thanks is due the Board members, particularly the hearing panel members, Dr. McHale and Mr. Brown, who, only yesterday, in recognition of his services, was named by President Truman as permanent Chairman of the Board.

THE RECORD OF SENATOR WILEY

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the hour is extremely late, and I am very reluctant to detain the Senate any longer. However, I feel impelled to rise to defend the challenged, though well established, public record of a good friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

He has not requested that I defend him. He has been advised that I was determined to speak about a portion of his public record.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington, because the hour is very late, if he would consider postponing his address until tomorrow. Perhaps we could enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that he occupy the floor first when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. I would be very happy to have such an agreement entered.

Mr. MOODY. I would be glad to agree.

Mr. CAIN. I would be very much pleased to have such an agreement entered, for it would give me an opportunity to speak in defense of this great friend of ours.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. MOODY. How much time would the Senator from Washington need for that purpose tomorrow?

Mr. CAIN. I think I would need not to exceed 1 hour.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the approval of the acting majority leader, that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, at 12 o'clock, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] be recognized for the remarks he chooses to make at that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire include in his unanimous-consent request a provision that the Senator from Washington be recognized following the disposal of routine business tomorrow?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, and following the making of insertions in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether there will be a quorum call; or will the call of the roll be dispensed with?

Mr. BRIDGES. We can agree as to that—in short, that after handling, first, the routine business and any insertions which may be requested to be made in the RECORD, the Senator from Washington be recognized.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that a quorum call be had following the consideration of routine business tomorrow, and before I occupy the floor for a brief period.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending unanimous-consent request, as the Chair understands it, is that on tomorrow, following the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock noon, routine business be disposed of; and that thereafter, following a call of the roll, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] be recognized.

Is there objection to the requested unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the Senator from Washington would consent to a limitation to 1 hour of the discussion he will undertake tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the requested unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I seek further information in regard to this proposal. I am a member of the committee which reported the bill, and I was out of the Chamber for a moment. Does the present proposal include provision for the consideration tomorrow of the bill which is the unfinished business?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the matter is left wide open.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the pending proposal applies only to the request of the Senator from Washington; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is there any possibility of including in the present proposal a provision in regard to providing time tomorrow for further consideration of the bill which is the unfinished business, and possibily for disposing of that bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know. So far as I am concerned, I can say that when this matter was discussed earlier, the majority leader did not seem to feel that the adoption of such a proposal was desirable, or at least he made no suggestion of that sort.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well, Mr. President; I have no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is entered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has moved that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at noon. Without objection, the motion is agreed to; and the Senate now stands adjourned.

(Thereupon, at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 24, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of April 14), 1952:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Karl Robin Bendetsen, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice Archibald Stevens Alexander, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Jack Garrett Scott, of Colorado, to the position of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Marshall E. Hanley, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana, vice Matthew E. Welsh, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast called us to positions of leadership in the service of our country and needy humanity we pray that we may accept and discharge our duties and responsibilities with unfaltering faith and indomitable courage.

Grant that we may be used by Thee in courageously championing every noble cause and in fearlessly denouncing everything that is wrong and that violates the rights of man. May the righteousness and justice of God find a voice in all our plans and proposals, our deliberations and decisions.

May we never be stoically and selfishly indifferent to the needs of others but may we honestly strive to legislate for the good and happiness of men everywhere.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who came to be the servant and saviour of all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for disaster relief for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6947. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY,

Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WILLIAM OATIS

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, this day is an anniversary—but what a sad one. One year ago today, William Oatis was arrested on trumped-up and false charges and thrown into a Czechoslovakian prison.

Both Houses of this Congress adopted a resolution in his behalf last year and the people of the United States began to say that once again it appeared that the people of this country, through their elected representatives, were asserting themselves. This resolution asked that trade relations be severed with Czechoslovakia until Oatis was released.

Today I have introduced another resolution to create a committee to investigate what actions have been taken by the executive agencies of the United States Government in behalf of William Oatis and in the implementation of House Concurrent Resolution 140, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

Mr. Speaker, what has been done by the State Department? I submit that the Secretary of State, or his associates, are wilfully disregarding the expressed sense of the Congress. Is our State Department afraid of an unfortunate nation that cannot control its own destiny, or is it playing hand-in-glove with the Soviet Communists that today hold Czechoslovakia in its clutches?

Bill Oatis was a resident of the Fifth Indiana District that I have the honor to represent. Today, Oatis is a symbol of the depth to which a nation can sink when its Chief Executive shows little interest in this case and its Secretary of State appears as a friend of too many who would destroy the kind of government that had built this Nation to a great power.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Aandahl	Burnside	Corbett
Abernethy	Butler	Crosser
Andrews	Byrnes	Dawson
Anfuso	Canfield	DeGraffenried
Angell	Carlyle	Denny
Barden	Carrigg	Dingell
Bates, Ky.	Chelf	Dondero
Battle	Chenoweth	Doyle
Blatnik	Chudoff	Durham
Bonner	Clemente	Eaton
Boykin	Clevenger	Elston
Buchanan	Combs	Feighan
Buckley	Cooley	Fenton
Fernandez	Kee	Potter
Flood	Kelley, Pa.	Powell
Forand	Kerr	Price
Fugate	Kersten, Wis.	Prouty
Gary	King, Pa.	Rees, Kans.
Gavin	Larcade	Regan
Gordon	Lesinski	Rivers
Gore	McDonough	Roberts
Granahan	McGrath	Sabath
Grant	McKinnon	Sasscer
Green	McMullen	Shafer
Gregory	Machrowicz	Shelley
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Madden	Sieminski
Harrison, Wyo.	Mansfield	Sikes
Hart	Miller, Calif.	Spence
Havenner	Miller, Md.	Stanley
Hays, Ohio	Miller, N. Y.	Stockman
Hedrick	Mitchell	Tackett
Herter	Morano	Teague
Hill	Morgan	Vursell
Horan	Morris	Welch
Irving	Morrison	Wheeler
James	Murphy	Wickersham
Jarman	Murray, Wis.	Williams, Miss.
Javits	O'Konski	Withrow
Jones, Mo.	O'Neill	Wood, Ga.
Judd	Passman	Woodruff
	Patman	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 305 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1203) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1203, with Mr. RABAUT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 10 on page 1 of the bill.

The Clerk will now read the committee amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Committee amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEATING moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I had a motion on the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has not yet been recognized. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this motion at this time is to dispose of this question once and for all. We might as well determine now whether we want to proceed further with this debate or whether this bill is so lacking in merit that it should be defeated. If this motion carries, it is my intention when we are back in the House to move to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary. That is the forum, rather than here on the House floor where the wheat should be separated from the chaff.

In my remarks yesterday in general debate, I set forth the principal objections to the bill. First that this omnibus measure does not seem to be a sound approach inasmuch as meritorious cases for new judgeships are thrown in with those lacking in merit. Secondly, a question which we are bound to consider as one factor in our deliberations is the cost of this bill. I pointed out that for each judge named, it means something over $50,000. Therefore, $1,300,000 roughly is involved in this bill. I do not contend that feature alone is determinating, but certainly we should not overlook it when we are hearing on all sides anguished and very natural complaints from overburdened taxpayers.

Also, it seems to me that the recent appointments to high judicial posts made by the present Chief Executive scarcely warrant an extension of his powers in that regard. Some meritorious appointments have been made, but others have been the subject of widespread criticism by bar associations and others who are well qualified to appraise the qualifications of candidates for judicial office.

Mr. Chairman, when this rule was before us 3 weeks ago, it was adopted by a narrow margin of 10 votes. That was 3 weeks ago. The situation, in my judgment, has substantially changed since that time. A lot of water has gone over the dam. It is my hope that the thinking of a sufficient number of the Members has changed, as they have witnessed the recent actions of the Chief Executive; that they will feel, even though they may have supported the rule, they should now support the motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on the Judiciary. Just within a day or two, there have been offered in this body by responsible and respected Members from both sides of the aisle, and I speak, for instance, of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], men who have the universal respect of all of us, whether we find ourselves in agreement or disagreement with them, resolutions which criticize in varying language the recent action of the Chief Executive is seizing the steel plants and which in one form or another ask our committee on the Judiciary to take up that problem either in full committee or by subcommittee and thrash it out, and determine what, if anything, can and should be done.

I would be the last one to stand here and say at this time, as a member of the committee which will be called upon to pass upon that question, what the right answer is. We will be sitting in a quasi-judicial capacity, and obviously it would be improper for members of the Committee on the Judiciary to prejudge the

issues or suggest a final answer until the evidence is presented. But we are today being asked to give to this same Chief Executive the additional power of creating 26 Federal judgeships for life; for life, I repeat. There is no way to remove these men except on the filing of charges, if they are once appointed. We are asked today to enact a bill which, rather than curtailing, will enlarge the powers of the Chief Executive just at this critical moment when the situation, as I say, is entirely different from what it was 3 weeks ago when we were voting upon the rule. This is an hour when, throughout the length and breadth of this land, the people are aroused to a fever pitch over action by the Chief Executive which runs counter to all our traditions, and most informed students think, to our constitutional processes. Is this any time to further broaden the President's powers?

It is my intention as a member of the Judiciary Committee, and I say it in no partisan spirit, but with a completely open mind, to move at the next meeting of the committee that we take up these resolutions for study by our full committee or that they be referred to a proper subcommittee. I feel sure the chairman of our committee will welcome such a motion, because he will undoubtedly prefer to have the full committee pass upon this question as to just what we are going to do in our committee with these many resolutions that have been presented to us, rather than to assume the responsibility alone for that decision.

Therefore, this seems to me a highly inopportune time to have this bill before us. As a minimum, it should be deferred until more pressing matters of great national moment are considered. I shall therefore move to recommit the bill at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expired.

THE PRESIDENT CANNOT BE TRUSTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the people, by the adoption of the Constitution, granted the powers therein named—and no other—to the Federal Government.

All legislative powers were vested in the Congress.[1]

The executive powers were vested in a President of the United States of America.[2]

The judicial power of the United States was vested in a Supreme Court, "and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."[3] The judges of those courts hold office "during good behavior."

The basic function of the courts and of the judges thereof, is to interpret the laws as written by the Congress and such lawful orders and regulations as may be issued by the executive department.

Obviously, the objective of the courts—as carved in stone over the door to the Supreme Court of the United States—"Equal justice under law," cannot be even approximately attained unless the judges are men of unquestioned ability and integrity. The stream of justice cannot remain pure when men, lacking either ability or integrity, are given judicial power.

The corruption existing in the present administration and practiced by those in high places, has become so notorious that congressional committees, controlled by the Democratic Party, have—and creditably, let it be said—found, and continue to find, it necessary to call attention to the lack of ability and integrity of many of those holding public office.

This bill calls for the appointment of 23 additional Federal judges who will, "during good behavior," so long as they live, remain in office, be charged with administering justice.

The President of the United States, if this bill becomes law, will, subject to Senate confirmation, have the privilege of appointment of the new judges.

The corruption, to which reference has just been made and which is matter of common knowledge, is so great and so dangerous that the power of appointment of these judges should not—even with the restriction that the appointees must be confirmed by the Senate—be granted to a man who has heretofore been so negligent in placing and retaining men of ability and integrity in public office.

To assert that the President of the United States has not known, does not know, of the lack of ability, integrity, and the degree of common decency required of public officials whom he has appointed and retained in office, is to charge and convict him with a lack of fundamental characteristics which a man should possess if he is to hold public office.

The President of the United States has, many times, by his own utterances and his own communications over his own hand, demonstrated his ill temper, his lack of judgment and a desire to be just.

He has more than once signified his determination to destroy the law of the land. Permit me to cite just two outstanding instances: Notwithstanding his oath of office and his public declaration that he would enforce the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, he has, on more than one occasion, demonstrated his purpose to, insofar as he could, ignore its provisions.

His removal of Robert N. Denham as counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; his failure to use the law on more than one occasion to settle strikes which interfered with production for national defense—the last being the seizure of the steel plants—demonstrate his willfulness.

The statement as reported to have been made by the President and which, in substance, was that if the Congress did not make appropriations of the sums demanded by him, he would force it to remain in session until it complied with his request, raises the question of his mental competency.

Coming from Missouri, Harry S. Truman—even though he be President of the United States—should be familiar with the old saying that "You can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink."

Could any normal individual—much less a President of the United States—retaining his mental faculties, really believe that he can force a majority of the 96 Members of the Senate, a majority of the 435 Members of the House, to abandon their convictions, slavishly follow his demand?

My convictions, my duty to my constituents, will not permit me to vote to give Harry S. Truman—who has demonstrated his lack of judgment on so many occasions—the authority to corrupt the stream of justice.

And, a word to my colleagues from the South—especially to my patriotic friend, Judge WILSON, from Texas; to our colleague from Georgia [Mr. COX], who so frequently and competently advises us of our duty—my colleagues, do you realize that, much as we may need Federal judges to preside over our courts, that need does not justify placing in the hands of the President of the United States, the power to select men who, once in office, may destroy not only the rights of the individual, but of the States? My colleagues, those of you who have watched the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the individual and the State, think long and well before you place in the hands of the man in the White House, the power to, for so long as they may live, interpret, construe, the Constitution, the laws of the land.

Typical of some appointments which have been made is the one referred to yesterday by several of the Members.

An editorial in yesterday's Times-Herald calls attention to one of those appointments. I read from the editorial:

"UNCLEAN"

Two sitting judges appeared before a Senate judiciary committee in Los Angeles to testify that a Truman nominee for the Federal bench was "unclean" and unqualified for the office. The nominee, Ernest A. Tolin, a former United States district attorney, also is opposed by the Los Angeles Bar Association.

One judge told the committee: "I think a man should not only be clean but have a reputation for being clean, and he hasn't the reputation for that. His conduct with employees of his office has been a matter of common discussion and hasn't reflected credit on him."

There was a time, within the memory of older Americans, when Federal judges were held in high respect. Misconduct was so rare that any deviation from the high standard was a national sensation. Political influence was not enough to win appointments; nominees also had to be men of integrity, with knowledge of the law.

Under Roosevelt and Truman the prestige of the Federal courts has gone so far downhill that rotten appointments to the bench are almost taken for granted. "Unclean! Unclean!" the ancient cry of the lepers, would be a fitting cry for the opening of courts presided over by corrupt and incompetent machine politicians.

Unfortunately, it will take a generation of good appointments to restore the honor of the Federal judiciary. Our children and grandchildren will still be feeling the effects of the Roosevelt-Truman legacy.

[1] Article I, section 1, the Constitution of the United States.

[2] Article II, section 1, the Constitution of the United States.

[3] Article III, section 1, the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is being discussed in an atmosphere that is surcharged with political feeling. This is unfortunate. The needs of the people of northern Ohio and of business and the lawyers of the northern judicial district of my State raises this matter above political considerations.

Perhaps we should amend this bill by including a provision to make it effective on the third day of January 1953. In this way it might be possible for us to take a more realistic view of the need for another judge in the northern district of Ohio and, perhaps, in other districts provided for in this bill.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has made two points in opposition to the bill. The first is his very frank statement that he does not want to see any more judges appointed by the incumbent President. His second objection is that this is an economy measure.

As an independent without any party affiliation whatsoever, I am not concerned with who makes the appointment of the judge for my district but, as a lawyer who has practiced at that bar for 30 years, I am vitally concerned, of course, with getting a good judge. We have only had three judges on the bench of the western division of the district since 1909, when that division was created. Two of these have been Republicans. The third and present incumbent is the Honorable Frank L. Kloeb, who had a distinguished record as a Member of this House and has further distinguished himself during the past 15 years as a jurist. All three of the judges have been men of ability, integrity, energy, and devoted to the public service. I am just as eager as the gentleman from New York could possibly be to see that the high standard of our Federal judiciary be maintained.

There is no economy in denying to the people adequate judges to take care of the Federal courts. The estimate has been made that the cost of a district judge averages about $35,000 a year. I will accept this figure as being approximately correct. When this is placed against the human rights of people awaiting trial in criminal cases, the material rights of litigants in private civil cases and the demands of Government efficiency involved in the United States civil cases, $35,000 a year is not a very significant figure. This, of course, covers the judge's salary, his necessary expenses, the salaries of his court aides and attendants, and the incidental expenses of operating the court. When we consider that the cost of the operation of the entire judicial structure of our Government is a very small fraction of 1 percent of our total budget, I cannot believe that the gentlemen of this House who oppose this bill on grounds of economy have clearly thought through this basis of objecting to the appointment of a few more much-needed judges.

I do not recall any of the gentlemen who have opposed this bill to have claimed that no additional judges are needed. I believe that all will admit that some are needed. If that be true, this matter should not be attacked as it is being attacked with a vote to kill the bill in its entirety. If there are judges provided for in this bill who are not needed, let us excise that provision from the bill. I am convinced that by every measure of need the Northern District of Ohio can justify its claim for another active district judge. At the present time there are four permanent judgeships authorized for this district. It has been stated on the floor that one of these is vacant. That statement is erroneous. I am sure that the error was inadvertently made. The vacancy created by the retirement of a judge in 1949, was filled by the appointment of Judge McNamee whose appointment was approved by the Senate March 8, 1951, and who took his seat immediately thereafter. Three of the judges of the district normally sit in Cleveland. One sits regularly in Toledo. Court may also be held at Youngstown and Lima, and this bill provides that court may also be held at Akron. I believe that I am correct in stating that it is the intention of the committee that this new judgeship provided for in this bill be a roving judge. This means that upon his appointment he will understand that upon direction of the senior judge he is to hold court in Cleveland, Toledo, Youngstown, Akron, and Lima. The original request was for the bill to provide that he should be designated as a roving judge. Mr. Harry P. Chandler, Director of Administrative Office of United States Courts, recommended strongly against designating any judge as a specialist. He felt that the better practice was for all judges to hold a like commission. Members of the Ohio Bar and, I believe, Members of the Judiciary Committee of the House have felt that it is proper that a judge created under this act accept his commission with the understanding that he is appointed for the purpose of relieving the docket wherever he is needed in the district.

I urge my colleagues of the House to examine carefully pages 51 to 54 of the report now before this committee. You will find a record of increasing litigation in the courts of the northern district of Ohio. The number of cases handled per judge has consistently for the past 10 years run well ahead of the national average of cases handled per judgeship. Particularly has this been true in the western division where Judge Kloeb with almost no aid from other judges has carried one of the heaviest case loads in the United States. He has done this by reason of long hours and great effort. After 15 years of that kind of work he cannot be expected to carry so heavy a load. He is entitled to help and he can only get it from the creation of a new judge for the district. The ever increasing load at Cleveland does not permit any substantial aid from the judges there.

I ask my colleagues to look at this matter fairly. I urge you to view it in the clear light of objectivity, devoid of political considerations. If necessary, to satisfy the opposers to this bill, make the effective date after the elections in November. If there are judgeships in this bill that are not needed, by all means, let us remove them from consideration in this bill. But, in fairness to the greatest judicial system in the world, a system which for 165 years has had the respect of the world, let us not now because of partisan considerations, or false economy, burden this great instrumentality of justice. It is our responsibility. We cannot avoid it by excuses that are not reasons. We cannot shirk it by objections that are not based on fact.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I think under the rules I have an opportunity to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] never once offered any objection to this bill, either in subcommittee or in the full committee. It is rather anomalous at this eleventh hour he now comes forward with a motion of this character.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to correct the record?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. On the day this bill was before our committee for a vote, the ranking minority member of the committee held my proxy in which I instructed him to vote against the bill.

Mr. CELLER. On the other hand, the gentleman was never articulate in any sense of the word in expressing himself in opposition to the bill, at any time, during its course through the judiciary amendment.

The gentleman questions the appointive power of the President. It is rather strange that in that regard he injects the question of steel in this debate. Water does not mix with oil and oil does not mix with water. You cannot mix steel with the appointive power of the President. The one has nothing whatsoever to do with the matter. It is just dust thrown to confuse the issue.

The gentleman brings in the question of cost. He said it cost forty or fifty thousand dollars for each judgeship. Mr. Shafroth, of the Office of Administration of the United States District Courts testified that a judgeship costs between thirty-five and forty thousand dollars, not fifty thousand as the gentleman stated. Let us see what the appropriations are for the entire judiciary. They are $25,000,000, on the average. The total budget is $75,000,000,000. The cost of our judiciary is therefore one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our entire budget. It is just fiddlesticks to come in here and object to a judgeship bill on the ground that it would cost thirty-five or forty thousand or even fifty thousand for each judgeship. The cost of our whole judiciary system with or without these new judges is piddling in comparison to our total budget expenditures.

