

Louisiana; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Ed Gossett, Texas; Clyde T. Ellis, Arkansas; _____; _____; Anthony J. Dimond, Alaska; Santiago Iglesias, Puerto Rico.

War Claims: Reuben T. Wood (chairman), Missouri; Joseph A. Gavagan, New York; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; William R. Poage, Texas; Martin F. Smith, Washington; Newt V. Mills, Louisiana; Lawrence J. Connery, Massachusetts; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Pius L. Schwert, New York; _____; _____; _____.

World War Veterans' Legislation: John E. Rankin (chairman), Mississippi; Harold K. Claypool, Ohio; H. Jerry Voorhis, California; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; George M. Grant, Alabama; Butler B. Hare, South Carolina; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; Joseph A. McArdle, Pennsylvania; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Rudolph G. Tenerowicz, Michigan; Pius L. Schwert, New York; _____; _____; _____.

The resolution was agreed to.

MINORITY COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer several resolutions, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 55

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, to wit: Karl Stefan, of Nebraska; Francis H. Case, of South Dakota; Dudley A. White, of Ohio; Clarence J. McLeod, of Michigan; Chester C. Bolton, of Ohio.

House Resolution 56

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, to wit: Carl E. Mapes, of Michigan; J. Will Taylor, of Tennessee; Hamilton Fish, of New York; Leo E. Allen, of Illinois.

House Resolution 57

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to wit: Donald H. McLean, of New Jersey; Bertrand W. Gearhart, of California; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; Benjamin Jarrett, of Pennsylvania.

House Resolution 58

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, to wit: Carl E. Mapes, of Michigan; Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey; James Wolfenden, of Pennsylvania; Pehr G. Holmes, of Massachusetts; B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee; James W. Wadsworth, of New York; Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana; Oscar Youngdahl, of Minnesota; Carl Hinshaw, of California; Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio.

The resolutions were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Vincent M. Miles, Solicitor of the United States Post Office Department, at the Jackson Day dinner held in Louisville, Ky., on January 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

SESSIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the sessions of the House during the remainder of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of the Committee on Economic Conditions in the South.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the text of Governor Dixon's inaugural speech, delivered at Montgomery, Ala., on Wednesday, January 18, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress is about to reorganize there are certain groups or societies that immediately start propagandizing the Members on various questions. At the present time we have certain groups in Washington and elsewhere sending out propaganda dealing with the so-called immigration problem and dealing also with the question of European refugees. In every instance this propaganda which you and I have received and will continue to receive day in and day out is not true. You will find that the bulk of the information contained therein is inaccurate. It simply seeks to mislead you when legislation dealing with this very serious problem is presented on the floor of the House so that you may perhaps be misguided when you vote on these questions.

As chairman of the Committee on Immigration, on which committee I have had the honor to serve for the last 10 years, may I say to the Members that I shall be glad to assist them in furnishing information and authentic figures on any questions they may present, so that you may have an accurate and true picture of the situation.

We have certain writers in this country and certain people in the country who have never seen an immigrant, although they write books about them. We have lecturers who go around the various cities of the country, including Washington, and preach the doctrine of hate and intolerance. I think we, as Members of Congress and as legislators, should be fully acquainted with this problem so that you and I and the country at large will know that all of this propaganda is not true and that it is given out in an effort to array hate and intolerance against fair play.

Immigration has been a problem of our Government almost from the very creation of the country. We have references to immigration in our Constitution.

Recent events have brought immigration to the forefront of public discussion and the public press is full of statements to the effect that there is an influx into this country of refugees from Germany and other places, and that as a result the economic structure of the United States is being adversely affected.

It is important for us as legislators to have a clear understanding of what is involved in this situation. For the benefit of the Congress I have taken the trouble to go through these statistics, and I wish to present my findings to you this morning.

We will consider first the following provisions:

1. The number of aliens.
2. The deportation of aliens.
3. Immigration quotas.

My analysis of these figures as well as the analysis of the Department leads to the following conclusions:

A. The statement made by various groups that there is a large influx of aliens is not true. As a matter of fact, there is no influx of aliens to the United States.

