not opposed by the administration and the bill later became a part of the Hawaii Omnibus Act. The opposition has referred to this act as "just a formality"--more than \$240 million in federal aid.

Here are the amounts Hawaii has already received or is scheduled to receive under this program through the 1963-64 fiscal year:

\$12.3 million in the 1961-62 fiscal year.
\$18.79 million in the 1962-63 fiscal year.
\$20 million plus in the 1963-64 fiscal year.

Nearly 50 miles of Interstate Defense Highways are already scheduled for construction on Oahu as follows: H-1, from Barbers' Point to Aina Koa; H-2, from Pearl City to Schofield Barracks; and H-3, from Middle Street to the Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station.

Because other states had a four-year jump on us--they began participating in this program with the passage of the National Highway Act in 1956--we are behind schedule.

These highways will alleviate a serious traffic condition on Oahu. They are one of the major foundation stones in a national program designed to provide needed assistance to limited state economies.

An additional \$5 million a year--to be matched on 50-50 basis by our state--is also provided for state primary and secondary highways on all the islands.

It's true that some--but not all--of this money is our own, coming back to us following payment of various federal taxes. But because we are a small state with limited resources, we must be ever alert in the Congress to be certain that we receive a fair share of federal funds marked for distribution throughout the nation.

USS ARIZONA MEMORIAL

For 20 years, the final resting place of the more than 1,000 dead buried in the rusting hulk of the USS Arizona was marked only by an American flag atop the superstructure.

Despite a determined campaign by the Pacific War Memorial Commission, efforts to raise \$500,000 for a permanent memorial to these honored dead fell short of its mark by \$150,000. Dan Inouye did his part to secure a \$150,000 appropriation in the House and the bill passed the Senate and became law.

The USS Arizona Memorial, a reality at last, was dedicated on Memorial Day of this year. It is indeed a fitting tribute to the brave men of the Arizona and a silent reminder to all the world that they will never be forgotten.

FOREIGN AID

Four cents out of every tax dollar goes for foreign aid spending. When we hear complaints about giving money to "foreigners" or people on the other side of the world, we tend to forget that much of our foreign aid money stays right here at home.

This is so because so much of our foreign aid spending is in the form of tanks made in Detroit, wheat and corn grown in the mid-west and western states, cotton for uniforms from our southern cotton fields, guns, electronic equipment, jet fighters, tires--the list is endless.

Much of our foreign aid is spent for defense to defend our friends and to defend ourselves. In return we often receive concessions such as Strategic Air Command bases in Spain, Turkey and elsewhere. This is part of our defensive ring around the Communist world.

Without our help, many free nations might fall into the Communist orbit. We must do everything we can to give our friends and allies throughout the world the proper assistance so that they can help us hold back the tide of Communist aggression.

We are often criticized for giving some foreign aid to such countries as Poland and Yugoslavia. Congressman Inouye said:

"Events of history have shown that the people living in many nations within the Communist circle are not necessarily sympathetic with the Communist cause.

"Giving the President authority to grant aid to such nations, under certain circumstances, may enable us to take advantage of some of the cracks we find in the Kremlin wall.

"To do otherwise would be to treat our friends as enemies. We must keep the torch of freedom burning bright and keep hopes for freedom alive."

There are times when we become annoyed by positions taken against us by the leaders of some countries which have benefited from our foreign aid program. They may vote against us in the United Nations, for example.

Let us never forget that we believe in the freedom of man. We cannot expect to make these nations over into our own image. Many of these peoples have vastly different cultural backgrounds and are often just emerging from the dark ages.

We do not seek to turn these countries into satellites of the United States as Russia did with so many small nations.

Of course we hope to plant the seeds of democracy but we must remember how long it has taken our country and many of those in Western Europe and Asia to achieve the freedoms we enjoy today.

HAWAIIAN PINEAPPLE IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

For the first time in history, the Department of Agriculture recently ordered \$600,000 worth of Hawaiian pineapple products for distribution in the national school lunch program.

This was another accomplishment for which Congressman Dan Inouye deserves substantial credit. The Department of Agriculture initially announced it would accept bids for pineapple only in cube form. This would have put the industry at a disadvantage because of limited inventories of this particular type of canned pineapple during the period when bids were to be called.

Dan Inouye intervened in behalf of the industry and helped convince the Department of Agriculture that the order should include chunks and tidbits as well as cubes.

The consequent purchase of 133,379 cases represented a welcome and substantial amount of new business for the industry.

Robert Cushing, president of the Pineapple Growers Association, said he hoped the Department of Agriculture will continue to request bids in future years to keep Hawaiian pineapple in the school lunch program.

The awards by the DA included Libby, McNeill & Libby, 69,211 cases; California Packing Corp., 39,688 cases, and Dole Corp., 24,480 cases.

The government's purchase price per case, based on delivery at West Coast ports, ranged from \$4.86 to \$4.96.

Dan Inouye is also aware of the problems facing the pineapple producers as a result of foreign competition. Commenting on some of these problems, he said recently:

"Because of the high tariff walls erected by the European Common Market, our industry has encountered serious difficulties in attempting to sell pineapple in Western Europe. At present the tariff is 25 per cent of the ad valorem price. As a result, the industry has lost one of its major European markets--West Germany. This tariff is simply too high for us to be able to compete favorably with other pineapple producers.

"President Kennedy was recently granted limited authority to negotiate on tariffs and I'm certain the results can only be good for our pineapple industry. He may be able to negotiate a lower tariff on Hawaiian pineapple which will make fair competition possible within the European market.

"Japan levies a 50 per cent tariff against Hawaiian pineapple to protect the pineapple industry on Okinawa. I believe, however, that the market in Japan is such that Hawaii can compete with Okinawa in this field without hurting each other.

2. HAWAIIAN PINEAPPLE IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

"For this reason, I recently talked with officials of the Japanese government and the Okinawan pineapple industry and all were hopeful that the barriers can be lowered.

"As pineapple is another one of our "Big three" industries (sugar, tourism and pineapple), we must do everything we can to keep our pineapple producers strong and healthy."