This is an attack on a political basis, and I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] when he attacks a judgeship bill on the basis of pure politics he is just as wrong as a 2-foot yardstick. We must keep politics out of it; in the creation of judgeships we certainly do not want politics to creep into the argument.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not true that even though the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has lost respect for the Chief Executive of the United States, if he has not lost respect for the other body also, they will have something to say as to whether or not these appointments are confirmed?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct; the Senate is a sufficient brake in that regard on whatever the President might do. The Senate can withhold confirmation; and, therefore, any appointment that the President makes would not be carried out if the Senate did not confirm it. I think that is sufficient deterrent against any excesses the President might be guilty of, if he were guilty of any.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not also true that many appointments have been held up in the last year and in the past?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

We try to do justice here, but you cannot do justice to the Nation if you do not provide the number of judges necessary for the dispensation of justice. Someone once said that justice is the bread of the Nation because the people hunger for it. Withhold not the means of justice to our people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I am afraid I have yielded too much already; I have only a few minutes. I hope the gentleman will not insist.

Not only does this bill provide for district judges but it also provides for circuit judges, a very important segment of our judiciary; it provides for places for holding court; it rearranges counties in the various judicial districts due to population changes and changing economic conditions; it increases the tenure of judgeships in certain of the Territorial courts; it provides that the President in the case of judges who have not yet reached the age of retirement but who are decrepit or incapacitated and who refuse to step down from the bench, may appoint substitutes. All these important provisions are contained in this bill.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. I wish to make the observation that this is the first time I have ever heard the argument advanced that judges would cost money. I think we all know that that is true; it is dependent simply upon the question of necessity.

I am impressed with the argument of the gentleman from New York who moves to strike out the enacting clause saying that some of these judges are not necessary. I take it that by inference he admits that some of these judges are necessary. This being true it would seem to me that the gentleman should not persist in his motion to strike out the enacting clause but should withdraw it and let this bill come before the membership, approaching the question by a proper amendment.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman from Georgia is correct. If the gentleman from New York feels that it is improper to set up one or even more judgeships he can offer a suitable amendment, and I assure him I shall be very glad to give most earnest consideration to his suggestion in that regard.

It is said justice is blind. She is depicted with a fold over her eyes. That is fortunate, today. I am sure she would not want to see the spectacle today of the minority playing politics with her judgeship bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired; all time on this motion has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. KEATING and Mr. CELLER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 143, noes 122.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RABAUT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1203) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the enacting clause be stricken out?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KEATING. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEATING moves to recommit the bill S. 1203 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 150, answered "present" 1, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—165

Allen, Ill.	Bow	Curtis, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bramblett	Dague
	Bray	Davis, Ga.
Anderson, Calif.	Brehm	Davis, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ohio	Denny
	Brownson	Devereux
Arends	Budge	D'Ewart
Armstrong	Buffett	Dolliver
Auchincloss	Burdick	Doughton
Bakewell	Busbey	Eaton
Bates, Mass.	Bush	Ellsworth
Beall	Case	Engle
Beamer	Chiperfield	Ford
Belcher	Church	Fulton
Bender	Cole, Kans.	Gamble
Bennett, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.	Gathings
Berry	Cotton	George
Betts	Coudert	Golden
Bishop	Crawford	Goodwin
Blackney	Cunningham	Graham
Bolton	Curtis, Mo.	Gross
Gwinn	McIntire	Scrivner
Hagen	McVey	Scudder
Hale	Mack, Wash.	Secrest
Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa	Seely-Brown
	Martin, Mass.	Shafer
Halleck	Mason	Sheehan
Hand	Meader	Short
Harden	Merrow	Simpson, Ill.
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Pa.
Harvey	Morton	Sittler
Heselton	Mumma	Smith, Kans.
Hess	Nelson	Smith, Wis.
Hillings	Nicholson	Springer
Hinshaw	Norblad	Taber
Hoeven	O'Hara	Talle
Hoffman, Ill.	Osmers	Taylor
Hoffman, Mich.	Ostertag	Thompson, Mich.
Hope	Patterson	
Hull	Phillips	Tollefson
Hunter	Poage	Vail
Jackson, Calif.	Poulson	Van Pelt
Jenison	Radwan	Van Zandt
Jenkins	Rankin	Velde
Jensen	Reece, Tenn.	Vorys
Johnson	Reed, Ill.	Vursell
Jonas	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel
Kean	Riehlman	Werdel
Kearney	Rogers, Mass.	Wharton
Kearns	Ross	Widnall
Keating	Sadlak	Wigglesworth
Kilburn	St. George	Williams, N. Y.
Latham	Saylor	Wolcott
LeCompte	Schenck	Wolverton
Lovre	Scott, Hardie	Wood, Idaho
McConnell	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Woodruff
McGregor		

NAYS—150

Abbitt	Frazier	Murray, Tenn.
Adair	Furcolo	Norrell
Addonizio	Garmatz	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Allen, La.	Greenwood	O'Brien, N. Y.
Aspinall	Hardy	O'Toole
Ayres	Harris	Patten
Bailey	Havenner	Perkins
Baker	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Baring	Hébert	Pickett
Barrett	Heffernan	Polk
Beckworth	Heller	Preston
Bennett, Fla.	Herlong	Price
Bentsen	Holifield	Priest
Blatnik	Howell	Rabaut
Boggs, Del.	Ikard	Rains
Boggs, La.	Jackson, Wash.	Ramsay
Bolling	Jones, Ala.	Reams
Bosone	Jones, Hamilton C.	Redden
Brooks		Ribicoff
Brown, Ga.	Jones, Woodrow W.	Richards
Bryson		Riley
Burleson	Karsten, Mo.	Robeson
Burton	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Camp	Kennedy	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Keogh	Rogers, Fla.
Carnahan	Kilday	Rogers, Tex.
Celler	King, Calif.	Rooney
Chatham	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Colmer	Klein	Smith, Miss.
Cooper	Kluczynski	Smith, Va.
Cox	Lane	Staggers
Crumpacker	Lanham	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	Lantaff	Stigler
Dawson	Lesinski	Sutton
Deane	Lind	Teague
Delaney	Lucas	Thomas
Dempsey	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Denton	McCarthy	Thornberry
Dollinger	McCormack	Trimble
Donohue	McCulloch	Vinson
Donovan	McGuire	Walter
Dorn	McMillan	Watts
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Whitten
Elliott	Mahon	Wier
Evins	Marshall	Willis
Fallon	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Fine	Morrison	Winstead
Fisher	Moulder	Yorty
Fogarty	Multer	Zablocki
Forrester	Murphy	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Harrison, Va.

NOT VOTING—116

Aandahl	Buchanan	Clemente
Abernethy	Buckley	Clevenger
Allen, Calif.	Burnside	Combs
Andrews	Butler	Cooley
Anfuso	Byrnes	Corbett
Angell	Canfield	Crosser
Barden	Carlyle	DeGraffenried
Bates, Ky.	Carrigg	Dingell
Battle	Chelf	Dondero
Bonner	Chenoweth	Doyle
Boykin	Chudoff	Durham

Elston	Javits	Passman
Feighan	Jones, Mo.	Patman
Fenton	Judd	Potter
Fernandez	Kee	Powell
Flood	Kelley, Pa.	Prouty
Forand	Kerr	Rees, Kans.
Fugate	Kersten, Wis.	Regan
Gary	King, Pa.	Rhodes
Gavin	Larcade	Rivers
Gordon	McDonough	Roberts
Gore	McGrath	Sabath
Granahan	McKinnon	Sasscer
Grant	McMullen	Shelley
Green	Machrowicz	Sheppard
Gregory	Madden	Sieminski
Hall,	Magee	Sikes
Edwin Arthur	Mansfield	Spence
Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, Calif.	Stanley
Hart	Miller, Md.	Stockman
Hays, Ohio	Miller, N. Y.	Tackett
Hedrick	Mitchell	Welch
Herter	Morano	Wheeler
Hill	Morgan	Wickersham
Holmes	Morris	Williams, Miss.
Horan	Murdock	Wilson, Ind.
Irving	Murray, Wis.	Withrow
James	O'Konski	Wood, Ga.
Jarman	O'Neill	Yates

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Holmes against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Stanley against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Withrow for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. McKinnon against.

Mr. Carrigg for, with Mr. Jarman against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Granahan against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. King of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. deGraffenried against.

Mr. McDonough for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Stockman for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Rees of Kansas for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Spence against.

Mr. Allen of California for, with Mr. Forand against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Harrison of Wyoming.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Hill.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. James.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Miller of Maryland.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. GARY, who is absent on official Government business. Were he present he would vote "no." I therefore withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 554 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes. It contains 165 pages, some parts of which are highly controversial. It seems to me it would serve little purpose to attempt to discuss this bill under the rule; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], as always, has most ably explained this rule. Although it is true that there are a few on this side who are opposed to the bill, I know of no one who is opposed to the rule.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5678, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Judiciary presents to the House a measure which has been given as much consideration as has been given any measure that this House has ever considered. I say that advisedly, because it was in 1949 that the first steps were taken to revise Title 8 of the United States Code.

Subsequent to that time the Senate ordered an investigation of our immigration and naturalization system. Upwards of 100 witnesses testified. Subsequently the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on the Judiciary held joint hearings. There was expended in the preparation of the background for this legislation upwards of half a million dollars. Twice daily hearings were held that took nearly 9 weeks, at which hearings 56 witnesses testified; in addition to which there were 76 statements filed.

Now, I make that statement for the reason that recently there came to all of our desks a letter signed by Nathan E. Cowan, director of the legislative department of the CIO, in which he states:

> We strongly urge, therefore, that the bill be referred back to the Committee on the Judiciary for much needed adequate hearings and full study.

Of course, that is the usual sort of an argument that is advanced when there is no logical, valid reason for opposing legislation. I am going to call to your attention the attacks made by the CIO on this legislation although they merely parrot attacks made by various organizations who would like to prevent the enactment of any legislation.

The first item in opposition states:

> While purporting to eliminate racial discrimination in our immigration law, H. R. 5678 in fact perpetuates such discrimination; the CIO, on the other hand, consistently has advocated abolition of racial discrimination in every form.

I say to you that that statement is out of the whole cloth. Among the groups most interested in the enactment of this legislation is the Japanese-American Citizens League. It is for this legislation because it removes all racial discrimination. So the CIO attack is clearly not based on sound grounds.

The second one:

> Instead of narrowing the unduly broad grounds for denaturalization contained in the Internal Security Act of 1950, H. R. 5678 expands the grounds for loss of citizenship by both naturalized and native-born citizens.

That simply is not true. There is not a word of truth in that charge.

The third ground on which they oppose the bill is contained in this paragraph:

> By abolishing existing statutes of limitation and by creating and making retroactive new grounds for deportation, H. R. 5678 jeopardizes the status of the resident foreign-born, including immigrants whose admission into the United States under the Displaced Persons Act was authorized by Congress and supported by the CIO.

Of course H. R. 5678 does not do that. The Internal Security Act does, and the Internal Security Act is a part of the

law of the land today. It is restated, that is true, in this bill. That is because we are trying to put together for the first time since 1802 all of the statutes relating to immigration and naturalization.

It does, however, cover the situation where an alien succeeds in hiding in the United States. If that man is successful for 5 years his status can be adjusted. Your committee felt that that was wrong. We felt there should not be a premium placed on the ability of an alien to conceal himself. Under the provisions of this new bill where such a situation exists that alien is deportable.

As those of you who have practiced law know, the statute of limitations does not run when a person hides. The statute is tolled. We carry that philosophy into this statute.

The next ground they state in opposition to the bill provides:

By establishing a host of unnecessary grounds for exclusion, including a grant of authority to the President to suspend at any time the admission of all aliens, H. R. 5678 would render immigration unreasonably difficult.

Immigration is rendered difficult for the criminal. If you are opposed to that, then you will agree with the CIO in this opposition which they voice.

There is a new ground for exclusion written into this bill, and that is for the exclusion of aliens who have been convicted of crimes in their own country on two occasions and have been punished by 5 years incarceration. Do we want that type of people in America? If we do, then you will support the position taken by those who voice their opposition to this bill. In that connection, let me tell you that we have in that particular section, a provision which deals with juvenile delinquency so that a minor under 18 years of age who has been convicted and has gone to jail, may under certain conditions be forgiven and admitted to the United States.

The next ground that they state is this:

In attempting to protect this country from subversives and other undesirable persons, H. R. 5678 erects barriers which will effectively prevent the admission also of desirable immigrants who would make valuable citizens.

All right. Whom do you think they are talking about?—subversives. Do you think we ought to let down the barriers and admit subversives? If an alien is a member of a Communist organization within 5 years of the time he applies for admission to the United States, he cannot obtain a visa. I am for that.

The next grounds that they state are these:

H. R. 5678 would emasculate judicial review and authorize arbitrary administrative practices of the very sort which the Administrative Procedures Act sought to correct and guard against.

The Administrative Procedures Act—do you remember the old Walter-Logan bill, which was subsequently enacted into law as the Administrative Procedures Act? Why, this question of unbridled authority in one person is almost an obsession with me. I am the last person in the world who would do anything to destroy the philosophy underlying that type of review. What do we do in this act? Instead of destroying the Administrative Procedures Act, we undo what the Congress did in a deficiency appropriation bill several years ago when it legislated to overturn a decision of the Supreme Court, which ruled that the Administrative Procedures Act is applicable in deportation proceedings. We undo that. So here, instead of our destroying the Administrative Procedures Act, we actually see that it is reinstated in every instance.

Do you remember Ellen Knauff? Do you remember that friendless little immigrant girl who sat on Ellis Island for nearly 3 years without anybody telling her why she was being detained? It was the Committee on the Judiciary who saw that that frightful injustice was corrected, and we have seen to it that that sort of thing cannot occur again, because under proper safeguards the Attorney General of the United States in a case of that kind is authorized to set up a hearing before the Board of Immigration Appeals so that when an alien is detained and cannot find out why all he needs to do under the provision of this law is to communicate to the Attorney General and he will then set up a hearing for that alien.

The last grounds for opposition is stated to be these:

By severely limiting the Attorney General's discretion in deserving cases to suspend deportation and adjust status or readmit resident aliens after a temporary absence, H. R. 5678 would work unnecessary hardship upon American citizens and impede foreign travel by representatives of American organizations, including labor unions.

The fact of the matter is, the discretionary power of the Attorney General is enlarged under the provisions of this bill rather than limited.

There is one situation, though, that perhaps gives some color to this statement. That is because of the language with respect to the adjustment of status. Under existing law the Attorney General has the authority to adjust the status of an alien in a case where his deportation would result in economic detriment to the members of his family. "Economic detriment." We have changed that language so that the Attorney General can adjust the status in cases of "extreme and unusual hardship." And why? There has been a racket grow up in this country where an alien and his wife want to come to the United States, and the quota is oversubscribed for their country. When the wife becomes pregnant they get a permit to visit Cuba. Of course in order to get to Cuba from Europe they have to pass through the United States. So that they get a transit visa, and somewhere between New York and New Orleans an American citizen arrives. In those cases the Attorney General has adjusted the status of the parents on the theory that to deport them or to compel them to leave the United States would work to the economic detriment of a week-old baby.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WALTER. We do not know of a better way to deal with that situation, but I think it calls for action. So we have changed the language from "economic detriment" to "an extreme and unusual hardship," because we do not believe it would work an extreme or unusual hardship on an infant if it was compelled to accompany its alien parents back to Europe.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a summary of all of the opposition to this measure. It is summarized in this letter from a member of the CIO, and if that letter has influenced you and if you do not believe what I have said today, I ask you to call—not the man who wrote this letter, but call somebody in the CIO, and find out whether the position taken by the writer of this letter is the official position of that organization. Then, I am sure nobody will be influenced by this letter, but I use that only because it contains in seven instances the entire opposition to the bill which, in the judgment of the committee in the Senate and in the House will at long last get rid of this crazy-quilt of immigration laws. Since the Rees Act was passed in 1940 there have been 32 amendments to it.

In closing I want to pay my respect to the staffs of the committees in the Senate and in the House, and to the immigration lawyers of this country and to the experts from the State Department and the Department of Justice who have been working since 1949 with the hope that we can consider and enact into law sensible and adequate legislation designed to protect, first, the interests of the United States.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In the early part of your statement you said that this bill removes racial restrictions against only one race. I am certain the gentleman did not mean quite that.

Mr. WALTER. It removes the last vestige of racial discrimination against any race.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That includes among others the Koreans and quite a number of other Pacific peoples.

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has consumed 19 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this legislation because when I first came to Congress I was a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization for a number of years. Those were the days when we were molding and forming the immigration policies of the Nation and I had the honor of being the author of some of that formative legislation. The United States of America has laid down to all the nations of the world one very great cardinal principle of government. That is that every nation that enjoys sovereignty, and as an incident of that

soyereignty has the right to determine who shall become citizens of that country. No foreign citizen has a right to American citizenship. He only has the privilege of securing American citizenship and then only if and when he qualifies by complying with our laws restricting immigration. We, the United States of America, laid down that principle many years ago, and since that time, this program has developed gradually and wonderfully even in my time. I remember when the principal qualification for American citizenship by foreigners was an educational test; later we required a character test in addition, and then just before I came to Congress they established the principle known as quotas. By quotas we determine how many should come from the various countries. Quotas were fixed for practically every country except the countries of North and South America. The reason that we excluded the countries of the Western Hemisphere was that since they were our close neighbors and since we protected them from foreign domination under the Monroe Doctrine we took a special interest in them.

Quotas were given to Great Britain which included Ireland, England, Scotland, and Wales, and also to Australia, and to practically all the countries of the world with the exception of China and Japan who were excluded entirely. I think some islands of the Pacific and some Asiatics also were excluded. But gradually and generally over my protest, there has developed a tendency to liberalize the entrance requirements. It may be best because we are becoming more and more a great international nation, and our relationships are more international than they have ever been. At any rate, the main purpose of the fixing of quotas was to keep from the shores of America undesirable groups of people, such as Communists and criminals, and the insane, and those who would become a burden on the country, and those who would be taking the jobs of our workmen.

I confess that I may not be up to date on this legislation as I should be and not as thoroughly conversant with the immigration problems as are these gentlemen who have prepared this very comprehensive piece of legislation, but I understand from all the groups in my section of the country who are very much interested in this kind of legislation, that this is a good bill and that they approve of it. Of course those who are in favor of opening up all the gates and letting everybody in without regard to any consideration whatever I presume would be against this bill as presented to us today. They have always been for free immigration. But generally speaking I think this bill now meets the approval of practically everybody who has been a student of this subject and this gradually growing legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. First of all, may I pay my due respect and thanks to the gentleman speaking in the well for the tremendous work he did back in the year 1924. He is one of the few Members remaining in the House who assisted in the preparation and the enactment of the immigration and naturalization laws of that time. He has retained his interest through the years, and his advice and counsel were of immeasurable help to us as we considered this bill.

The American Legion in their convention in Indianapolis last September approved this bill. Many other national organizations have approved it.

Mr. JENKINS. I appreciate the remarks of my good friend, Judge GRAHAM, who is one of the best posted men in this House on immigration matters. His good Americanism will guarantee us against any un-American legislation, and his fine ability as a lawyer of wide experience will guarantee that this legislation which he has helped to prepare and which he is supporting is good legislation. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Does this bill restrict at all or invade at all that basic principle that we call national origins?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not.

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad to hear that. That will be one other reason why I can support this most enthusiastically. Let me ask another question. I appreciate as a lawyer that this legislation has been built up over the years. It is a great big, gigantic fabric that deals with human beings and their rights and privileges—and with humanity everywhere. There has grown up naturally over the years many legal definitions that have from practice become practically a part of the law. Take, for instance, immigration and deportation. Also such words and phrases as "right of entry" or "legal entry." Does this bill invade any of these legal definitions seriously?

Mr. GRAHAM. It restates the former definitions in accordance with existing law and the most recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for this assurance. It means that all the great amount of work that the Government departments have been doing for so many years in an attempt to make this program work will be considered almost as a part of the law. If the gentleman's work and the work of his able colleagues is as good as I think it is the immigration laws will be greatly improved and will be more easily understood and enforced. I hope that he and his colleagues have gone over these legal definitions and consulted with the departments, and that out of that work he and his colleagues have clarified the law and made it more easily understood and more easily enforceable.