B. The number of deportations is continuously increasing instead of decreasing, despite the charges made by certain Members of the House regarding the attitude of the Department of Labor toward deportation.

C. The immigration quotas in the past few years in many instances have not been filled.

Therefore, the charge that thousands upon thousands of refugees are coming into the United States and flooding this country is absolutely false and untrue, and the charge that the quotas are now being filled or have been filled in the recent past is not true.

Dix Bridges Perkins

As I go along I will show that this country has done nothing to help refugees and that no persons come into the United States other than those whom the law allows to come.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not at this point.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman made the statement we are not doing anything to help foreign political refugees.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We are not.

Mr. STEFAN. We have a Commission over in Europe now for the purpose of helping foreign political refugees, have we not?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; we are not helping foreign political refugees.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the commission doing there, then?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know what they are doing there. I am not at the table with them. I am now talking about immigration and the immigration law.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman referred to foreign political refugees and said we are not doing anything to help them. We have a commission in Europe now.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am telling the gentleman we are doing nothing as far as allowing refugees to come into this country is concerned.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman should qualify his statement.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No refugees are coming here other than persons who are entitled to come under the quota law enacted in 1924, and then they must show they will not become public charges, and they must be physically and morally fit.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman as to that, but the gentleman should qualify his statement that we are not doing anything to help foreign political refugees when we have an American commission in Europe helping foreign political refugees.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not intend to modify my statement. I repeat that conferences and commissions do not help people to escape death, because they simply lead to more commissions and more conferences. When I say we are doing nothing to help refugees I mean that we are not allowing them to use up the quotas that are left over every year in this country and that we throw in the basket. I am saying, figuratively speaking, that we are not allowing human beings to save their lives by letting them come in here under the unused quotas. I am not speaking of conferences, wherever they are.

As to the number of aliens, the number of aliens admitted to the United States since the restrictive immigration laws went into effect has been dwindling from year to year. In 1935 the total number admitted was 34,956; in 1936 the total number admitted was 36,327; in 1937, 50,244; and in the last year, 67,895. But against this figure must be charged the number of aliens who left the United States during the years in question, and it will be observed that for 6 years, from 1931 to and including 1936, the number of departures exceeded the number of admissions. So that we have for the years 1931 to 1936 the following figures:

1931, 10,237 more aliens left this country than entered it.

1932, 112,786 more aliens left this country than entered it.

1933, 93,074 more aliens left this country than entered it.

1934, 13,268 more aliens left this country than entered it.

1935, 9,329 more aliens left this country than entered it.

1936, 2,385 more aliens left this country than entered it.

It is only since 1937—in the last 2 years—that immigration exceeds emigration, and, even so, the excess is very slight. In 1937 the net number of immigrants was 7,302, and in 1938 the net number of immigrants was 30,083. So that in the face of all the clamor raised about refugees and others entering the United States we only had a net total immigration last year of little over 30,000.

As to deportations, the number of deportations have been increasing from year to year, and the total of deportations should be further deducted from the amount of net immigration for the years in question. Thus, we find that in 1934

there were 8,879 aliens deported; in 1935, 8,319; in 1936, 9,915; in 1937, 8,829; and in 1938, 9,275. The average deportations being around 8,500 to 9,000 in each year.

As to immigration quotas, the annual immigration quota under the immigration law is 153,774. In not a single year since the law went into effect has this quota been reached, and no immigration quotas in any one year since 1931 were in excess of 50,000. As a matter of fact, the number is far below this figure. In 1931 there were 54,118 aliens admitted to the United States under immigration quotas, but this figure represents the highest total number of admissions in any one year between 1931 and 1938. The following year, 1932, had but 12,983 quota visas issued, and the low was reached in the following year, 1933, when only 8,220 quota visas were issued. In 1934 the number was 12,483; in 1935, 17,207; in 1936, 18,675; in 1937, 27,762; and in 1938, 42,494. So that even in 1938, with all demands by refugees and others, the total quota visas issued was less than that in 1931, and far below the authorized quota of 153,774.