Mr. GRAHAM. Beginning on page 5 and running through page 19 there has been a restatement of all the definitions, which I previously stated.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman. As I read through the bill I notice that the quotas have been changed. How much will you increase the quotas above 154,000, which has been the quota limit for some time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Four hundred and sixty.

Mr. JENKINS. That includes all the races. I presume it has been decided this increase is about a fair proportionate increase?

Mr. GRAHAM. That was our decision, and may I say to the gentleman for his information that the bill itself contains 165 pages, the report contains 328 pages, and the hearings, which occupied over 9 weeks, total 800 pages. Everyone was given an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad to feel that in those hearings you gave all groups a chance to come forward and present their case and their arguments. While there are some provisions of this bill that do not have my full support, I know that the immigration activities of our country have increased greatly in the past few years, and I know that the members of the committee have given this bill their most careful consideration. And now, Judge GRAHAM, it is true, is it not, that you and Mr. WALTER, your able colleague, and the large majority of the members of your able Committee on the Judiciary feel that this bill should become a part of the law of the land?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. I shall support it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from the Hawaiian Islands [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of the people of Hawaii this is one of the most important pieces of legislation to be presented to this House since the annexation of the islands in 1898. In our Territory we have as permanent residents more people of Japanese origin, Chinese origin, Filipino origin and from the islands of the Pacific than there are in all the rest of the country combined. Most of those people today are American citizens. They have come into the right of citizenship by reason of their birth in Hawaii. But during this long period the parents of most of them have been denied the right of naturalization.

The record of Americans of Japanese ancestry in World War II dramatically vindicates the soundness of the policy under which they were given the privilege of citizenship by reason of birth in this country. But, more than that, it gave great emphasis to the injustice of denying their parents and the parents of other races now ineligible to citizenship the privileges of naturalization. I am sure this record—Hawaiian record—more than any other factor has convinced Congress that the time has come when the racial restrictions still remaining in our naturalization and immigration laws should be removed as is proposed in this bill.

I am strongly in favor of the legislation principally because it will do that.

There are relatively few aliens of Oriental and Pacific island origin in Hawaii today. But many of our citizens are their descendants and feel strongly that in the light of the record that has been made by their parents, their demonstrated loyalty to this country, despite the fact that they were aliens, they should be honored by being granted the privileges of naturalization. I do not anticipate that among the small group

of aliens still in Hawaii there will be many who will apply for naturalization, once the law is enacted. I think the experience will be much the same as it was when racial restrictions against naturalization of Chinese were removed. Relatively few of the Chinese aliens took advantage of it.

But the enactment of this law will bring great change in the attitude of those people and be of enormous influence on the attitude of the people of the Far East toward this country. I am not given to making extravagant statements as to what benefits might come to this country in the improvement of the attitude from the enactment of this legislation, but I do want to say that I think its passage is vitally important from the standpoint of our future in the Pacific because it will remove what has always been a serious source of irritation in our relations with the pecple of the Far East. The value of such a step at this time is indisputable.

In 1943, following the appearance before the House of Madame Chiang Kai-shek, and in our anxiety to get the support of the Chinese in the fight against the totalitarian powers, the House repealed the racial restrictions in our immigration and naturalization laws against the Chinese. This was followed in 1946 by similar action in regard to the Filipinos and the people of India.

The restriction against the people of Japan, Korea, the other Oriental countries, and the people of the Pacific islands still remains on our statute books. The House has on two previous occasions passed legislation that would remove the barrier. Now it is proposed to accomplish this in the omnibus bill. I most certainly hope that it is finally enacted into law.

It provides in addition the solution of several difficult problems. One of these has been created by the marriage of a great many American citizens serving in the Armed Forces in the Pacific and Far East to girls of races now ineligible for citizenship. The troops we have had in the Far East include a great many Americans of Japanese ancestry, many Americans of Korean ancestry, and others who have married girls of their own races, only to find that unless they were veterans they would not be permitted to bring them to this country as their wives, as can be done and has been done by Americans who marry into races eligible to citizenship, such as are found in Europe, in fact, in most of the world. The bill, furthermore, will give preference only under the limited quota granted to oriental countries to the parents of American citizens. This is fair and just and will be of great practical value in the case of Japanese-Americans whose parents in many instances were once residents of this country, left because they could not become naturalized, and now, in their old age, desire to rejoin their American citizen children.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. For instance, I live in the State of Ohio. We have no State law on the matter in any respect whatever. Does Hawaii have the right to lay down some regulations with reference to entry into that Territory because it is a Territory?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No.

Mr. JENKINS. Does the organic law give you some special privilege over any of our States?

Mr. FARRINGTON. No. We are subject to the immigration laws in the same manner as are the States, with several exceptions. One of those exceptions is the requirement that aliens traveling from Hawaii to the mainland shall be subject to the same restrictions as aliens traveling from a foreign country to Hawaii. I hope to offer an amendment later to correct that, because I believe it is unnecessary and extremely unjust and imposes restrictions that are nothing more than a nuisance.

Mr. JENKINS. Here is what I want to bring out. Suppose we permit Hawaii to come into the Union? Would there be any chance for persons to go to Hawaii and thus gain an advantage that would permit them to become American citizens, that they could not gain by coming to New York, say, and coming through the ports of entry there?

Mr. FARRINGTON. None whatsoever. The fact of the matter is that about 87 percent of our people are American citizens. The restrictions apply to Hawaii as they do elsewhere. That is the chief point of entry from the Pacific.

The injustice of the racial restrictions in the present laws has been very dramatically demonstrated in several instances. For many years we had as a resident of the Territory of Hawaii a gentleman by the name of Sir Peter Buck. Sir Peter Buck was the son of an Irish father and a Maori mother. The Maoris are Polynesians, of the same race as the native Hawaiians and the Samoans. The late Sir Peter Buck achieved great distinction in the world as an authority on the Polynesians. His contribution to science was outstanding. He lived in this country for many years. He wanted to become an American citizen, but was not eligible under the present immigration laws because his mother was of a race ineligible to citizenship. He was finally knighted by England—a great honor, but one he would never have accepted had he been allowed, what he regarded a greater privilege—American citizenship.

I was in Hawaii about 2 weeks ago. Among others who called upon me was a young man whose father was an Englishman who had married a Cook Islander, in the South Seas. The people of the Cook Islands like the Maoris and Hawaiians are Polynesians. There are between 300,000 and 400,000 Polynesians on the earth today. They include, among others, the Samoans, a large group of whom have lived under our flag for more than half a century. But they are racially ineligible to citizenship. So the young man who is half Cook Islander cannot become naturalized regardless of anything he did. The enactment of the bill will correct that. It will remove all the racial restrictions in our immigration laws.

On December 7, 1941, every doctor in Hawaii was immediately called into service. Among them was one of our outstanding physicians, a man who had lived and practiced successfully in Hawaii for many years. He is today Ambassador from Korea, Dr. Y. C. Yang. He would undoubtedly have been an American citizen then if it were not for the racial restrictions in our immigration laws. But because of them not only was he not an American citizen, but technically he was an alien enemy and subject of Japan. It was necessary, therefore, to dispense with his services.

These racial restrictions have no place in our naturalization and immigration laws. They have done us untold injury in the past. They will be damaging in the future if they are allowed to remain. This bill proposes that all of them be eliminated. I hope, therefore, that it will be adopted and by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state at the outset that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], and his colleagues of the subcommittee on immigration worked painstakingly on this omnibus bill. It has been the work of hours and hours of labor. They are entitled to credit for weeding out numerous unfair and injudicious provisions that have crept over the years into our immigration and naturalization code.

The bill of course is not perfect. No bill can be perfect. Despite the praise I have given to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his colleagues on the committee, the bill nevertheless warrants careful scrutiny by the Members of the House. It must be amended materially before I shall vote for it. I believe there are some glaring provisions to which we should direct our attention. They have been the subject of considerable criticism and objection. That objection has come from very responsible sources. We cannot, we dare not, disregard that criticism. We must evaluate, naturally, that criticism with all the general provisions of the bill.

By and large, I am willing to accept many provisions of the bill, but numerous others I must reject. Therefore I hope that in the Committee of the Whole when proper amendments are offered and maturely considered, particularly the amendments I have in mind, they will be adopted so as to make this bill a better one. There is provided in this omnibus immigration bill, a very, very broad provision empowering the President of the United States willy-nilly, on good grounds, or—if I may be facetious—on coffee grounds, to suspend totally any immigration into this country. When we go so far as to give an administrative officer, even a President, by mere fiat the right to exercise such tremendous power, then we are departing from our well-known traditional principle of government of law and not government by men. As much as I respect and admire the present incumbent of the White House, much as I respect the office of the Presidency of the United States, I do not want to give either the present incumbent or any future incumbent of the White House,

the right to say that hereafter there shall be no more immigration into the United States. Yes, I would give that right to the head of the executive branch of our Government—I would give that right in time of war, in time of extreme emergency, but not certainly in times of peace. There is no differentiation made: The President has that right in times of peace, in times of war, in times of emergency, and in time of nonemergency, to shut off immigration. I think that is improper, and we should very carefully scrutinize that provision and strike it out.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I know the gentleman does not want to be unfair.

Mr. CELLER. No, I do not want to be unfair.

Mr. WALTER. But the gentleman has failed to state that the only time the President has that authority is in a situation where the entry of an alien would be detrimental to the interest of the United States.

Mr. CELLER. But what is meant by "detrimental" is left entirely to the judgment, or shall I say the possible imagination of the chief executive officer who incidentally usually designates some subordinate to make the determination. So that I still maintain there are no proper safeguards—there are no proper hindrances which would prevent the executive branch of the Government from acting arbitrarily. There is no standard, and ordinarily we erect standards when we give such power. I do not want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to gather from the vehemence of my voice that there is anything personal involved in these objections, but I do believe that at the proper time a suitable amendment should be offered to take care of that situation.

Secondly, I listened with considerable attention to what the gentleman from Ohio said. He was here when I was here way back in 1924 when there was considered in the House, immigration based upon national origins. The gentleman may remember that I took the floor in opposition to what was then a new theory—the theory of national origins. What is meant by "national origins"? "National origins" as it was exemplified in the 1924 act meant that if there is to be any new immigration into this fair land of ours, it should be as near as possible consonant with the complexions and nature of the races and strains of peoples that existed in this country not in 1924 but way back in 1890. Why was 1890 taken as the open sesame, the magic year?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman means 1790 and not 1890?

Mr. CELLER. No. The gentleman is in error. 1890. Why was 1890 taken as the basis for the immigration stock—the new stock that was to come in by virtue of the act of 1924? I will tell you why. It was deliberate; it was not accidental. The year was deliberately chosen because before 1890 the Aryan races came in in profusion, but the Italian race came in after 1890. I am looking at the gentleman from Connecticut who is of that very distinguished race and a very eminent son of that race. Why was 1890 taken? Because they did not want any more Latins in the country. They did not want any more people from eastern and southern Europe in the country because those people had come in after 1890. That is what is meant by "national origins." There were some little changes with reference to the national origins subsequently. I opposed national origins then and I oppose national origins now. If you are going to define to me what is "American," and you define it properly, national origins as embodied in the immigration fabric is un-American. Take the casualty lists in Korea; take the roster of baseball teams: Do you only find people, soldiers, and players who have only British names or Irish names or German names or Aryan names? No. Many have gone through the valley of the shadow of death in Korea and through our wars after 1890 who bore Polish names, Italian names, Czechoslovak names, Rumanian names, Hungarian names, and Jewish names. Be it known that it is unfair to the memory of those who bore those names that we shall continue to say that the peoples who come from southern and eastern Europe are unworthy; first, of entrance into this country; and, second, unworthy of becoming citizens of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

That is why I say today, as I said many years ago right in this well, that the theory of national origins is utterly unfair. So, at the proper time, in order to create some sort of balance, I am going to offer an amendment to provide that where there are unused quotas those quotas shall be equitably divided amongst those countries which have pitifully small quotas. By virtue of the national-origins theory, Great Britain gets 65,700 quota numbers out of a total of 154,000 a year.

Does Great Britain use those quotas? We beckon to the people of Great Britain: "Come in; we will give you 65,700 numbers." How many come in from Great Britain? Usually about 10,000. On closer examination I think that covers Ireland as well as Great Britain, but in any event never has the 65,700 quota been used by Great Britain. It is a hoax; it is a fraud. I emphasize that with all the power within me. When we say Great Britain can use 65,700, practically all that quota goes down the drain. That is horribly unfair.

Then we say to the people of Ireland: "You can come in to the extent of 17,800." They hardly ever use the quota. So when we consider the quota from Italy, the quota from Poland, the quota from Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and so forth and we find that they are so small with people from those countries waiting, waiting, and waiting months on end to come in but cannot because the quota is filled—we know that the quota distribution is a breeder of ill-will and injustice. I want to say those people who are just as worthy as the English who never use the quota, I want to say to those people: "Since the English will not use the quota you shall have some of those quota numbers." To that extent I say to the gentleman from Ohio I am willing to violate the false theory, utterly false and fallacious theory, of national origins.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLAR. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to correct my distinguished friend from New York; he should have said "more worthy than the English."

Mr. CELLER. Let me give you a few figures as to the quota numbers that have gone to the United States over the years. Take England in the 19 years between 1930 and 1948, both inclusive; the English quota was 65,721 per year; multiply that by 19 and you get a permissive quota number of 1,248,699. In those years instead of using 1,240,000 England used 151,000 in 19 years, leaving a balance of 1,097,226 quota numbers which went to waste.

Ireland: The quota is 17,853; multiply by 19 and you have a total of 339,207. In those years only 43,000 Irish quota numbers were used. Thus there went to waste 296,000 quota numbers from Ireland alone.

I am not going to burden you with more statistics except to state that of those quotas in those 19 years, 1930 to 1948, 2,151,372 quota numbers were wasted.

All I want to do is simple justice, take those wasted quota numbers and put them to good use by dividing them amongst the nations that have quotas of less than 7,000. That would increase a bit the Italian quota, the Polish quota, and so forth; and then we would do away with the theory that was promulgated with such tremendous havoc, loss, and sadism to the world, promulgated by the man who came to power on a cannon top in Germany, Hitler, who advocated that which is very much akin to the national origins theory, namely, herrenvolk and scarbenvolk. He said there were two classes of people, good people and bad people, but he said there was a superior people, the herrenvolk, and there was the inferior people, the slavenvolk, the slave race. He did make slaves out of many of those who were within his clutches. That is what the national-origin theory is. The national-origin theory is that people from southern Europe are the slavenvolk, while the people from northern Europe are the herrenvolk. I see no difference whatsoever, Mr. Chairman. So I want to strike a blow at that theory. I have not the power to rip it out of our statutes completely, but in the interest of fairness, equity, and justice I will ask that this amendment be adopted.

I ask it on the further ground that many of the quotas from these countries that have small quotas are mortgaged to the hilt; they are mortgaged sometimes for 50 years to come, so that if you happen only by accident of birth to have been born in one of those countries you

are penalized, and but for the grace of God, only by a quirk of fate you are native of this country, you are placed in the position of sharing your good fortune, or hugging it to yourself, but if you were born in those countries, and you would want to come to America, God help you, no matter how good you may be, no matter how good citizen material you may be, despite the fact that your brothers or your parents or your relatives might have gone through the valley of the shadow of death under the American flag, you cannot come because the quotas are mortgaged for years and years to come. Many of these people who want to come here are just as good Americans as you and I.

What is America? It is not so much that you were born in America. The important thing is has America been born in you? Benedict Arnold was born in America, but America was not born in him. Alexander Hamilton was not born in America but America was born in him. And I could go on down the line. Many Americans did not have America born in them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, so when you set forth a test, with proper screening for internal security and the like, and these people are worthy, within reasonable limits they should be permitted to come in. That is all I seek by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, beyond that and despite the fact that this is a worthy bill, there are one or two other provisions that stick out like sore thumbs. We have heard tell, and very properly so, that racial restrictions are eliminated from this bill. But that is not quite accurate. Why? Because when it comes to certain of the islands and colonial possessions in the Caribbean area, like Jamaica, Trinidad, and Guadeloupe, what do we have by virtue of this bill? We say to the natives of Jamaica: "You can only come in to the extent of 100." No more is the quota number of the mother country open to them. This is a drastic change. Formerly they could so be charged. We say to those people on the Islands of Trinidad and Guadeloupe, colonial possessions of France, only 100 can come in from those islands. We have always said that anybody born in the Western Hemisphere shall be privileged to come in here quota free, without consideration of quota. Now we say to the Jamaicans there is a quota of 100; you cannot exceed that quota of 100. Is it because the pigmentation of the skin of the Jamaicans is darker than yours and darker than mine that that provision is inserted? You jolly well can lay that unction to your soul. That is the reason that it is unfair; it is unfair to a minority race in this land of ours. So we do continue racial discrimination when it comes to the denizens and the natives of those colonial possessions. What are we going to say to the people of the colored race? I have received many letters from most respectable people of that race complaining about this discrimination. And, you want to treat this lightly. There is no reason as far as I can fathom or gather for the placing of this restriction in this bill. It is wrong and should be taken out of the bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I always am glad to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman said he could not see any reason for it. Well, the reason is a very simple one. The St. Thomas Labor Conference in the Virgin Islands and the Virgin Island Civic Association both communicated with the committee and asked that this be done in order to protect those islands from the large migrations to them from Jamaica.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think there are many Jamaicans coming into this country.

Mr. WALTER. I am not talking about this country; I am talking about going to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. CELLER. Even so, but there is a great principle involved here. I do not know what is behind those communications or those associations in those islands, but I am interested in the principle. We established one principle in our general immigration policy that anybody born within the Western Hemisphere shall not be subject to a quota, and now we say they shall be subject to a quota of 100. That does not seem right. That does not seem fair. It is within the quota of the mother country.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, but do not forget this: This gentleman has endeavored to create the impression that Jamaicans are being discriminated against because of their color. It is just a case of equal treatment. Why should they be more privileged than Australia? More than that, Haiti and the Dominican Republic all come in without regard to quotas, and they are all colored people.

Mr. CELLER. Yes, but if the Australian quota is too small, I would say enhance the Australian quota, but do not depress the Jamaican quota. Why, you cannot argue with me, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that this quota of 100 from Jamaica was not devised to discriminate against certain colored people. I cannot believe that. You can say that all you wish, and I have the greatest respect for the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman has just said he does not believe me, and whether he believes me or not is immaterial. I am merely pointing out to him the fact that this provision is not designed to militate against the Jamaicans because of their color.

Mr. CELLER. I do not want to get into a personal argument with the gentleman because I have affectionate regard for him. But, we have been debating this thing, and I do not want the gentleman to take it personally. I believe it was done deliberately to discriminate, not necessarily by the gentleman from Pennsylvania but by others. You will find out when we go further and further into this debate that there will be many who will disagree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in that regard.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLAR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have this rather unusual situation in the Virgin Islands. I see on the floor some other Members of the House who are quite familiar with this. Certain people in the Virgin Islands, citizens of the United States, object to Puerto Ricans coming from Puerto Rico into the Virgin Islands. Yet those Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States. It is not a question of color, it is a question of something else, the answer to which I have not been satisfied with.

Mr. CELLER. Probably economics.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I do not think it is so much economics because you are substantially fully employed in the Virgin Islands.

The British Island of Tortola is only a few hours' sail from there, very close indeed, perhaps 2½ hours by sailboat. The Virgin Islanders, citizens of the United States, are quite willing for British subjects, Tortolans, to come into the Virgin Islands. It is not a question of race, not a question of color, it is a question of something else. I repeat, I have not yet found a satisfactory answer to it. I think that has something to do with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has just pointed out to us. These are deep-running currents to which we do not know the answer yet.

Mr. CELLER. I do not know what answer to give to the statement of the gentleman. I am not familiar with it. I could not say.

There is another provision I think it is well to direct your attention to, and I am going to read from a portion of the report I filed with this bill:

> Under H. R. 5678, the theory of nativity as the determining factor in the granting of immigration visas is discarded when it comes to persons of oriental stock.

I am addressing myself to what is known as the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions.