There is an impression abroad to the effect that the passage of the restricted immigration law by Congress was absolutely necessary because of economic conditions then existing in the United States. Somehow or other, right after the World War most statesmen insisted on restricting the number of aliens who would be inclined to enter this country, apparently being afraid that a large influx of immigrants would destroy our economic system. And yet, strange as it may seem, right after the passage of the restricted immigration law, and, in fact, for 7 years or so thereafter, the number of emigrants who left the United States exceeded the number of those who entered this country. The figures also show that only in the last 2 years there has been a somewhat increased number of immigrants as against emigrants; and even so, the number is very slight.

We, as legislators, who are accustomed to analyze and digest facts, must therefore take exception to the promiscuous statements relating to immigration which come from so-called patriotic organizations or the American Legion, even if those expressions be well meaning and intended to convey facts. The record speaks for itself.

I am not quarreling with some of my colleagues who have spoken about the Department of Labor, but figures do not lie. I believe the Department of Labor under this administration has a fine record to its credit in connection with the deportation of aliens.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Of course, the gentleman is not referring to the cases of persons like Bridges and Pritchett, who may be in this country illegally?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know that I understand what the question is. I am referring to deportation of aliens back to their homelands.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman does not mean that he believes the Department of Labor has had a very good record in deporting the Communists who are illegally in this country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I mean to say that the Department of Labor has a record for deporting all aliens who have no right to be in the United States, be they Communists or members of any other group that should be out of the country. I assume the gentleman wants me to take up the cudgels for Bridges, but all I can say to the gentleman, without taking up too much of my time, is that I am not in sympathy with Bridges and so far as I am concerned he can leave now, but the Department is proceeding under law and order and when the decision comes down from the Supreme Court dealing with that matter and other questions, I am sure the gentleman himself, in spite of the statement about his alleged charges for impeachment of the Secretary of Labor, will be satisfied that the law is to be enforced.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I think the gentleman from New York is making a very interesting address and I am pleased to see that he is including the statistics he has referred to and I believe they will be very helpful to the Congress. I think if the gentleman will be at the sessions every day next week, he will learn something about the Department of Labor that he does not know now.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not think the Department can teach me any more than I know now, or the gentleman's committee or any other committee of this House dealing with that question.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has given us figures on those who have entered legally. Has the gentleman any estimate of any considerable number that have entered illegally and are not included in the quota figures the gentleman has given us?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I can do that as I go along with my remarks.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman has said that neither the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] nor the members of the committee can teach him anything he does not know about the Department of Labor or about immigration. If the gentleman believes that the attitude of the Secretary of Labor has been consistent in the Bridges case, all the gentleman needs to do is to refer to his own record in his own committee, because, as a matter of fact, I had passed through this House a bill involving a case where the Secretary of Labor desired to deport two aliens who were here, who were observing the laws, but one night they simply got into a communistic meeting by mistake, and it was mandatory upon the Secretary of Labor, so she said, to deport these two men, although Mr. Bridges and others are here, who are violating the same law. Apparently it is not mandatory to deport that type of person.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's thought, but you are talking now of the Dies committee—the Dies committee that the Dickstein resolution created.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think the gentleman did a very good job.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I never got any acknowledgment from the gentleman or from Mr. DIES, or anybody else, neither did I get any medals, nor am I seeking any medals, but I think I tried to do a good job.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say to the gentleman he never made it known to me that he was the creator of the Dies committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, I am the father and the mother.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is news to me, and I am sure it is to most of the Members.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let me answer the gentleman's question by saying that I always tried in my investigation in the previous committee, under the leadership of JOHN McCORMACK, to protect character and reputation, no matter who the person may have been. I would not allow a lot of numbskulls and crackpots to come before a meeting of a congressional committee and let them talk their heads off for days and array one group against another. I would not bring in labor strikes, and I would not bring in a million other things; and if I had something to say about the Department of Labor, I would not issue too many press releases without giving the American people absolute facts as to what the charges were. Now the point is that the gentleman says she has deported two aliens in hardship cases, or tried to do so—