> The effect in Asia of such discrimination will have far-reaching effect and will supply ammunition for Communist propaganda in that troubled area of the world. H. R. 5678 places a special stigma on oriental or part-oriental ancestry. Although the proposed measure takes a most important step forward by making all people, regardless of race, eligible for immigration, the very same provisions of the bill establish a racial discriminatory rule for admission by declaring that a person born in any European or other country, outside the Asia-Pacific triangle, "who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the 'Asia-Pacific triangle,'" shall be chargeable—not to the quota of his country of birth—but to the quota of the country of such of his ancestors as were Asiatic, or, if no such quota exists, to the "Asia-Pacific triangle" quota of 100. As was stated succinctly by one of the witnesses:
>
> "We are thus, in effect, announcing to the millions of inhabitants of that area that we are continuing arbitrarily to attach an onus to their national identity and that, as far as this country is concerned, they will never escape that onus no matter to what ends of the earth they may migrate."
>
> The proposed text would certainly be offensive to the countries of Asia to whom we

attribute a contaminating ancestry. Tragic consequences are foreseeable, as a result of such legislation, in the development of our foreign policy vis-à-vis Asia.

That means just this, if I may define it in different terms: If perchance we have a mixed marriage, say in England, where the husband is a Chinaman and the wife is an Englishwoman, the child born in England of that parentage ordinarily, since born in England, would be attributed to the English quota but is now attributed to the Chinese quota.

If there is a Polynesian in, say, Brazil who married a Brazilian woman, ordinarily the issue of that marriage would be subject to the Brazilian situation, and that child could come into this country without consideration of quota. Now that child is attributed to whatever country that Polynesian belonged, and if there was no quota in the law for that country, that issue would come within the basket clause called the Asiatic-Pacific triangle of one hundred. There is no doubt that many of the peoples of Asia are going to consider this provision most offensive. I do not see why it was developed. There was no real reason for it except probably convenience. I do believe a change should be effected so that we would not have a compressing of the issues of such marriages into a so-called Asiatic-Pacific triangle.

Mr. Chairman, I have probably held forth unduly long, but there is one last provision in which I am interested. This bill most commendably provides that a former Communist or totalitarian may recognize the error of his way, may appreciate his mistakes and become a useful member of our democratic society providing his history shows that for 5 years prior to the application for entry, he has departed from his totalitarian, Fascist, or Communist ideologies. That theory of redemption is in keeping with the best ethics of our country, however, we make a distinction here which I do not think is fair. We say to a prospective alien who seeks entrance into this country, "If for 5 years, you have lived an exemplary existence, and you have departed adequately and properly from your bad conduct, and you have discarded the Communist theory and you have lived a decent and righteous life, you can come in. But, if the Communist is in this country, he has to wait 10 years. The theory may have been that since he was in close contact with democracy and still is a Communist for 10 years or 9 years, there is a difference. I cannot see it. I fail to see it. I fail to see why we make a distinction and give the preference to those who are on the other side. To those on the other side we say 5 years, but when it comes to an individual who is here in this country, we say 10 years for him. I cannot see that. I cannot see the reason or the adequacy of any reason for that difference.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Perhaps, if I call your attention to a decision of the Supreme Court in the recent case of Harisiades against the United States, decided March 10, 1952, the gentleman will understand the reason for that. This is what the Supreme Court said:

> During all the years since 1920 Congress has maintained a standing admonition to aliens, on pain of deportation, not to become members of any organization that advocates overthrow of the United States by force and violence, a category repeatedly held to include the Communist Party. These aliens violated that prohibition and incurred liability to deportation. They were not caught unawares by a change of law.

That is the reason why the situation is being dealt with as it is—about which the gentleman complains.

Mr. CELLER. I must even have the temerity to differ with the pronouncements made by the distinguished judges of the Supreme Court. It is not the first time I have disagreed. I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has on many an occasion expressed disappointment and dissatisfaction with the decisions of the Supreme Court. There is nothing sacrosanct about what a Supreme Court judge may utter. Why, no; I have a perfect right to differ with what a Supreme Court Justice may say. I am going to continue to differ with what a Supreme Court Justice may say. I am going to differ with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania may say, or the distinguished members of his committee, and differ with what my very dear friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] may say in that regard. I have an affectionate regard for him, I assure you. I feel if it is 5 years for the one on the other side, it should be 5 years for the one on this side. I cannot see the adequacy of the reason thus expressed in the report or expressed on this floor for that discrimination.

I stop as I began by saying that this job of codifying, reexamining, and revising the Immigration Code is not an easy job. It is very difficult. The professional staff, headed by Mr. Besterman, worked indefatigably on this matter. Mrs. Benn likewise worked night and day. Upon them I place an accolade of distinction because of their painstaking efforts. But despite all that, I would be derelict in my duty if I would not point out what I deem to be the defects in these various provisions, and I hope that at a suitable time those defects will be remedied.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 38 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

First, I want to add my word of appreciation for the work of our administrative assistant, Mr. Walter Besterman, and his legislative clerk, Mrs. Ruth Benn. I know of no two persons who have labored more than they have on the infinite details of this tremendous bill on which we have been engaged for so many months. But over and above any other mark of distinction, I want to pay my respects to the chairman of our subcommittee, Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania. During the 14 years that I have been in Congress I have been on the same subcommittee with him. At one time I was chairman, and at other times he has been chairman. Our relationship has been most pleasant. To him I believe more than any other individual is due the credit for this momentous, magnificent work that has been brought before you. It has been a great work. While I differ radically with my chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I know that out of the kindness of his heart and sweetness of his disposition he is sometimes led astray, but we who face the facts face them with the knowledge that we are protecting, as we think, the best interests of America.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who had the honor of serving on our committee at one time, and who speaks with knowledge and authority of what has taken place in the matter of immigration.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss only one segment of this bill which it seems to me is of very great importance. My view in that respect is no doubt colored by the fact that I have served since I have been in Congress as a member of the objectors committee on the Private Calendar. It is not a job that is designed, as I have said before on this floor, to make friends among the Members. An objector is in the unfortunate and unhappy position sometimes of throwing bills off the calendar which are the particular property, so to speak, of individual Members.

During the years I have served on the objectors committee there have been scores, yes, hundreds, of private immigration bills that have been brought to the floor of this House, either from the old Immigration Committee on which I served, or from the now Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary. It has been one of the very difficult problems of the objectors to discriminate among this multitude of private immigration bills to discern which are worthy and which are unworthy.

Unfortunately, there have been few legislative standards by which we could judge the merits or demerits of private immigration bills. Indeed it has become a difficult task at times.

If this bill is passed—and I believe it will be—it will virtually eliminate the filing of private immigration bills and their consideration on the floor of the House. This, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

The historical analogy that comes to my mind in this respect is the analogy of the old private pension bill. That was a phenomenon that came after the Civil War. Many worthy veterans came to their Congressmen or Senators and asked that a private relief bill be passed for them, indigent and wounded veterans of the great War Between the States. There were many, many private relief bills, pension bills passed in the decades following the Civil War, until there came a time when the whole pension problem was solved by a general pension law. That is an easily understood analogy to the private immigration bills.

We have had these private immigration bills coming to this floor over a long period of time. This bill if passed will solve that problem, I think, 90 percent at least.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to pay my respects to the gentleman and the Objectors Committee for the very careful consideration they have given these private bills. I know how much of a nuisance it must be to them. But I call your attention to the fact that the bill under consideration provides that stepchildren of American citizens shall have the same rights as natural-born children. The adoption of that part of the bill will mean the elimination of about 50 percent of the private bills, because that percentage of the bills deal with stepchildren.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There are two specific provisions in this bill which have direct applicability to what I am talking about. Namely, the provision for the prevention of the separation of families—a great many of the private bills were directed toward that objective, to prevent a family from being separated where a marriage took place overseas or where there was a child adopted overseas or a child born overseas.

The other provision which will be of great importance in eliminating private immigration bills is that which has to do with the adjustment of immigration status. Bills to adjust that status come to the floor frequently. That provision in this bill will solve that problem.

I sincerely hope this bill will be passed, I believe it will be. It will do a great deal of good in doing away with private immigration bills which at best are only a stopgap method of dealing with the very human and appealing situations.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON], who has lately come upon our committee, but who has done outstanding work during her membership. I am only too glad to bear this testimonial of her worth.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of adding my comment in relation to H. R. 5678. I have been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for about 1 year and 4 months and of that time a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization only since January of this year. However, I have been a member of that subcommittee long enough to know of the great amount of work that has been involved in writing this new bill on immigration and naturalization. I am aware of the amount of time, the great amount of interest, the conscientious interest, that has been given by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], in regard to this matter.

I have read this bill over rather carefully, and I believe the best judgment of all of the members of this committee has been utilized in writing the bill. I therefore commend it to the Members of the House for their very serious and careful consideration.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, it is not always easy, in times such as these, for an honest man to cast his vote in this House with the comfortable certainty that time will prove that he made the right choice. But in rising today to voice my opposition to the passage of H. R. 5678, I have that conviction. For we are not concerned merely with the proper distribution of some 150,000 quota numbers each year. Let us be clear about the fact that this is not special-interest legislation, or a measure drawn to meet a specific problem at a given time. We are here concerned with a bill which, for the first time since 1911, proposes to redefine this country's immigration policy in all of its ramifications. And in my considered opinion, the major argument against H. R. 5678 is the evidence of history and of conscience that it represents a repudiation of some of the most basic and time-tried principles underlying the American idea.

Let us remember, today, that this is not the first time that Americans have been called upon to consider this type of legislation. The first organized attack on the immigrant occurred during the administration of John Adams, when the Congress enacted a series of laws which are remembered in history as the repressive measures of his administration. The Naturalization Act, with its provision to increase the requirement for citizenship from 5 to 14 years was clearly an attack on those immigrants and refugees who, because of political upheavals in France and the British Isles, had come to America. These debates indicate that some men of that time wanted to deprive the immigrants of all political rights. Others were content to keep them from holding office. Then, as now, the argument was that national security considerations required such measures. But, as we all know, the laws were speedily repealed after the Jeffersonians won the election of 1800, and time proved that the little band of fearful men responsible for the repressive measures were wrong.

During the 1840's and 1850's Americans were subjected to another period of intense nativist agitation. This time the chief targets were the refugees from Ireland and Germany. The agitators used platforms and pamphlets to warn their fellow citizens of the dangers of allowing the country to be taken over by "splay-footed Irish bog trotters," and "dumb, lop-eared Dutchmen." Fortunately, once again, wiser men were to prevail. It is appropriate, I think, to cite the words of one of them at this time, because they show that, for Abraham Lincoln, the issue was clear. On August 24, 1855, Lincoln wrote to Joshua F. Speed:

> As a Nation we began by declaring that "all men are created equal, except Negroes." When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read, "all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics." When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty.

I cite these few instances in the long story from our past because I believe that they emphasize the fundamental principles upon which my own convictions rest. My first and most fundamental reason for opposing H. R. 5678 in its present form arises from my belief that we must carry forward into the future the precious principles of the past. It is within this framework that I submit my specific objections to certain of the proposals of the bill before us now.

I am opposed to H. R. 5678 because it incorporates principles of restriction which I believe to be both outdated and discriminatory. And here let us look at the facts. You will recall that national origins principle, outlined in the Immigration Act of 1924, reduced quotas from Southern and Eastern Europe to only 14 percent of the annual total, while increasing the percentage from Northern and Western Europe to 84 percent. If such a distribution seemed inequitable in 1924, certainly it is far more unreal and inequitable today. Moreover we now know that the methods used in determining the national origins of the population were necessarily superficial, since nationality was chiefly determined by surnames. If a name had been Anglicized either legally or to simplify procedure at Ellis Island during an earlier period, it went down on the British list. I know of instances for example, where Italian immigrants early in the century, struggling to give their proper names, were "assisted' by the inspectors at port of entry through the expedient of translating the first name "'Paolo" into a surname of "Pollock." If the national origins principle is to apply, certainly it should at least be brought up to date, both by adopting the 1950 census rather than the 1920 census, and by using the more precise methods of refined statistical research which we have today.

But I should like to point out, too, that the record of the past quarter century shows us first of all that immigration has not, in fact, flowed in the national origins channels for the major reason that established quotas of many countries have never been fully realized. And these unfilled quotas were not confined to the favored countries of northern and western Europe. Let us look, for example, at the quota for Italy. Between 1930 and 1934 only 49 percent of the Italian quota was used. Between 1935 and 1939 it rose slightly to 52 percent, but in 1940–44 it dropped radically to 17 percent. In 1945 less than 10 percent of the quota was filled, and in 1946 the figure stood at 33 percent. The truth of the matter is, then, that for most of the period since the 1924 act went into effect, even the limiting quotas set by that act have not been filled—largely as the result of depression in the 1930's and of World War II. During the period 1930 to 1946, the favored countries of northern and western Europe used on the average 17 percent of their quotas, while in southern and eastern Europe only 42 percent of the much smaller annual quotas were used during this period. In the quarter century from 1924 to 1950 only 1,500,000 immigrants were able to enter our country

under quotas, while a total of approximately 2,500,000 quota numbers went unused.

Since the war, as we know, the Congress has enacted special legislation to admit displaced persons from the war-torn areas of Europe. We could have chosen to admit them by using unused quota numbers. But we did not. We chose instead to admit displaced persons in numbers exceeding annual quotas in certain instances, but to charge the excess against future quotas, with a future-quota-sharing limit of 25 percent of each national quota for the years 1950 to 1954, and 50 percent of each quota thereafter. Now how does that decision apply to our legislation today?

Such a policy has, of course, resulted in the fact that the future quotas of many countries are mortgaged far into the future. The quota for Yugoslavia, for example, has been mortgaged in this way up to the fiscal year 2001; the quota for Greece to the year 2013; and the quota for Turkey to the year 1964.

These are only a few examples and I have chosen these countries not only to show the effect of mortgaged quotas on immigration policy for the future, but also to illustrate another point which is a very important one in our consideration today. We must ask ourselves what effect such restrictions have upon the people of Greece, of Yugoslavia, and of Turkey—those key countries in our stand against Communist aggression. We must realize that we are not concerned alone with domestic policy in this matter—but that our decision in this matter will very profoundly affect world opinion and our own foreign policy. Can we honestly believe that these countries—or any country—can interpret such legislation in any but an unfriendly light? And can we honestly hope that the peoples of these countries will be inspired to join us in our stand against totalitarianism at the same time that we write the kind of legislation which is here proposed?

No one will deny that the security of our country must be defended from spies and enemy agents. The question is whether we shall accomplish this purpose with rigid, arbitrary, and unrealistic bans or by the proper and proved method of careful screening.

I am opposed to this bill because its security provisions, as written, would not only make it difficult for some of this country's best friends to be admitted, but many naturalized citizens would be forced to live constantly in fear of deportation or loss of citizenship, because of violation of a simple municipal ordinance, such as parking a car at the wrong time or in the wrong place. The further proposal that wherever there is a minor, technical defect in the admission of an alien, he or she is always subject to deportation, is another example of the kind of thinking which, in my opinion, should not be written into legislation because it is contrary to the most basic precepts of our legal system.

I am opposed to H. R. 5678 because, in section 212 (a) it abdicates for Congress the power of the control of immigration by providing that the President may, at any time, establish a barrier against the entry of any or all foreigners to the United States. It may be necessary, in times of great emergency, to delegate such power to the President briefly. But it is poor policy and poor democracy to grant such power to one man and to allow him to use it under normal as well as under emergency conditions.

It is impossible, at this time, to enumerate all of the reasons which I could give for my opposition to this bill, on a page-by-page or a point-by-point basis. Many of my objections have already been made on the floor today. The underlying assumption of the legislation seems to be that every would-be immigrant is a suspicious character who is to be admitted, if at all, by sufferance and who is to remain subject at all times to instant apprehension and deportation. I believe that rather than this un-American and negative approach our immigration legislation should be based on the assumption that the infusion of fresh new blood, of a selected stream of immigration, is good for the economic, spiritual, and cultural growth of our country which was settled and peopled by immigrants and built to greatness by immigrants.

It is true that H. R. 5678 provides at least two important improvements on our existing immigration and naturalization system. It would make Asiatics eligible for admittance and citizenship, even though it retains a strict racial concept by discarding the principle that place of birth determines country of origin in the case of persons of oriental stock. And it removes existing discriminations on account of sex. But in an omnibus measure such as this, the record of a few improvements such as those noted is far outweighed by the multitude of undesirable features which I have just outlined.

Let us, in this year 1952, reject the outworn principles of the past—many of which are demonstrably unworkable—and write into law a genuine revision of our immigration policy which will reflect the kind of Americanism we are proud to show to the world. One major and relatively simple way of accomplishing that purpose is the manner suggested in other bills before this Congress which call for the pooling of unused quotas at the end of each year in order to make visas available for the benefit of victims of political or racial persecution.

A little over 60 years ago the Statue of Liberty was dedicated as a gift of the French Nation to the American people. The statue was the work of Auguste Bartholdi, an Alsatian who had fought for France in 1871 and for Italian liberty under Garibaldi. The funds needed to build a pedestal for the monument were raised by the New York publisher, Joseph Pulitzer, a Hungarian refugee, and it was Emma Lazarus who wrote the immortal lines on the tablet. For millions of people in the past, as for millions of people today, that statue has stood as a symbol of man's most cherished dreams of freedom and opportunity. Let us do nothing here which will dim the light which flows from her torch throughout our own land, and throughout the world.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 5678, which we are considering today represents nearly 4 years of intensive study and consideration. I am in sympathy with its laudable purpose of redefining and codifying our immigration and naturalization procedures into a consistent whole. No one is more aware than I am of the long hours and patient study which have gone into this bill. But most of all I am concerned today with the basic principles which are incorporated into this measure. However, at this time in the history of our country, and in the history of the world, I cannot justifiably support a bill which, by its restrictive features, makes it even more difficult for immigrants to enter this country—and to remain here—than it has even been before. To such restrictive measures I am opposed.

I want to go on record in support of a more equitable principle of immigration. In my opinion, it is better to adhere to the principle of equity for which this country stands, and demonstrate to the world that we continue to believe in our time-honored tradition of asylum. Without changing the fundamental basis of the quota system, and without increasing the legally established number of admissions each year, we can adopt modifications which will liberalize the quota system and make it conform with world conditions.

Thoughtful persons are becoming increasingly aware of the direct and important relationship between the immigration policy of the United States and our policy of joining with the other nations of the world in defense of our way of life. However the restrictive features of this bill will work the greatest hardship against those countries on the continent of Europe which are joined with us in the North Atlantic Pact. An even more important reason why I am opposed to further restrictions arises from my conviction that our history and our development as a nation have demonstrated that immigration—adjusted to our absorptive capacity—is good for the country.

In H. R. 5678 this Congress is being asked to reendorse a principle of quota distributions which is, to my mind, thoroughly contrary to the American idea. I refer, of course, to the quotas set under the "national origins" principle in the 1924 act. I think it is time to call the principle for what it is—an attempt to set out a theory of racial superiority. Our immigration-total quotas permitted to be distributed for a year number 153,929. Of this group the northern and western European countries—12 of them—are allotted 125,855. The southern and eastern European countries—about 18 nations—are allotted 24,648. In a period of 130 years, from 1820 to 1949, Great Britain, which has a yearly quota of 65,721, has sent to the United States 4,373,937 people. Italy, which has a quota allotment of 5,802, has sent to the United States in the same period of 130 years 4,765,430. Yet Italy now has a waiting period of 6 to 8 years.

Moreover, I cannot justify an extension of the existing system of rigid national quotas because, as the record has shown, the principle underlying the national-origins theory simply does not work. The major reason, of course, is the fact that quotas of all countries have been so largely unused during most of the years of its application.

The historical picture of American immigration since 1925 illustrates how large blocks of unused quota numbers have influenced American immigration, largely as a result of the fact that the national-origins principle had the effect of reducing quotas from southern and eastern Europe to only 14 percent of the total for all countries, while increasing the percentage from northern and western Europe to 84 percent—remaining 2 percent going to Africa and Asia. The British quota, for example, was raised to 65,721 annually, and Britain and Ireland received more than 50 percent of all quota allotments. The fact that the number of persons admitted under the British quota has at no time since 1931 exceeded 7 percent, and that Irish quotas have not exceeded 10 percent of the total is a major reason for a large block of unfilled quotas each year in one area—northern and western Europe—at the same time that quotas from southern and western Europe are now heavily oversubscribed.