Mr. DEMPSEY. I say she tried to do that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And she did not deport Bridges. I have told you, in answer to my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]—and he knows my attitude on this question—I am not holding any brief for anybody that ought to be deported, and I do not say that Mr. Bridges ought to get a bouquet of flowers. If he does not belong here, he ought to be deported;

but for heaven's sake, let us do it lawfully. Let us do it legally. If there is a case pending in the Supreme Court that deals with that problem and affects the Bridges case, I say wait for the decision in the pending case, and do not issue any statement and do not make accusations but give her a chance to present the facts in an orderly way and in an American way, and I do not think the committee saw that point.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say to the gentleman that the cases pending in the Supreme Court, in the unanimous opinion of the members of the Dies committee, have no bearing upon the Bridges case.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have the highest regard for the gentleman and for Mr. DIES and for every member of that committee. I honestly believe you tried to do a real job. I do not want to go into that question now. I hope to say something about that at a later time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I answer very briefly one thing that the gentleman has said.

The gentleman stated that he would not permit crackpots and irresponsible people to come before the committee and testify. My position, as recorded by the press, is very well known on that subject. However, I say this to the gentleman. When the committee came before this body and asked for \$100,000 to conduct that investigation, they were told by the membership of the House that they would receive attorneys from the Department of Justice, that they would receive investigators from the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Justice, but if the gentleman has read the report of the committee, he will have found out that they were refused these people by the Departments. The committee did the best it could with the money that it had.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not read the report.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thought so.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But I read the evidence, and I could not find anything in the evidence that any court of law or even a justice of the peace would permit.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I agree with that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then what is your report? The report is based on the evidence in the record, and I am telling you that the report has a lot of fine language in it. I admit that, but it is based on nothing from the documents that were in the possession of the committee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the opinion of one man who says that he did not read the report. The gentleman does not know what is in the report.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I say this. The information which is in the report should be based on the evidence that was in the record.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The report is based on the evidence that is in the record.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But the report and the conclusions in the report and the record of the documents themselves are inconsistent with each other.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is only the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to finish my speech and I do not desire to yield further. I say again there is no personal criticism to be made against Mr. DIES or the individual members of his committee. I say publicly that they started out to do a job, and I am not in position now to pass judgment on what they did or did not do. This was just brought in during my discussion of an immigration problem. Now, coming right back to the question of deportation—and I am coming back to the gentleman's question—the number of deportations has been increasing from year to year, and the total deportations should be further deducted from the amount of net immigration for the year in question. Thus we find that in 1934, under the present administration, there were 8,879 aliens deported. In 1935 another 8,319, and in 1936 over 9,000 or 10,000 people were deported. In 1937, 8,829 were deported, and in 1938, 9,275 were deported, and the average number of deportations by the Secretary of Labor for those years was close to 9,000, and the records will bear me out.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Did we have evidence before the committee at the last session of Congress that there were some 3,000 aliens, who had been ordered deported by the courts, who were still here in the United States and that the Secretary of Labor had either refused or failed to carry out the orders of the court?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. I want to get the record straight, as we say, and I say this to my good friend, the ranking member on the Republican side of our committee. We passed in the last Congress the Dies bill, which would save the deportation of 8,000 aliens of good character who had family ties in this country, but who were technically deportable. We tried to save them by allowing them to stay if the Dies bill became a law. We passed that bill in the House by a vote of 6 to 1, and it got to the Senate during the last week of the session, as all immigration bills do get to the Senate at that time. The bill died there. Under that bill we would have allowed these people to stay. Presently, technically, they are subject to deportation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Not those people who had been ordered deported through court proceedings.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The courts do not order deportation, the Secretary of Labor does that. And the cases which were covered by the Dies bill had not—certainly over 99 percent of them—been before the courts.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. We had information of some 3,000 such cases.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I know; but we get so much information, and if you carry through with it, you find that it is just a lot of propaganda.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I never heard that information challenged.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let me repeat that. We allowed a lot of these 8,000 fathers to stay here. They are married to American women and have children who are Americans. They have committed no crime involving moral turpitude. At the same time that law would deport 20,000 alien criminals that we cannot deport at all. If there are criminals here, I am willing to do everything I can with my colleague and other colleagues to see that the law is enforced.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. As a matter of fact, the law makes it mandatory, when an alien is convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, to deport him.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct in part.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not a fact that there are in this country today aliens subject to deportation under that law who are still in the United States and should be deported?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have to answer this question in this way.