In the 25 years from 1924 until 1950, only two-fifths of quota numbers have been filled, and only 1,500,000 immigrants have entered this country under quotas, while approximately 2,500,000 quota numbers were unused. Between 1930 and 1949, only 836,085 quota immigrants were admitted, and it has been estimated that 2,240,169 quota numbers available during that period were lost. It is true, of course, that outside factors influenced this result. A substantial drop in immigration during the 1930's, for example, was influenced by the depression and the consequent inability of United States residents to bring their relatives here, together with a strict interpretation of the 1917 provision excluding persons likely to become a public charge. Similarly, wartime conditions in the 1940's resulted in a substantial reduction of normal immigration. But the operation of the "national origins" principle in weighting annual quotas in favor of certain countries, has also had a marked effect, especially as small quotas have generally applied in the countries where the greatest demand for visas prevails.

In its provisions for mortgaging future quotas to admit displaced persons, the Congress has further limited the quotas of those countries of southern and eastern Europe where the demand for visas is heaviest. As of December 10, 1951, the future quotas of 17 countries were mortgaged for a period ranging up to over a century. Just for a moment I would like to call your attention to the effect this legislation has had on the quotas of three countries which are extremely important to us at this time, namely, Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. As of December 10, 1951, the quota for Greece was mortgaged up to the year 2011. At the same time the registration of intending quota immigrants from that country totaled 16,195. Yugoslavia's quota is mortgaged to the year 1998, and more than 33,000 persons are on the waiting list. Turkey's quota is mortgaged to the year 1963, and 7,780 persons are on the waiting list.

One notable result of the operation of quota immigration under existing law has been a marked change in the type of immigration. Prior to the 1924 act, more than 60 percent of immigrants were males. By 1947, however, females predominated, constituting about 59 percent of the total. Increases in family immigration was reflected in figures showing an increase in the proportion of children and older people, and a decrease in the proportion of prospective wage-earners. At the same time, curtailment of immigration has resulted in pronounced reductions in the foreign-born and alien populations of the United States. In 1910 the foreign-born constituted 14.7 percent of the entire population. This proportion dropped to 11.6 percent in 1940 and to an estimated 6.6 percent in 1950. A rough count of the number of aliens now in this country puts the figure at around 3,000,000, but no accurate figure will be available until 1950 census figures are available sometime during the summer of 1952.

These facts sharply emphasize the point that in terms of contributions, in terms of need, and in terms of waste, the quota system based on national origin is hopelessly out of balance. If there is no hope of changing this unrealistic and unfounded system of national quotas we can, at the very least, adopt the proposal that the unused quotas can be distributed more equitably among those countries which have been so arbitrarily discriminated against. Under this proposal unused quotas for the year would be distributed to those countries with less than 7,000 annual quotas in the same proportion as they bear to the total quotas of these countries. All of the countries now so greatly penalized would benefit under this plan. As we have seen, almost 50 percent of the quotas go to waste each year while human beings live in alternate currents of hope and despair for periods.

Another important improvement would be a provision to liberalize the method of allotting quota numbers. At present no more than 10 percent of the total annual quotas are permitted to be allotted during each month. This means that at the end of the year there is a tragic waste of numbers of quotas which otherwise could have been used. For example, Italy, with its quota of 5,802 could use, because of its 10-percent provision, only 5,207 quota numbers despite the fact that Italy has a waiting period of 6 to 8 years. This proposal keeps the 10-percent limitation for 10 months of the year, but wisely frees the last 2 months.

Let us consider, briefly, some of the arguments advanced by the advocates of a restrictive policy. We are told that millions of persons in Europe are trying to come to the United States; that we must solve our own economic problems before accepting further immigration; and that the new immigrants will take jobs away from American workers. These arguments simply do not stand up in the light of cold facts and logic.

In the first place it must be clear that we would not be overwhelmed by a deluge of new immigrants under the unused quota proposal since the number who may enter the United States each year is still limited to approximately 150,000 persons each year—a figure which represents less than one one-thousandth of our total population. Controlled immigration is established as an integral and necessary part of American policy, and few would propose that we abandon that policy.

The suggestion that we must postpone new immigration until some of our economic problems are solved is convenient but hardly convincing. In the first place, we have always had urgent economic problems, and undoubtedly always will have them. We learned during the 1930's that immigration automatically declines as a result of economic depression. Now, in a period of manpower shortages, full employment, and high prosperity there is even less validity to this argument.

The charge that new immigrants will take jobs from American workers stems from the old days of mass immigration when there was a tendency for immigrants to accept lower wages and inferior working conditions. But in these days of strong unions, full employment, and Government safeguards, these dangers have largely disappeared.

The arguments in favor of a closed-door policy have been repeated over and over again since the days of John Adams in spite of the fact that our periods of greatest expansion have invariably coincided with our periods of greatest immigration. The record shows the role which immigrants have played in pushing our frontier west and in building the industrial machine which is the greatest the world has ever seen. We know that immigration is good for the country in terms of national wealth, national culture, national productivity, and national defense. We know that the new skills brought by immigrants can create new industries; that new blood and new cultures enrich the creativity of our land. We know that the five States with the largest populations of foreign born—New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Michigan—are also among the most prosperous of all the States.

Without the immigration of our past, it is safe to say that our country could never have risen to the position of leadership which it commands today. For example, it has been estimated that if it had not been for immigration since 1789 our population today would be approximately 85,000,000, or a little more than the population of Japan. Population experts have pointed to America's declining birth rate and have predicted that our population would become static by 1970. When this prospect is contrasted with the predictions of rapid increase for the populations of countries like Russia, the danger to our world position becomes apparent.

The question of immigration is so basic to our welfare, so basic to our interna-

tional relations, and so basic to the growth and development of this country that we must make every effort to place the national need above personal prejudices in considering this legislation. I am confident that the Congress will keep its eyes on the future. I believe we will demonstrate to the world that we are the kind of land which can grow and develop dynamically and generously. Thus, we shall most effectively proclaim the blessings of liberty throughout the world.

UNITED STATES NEEDS LIBERALIZED, NOT RESTRICTIVE, IMMIGRATION

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my vigorous opposition to the Walter immigration bill, H. R. 5678. It has been reported to us as a package bill designed to codify and revise our immigration and naturalization laws. It is package legislation all right—a package which, in my opinion, fails to list all of its "ingredients" on the label.

First of all, it should be noted that we are not concerned here only with a measure which seeks to clarify and codify existing immigration and naturalization procedures. Surely no one who has read it can deny that this bill proposes, as well, to write into basic legislation the most discriminatory and restrictive immigration policy this country has ever seen.

I am opposed to this bill because I am convinced that it not only outlines an unduly restrictive immigration and naturalization policy but also because it contains major threats to our civil liberties, our foreign policy, and our way of life.

H. R. 5678 has been described as a bill to modernize our immigration system. The restrictive principles contained in this bill are just about as far removed from modern needs and requirements as they could be. This is no time to set our standards narrowly or provincially. A sound national immigration policy would make it practicable for us to admit larger numbers of worthy immigrants from the overcrowded countries of the Old World. Thus, we would contribute our share toward the relief of population pressures in war-torn countries abroad and we would, at the same time, add to our supply of manpower so urgently needed here in order to assure continued and expanded productivity on our farms and in our factories which is so vital to our national security.

Moreover, the Walter bill fails to modernize our immigration system in another important area. It retains the 1920 census data as the base for quota allotments—thereby rejecting the opinion of experts who hold that it would be more logical to use the 1950 census as a base. I heartily agree with our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER], that our immigration system should use the 1950 base. Surely even the most ardent advocates of the national origins principle cannot really believe that this principle can apply to the American Nation today, unless it is kept up to date.

If our aim is really to modernize the immigration and naturalization system, then we should first make the necessary changes in those sections or provisions of the immigration laws which have never functioned properly. The historical picture of American immigration since 1925 demonstrates that only about two-fifths of the quota numbers have been filled—which, in itself, is the clearest indication that the "national origins" principle has never worked. Only 1,500,000 immigrants have entered this country under quotas in the last quarter of a century, while approximately 2,500,000 quota numbers were not used at all.

The fault for this can be directly and entirely ascribed to the "national origins" concept, which awarded 84 percent of the total quota numbers to the so-called Nordic countries of northern and western Europe, while only 14 percent were allotted to southern and eastern Europe where the need is greatest. Clearly, from the record, this unrealistic quota distribution should be revised and modernized, and there are bills before this House which would do it.

One of the simplest and most effective ways is to use the method of pooling unused quota numbers, as outlined in the Celler or in the Roosevelt bills. In adopting this method, we would achieve greater flexibility to meet world conditions without requiring a major overhauling of the whole immigration system.

Of course, the most logical step would be to eliminate the "national origins" principle altogether. Picture for a moment if we were to apply this principle to other legislation, for example, the draft law. Suppose we specified in that law that 84 percent of the draftees must be descended from Nordic stock and only 14 percent of the draftees could be descendants of immigrants from Italy, Greece, Poland, and the rest of the countries of southern and eastern Europe. Suppose we had had to fight World War II with that kind of an Army, Navy, and Air Force. Could anything be more ridiculous than that?

Now, let us briefly examine some of the other provisions of this bill, which are particularly objectionable and which are not described on the label. We have been told that this bill repeals all racial discrimination from our immigration and naturalization laws. I wish that were true. But how can it be claimed that racial discrimination is repealed when the bill makes a specific exception in the case of persons of oriental stock? While all other aliens qualify for quota numbers according to the country of their birth, applicants of oriental extraction, regardless of where they were born, are admitted on the basis of their race. Is that the kind of policy which will improve our position in the vital area of Asia? Is that the kind of democracy we want to proclaim to the world?

Actually, this bill establishes a new form of racial discrimination—against Negroes from Jamaica, Trinidad, and the other British West Indies—by setting special ceilings of 100 quota numbers for each of these colonies within the quotas of the mother country. Under present law no ceiling is set for these British possessions and immigration from there to the United States has been largely unrestricted. Such a provision discriminates against these Caribbean neighbors of ours by imposing ceilings and by making them the only group in the Western Hemisphere subject to quota limitations. Up until now, natives of all other countries in this hemisphere have enjoyed nonquota status.

I am further opposed to the Walter bill because it provides for procedures which, in my opinion, run directly counter to the basic principles underlying civil liberty and the bill of rights. It is an administrator's bill—a bill which could remove powers now properly belonging to Congress and to the courts.

In effect, Congress offers to abdicate its power over the control of immigration by providing that the President may completely shut off immigration at any time. This power of the President is not limited to times of emergency, but may be invoked at his will. Anyone who has read this bill carefully must be greatly concerned with the almost arbitrary power it bestows upon officials to seize, deport, or bar aliens from this country without the right of appeal. Deportation, for example, can be authorized by such officials for technical violations of law, and in some cases even where no violation of law is involved.

The bill we now have under consideration also provides for the revocation of citizenship—one of the most severe penalties which could be applied to a naturalized American citizen. It distinguishes between native-born and naturalized citizens for a probationary period extending for 10 years beyond the granting of final papers by providing for revocation of the citizenship of naturalized Americans. It would grant to immigration officials unprecedented powers for search, seizure, and deportation of aliens in this country.

To me, these are police-state methods. I regard them as constituting a serious threat to our democratic form of government. I am not convinced by the argument that these methods need not be used if proper and judicious people are employed in administrative jobs. If there is one conviction that is basic to our democratic way of life, it is certainly the principle that ours is a Government of laws rather than of men, and that our liberties must be protected through laws, rather than by individuals.

Mr. Chairman, I have covered only a few of the most glaring deficiencies contained in this bill. There are many other objections to H. R. 5678, which will undoubtedly be explored and discussed by other speakers. All of these objections should help to establish clearly the great shortcomings of this bill.

Congress must reject the Walter immigration bill in its present form for reasons which are vital to the freedom and the continued growth of our land. Let us make certain that whenever any man, regardless of his race, color, or creed, applies for an immigration visa, he will have the opportunity to see democratic ideals in operation. Let us write an immigration bill which will clearly speak to all the world of what we mean by the idea of American democracy.

The Walter immigration bill is not in accord with that idea and it should, therefore, be defeated.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this bill is very lengthy, containing 165 pages, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be considered as having been read and open for amendment at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, table of contents, amend the title of section 212, as follows: After the word "aliens" strike out the remainder of the title and add the following: "ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 7 of paragraph (9), after the words "Panama Canal", add the word "Zone."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of amendments similar to the ones just read. There are 37 that are editorial amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments to be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 7 of paragraph (15) (H), change the word "campable" to "capable."

Page 19, beginning on line 4 of paragraph (4), strike out "; and" after the word "parent" and substitute a period, and strike out all of paragraph (5) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) other than as specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection, or as defined in paragraphs (27) (A), (27) (B), (27) (D), (27) (E), (27) (F), and (27) (G) of section 101 (a), any alien who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle defined in subsection (b) of this section shall be chargeable to a quota as specified in that subsection: *Provided*, That the spouse and child of an alien defined in section 101 (a) (27) (C), if accompanying or following to join him, shall be classified under section 101 (a) (27) (C), notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section."

Page 23, in the title of section 204, substitute "Immigrant" for "Immigration."

Page 34, line 6 of subsection (c), substitute "(25)" for "(24)."

Page 34, paragraph (3) of subsection (d), line 6, after the words "recommendation by", add "the Secretary of State or by."

Page 36, line 2 of paragraph (8), after the word "servants", insert "personal."

Page 42, section 222 (a), beginning on line 3 and ending on line 8, delete the language beginning with "Such application shall be filed" through and including "as may be designated by regulation."

Page 43, line 1 of subsection (b), strike out "Every alien making application for a visa as an immigrant" and substitute in lieu thereof "Every alien applying for an immigrant visa."

Page 43, lines 1 and 2 of subsection (c), strike out "Every alien applying for a visa and for alien registration as a nonimmigrant" and substitute in lieu thereof "Every alien applying for a nonimmigrant visa and for alien registration."

Page 51, line 7 of subsection (c), strike out the word "accompany" and insert in lieu thereof the word "accompanying."

Page 59, paragraph 8, line 1, after the words "Attorney General, has", strike out the word "heretofore."

Page 59 (paragraph 8, lines 2 and 3, after the words "entry become", strike out ", or hereafter and at any time after entry shall be or shall have been."

Page 70, strike out all of paragraph (3) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) is deportable under paragraph (2) of section 241 (a) as a person who has remained longer in the United States than the period for which he was admitted, or under paragraph (9) of section 241 (a) as a person who was admitted as a nonimmigrant and failed to maintain the nonimmigrant status in which he was admitted or to which it was changed pursuant to section 248, or to comply with the conditions of such status, or under any law of the United States for an act committed or status acquired subsequent to such entry into the United States and is not within the provisions of paragraph (4) or (5) of this subsection; was possessed of all of the requisite documents at the time of such entry into the United States; has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than 5 years immediately following the commission of an act, or the assumption of a status, constituting a ground for deportation and proves that during all of such period he has been and is a person of good moral character; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child who is a citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or."

Pages 70 and 71, strike out all of paragraph (5) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) is deportable under paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), or (16) of section 241 (a) or under the act of May 10, 1920, as amended, for an act committed or status acquired subsequent to such entry into the United States; has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than 10 years immediately following the commission of an act, or the assumption of a status, constituting a ground for deportation, and proves that during all of such period he has been and is a person of good moral character; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien's spouse, parent, or child who is a citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence."

Page 73, strike out section 246 (a) and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 246. (a) If, at any time within 5 years after the status of a person has been adjusted under the provisions of section 244 of this act or under section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the person was not in fact eligible for such adjustment of status, the Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case. Such reports shall be submitted on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation, the person shall thereupon be subject to all provisions of this act to the same extent as if the adjustment of status had not been made. If, at any time within 5 years after the status of a person has been adjusted under the provisions of section 245 or 249 of this act to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the person was not in fact eligible for such adjustment of status, the Attorney General shall rescind the action taken granting an adjustment of status to such person and canceling deportation in the case of such person if that occurred and the person shall thereupon be subject to all provisions of this act to the same extent as if the adjustment of status had not been made."

Page 93, the last line of section 284, strike out "specificaly" and substitute the word "specifically."

Page 97, line 4 of section 291, after the words "that he is", insert the following "eligible to receive such visa or such document, or is."

Page 102, line 3 of subsection (c) of section 307, substitute "1953" for "1952."

Page 107, line 4 of section 315 (a), substitute "relieved" for "relieve."

Page 110, line 11 of section 318, after the word "Service.", strike out the remainder of the section.

Page 112, line 2 of paragraph (3), after the words "separation of the parents", insert "or the naturalization of the mother if the child was born out of wedlock and the paternity of the child has not been established by legitimation."

Page 122, line 2 of subsection (c), substitute the word "to" for "in."

Page 142, in the title of section 349, substitute the word "naturalized" for "nationalized."

Page 143, line 9, substitute "twenty-fifth" for "twenty-third."

Page 144, paragraph (b), line 4, substitute "state" for "State."

Page 144, paragraph (b), line 5, substitute "state" for "State."

Page 148, paragraph (1), line 2 of section 354, after the words "World War II,", insert "or the Korean conflict."

Page 153, add the following sentence at the end of subsection (i): "The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives may assign members of the staff of the said committees to serve on the staff of the committee, without additional compensation, except for the reimbursement of expenses incurred by such staff members as prescribed in this subsection."

Page 153, add a new subsection "(k)" to read:

"(k) This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this act."

On page 157, at the end of subsection (h) (2) add the following: "The second proviso to subsection (c) of section 3 of the act of June 25, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009, 64 Stat. 219), is further amended by deleting the language 'and before January 1, 1949' and by deleting the language 'outside Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria:'."

On page 159, line 4 of subsection (k), change "243" to "242" and "244" to "243."

Page 159, section 403 (a) (5), change "1898" to "1893."

Page 158, last line of the page, after the words "held in Italy" strike out the word "on" and insert in lieu thereof the word "between."

Page 159, line 1, after the date "April 18, 1948," insert the word "inclusive."

Page 162, strike out section 407 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 407. Except as provided in subsection (k) of section 401, this act shall take effect at 12:01 antemeridian United States eastern standard time on the one hundred eightieth day immediately following the date of its enactment."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman reserving the right to object, I think I know what the answer will be, but in order to make the RECORD clear I think that the gentleman should state that all of these amendments are purely clerical, and that none of them change the real text or the real purpose of the act.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman is correct, and they are all printed in the report with an explanation as to why the changes should be made. They carry the same numbers in the report.

Mr. JENKINS. So that if the citizens of the United States who have been interested in this text as it has gone out see the printed text, we can safely assure them that these changes do not change the substantive law in any particular.

Mr. WALTER. That is exactly correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 5, paragraph (6), substitute a semicolon for the period after the word "regulations" and add the following: "a special border crossing identification card may be issued by the Attorney General to an alien within the United States who has been given assurance of the availability to him of an immigration visa at a United States consulate located in foreign contiguous territory and whose admissibility to the United States has been predetermined in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to preserve the situation that exists now between Canada and the United States where there are frequent border crossings for the purpose of obtaining American visas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 94, section 281, line 2 of paragraph (6), strike out "215 (c)" and insert "214 (c)."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to correct a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 105, section 309 (b), first line, substitute "405" in lieu of "404."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the same purpose, to correct a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 149, section 353, paragraph (3), line 2, strike out all language appearing after the word "naturalization" and substitute in lieu thereof "and prior to the establishment of his foreign residence; or."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to preserve the citizenship of any naturalized citizen who has lived in the United States for 25 years, and thereafter obtains employment or goes to some other country for business purposes. If he goes to the country of which he was a national, at the end of 3 years he would lose his citizenship. If he goes to a third country, at the end of 5 years he would lose his citizenship. It is the opinion of the committee that after having resided in the United States for 25 years a citizen who has been a naturalized citizen for that period of time should be permitted to stay wherever his business requires him for a period in excess of the 3- and 5-year periods.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Section 201 (a), change period at the end of subsection to colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That the unused portion of the sum total of all quotas for each fiscal year shall be made available in the following fiscal year in direct proportion to the quotas for each quota area affected, to immigrants specified in paragraph (4) of section 203 (a) of this title if such immigrants are determined to be chargeable to quotas not exceeding 7,000 annually."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the Members of the Committee that I expressed myself fully on this amendment in my previous remarks. By way of reiteration, the amendment provides in a word as follows:

Where there are unused quotas, those unused quota numbers shall be distributed equitably to those countries which have quotas below 7,000, so that the bulk of the British quota, for example, which is unused to a marked degree, would be pooled with other unused quotas, the quota from Ireland, for example, and that unused quota pool would be equitably divided amongst countries that have quotas below 7,000, like, for example, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and so forth.

As I indicated, in my opinion that would be the only way by which we could give a fair degree of justice, a modicum of justice, to those countries whose nationals wait for many, many years before they can get a quota number to enable them to come to this country, because quotas in many instances are mortgaged for years to come.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to explain further what he means by "equitable distribution"?

Mr. CELLER. Let us assume you have, say 10 countries and you have a pool of say a thousand unused quota numbers. You would then take and add together all quotas of all countries having quotas of 7,000 or under. Then you would find out what proportion a given country's quota bears to the total. Say, for example, Italy would have say 10 percent of the total of all quotas attributed to countries of 7,000 numbers or under. Italy would then have 10 percent of the thousand. Italy would then have 10 percent of all pooled unused quotas. If say Poland's share would constitute 7 percent of the total of countries with 7,000 or less Poland shall have 7 percent of all unused quotas. If Czechoslovakia has 5 percent, for example, it would get 5 percent of the unused quota. If Spain has 3 percent, it would get 3 percent of the unused quota.

Mrs. CHURCH. Does the use of the word "equitable" specify that there should be a semiproportionate method of allocating unused quotas?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think I used the word "equitable" in the amendment. I simply used it in my argument here. But the amendment would be "equitable."

Mrs. CHURCH. Is there any place in the amendment which would permit any authority or any department to use its own discretion in making those quotas?

Mr. CELLER. No, there is a definite standard set.

Mrs. CHURCH. Who will make the allocations in this case?

Mr. CELLER. The State Department will make the allocations.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would have the effect of destroying entirely our theory of national origins. I do not know whether or not the percentages that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has spoken about are correct. I do know that after many hours of deliberation it was decided unanimously by the committees of the House and the Senate not to depart from this theory of national origins.

During the course of the hearings the same argument was raised by a witness by the name of Maslow, who is general

counsel for the American Jewish Congress. In the course of his testimony this colloquy developed:

Representative WALTER. Suppose we adopted some other method, how could we determine where the people were to come from?

Mr. MASLOW. That is a fair question.

Then he goes on to testify:

The only fair way to decide, assuming they meet all the other tests and come within these priorities, is on the first-come first-served basis.

Representative WALTER. I am thoroughly convinced of this: That, if your idea was written into law, our entire immigration for the next year would be from China.

Mr. MASLOW. You mean there are 150,000 Chinese persons who could qualify?

Representative WALTER. The registered requests, according to the information just given to me from the expert from the State Department, exceed a quarter of a million. On a world-wide level it would be between 18,000,000 and 19,000,000.

It seems to me that the only sound and sensible way to deal with this problem is to continue the fundamental philosophy, and any departure from it would result in nobody knows what. I am not prepared at this moment to say to our British cousins, our strongest allies during this hour of danger, that we do not want them to continue to have the same opportunities they have always had ever since we have had an immigration law, and that we are going to pass on those quota numbers to those people who yesterday were shooting at us. It certainly seems to me that if there is to be a departure from our fundamental philosophy, then it ought not to come until there has been a full and complete analysis of the census of 1950. Our committee has requested of the Bureau of the Census that this analysis should be made. They are working on it now. We have been informed it will take them upward of a year to prepare the material. But, until that material is ready so that we will not be legislating in the dark, I do not think we should depart from the practice which has been in existence since 1924. I ask you to vote down this amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Do you think we should continue a quota for Great Britain of almost 65,000, when over the years Great Britain has never used that quota except in small numbers? Do you think that is proper when you consider all the other quota nations?

Mr. WALTER. Of course, I do not regard immigration as a method of getting people or bringing people into the United States. The gentleman from New York talked about wasted numbers. I do not know whether they are wasted. Opportunities are given to those people on a basis which we agreed on in 1924 as the basis for accepting them, and whether they are used or not, as I see it, is beside the point.

Mr. CELLER. Have we not over the years, especially in the early ones, with our immigration policy endeavored to induce people to come into this country? When we were a vast unused continent decades ago, we needed people. See to what extremes, for example, Australia and Canada are now going to induce people to come to their shores. That is because they need the manpower. We needed manpower and offered all manner of inducements for labor to come in. Now while our physical frontiers may have closed, our spiritual and economic and cultural frontiers are unlimited in this country, and we should not be satisfied merely with the brain and brawn of people presently here. We need new seed, the kind of seed which helped to make us what we are. The statistics tell us that unless we get new seed in this country, then because of the lengthening of life and the increased expectancy of life, by the year 1970 or soon after, our population will be static. In other words, deaths will be equivalent to births. We will not go forward from a population standpoint. When we consider the situation in Russia, we find that Russia is advancing her population tremendously and will continue to do so. A country with a static population is a country of the middle-aged, without the vigor and inventiveness of a growing people. From a defense angle alone we have to consider increasing population needs of this country, because when that year is reached that will be a perilous year for us; namely, our population will be static and the Russian population advanced to a very, very marked degree. For offensive as well as defensive purposes we must watch that situation very carefully. This country has been built up by virtue of the brain and brawn that we siphoned off from various nations. That is what has made us great, because we have the highest standard of living that civilization has ever seen. Therefore, I want to induce others to come into this good land of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am still somewhat a newcomer to the House, but even though a newcomer I am interested in America. I am not at all persuaded that anyone outside of this country has any right whatever to come here. Some of the gentlemen have spoken as if there was some inherent right that people in other countries have, no matter what their status and condition may be, to come into this country. If they have anything at all, it is a privilege of coming into this country. If I know anything about privileges, they are something that can either be given or withheld. I maintain that we are in no position at this time to throw our gates wide open to all the world, especially in a time of trouble in which we find ourselves.

If you followed the crime investigation last year about this time you would not have failed to observe the enormous number of people who have been permitted to come into this country, even under conditions that were standard since the act of 1926, and the tremendous development of crime among a goodly portion of those who came here. I know of no right that anyone has except to come here and be a good American citizen.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think if the gentleman will take the trouble to check on the crime statistics, he will find some of them very startling. The FBI will tell you that there is more crime among the native-born than among the aliens. I am telling you that is so.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. But even granting that that is true—I am not informed on that—crime still exists among those who are undesirable citizens, however they came here, even if they came here by accident of birth. We should not throw the gates wide open to people who have demonstrated over a good many years that they are not yet of the type that can easily be built into good American citizens.

It seems to me that the question of racial origins—though I am not a follower of Hitler—there is something to it. We cannot tie a stone around its neck and drop it into the middle of the Atlantic just because it worked to the contrary in Germany. The fact still remains that the peoples of Western Europe have made good American citizens. I come from there, and I am not conscious of any let-down in my loyalty to America. I believe that possibly statistics would show that the Western European races have made the best citizens in America and are more easily made into Americans. In a time of trouble and stress, such as we are going through at this time, it seems to me it is a poor time to increase entry into our country of material that is questionable, when we have a very large proportion of people that we have not yet digested, and who have not yet learned the first principles of American citizenship. If there was some law that could take these people that you even wish to bring here and put them out on the prairies of the West, I maintain they would make good American citizens in a considerably shorter time than if you leave them penned up among the people of their own kind in the large eastern cities where they do not learn to talk English readily. They read their own newspapers. It has been my impression from the short space of time spent in those eastern cities that it takes almost three generations to make a good American citizen.

I feel very strongly about this. I do not know that I have any opposition to any peoples at all; if I have, I am not conscious of it. I do not care what the color of their skin is; the only importance with me is whether they are material that will make good American citizens readily; if they are, it is all right with me. I am opposed to the amendment because I am of the opinion it will tend to bring in many aliens, whose general characteristics seem to show they do not readily make the best American citizens, and the exigencies of the times seems to indicate that none of that type should be admitted at this time, either within or without quotas. America must guard its citizenship.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to take this opportunity to ask the author of the amendment a question: How would the amendment affect unused quotas which developed during the war for such countries, say, as Italy? Does it apply to them at all?

Mr. CELLER. It applies only to prospective quotas.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, it applies only to unused quotas which may develop in the future.

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the parents, grandparents, or great-grandparents of most of us came from some other country. The fact that they left their country and then came here and became good citizens would not seem to be any proof that others now wanting to avail themselves of a similar privilege would not make good citizens. I agree wholeheartedly with the views so logically expressed by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD]. I do know many people who came from abroad and who are good citizens even in the first generation. I do not eavesdrop, but just a moment ago I heard my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MASON] suggest that he came from abroad. He is not even a first-generation American; he is just an American, always loyal to this his land, never lacking either the ability or the words to preach Americanism—adherence to constitutional principles.

But what this amendment, as I get it, would do would be to open wide the door to those countries whose people might or might not make good citizens after they arrived. I do not think that at this time we should take any chance on that.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] challenged the statement that a great many of those engaged in organized crime came from the foreign-born.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say "organized crime."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman did not say what?

Mr. CELLER. I did not use the word "organized."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very well; I will accept the gentleman's statement. I will say "crime." "Organized crime," according to KEFAUVER, the fellow, so he hopes, who is going to be the next President, or the nominee, anyway, the nominee—well, I will be very, very glad to see someone who is sincere in the belief that we should get rid of crime, including the criminals, in the present administration in the White House, but we need go no further than to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TAFT, to get that kind of a President.

Now, the record will show that organized crime is headed by people most of whom came from abroad and even some of them that were fired out of here, deported, still conduct their criminal activities here.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the provision in this bill with respect to the deportation of gamblers was inserted as a result of the investigations of the committee headed by the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Michigan referred.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean that grass-roots candidate who is running throughout the country for the Democratic presidential nomination, who appeared on television? And who, until he put on his show and went on tour at the taxpayers' expense was comparatively an unknown?

Mr. WALTER. The man who wears the peculiar hat.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Wears a peculiar hat. Well, I am glad he did no worse, if I may use that word, because I can think of some animal's hide—pelt, I guess they call it, for a cap, which would not be quite as—well, I do not know how to put that—as acceptable in polite society, let us say as the coon-skin cap. I have noticed recently that it is not worn so frequently—perhaps because some mistake it for part of a mink.

The gentleman said that we were in such a state, woeful I think he said, that we needed new foreign seed to increase our population and to it add strength, courage, and apparently many other good qualities he seemed to think our people now lacked.

To me that shows a most amazing lack of appreciation of our own people. I hope my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], will get that. That is what this country needs. So said the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], people from abroad to teach Americans their view of what Americanism is and means. Just some more people abroad—from the islands of the seas to put a little vigor and life into us. I would not object so much to that if I thought any good would come out of it, but I do recall that our soldiers abroad are doing a pretty fair job in creating a desire for freedom and liberty among certain groups over there. Not only do the wives and children of our men in the Armed Forces want to come here, but most of the in-laws have the same desire.

Now, one of my objections to bringing in so many of these people unclassified is that just as soon as they get here, instead of wanting to become good Americans, instead of subscribing to the principles of our Government, what do they do? They want to remake our society, they want to remake our laws, change them over, so to speak, into imitations of what they have been so anxious to leave behind them. They did not like where they came from, they did not like what they had there, and they are not satisfied when they get here, nevertheless they want us to adopt and live under the same laws and conditions which made them dissatisfied. I, myself, do not know of any place you can consign them to and if I did I would not suggest it. But it does seem, after all, that the time has come when we should realize from the figures or from the facts disclosed in various committees of the House and Senate that most of our Communists come from abroad; at least those who are powerful enough to have worked their way into the Federal Government. We should do a little more screening.

I cannot go along with an amendment that would open wide the door of immigration. The gentleman said that we have to do something to bring them here. Did you ever hear of that one before? My understanding has always been that every mother's son of them who lives abroad wants to come here not for the purpose of helping us, not for the purpose of sustaining or helping our Government, but to better themselves individually. Every last one of them is, as an individual, an isolationist. Then I repeat, they get here, and many of them pay a pretty good fee to smart lawyers in this community, in New York, and elsewhere to get in, many of them do that, you know, and just as soon as they get here they say our Government is no good, our way of life is no good, and they want to change it, just like Anna Rosenberg, who wants to take all the boys and girls and put them into the armed services.

Why not screen carefully all those who now desire to make this their place of residence if not their home?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LET'S SAVE AMERICA FOR AMERICANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to engage in this debate. Of course, I am for restricting immigration. For years and years the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and I fought against opening up of the gates of immigration to those foreigners who come here to start trouble.

Nine out of every ten of the Communists that have been convicted of treason in this country were foreign born. If you want more of that element in here to help wreck this country, just continue to tear down the gates of immigration.

We have one man in this country now whom this House tried to deport. He has caused and is still causing infinite trouble. I refer to this bird out on the Pacific coast, Harry Bridges, who came in here directly from Australia. I do not know how he got to Australia, but you can look at his picture, and look at his record, and tell that by all means the other body made a horrible mistake when it buried that bill which the House passed to deport that dangerous individual. That bill I believe passed this House unanimously.

Our first duty is to the American people, our first duty is to the people of the United States, and so far as I am individually concerned I am not for tearing down, or opening up, the gates of immigration to those elements that would undermine and destroy America, and every other civilized country in the world, if they had a chance.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. AREND. What happened to the bill that we passed regarding Harry Bridges?

Mr. RANKIN. It passed the House and was buried in the other body. It is sleeping over there now, while Harry Bridges continues his communistic activities. He has caused more trouble probably than any other one individual in the country.

We have a battle before us. Everybody has found out by this time that Communist Russia is bluffing. She does not intend to make war on us. But we have a cold war against these Reds here at home.

I said the other day that you Republicans ought to be grateful to us Democrats. We have nominated your Presidential candidates for the last 15 years. We nominated Wendell Willkie, then we nominated that little mustached man from New York twice, and look at the billions now being spent in Europe to build up Eisenhower for you. Look what it is costing us taxpayers.

So I say you ought to be more grateful.

But I have always found that whenever the safety of this Nation was at stake, the men who first rushed to the defense of the country to be the sons, grandsons, and collateral relatives of those brave men who wore the blue and the ones who wore the gray in the War Between the States. I am talking to you Americans now. I am not in favor of tearing down our immigration laws in this country for the elements that are flooding in here now and have been doing so for many years. I say this from experience. No man in this Congress has had more experience in fighting communism than have I. It was my amendment to the rules that created the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee of this House.

In 1945 they were getting ready to kill or abolish the committee and to destroy all that vast wealth of records that we have that has been of such great value in running down and exposing the Communists who are here trying to undermine and destroy this Government.

I think we had better look out for America first, and not open these gates of immigration and flood this country with more undesirables.

So far as I am concerned, they can call me an isolationist if they want to. They called George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, James Monroe, John Adams, and those other great men of the past isolationists. I have no objection to being classed with them.

But I am a nationalist. I believe in America first. It is up to us to build the strongest nation the world has ever seen and lead the world by precept and example into a new day of peace, progress, and prosperity.

But we cannot do it by bribery at the expense of the overburdened taxpayers of this country, nor can you drive them to it with the bayonet, at the sacrifice of the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys.

I say, let us get back home, build up our own strength, and save America for Americans.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Strike out 202 (a) (5) and all of 202 (b) and substitute the following:

"202 (b). In addition to quotas for separate quota areas comprising independent countries, self-governing dominions, and territories under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations situate wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, which triangle shall comprise all quota areas and all colonies and other dependent areas situate wholly east of the meridian 60° east of Greenwich, wholly west of the meridian 165° west, and wholly north of the parallel 25° south latitude, there is hereby established an Asia-Pacific quota of 100 annually, which quota shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (e). Any immigrant born within a colony or other dependent area situate wholly within the said Asia-Pacific triangle, who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous thereto, shall be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I expressed myself at length in my previous remarks on this subject. In a word, this provision would strike out the discriminations against certain oriental peoples. For example, under the present statute, if a Japanese is married to an Englishwoman and a child is born unto that couple in England, presently the child, having been born in England, could come into this country under the English quota. However, under the provisions of the omnibus bill that has been submitted here, H. R. 5678, that child would not be ascribed to the British quota but would be ascribed to the Japanese quota.

Say a Polynesian is married to a Brazilian and a child is born in Brazil. Under the present statute that child could come in quotaless because it was born in the Western Hemisphere, but under the provisions of H. R. 5678 that child, born a half Polynesian, would come under a quota which is artificially set up called the Pacific-Asiatic triangle quota, which is 100. It is a sort of basket clause that takes in the natives of all countries that do not have quotas. To my mind, that Asiatic-Pacific basket clause will wound the sensibilities of the people of Asia, people whose friendship we are endeavoring now to cultivate. It will be grist to the Communist mill. It will be bruited about throughout all Asia that we are discriminating violently against these peoples. For that reason, I do hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the hypothetical case discussed by the gentleman from New York could not exist because the half-Japanese child born in England would not be admissible in any event because of the prohibition of the existing law against Japanese or half-Japanese, so that is entirely in error. However, more important than that, if the amendment offered by the gentleman is adopted it would make eligible for admission to the United States over 2,000,000 orientals on this continent, something that is opposed by the Japanese-Americans in this country. Let me read to you what they say about the provision with respect to the Asia-Pacific triangle:

We reluctantly acknowledge that the political realities which conceived this formula remain today. Opening wide—

That is what the adoption of this amendment would do—

the doors of immigration to the hundreds of thousands of orientals now residing in Canada and Central and South America would threaten to revive the now dead anti-orientalism of the west coast.

Nobody knows better than this group what this bill should contain with respect to the admission of orientals or partial orientals into the United States. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that the substance of this is that if there is an undesirable any place who is not granted admission directly, this will take him in and give him a chance?

Mr. WALTER. It means there are available 100 quota numbers in this triangle for the use of those people.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is not to open wide the gates for a flood of orientals into this country, it is simply to apply the present tests that we apply to every other racial group in the world. Why do we pick out the orientals by saying that it does not matter whether you are born in England, France, Brazil, or some other part of the world, than, let us say, Indochina, you are still 50 percent Indochinese even though you are born in France or you are born in South Africa. All we say is because you are 50 percent Indochinese, you should not be discriminated against. That is the only purpose of this bill.

I would like to read to the gentleman from Pennsylvania the remarks of Mr. Mike Masaoka on behalf of the Japanese American Citizens League. I think that we recognize that this is the outstanding league representing Japanese-Americans in this country. He said the following:

The pending bills repeal the racial-exclusion barriers as to nations but not as to the natives of these same Asian nations residing in the New World. As far as they go, they are commendable, but they should go one step further. They should place all persons, irrespective of race, on the same level of equality everywhere in the world.

That is all that the Celler amendment is trying to do—to place them all on an equal basis, and not to single out the orientals and say if you are 50 percent oriental, you have to come in under the quota of the Asiatic Pacific triangle. That is discrimination of the worst kind.

In addition, Mr. Masaoka goes on to say:

For immigration purposes from Latin America and Canada, the pending bills place all Asian and Pacific peoples on the same level of equality, but not on the same level as Europeans, Africans, and those of the Western Hemisphere.

Fears that immigrants of Asian extraction would flood our gates via countries bordering us to the North and South are groundless in our considered judgment, for every nation in the Pan American Union has for many years past either practiced a policy of complete exclusion (which was patterned after our laws in this regard) or rigidly controlled immigration from the Orient.

We are not going to be flooded by partially oriental peoples from Latin America or from Canada, because they have been using the same exclusion laws that we have; the same rigidly restrictive immigration.

He goes on to say:

We do not anticipate that any of these nations will open its gates to the free immigration of peoples from the Pacific basin.

And since our immigration laws authorize the admission only of native-born citizens of these Western Hemisphere nations, only a relatively few individuals would qualify for entry.

The extension of pending legislation to eliminate racial distinctions between the native born of these Latin-American countries and Canada would not disturb our basic immigration concepts that are founded upon the national origins idea.

I could read to you the opposition to this particular section of the bill by the American Federation of Labor, the Liberal Party of the State of New York, the International Institutes, the American Jewish Congress, the Councils for Community Action in my own district, one of the outstanding civic organizations in New York City, the American Friends Services Committee—a Quaker organization—The National Catholic Rural Life Conference is strongly in favor of this Celler Amendment. Many of the organizations that have been working in this field oppose this discriminatory section of the bill, and support the Celler amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will see fit to pass this very, very important amendment.

In addition, I would like to endorse what my colleague, the gentleman from New York, said about the international implications of this section of the bill. We are trying to tell the people of the world that we are their friends, and that we believe in the equality of nations, and here we turn around and pass a section in this bill which is singling out the orientals and saying to them, "You are different, you are lower than we are."

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 25, noes 70.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a teller vote.