Mr. COCHRAN. Answer it "yes" or "no."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am not going to answer it "yes" or "no." This is not a "yes" or "no" proposition. It is too serious a proposition to answer "yes" or "no."

Mr. COCHRAN. When a person has been convicted of a crime and served time in the penitentiary the law says they should leave the country, and they should be made to leave the country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman first ought to understand the law. He is misquoting the law. The law provides that an alien who has committed two crimes involving moral turpitude, and who has been sentenced therefor to a year or more in prison, or who has committed a crime involving moral turpitude within 5 years of entry and sentenced therefor to a year or more in prison, can be deported at any time. We have in this country today nearly eighteen or twenty thousand alien criminals who have been here more than 5 years who have not been convicted of two felonies involving moral turpitude, but who have been convicted of one felony and perhaps 20 misdemeanors. The Department has no power to deport those people. Under the Dies bill that we passed last year,

I sought on one hand to allow 8,000 people—decent people—to remain here, and with the same law deport eighteen or twenty thousand criminals who should be deported.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Last year the gentleman made statements with reference to people in this country who should be deported, especially when the gentleman was discussing the German bund camps, and that many of those people had not been naturalized. The gentleman stated then that they should be deported and the gentleman criticized the Department of Labor for not deporting them. I am now surprised at the statement the gentleman is making, defending the Department of Labor for not deporting these people.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman is misquoting something I was supposed to have said that I have not said.

Mr. RICH. No. I was on the floor of the House and I listened to those statements.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No alien who is in this country legally can be deported. If an alien enters properly, does nothing which the immigration laws prohibit after his entry, he cannot be deported. Deportation must be grounded on some provision of the immigration laws as they exist today, so I could not have possibly told you that these people, because they were Nazis, could be deported.

For many years I called attention to the fact that the Quota Act of 1924 discriminates against American families. Because of the fact that quotas are so small for countries of eastern and southern Europe, American citizens whose family ties are with those countries are being discriminated against, while American families whose relatives come from England or northern Europe are in a better position to unite with their families. The fact that the quota law is so arranged that two-thirds of it goes to northern and western Europe and one-third of it goes to southern and eastern Europe is an unjust discrimination against our people.

I therefore suggest that there should not be any increase in the number of immigration quotas, but there should be a redistribution of the unused numbers for the current or next fiscal year to relieve the pressure on the small-quota countries, which are discriminated against. This should not be a permanent policy but only for the current fiscal year, for humanitarian reasons, as stated. Let not American families be discriminated against, and where an American family wishes to accomplish union with one residing on the other side, and there are quota numbers available, let them be distributed so that they may do good to those who need them. This, I am sure, will go a long way in the solution of our immigration problem.

Earnest study and attention will be required by this Congress in order to solve the immigration problem of the United States. I am sure my committee will be glad to entertain any intelligent proposal, and any interested citizen who wishes to be heard will be given an opportunity to appear before the committee and state his facts.

A real problem that has been making itself felt in recent years arises out of the enforcement of the deportation laws with respect to aliens who entered the United States since the enactment of the quota laws. It must be remembered that prior to the time when the principle of numerical restriction was put into effect aliens were subject to deportation only, with a very few exceptions, if found to be of the criminal, immoral, radical, or physically and mentally unsound classes. While in some instances deportation then resulted in a hardship to the individual alien and his family, it was felt that the greater good to the country which was derived by the deportation of an undesirable outweighed the harm done to the individual alien and to the members of his family. However, since the quota laws have been enacted, that no longer holds true. A person may now be deportable because of entry without inspection, residence without permission, or flaw in the record of admission. Inevitably, as the years passed, aliens of good character and good repute, in many instances through error on the part of the Government, found themselves enmeshed in deportation proceed-

ings from which there was no escape. The technical violator of the quota laws is as much deportable as the basest alien criminal.

Let me give you an illustration of what I am speaking about by citing one or two cases which have been presented to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. A young Irishman first entered the United States in December 1923 at the port of New York and was admitted for a period of 6 months. He stated, when examined in deportation proceedings later started, that he intended to make this country his permanent home when he first arrived in the United States. He remained here until 1928 when, desiring to go abroad to visit, he applied for a reentry permit. Through error on the part of one of the clerks at Ellis Island, the record of his entry in 1923 was recorded as one for permanent residence and he was issued a permit. He departed and after his reentry into the United States he married a legally admitted Irish girl in 1929. Desiring to complete an application for citizenship, he appeared at the naturalization office in New York in 1933 and then learned that he was in the United States illegally. He promptly and voluntarily sought advice as to his immigration status at Ellis Island. Notwithstanding his apparent desirability, notwithstanding the unfortunate predicament in which he finds himself, through an error on the part of the Government, notwithstanding that he is now established here with a family, he is subject to deportation under existing law.

The case I have cited is typical of many others involving hardships brought about by our deportation laws. The aliens concerned are not criminals; they are not of the immoral type; they are not mentally or physically unsound; they are not public charges. Illegal entry is the sole basis for their deportation. But present law requires that they be deported.

It is because of this unyielding technical aspect of the immigration laws that an attempt has been made in the recent past to enact legislation which would alleviate to some extent the harshness and cruelty of deportation when that deportation is based solely upon the technical ground of illegal entry. That attempt in the last session of Congress culminated in the passage by the House of Representatives of a bill to alleviate this situation. A similar bill will be introduced in the present House.

I shall dwell briefly on the measure. First, it allows the Secretary of Labor, during a period of 4 years, to permit to remain in this country as permanent residents, a maximum number of 8,000 aliens—I wish to emphasize that number—8,000 aliens who are now subject to deportation because of technical illegal entry into the United States.

If they are of good character and if they have resided in this country more than 10 years or have close family ties here—husbands, wives, or children of citizens or legal residents of the country. Second, it permits aliens who entered the United States before July 1, 1924, who are not now subject to deportation, but for whom there is no record of their admission for permanent residence, to legalize their status so that they may become citizens, provided, of course, that they are in all other respects able to meet the qualifications of the naturalization law. Third, because of what has been deemed to be an inadequacy of our present deportation laws with respect to alien criminals, it proposes new classes of deportable aliens removable because of criminal misconduct.

Intolerant of any contrary view on the subject of aliens, extremists have proclaimed their dissatisfaction with the bill that passed the House last year. The pro-alien groups cry out that you are infringing upon the freedom of aliens; you are adding to the deportable classes and thereby making more hardships; you are not giving to the Secretary of Labor enough discretion to make justice in aliens' cases possible. The antialien groups quite as vociferously state: You are attempting to destroy the principle of numerical restriction;

you are nullifying the existing provisions of the immigration laws with respect to alien criminals.

Let us not be intolerant or unreasonable in our views on a subject relating to aliens. Let us not be sentimentalists, so that any hardship to an individual undeserving alien appalls us. Let us not be prejudiced against the foreigner in our midst, so that their very presence is looked upon as a menace to our form of government and to our economic life. Let us seek to do that which is right in keeping with American ideals.

I do not think either of the extremists' views are justified. I believe the bill as a whole is a step forward in the immigration policy of the Nation. It not only will enable the administrators of the law to consider and treat humanely the many aliens deserving of such treatment, it will rid the country of many aliens inherently undesirable. It is an immigration bill drawn with a view to solving our present immigration problem to the advantage, first and foremost, of the American people.