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. A demand for a vote on the ground that there is no quorum present is not in order in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CELLER. I ask for a teller vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order of no quorum at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a teller vote.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. CELLER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 29, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: That section 202 (c) be amended as follows:

"202 (c). Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a governing country for which no separate or specific quota has been established, unless a nonquota immigrant as provided in section 101 (a) (27) of this act, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this amendment does away with racial discrimination as far as certain colonies of the Caribbean area are concerned. Presently, if a person were born, say, in the island of Jamaica, that person comes to this country under the British quota, because Jamaica happens to be a British colonial possession. If he happened to be born in Guadeloupe, St. Martin, that individual having been born in a French colonial possession, the quota number is chargeable to the mother country, to wit, France.

Under the bill H. R. 5678, the omnibus immigration bill, there is a quota set up of 100, say, for the island of Jamaica; a quota number of 100 for the island of Martinique, a quota sort of within a quota, a rather anomalous situation.

Many organizations have objected strenuously to this discrimination. For example, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference says:

It would seem more in accord with the objectives of hemisphere policy to accord nonquota status not only to natives of independent countries, but to accord it also to natives of colonies, dependencies situated wholly within the Western Hemisphere.

So the National Catholic Rural Life Conference would go further than I would go. The National Catholic Rural Life Conference says that when a person is born in a Pan-American country, namely Central America, South America, Canada, such a person comes into this country quota-free. I think the National Catholic Rural Life Conference would want a similar situation to be applicable to the natives of these colonies in the Caribbean.

I would like to have the status quo maintained; namely, that natives of those colonies would be attributed to the mother country's quota. But now it is said that we should discriminate—that is the only word I can use—and provide that only 100 shall come from Jamaica, only 100 shall come from Curaçao, a Dutch dependency. Why is that? Is it merely coincidental that those who come from the island of Jamaica may be colored? I leave that for your judgment; and if that be so, then we pick out the colored race for discrimination in this bill. The judgment is yours. If you vote for this amendment as I hope you will, you then indicate to the Nation and the world that you want no discrimination on the ground of race or color. If you vote down this amendment then I think the contrariwise can be attributed to you, that you do want that kind of discrimination.

The American Friends Service Committee is on record as being in favor of the words of my amendment. The American Friends Service Committee stated:

We also urge that nonquota status be accorded all natives of the Western Hemisphere without discrimination.

Their point of view is exactly on all fours with that of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in my life—I suppose there is always a first time for this sort of thing—I have been charged with prejudice. That I resent because there is not a word of truth in the intimations that this language under discussion was designed to prejudice anybody. The fact of the matter is that "nonquota immigrants" include natives of the Republic of Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and if Jamaica had its independence then the residents of that island would also be quota exempt. But it certainly does not seem fair to me, Mr. Chairman, to give to the British colonies a greater preference than is given to Australia or to New Zealand or to India or to Ceylon.

The language contained in the bill, the language which the gentleman from New York seeks to amend, treats the colonies and the countries of the commonwealth exactly the same.

In addition to that, there is the problem of protecting the labor market in the Virgin Islands. Let me read part of a letter that came to the committee from the St. Thomas Labor Union:

Because of the fact that the British immigration quota has never been filled, employers here embrace the opportunity to sponsor hundreds of British Islanders for immigration visas. Obviously, if this practice is continued the island will be swamped by these foreigners and the result will be the same as if the immigration barriers were removed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is clear, and I would like to get away from the question of discrimination a moment. I impugn no motives of prejudice to my good friend from Pennsylvania. I respect him and know his record too well to intimate any such prejudice on his part. However, I think that we should approach the problem of these West Indies colonies from a broader point of view than that from which the committee has seemed to have approached it up to this point.

Suppose Jamaica was an independent country such as the Dominican Republic or Cuba. Her population would then, like all the other people of the Western Hemisphere, be free to emigrate within our hemisphere as nonquota immigrants and they would be free to come into this country or to the Virgin Islands or to any other Territory of the United States. So I think that the problem boils down to whether we are going to single out the citizens of Jamaica, the citizens of Martinique, or any other colonials of the West Indies and say to them, "You are going to be put on a different basis and a different footing than any other peoples in the Western Hemisphere." Now what we are trying to build is a sense of unity and cooperation in this hemisphere. These peoples in World War II were very helpful to us. They provided us with naval and air bases in Jamaica and Martinique, and also training camps for our troops. We should not now turn against them and say, "Thank you for helping us in World War II, but we do not like you as much as we like all the other peoples of the other Americas, so we are going to only let 100 of you come into this country a year."

I am not at all sure that the old system of attributing the Jamaicans and the other colonials in the West Indies to their mother country quotas was a fair one. I go along with the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, who said that perhaps they should be pulled out from under this quota-of-the-mother-country concept and placed like all other Americas on the equal footing of a nonquota status. I think that is the only fair, the only dignified thing for the United States to do if we expect to have the support for our leadership of the Western Hemisphere.

Let us forget about this question of discrimination. Let us approach it from the point of view of equality for all citizens of the Western Hemisphere. Let us give the Jamaicans and the other colonials the same rights that we give the citizens of the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Cuba, or of any South American country. Let us treat them equally, members of the Committee. Let us support the Celler amendment.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know who the gentleman was who spoke a few minutes ago and who said that he was a freshman Congressman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That was our colleague, the gentleman from Idaho, Dr. WOOD.

Mr. FORRESTER. I happen to be also a freshman Congressman, but I want to say to the freshman, the doctor, that he does not have to take a back seat to anybody here when it comes to being a real American. You do not know how glad I am to hear someone get up in the well of this House and say to the people desiring to come into this country, that coming into this country and acquiring citizenship is not a right. I want them to understand and to know it is an exalted privilege—a privilege we can grant or deny.

I am glad to hear the gentleman from New York say that he wants to eliminate the question of discrimination at the present time. That is quite unusual so far as the gentleman is concerned, and if my memory is correct——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think my record is very clear that I have always opposed discrimination, and it is in that sense that I want to remove discrimination from this discussion.

Mr. FORRESTER. And if my memory serves me correctly, the gentleman from New York is the first gentleman who used the word "discrimination" in this debate.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman has yielded to me. I have the floor and I do not yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point of order is that a Member desiring to be heard should first address the Chair, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORRESTER. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I waive that, and I am ready to yield to the gentleman, and ready to answer the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. A Member cannot waive a point of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is again correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the honorable Member from Georgia, the honorable gentleman from Michigan, and my colleagues on the committee, I just want to keep the record clear. I was not the first to bring the word "discrimination" into this debate. I repeated what has been mentioned before because I wanted to make clear to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I imply no motives of prejudice to him.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am aware of that, but I think on the amendment just before this, the gentleman did bring in the word "discrimination" to this floor. But regardless of that, I want to say that I think this word "discrimination" has been used so much that it has just about lost its effectiveness. The truth of it is, I happen to come from a section of the country where, some people say, we believe in discrimination, but since I have gotten up here I have found out that the people from my section do not know anything about that term. As a matter of fact, since I have been here, and I might as well say it to you right here and now, I have come to the realization that the persons who are being discriminated against in America are the old-fashioned Yankee and the old-fashioned southerner.

I want to say another thing, too. You know, it is strange to me, but the men who are always hollering "discrimination" I find are living in the most palatial apartments in Washington and driving the best automobiles, and as far as they themselves are concerned, they are so far up in the upper bracket that they know that that question can never confront them.

One of the reasons I am complaining is that I happen to be one of these fellows who is just an ordinary person. I come from a section where we have to rub shoulders with this thing, and we have to look at it in a practical sort of way.

I want to tell you another thing. We might as well get down to brass tacks. It is high time we approach all matters purely on the basis of what is good for our country, and stop injecting immaterial issues into every debate that actually few believe in, and none practice.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I will fit into the definition of Yankee or any of the other sectionalistic words that have been used during the course of the debate today. I do not know whether my father and mother came here because somebody gave them the exalted right or the exalted privilege to come here, but I do know that none of us would be here today if their forebears had not had the absolute right to come here before the time that some Congress wrote into this Nation's law the provision making it only an exalted privilege.

I do not know who it was that divided the world geographically by sections, but it certainly was no divine power. I know that those of you who remember the words of the Book of Leviticus know there is no division there when God enjoined us to proclaim liberty throughout all the land, whether it be Yankeeland or Southern land or Europe or the West Indies.

No Member of this Congress has any right to be resentful because amendments are offered to this bill and no one

of us has any right to attack the good faith of any other Member for any position he or she takes as to any portion of the bill or any amendment to it.

I do not care who first brings in the word "discrimination," but if you look at the bill and try to determine where the merit or lack of merit lies, you will find there is discrimination written all through the bill. It should be our duty and our function regardless of name-calling and regardless of who offers the amendment or who opposes it to look at the bill and the language of the amendment. Is there discrimination in the bill as proposed, and is there an attempt by the amendment to eliminate that discrimination? You must come to the conclusion if you are going to look upon this fairly and soundly and logically that there is discrimination in this bill and there is discrimination in this very section of the bill which is sought to be amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

He quoted to you from a Catholic organization which supports his amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] quoted a Jewish organization that opposes the objectionable language, and from a Quaker organization that is opposed to this precise part of the bill which is sought to be amended.

If you will look at page 744 of the hearings, you will find that the Young Women's Christian Association came in and found fault with this precise language in this bill because it is discriminatory—discriminatory against Negroes or persons of darker skin than that of some of us. And no matter what you may say, it is apparently, even though the words are not used there, aimed against the colored people of the British West Indies. New Zealanders and Australians come here in very few numbers, and it is not intended to apply to them, but it is intended to apply to the British West Indies. You should take that provision out as the amendment suggests, and then nobody can accuse you of trying to discriminate against people no matter where they may come from. Just as they came to these United States before we became a United States of America from all parts of the world, and sought refuge here from persecution, and built up this great free nation of ours, we ought to, within the limits of our screening them to make sure they will be good Americans, discard any semblance of racial or religious discrimination from our laws. You cannot eliminate that from this bill unless you adopt the amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York. I trust the amendment will prevail.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman quoted from a statement by the Young Women's Christian Association. I would like to call your attention to the last sentence in their statement with respect to this particular problem. They said, "The suggestion that such groups should be accorded independent minimum quotas on the same basis as natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere would appear to be sound."

That is exactly what has been done in the bill, so that instead of opposing it, they are supporting it.

Mr. MULTER. Let us be fair. You must read that as part of the entire statement, and not out of context. Read the whole statement. It begins, "We are disappointed in the suggestion that immigrants born in a colony or other dependent area, for which no separate quota area has been established, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country up to the limit of 100 per year."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a new and interesting concept of wealth in our country, and I think if Members will search their minds, they will agree with me about it. We now honor those rich people who treat their wealth as a trust. They have made their wealth in America, and they treat it—many of them do—as a trust for benefiting the country, whether it is in education or charity or some other form of showing that they regard great wealth as a way in which to help their fellow Americans.

I am a child of immigrant parents, and so are many here, too—I like to think that we, in America, born here or naturalized here, keep this great heritage as a trust, as a trust for as many people of the world as we can suitably admit as we ourselves or our forefathers were admitted before us—as a trust for the highest kind of example in human living, let alone democracy or a republican form of government, that the world has ever known. It seems to me we ought to debate this whole bill in that spirit.

I think all of us know that Judge Walter's committee has done a very hard job in trying to codify the law. I think that is the sense in which these amendments are offered. I expect to offer some, and others will, too. We think that the bill needs a good deal of correction. This is a big job, and a big bill, and difficulties are bound to creep in.

I think this amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is seeking to have the committee adopt deals with one of the major difficulties. It comes down to this because Members, when they think of the word "discrimination," generally have in their minds that it applies to color or race or creed. I do not think that would be necessarily apt in this case. I think the question is: Is it discrimination against citizens of the Americas?

Let us understand that we are talking in a concept of the national security. We are spending billions of dollars for national security. The Caribbean is right on our doorstep, as are the other countries of South and Central America. Those are important defenses at our door. This is the good will of people which we certainly want to keep.

The provision against which this amendment is directed is discrimination against other citizens of the Americas, treating them differently than we do the citizens of sovereign countries of the Americas because they happen to be possessions or colonies. In a sense we tolerate those foreign possessions under the Monroe Doctrine because they have not been troublesome. But we do not think of them except as a part of the Americas. It is in a spirit of the brotherhood of the people of America, in a spirit of the policy of the good neighbor that this amendment should be considered. I believe that in terms of our own security and majesty as a nation we should pass this amendment. You know the difficulties which were caused by the Oriental Exclusion Acts, in alienating our friends in the Far East. Here is something much closer to home. Here is an opportunity to hold out a real hand of friendship to our next-door neighbors in the Caribbean when it counts, and show that we treat those people in the West Indies just as we do all of our other brethren of the Americas. I think it ought to be considered entirely in terms of American security, foreign policy, and friendship with our next-door neighbors, and on that ground the amendment ought to pass.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have always had difficulty in understanding just where the line of preference ended and that of discrimination began. We all have our preferences. As I suggested one day to a member of the minority who said a great deal about discrimination, every one of us discriminates when we exercise our preference for anything, as for example, to get married, or almost anything else we do.

Our forefathers who founded this country came here, I have been told, to escape persecution. They wanted to enjoy liberty and freedom. But, if I remember correctly, about the first thing they did when they got here was to say that no one here in America should drink tea made from a certain shipment to Boston that came from Great Britain. They sure discriminated against that tea—they dumped it into the harbor. Then, the next thing they did was to fight Great Britain and finally kick the British armies out. Yes, they surely discriminated against the British in those days. There is no doubt about that.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] just said that what this country needed was a new people, new seed. Evidently, he has so little faith in the present generation of Americans that he thinks we must go abroad and import more people in order to be able to continue our existence. He sure was completely wrong in his statement that our people do not live as long as in other days.

I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], continuing his argument, does he mean that when people come here from abroad, regardless of their station in life, their knowledge, their physical or mental condition, or

their race, that they should intermarry with those who are here and create a new race of people? Is that your argument?

Mr. CELLER. I said before that we are approaching a situation in this country, because of the lengthening life expectancy, that in the not far-distant future our population will become static.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, the tendency is that we now live longer than before?

Mr. CELLER. Now you asked me a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I asked you whether you advocated intermarriage with those people who are, under your amendment, to be brought here from abroad.

Mr. CELLER. I advocated nothing of the sort.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What do you advocate?

Mr. CELLER. I want to have this pending amendment passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. That is all. This gentleman wants to bring these people in to strengthen this Nation, but he discriminates against them by saying that he does not advocate intermarriage with those who are here. He does not want to let them marry other people who are here. Why is he not consistent? He advocates the practicing of discrimination by those he would admit by holding that they should not intermarry with our own citizens.

One moment he condemns discrimination. With his next breath he urges it be adopted by those his amendment would bring here.

I go along with my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in one thing. I am glad to see him here. Over the years he has insisted that if there were any people in this country that needed protection from those who practice discrimination while condemning it, it was the white gentiles. Is not that what you have here? I have no question. My answer is "Yes." You will find that is the right answer. Who practices discrimination? Think that one over, Judge, from your own knowledge. Here is the situation; I ask you to look at the record of the various commissions and groups that have been created here under the last and the present administration. Who was it that was discriminated against? I recall one group that obtained control of a commission, a commission created to prevent discrimination, and what did that group do? Although they numbered but 9 percent of the population they held 52 percent of the jobs and spent 59 percent of the money that was appropriated to prevent discrimination, and they discriminated against every white American. Deeds of kindness, not words, from social reformers, so-called, and professional troublemakers is what we need.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is another dangerous amendment that tends to wreck our immigration laws and flood this country with undesirable elements. We have had too many questionable characters swarming into this country already, bringing with them communism, atheism, anarchy, infidelity, and hatred for American institutions.

Instead of bringing in more of that ilk we had better begin to deport some who have already arrived, if we want to save this country from destruction at the hands of the enemies within our gates.

If certain individuals who have spoken for this and other similar amendments had the power to write the immigration laws of this country, and to govern our people generally, I would say, "God save America."

They whine about discrimination. Do you know who is being discriminated against? The white Christian people of America, the ones who created this Nation, who established our independence and who have maintained it throughout the years, who have fought its battles in times of war and sustained its institutions in times of peace. I am talking about the white Christian people of the North as well as of the South. They are the ones who are being discriminated against.

Never have I seen such beastly treatment as has been meted out to the white children here in the District of Columbia by this administration. The innocent white children here in Washington have been driven from their playgrounds, and from their swimming pools, with the result that the white people are moving over into Virginia and out into Maryland by the tens of thousands. The white women in the various departments of the Government are being subjected to the most beastly treatment ever imposed on the white women of this country.

And the administration's crazy order wiping out segregation in the Armed Forces has done more to lower the morale of our servicemen than anything else that has taken place. Our white boys are being treated like dogs at a time when untold thousands of them are giving up their lives in the "police action" in Korea, concerning the beginning of which Congress was not even consulted.

This same element is trying to force the communistic FEPC onto the people of the various States. If you will go back and search the record, you will find that the FEPC is a part of the Communist platform. It is doing more to drive industry out of the States where it has been written into their laws than probably anything else that has ever happened.

They are trying to force this so-called antisegregation onto the people of the South. It is also Communist-inspired; and if it is forced onto the South, which means forcing the Negroes into our white schools, the chances are that the Southern States will go to private school systems. Then many of the Negroes in those States will not have any schools at all. The better element of the Negroes in the South do not want this FEPC, and they are not in favor of this antisegregation program. You notice I said "Negroes" and not "Neegroes." The Negroes of the South know who are their friends; and they are finding out who are their enemies. This agitation is causing untold thousands of them to lose their homes and to move north into congested centers where race trouble is more dangerous than it has ever been in the Southern States.

The members of this communistic racial minority that is behind this drive to wipe out segregation in our public schools in the South are doing so in order to try to force amalgamation of the whites and Negroes, and in that way destroy the white race. They do not give a tinker's damn about the Negroes, and the Negroes of the South know it.

When they have race trouble in the South the Negroes run to the white people for protection. When they have race trouble in the North they run the other way. There were more Negroes killed in the Chicago race riot, just after the First World War, than had been killed in my State since the Civil War.

You will remember that there was also a race riot in Springfield, Ill., the home town of Abraham Lincoln, and one here in Washington just after the First World War. There is no telling the trouble that is ahead for you people in the Northern States unless you join us in turning back this tide of communistic fanaticism which these amendments represent.

Communism is racial. A racial minority seized control in Russia and in all her satellite countries, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and many other countries I could name. Just a little group at the top have control, and they know that if the people of those countries ever get a chance at them their yellow heads will roll in the sawdust.

They have been run out of practically every country in Europe in the years gone by, and if they keep stirring race trouble in this country and trying to force their communistic program on the Christian people of America, there is no telling what will happen to them here.

The Communists are behind this so-called anti-genocide movement which they are trying to force onto this country through the so-called United Nations. Do you know what genocide means? Among other things, it means "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group." I am quoting from the record. If this Genocide Convention, as it is called, is passed by the Senate, and you are charged with committing physical or mental injury to such a group, you can be prosecuted for genocide. Prosecuted where? Either in the State where it was committed, "or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction."

In other words, you could be tried in a foreign country.

It is about time that Members of both Houses of Congress woke up to the dangers confronting us and turned back this tide of communistic fanaticism that not only threatens the safety of our country, but threatens the destruction of our Christian civilization.

By all means this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Celler amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 22, noes 90.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, that was a real victory for America.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF THE TAX SETTLEMENT BOARD BILL

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the taxpayers of the United States face the largest burden in peacetime history, it is of the utmost importance that they should have confidence in the Government's machinery for collecting taxes and adjusting disputes involving the proper amount of tax.

Our whole income-tax system depends to a very large extent upon the average taxpayer's belief that he is getting fair treatment in relation to everybody else. It is essential not only that no taxpayer should receive favors or pay less than his fair tax, but also that the taxpayer who has an honest difference of opinion about the amount of tax due should be able to obtain a prompt, impartial, and inexpensive settlement of the controversy.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue has attempted to provide machinery for settlement of tax controversies by establishment in the district offices of an appellate division which deals with tax cases on an informal basis with the taxpayer and his legal or accounting representative. But despite this appellate machinery within the Bureau, there has long been a feeling on the part of taxpayers that when they appeal the decision of a revenue agent they are still dealing with officials whose primary responsibility is to collect as much revenue as possible, and so to a certain extent they face a judge who is also a prosecutor. Their only alternative to accepting the decision of Bureau officials is litigation in the Tax Court or the district court. This is particularly aggravating when the amount of tax in dispute, although it may represent a substantial sum to the taxpayer, does not justify the expense of a formal appeal to the courts.

To remedy this situation, I proposed the creation of an independent, informal tax settlement board in a bill which I first introduced 3 years ago. I have introduced it again in the present session as H. R. 1062. An agency to settle tax controversies of the kind proposed in this bill is even more urgently needed in the circumstances we face today.

The reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue under Reorganization Plan No. 1 involves decentralization and greater responsibility in the hands of regional or local administrators. The employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who handle appeals in tax cases will be even more closely tied in to those whose primary responsibility is collecting revenue. Desirable though this may be from the administrative point of view, it is not likely to restore the taxpayer's confidence that he can get absolutely fair and impartial treatment without resorting to litigation.

On the other hand, the creation of an independent tax settlement board whose sole responsibility was to adjust tax controversies as fairly and inexpensively as possible would help immeasurably to convince taxpayers that their Government will give them honest and impartial treatment. The very existence of such a board would give taxpayers a new feeling of confidence in their dealings with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, because they would always know that an inexpensive avenue of appeal was open to them.

It has been argued that the tax settlement board provided in my bill would encourage taxpayers to make extreme and unwarranted claims and allegations without proof or affidavit, and that it might lead to a tremendous number of frivolous appeals. I do not believe that this is the case. On the contrary, I think it would lead to more satisfactory settlement at lower levels because both the Government agent and the taxpayer would be aware of the fact that unreasonable claims would be quickly disposed of by the tax settlement board.

It has also been asserted that an informal tax settlement board would interfere with the uniform administration of the tax laws, and might lead to inequitable discrimination as between taxpayers. Again, I do not think that this criticism is well founded. Let me make it clear that the proposed tax settlement board would not be expected to deal with difficult or complicated questions of law involving the establishment of precedents. Such cases properly belong in the Tax Court or the district courts. But in the vast majority of tax cases, the principal question at issue is simply the amount of tax due.

More often than not the taxpayer and the agents of the Bureau are in agreement about the application of tax laws and regulations. What they disagree about is simply the amount of money which should be paid, and the proper amount can best be determined by an impartial appraisal of the facts in a given case. By that I mean such questions as the reasonableness of the salaries of corporation officers, the tax year to which certain items of income or expenses should be attributed, the propriety of depreciation charges, and similar matters which involve the examination of records and facts presented by an individual or a company. What we are looking for is a fair decision based on these facts. There can be no discrimination, because so far as the amount of tax due is concerned, each case is unique.

Let me emphasize also that under the provisions of H. R. 1062 any decision of the tax settlement board could be rejected by either the taxpayer or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the case could then be taken de novo to the Tax Court or the district court.

At this particular time, when all of us are deeply concerned with taxpayer morale, and when we are undergoing a reorganization of our tax-collection machinery, I believe that the establishment of an independent tax settlement board of the kind I have proposed would be a major step toward solving both problems. The procedures for settling tax controversies by conferences within the Bureau of Internal Revenue would be strengthened rather than weakened by the existence of a separate agency to handle appeals, because the Bureau would no longer be in the anomalous dual position of prosecutor and judge in appeals from its own decisions. The taxpayer would no longer be compelled to accept a Bureau decision which he regarded as unfair merely because he was unwilling or unable to afford the time and expense of litigation.

I think it is quite possible that the precise form of tax settlement board proposed in H. R. 1062 may be improved and strengthened as a result of suggestions from experts both inside and outside of the Government. I hope therefore that this bill will receive early and serious consideration. I believe that it would provide a natural and desirable supplement to the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which is expected to clarify and simplify lines of administrative authority. The desirability of an independent settlement board is further increased by the fact that under Reorganization Plan No. 1 the appellate staff is to be placed under the jurisdiction of district commissioners, instead of reporting directly to a chief in Washington as the former technical staff did.

For all of these reasons, I am convinced that the creation of a new, informal agency for handling appeals in tax cases would be a major constructive step in guaranteeing fair and honest administration of our tax laws.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF ENLISTMENT

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, very recently the President issued an order that resulted in the seizure of the steel mills. The reason given for that order was that it was necessary to take that action for the security of the Nation.

I think every Member here has probably received hundreds of letters and telegrams and been contacted by various people protesting the seizure. You have also seen editorials and newspapers and heard radio commentators and read newspaper columnists in connection with it. Protests and demands for an investigation came from many quarters.

There is another order that was issued, and I want to talk about that a little bit, but not in connection with the steel mills but in connection with our military forces.

Recently, upon the advice of the Defense Department, the President issued an order extending the terms of enlisted men by 9 months. That did not apply to all the men in the armed services, but it did apply to the men who had enlisted for a specific period of time.

The President's order with reference to extending the time of service of enlisted men does not affect property rights. It has nothing to do with profits. It has nothing to do with wages or dividends. However, it does affect human rights.

It does keep in the service beyond the time that was specified in their enlistment contract many of our enlisted men. It does violate the word of the United States Government to those men.

The very same reason was given for that extension as was given in the case where the steel mills were seized, in other words, that it was essential for the security of the Nation that that be done. In addition, I think all of us will agree that in both cases there is no defense to what the President did unless that it be essential for the security of the Nation. That is not the point I want to make, however.

The point I want to make is this: The whole Nation seems to be aware of the fact that the steel mills were seized. Members of Congress seem to be aware of that fact. Everyone who is interested in property rights seems to be aware of that, and there is a hue and cry throughout the land. But what about this other case? What about this other matter, where not property was seized but where in effect the liberty, perhaps the very lives of some of the men in the armed services, have been seized?

We have not heard any hue and cry anyplace we have not seen Members of Congress rising to protest about that or demand an investigation. Where has the press been? Where have the radio commentators and the columnists been? Where have the people been?

Back before I came to Congress I had been told that very often the political parties of the Nation went back to our Declaration of Independence for one reason or another. I was told the story of how in that Declaration of Independence, when Thomas Jefferson was seeking the correct words and phraseology, originally the words had been "The right to life, liberty, and property." Then, upon the advice and recommendation of Thomas Jefferson the words "and property" were stricken and in their place were put the words "and the pursuit of happiness."

Our founding fathers indicated very clearly that this was a Nation in which human rights came far before any rights of property, that the important thing in this Nation was the human being. I am afraid we have lost sight of that.

There is no other explanation for the fact that all the people in the Nation who have expressed themselves about the steel mills seem to be concerned about the property, whereas no one seems to be concerned about the fact that human lives and human beings are involved in this other order. Both those orders are based upon one and the same thing, that they are essential for the security of this Nation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am in accord with the gentleman's views with respect to the extension of the terms of these men who are serving in the Armed Forces. However, I think there are people who are concerned. The fathers and mothers and sisters and brothers and husbands are concerned with respect to that matter, and if the gentleman who is of the majority party will submit a resolution dealing with this subject matter to find out just the why's and wherefore's, and why this thing is being done, I will be glad to join with him because I do not think it has been shown there is such an emergency at the present time that it is necessary to extend the time of these boys in the Armed Forces.

Mr. FURCOLO. I appreciate the gentleman's offer, and I may say that I have asked the Committee on Armed Services, and the subcommittee on appropriations having jurisdiction of the Defense Department to investigate.

It may be that both of those orders were necessary. It may be that neither one of them is necessary.

What has disturbed me has been this fact: Yesterday I had something in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this point. This morning I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I was shocked and distressed to see that while several Members rose and spoke about the steel mill situation, expressing the belief that there should be some investigation—and I do not quarrel with that position at all—I was surprised to see that nobody apparently seemed to be interested in this other situation. No one here in the Congress, or the newspaper people, or the radio people, or anyone in addition to the families of the boys affected. Why should there not be at least as much concern about the order extending enlistments as there is about the order seizing the steel mills?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman advise us whether or not there is anything in the law of the land that gives the President the power to extend the period of enlistment of the men? My understanding is that there is such a provision in the law, and, of course, if that is provided for in the law, the exercising of that power by the President would not be in line—and I am one of those gentlemen who spoke yesterday about the seizures—it would not be in line with a seizure, which I say has no support either in the law or in the Constitution.

Mr. FURCOLO. The basis of both orders was the same. The basis for the order seizing the steel mills, was that it was essential to do that for the security of the Nation. The basis for the order extending the period of enlistment was that it was essential for the security of the Nation.

As far as I am concerned, I can readily see how many people will say about the steel-mill seizure that it is important to have an investigation to determine if that was essential for the security of the Nation. Because otherwise I think all of us will agree, it is indefensible.

But, the very same reason applies, in my opinion at least, for the seizure, in effect of the liberty and perhaps the lives of some of these men in the service.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is an able and patriotic member of the House, and I commend him.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know whether you agree with me, however, that if there is in the law a provision for the extension of the term of enlistment, that creates a distinction insofar as the power of the President and his exercise of such powers are concerned. In other words, in back of the exercise of the power, even though it is granted by the Congress, should be a concern for the national security—a real concern. But, the exercising power, which is clearly there, is a different proposition from the exercise of power which is not there.

Mr. FURCOLO. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, I have always respected him for this: I have never yet known him or any other Member of the Congress on either side of the aisle to hesitate in any way to call to the attention of the people, something that was basically wrong regardless of whether or not there might be authority for the act that was done. I think it is important that such things

should be brought out. So my position would be exactly the same whether there was any law about that or not.

But, whether there is a law or not, when the President seizes—and, by the way, I suppose the real responsibility is upon the Defense Department, but he issued the order—when an order is issued based upon the fact that it must be done for the security of the Nation and is essential for that, if it does violate the word of the Government—as this order does—and if it does take away the liberty of some of the people in the armed services—as this order does—then it is imperative that this body, the Congress of the United States, look into that and see whether or not it really was necessary.

If it was not necessary, that can easily be determined. And if it was necessary, that can be determined too. But, what has shocked and distressed me has been the fact that when the steel mills were taken, there was a great hue and cry raised by many Members of the Congress, by the newspapers and the radio, and by many people in the land. A congressional investigation is underway. Resolutions to impeach the President will be considered. There it was a question involving property, and involving dollars and cents.

But, when the lives and liberty of these men in the Armed Forces are concerned, they did not seem to raise the same hue and cry although the principle was the same and the basis for the order was exactly the same, too.

These men in the Armed Forces do not have the propaganda people who can flood the mails with literature and circulars. They do not have any spokesman to speak for them. Because of that, we Members of Congress have a double responsibility and duty to raise our voices for them.

Let me conclude by recalling that this Nation was founded upon the importance of the individual. The rights of the human being were supposed to take precedence over property rights. We have gone a long, long way from our principles if we disregard that.

If we ever lose the vision that our founding fathers gave to us in stressing the fact that human rights come before property rights, then we shall have sacrificed the true greatness of this Nation.

I think that has been forgotten as far as the order extending enlistments is concerned. Forgotten not just by the Congress but, what is even more important, it has apparently also been forgotten by the people of this Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

SCHERING CORP.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at a time when investigations of Government departments and agencies have become almost the only business of Congress, when these great halls resound with criticism of Government institutions and Government personnel generally, when charges are preferred against high administrative officials with wild and reckless abandon, when the misdeeds of a few officials are highlighted in an attempt to bring infamy and dishonor on all, I believe in all fairness it is time to call the attention of Congress and the public generally to one of the finest achievements of the executive branch of our Government.

At 11:05 a. m. on Thursday, March 13, 1952, the Department of Justice completed a very important chapter in the administration of enemy property vested in World War. II.

Hon. J. Howard McGrath, former Attorney General of the United States, through Assistant Attorney General Harold I. Baynton, accepted a check which completed a transaction involving the sale of all of the outstanding capital stock of Schering Corp. for the sum of $29,131,960. This transaction culminated a public offering of this property, for which sealed bids had been opened 1 week previously.

The importance of this event was not only measured by the almost $30,000,000 received by the Government but was entirely representative of an American success story of from rags to riches in the short space of 10 years. More interesting is this story since this transition took place not in the realm of private ownership but under the aegis of Government control.

In 1942 the Alien Property Custodian vested the control of Schering Corp. The company at that time was a small subsidiary of one of the largest German pharmaceutical manufacturers. Since its creation it had been completely dominated by its German parent. Its active competition in world markets was onerously circumscribed and a great many of the accepted freedoms normal in American business were denied it. No extensive research was permitted the company but it was kept completely dependent on its German parent for this extremely important necessity in the highly technical and competitive pharmaceutical industry. Its products were, for the most part, concentrated in the then small field of hormone therapy. Its German parent had caused it to participate in a world-wide cartel which sought to restrict competition and maintain burdensome prices to consumers.

With the assumption of control, the Alien Property Custodian was faced with a decision as to the disposition to be made of this asset. This decision involved a determination as to whether the company could, after separation from its German parent, be stimulated into the competitive system of American industry. In addition, our Government had been requested by various Latin-American governments to assist them in obtaining pharmaceutical products heretofore supplied by German manufacturers. The Alien Property Custodian faced this problem realistically. The decision was made to exert every effort to readjust Schering's business concepts to the American industrial pattern and to channel its activities into our free enterprise system. In addition, a program was undertaken to assist in the replacement of German products in the Latin-American market, a field which had been denied to Schering Corp. heretofore. The decision was also made for the corporation to conserve its earnings and to divert them to the greatest extent possible to the establishment of research, the heart of any pharmaceutical business. This resulted in the creation of many new products of considerable therapeutic value.

The results of this successful farsightedness are graphically illustrated by some comparisons. In 1942 the company had a little over 400 employees. At the end of 1951 this number had grown to almost 1,200. Its sales in 1942 approximated $2,900,000 and by 1951 had reached a total of $15,500,000. Its profits after taxes at the time of vesting totaled $205,000 and for the year 1951 had multiplied more than six times to the sum of $1,375,000. As a more important indication of the efficient administration of this property is the fact that this company, with a net worth of a little more than $1,000,000 at the time of vesting, was sold by the Government for almost $30,000,000 10 years later. In addition, the company, during Government control, paid over $11,000,000 in Federal income and excess-profits taxes.

These financial values do not represent the complete gain to the American public. To this financial gain must be added benefits which cannot be measured in dollars alone. Prior to the sale, all of the company's patents acquired from its German parent were made available to the American public on a nonexclusive royalty-free basis and all of its patents developed under the 10 years of Government control were made available on a nonexclusive reasonable royalty basis.

All of these results were accomplished without one single step in the direction of so-called socialization of industry. The company during Government control operated as did any other American enterprise except, of course, that all of its policy decisions were conscientiously reviewed and directed in channels parallel to the national interest. Its business practices were identical with those of all other competitive American businesses and were conducted on the highest possible moral and ethical plane. No special concessions were sought for the company while under Government control, and by the same token every effort was made to operate the company in accordance with the best accepted business practices.

At a time in world history such as this, when democratic institutions are under attack and democratic governments accused of ineptness, inability to act, and decay, it is indeed heartening to be able to report a story such as I have just given you. A story of the operation of a small Government agency faced with a challenge of administering an important industrial enterprise. This agency met this challenge with results that brought only

honor and credit to those who participated in it. I commend the Schering story to the American people as one to which they can point with pride, and we can extend our congratulations to all of those public servants who participated in this adventure and say to them, "Well done."

The record of this company while under Government supervision and control, exemplifies the sound policies which have been used in the appointment and employment of personnel to administer the business enterprises and property which has come under its supervision and control and the efficient and financial manner in which these appointees have operated and managed these properties.

The patent policy and the subsequent sale of this company is a good example of a disposition of property in the best interest of the United States. Every reasonable and proper effort was made to realize the maximum amount from the sale of this company for the benefit of the War Claims fund for payment of claims of former civilian internees and prisoners of war and at the same time to give proper consideration to the widest possible distribution to the public of the scientific and technical discoveries and technological advances which have been made.

Examination of the record of the business enterprises administered by the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, will disclose that the administration of this company over a period of 10 years under government supervision and control, is the type of government supervision and control which exists in the other vested business enterprises.

The Schering story is a complete refutation of the baseless, politically inspired charges that inefficiency is rampant in the Office of Alien Property. It demonstrates that vested assets are administered for the best interest of the Nation, the Government, and the American public.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MARSHALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. HELLER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGEE and to include a study and statement by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., professor of the University of Missouri.

Mr. MILLS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNEY and to include an article.

Mr. BELCHER and to include extraneous material.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN and to include certain statements and extracts from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CRUMPACKER and to include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York and to include two statements.

Mr. MORTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address recently made by Dr. Harold V. Gaskill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE and to include a statement from the Iowa Dairy Co.

Mr. BENDER in three instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. SADLAK and to include the so-called John Russell letter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include a letter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in three instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THORNBERRY and to include a statement.

Mr. ENGLE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bow and include an editorial.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS to revise and extend his remarks in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN in two instances, to include in one an editorial and in the other a letter.

Mr. RANKIN in two instances in connection with remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an editorial appearing in the Boston Post entitled "The Flood Peril."

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for disaster relief for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for disaster relief for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MILLER of Maryland (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for April 22 and 23, on account of official business with the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, April 24, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1366. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 31, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Sakonnet Harbor, R. I., with a view to determining if further improvement is advisable at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 436), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2643. A bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project; without amendment (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3882. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease withdrawn or reserved public lands in Alaska for dock, wharf, and landing-site purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6439. A bill to authorize the addition of land to the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument, Virginia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 2223. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy the Government-owned magnesium foundry at Teterboro, N. J.;

without amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution to give the Secretary of Commerce the authority to extend further certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6556. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4991. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Almira Gilbreath Ramser; with amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 7545. A bill to make $1,000,000,000 from the unexpended appropriations authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1951 available for the emergency relief of the midwestern flood victims and for the permanent restoration of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 7546. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 7547. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 7548. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 7549. A bill to extend and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, to prevent loss of benefit rights in the event of disability, to provide for rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 7550. A bill to repeal certain excise tax rates on watches and clocks and cases and movements therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7551. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the United States Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 7552. A bill to amend the act approved June 30, 1950, entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 7553. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7554. A bill to amend section 22 (d) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBESON:

H. R. 7555. A bill relating to the exchange of land for purposes of the Colonial National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7556. A bill to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 198), as amended (32 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 4c), to include the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7557. A bill to provide combat-duty pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 7558. A bill to provide additional authority for the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase certain mortgages and loans guaranteed or insured under the National Housing Act or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. J. Res. 432. Joint resolution to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the existing state of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution for consideration of the Tunisian issue; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 607. Resolution creating a select committee to inquire and report to the House whether Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, shall be impeached; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. Res. 608. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate what actions have been taken by executive agencies of the Government in behalf of William Oatis and in the implementation of House Concurrent Resolution 140, Eighty-second Congress, first session; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. R. 7559. A bill for the relief of Aina Brizga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

H. R. 7560. A bill for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7561. A bill for the relief of Masumi Suzuki and Mari Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 7562. A bill for the relief of Rose Maria Gradelone Calicchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7563. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Minowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7564. A bill for the relief of Fred M. Kay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 7565. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7566. A bill for the relief of Margaretha Foedisch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7567. A bill for the relief of Naim Solomon Bahary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7568. A bill for the relief of Rosa Djedda and Lilly Djedda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7569. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna Hamas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 7570. A bill for the relief of Miss Kimie Ishimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

681. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of certain citizens of Little Rock, Ark., petitioning consideration of H. R. 2188, by Mr. BRYSON, penalizing interstate transmission, by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, newsreels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

682. Also, petition of certain citizens of Conway, Ark., petitioning consideration of H. R. 2188 by Mr. BRYSON, penalizing interstate transmission, by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, newsreels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

683. Also, petition of members of the Non-Uniform Employees of the City of North Little Rock, Ark., petitioning in behalf of H. R. 4411, by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, permitting the extension of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits to employees presently covered by a State or local retirement system, after such employees by written referendum and secret ballot, etc., have voted in favor of social security coverage rather than the State retirement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1952

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, for a hallowed moment we step aside from the crowded highway, with its clamant voices, to seek the garden of the soul; that we may become conscious of Thee, knowing that we have been assured that if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee, we shall surely find Thee. Often when we think Thee far away Thou art by our side, unrecognized. Only when our vision is cleared and corrected by far horizons can we see the transient in the light of the everlasting.

Humble us and forgive us, that we may enter into unity with Thee and in some measure may become the instruments of Thy peace. Set us at our tasks with a