The two bills—one to alleviate hardship cases and deportations and the other to redistribute unused immigration quotas—should engage the earnest attention of the Congress during the forthcoming session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including a few stanzas of blank verse composed by a very distinguished constituent of mine, Hon. J. D. Albright, of Knoxville, Tenn., on existing conditions in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an address recently made by Hon. Roy Miller, of Corpus Christi, Tex., concerning Mr. JOHN N. GARNER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CUMMINGS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, the largest sugar-producing section in the United States is the Second Congressional District in northern Colorado. This is the district that I represent. We have a quota for 1939 of 157,936 acres. This is more than we grew in 1938. Our acreage has been reduced the last 5 years, due to a shortage of water for irrigation purposes. All of our sugar beets are grown by this method of agriculture. Our beets averaged in 1938 a little more than 15 tons per acre. This would mean a potential crop in 1939 of 2,400,000 tons of beets. During the manufacturing period in the fall more than 100 carloads of pure granulated sugar is produced per day.

We thought the low price of sugar had been reached in 1933. Secretary Wallace invited the people who were interested in the sugar industry in the United States to meet in Washington in July of that year. Some 3 months were spent in trying to solve the sugar problem. The stabilization agreement, similar to our present quota plan, was agreed

to by those who represented 98 percent of the sugar business in the United States. This agreement was nullified by Secretary Wallace. A year later we passed the Jones-Costigan Act, which measure was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. In 1937 another law very similar to the Jones-Costigan Act was passed. This measure was signed by the President on the first day of September 1937, and its provisions were applicable to the year 1937. Among other things it provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate the amount of sugar that will be consumed in the United States for each calendar year, then proceed to divide that amount between the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Philippine Islands, Virgin Islands, and Cuba. This act says that the people of those different countries can import a certain amount of sugar but that does not guarantee them a market. If this estimate should be too large, and it proved to be so in 1938 by some 300,000 tons, it means that the sellers of sugar in the countries named will be each striving to dispose of their quota. If in a community there are 10 houses, or 10 horses, for sale and only 9 buyers, the owners will all be striving to supply those 9 buyers. That is what happened in 1937 and 1938 to the sugar industry.

The average price of raw sugar in 1932 was \$2.925 and in 1938, \$2.940. Labor represents the principal cost of sugar. Cuba's geographical position, plus her quota and tariff benefits, allows her to dominate the sugar market in the United States. I am told her average laborer is paid \$1 per day. The beet laborer on farms under the new schedule imposed by Secretary Wallace receives more than \$5 per day. The workers in the factories of the processors of beets are being rapidly organized by the American Federation of Labor, and their average wage is several times that of Cuba. If Cuba used her full tariff benefits, it would not make much difference to the continental producers of sugar, but from April 12 to September 22, 1938, their sacrifice of duty varied from 90 cents per ton to \$6.10 on June 2. An acre of beets will produce about 2 tons of sugar. That means when Cuba was sacrificing \$6.10 per ton, it was reducing the value of an acre of beets \$12.20. On June 30 they were sacrificing \$4.90, which meant \$9.80 per acre of beets.

The Department of State at the present time under authority granted them by the reciprocal trade agreement are negotiating a treaty with Cuba which would lower the present duty on sugar 15 cents per hundred. This will be a reduction of \$3 per ton for Cuba, and if they fail to take advantage of that rate, it would be a loss of \$6 per acre to the growers of sugar beets in the United States, or a total of \$6,000,000.

A Habana dispatch of November 12, 1938, published in the Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal, reads as follows:

A 15-point cut: It is generally believed here that Cuba will get a 15-point cut in United States tariff rates on sugar. In New York trade circles, however, nobody seems to know anything about it, as witness the fact the Philippine and Cuban raws continue selling at the same comparative level, i. e., a 90-point difference, whereas a 15-point reduction, if we get it, will immediately be reflected by our American price.

This statement simply means that Cuba has no intention of keeping 15 cents per hundred if granted the proposed reduction, but does intend to lower their price that much per hundred in New York to assist them in finding a market for their full quota.

I have heard people criticize the sugar industry on the grounds that it furnished only seasonal employment. If this should be construed to mean that the sugar industry should not be allowed to develop in the United States because the labor is seasonal and the same rule were applied to other crops, what would be the results? All fruits and vegetables provide seasonal employment; so does corn and wheat—in fact all crops grown on the farm. Unless connected with winter feeding operations, the average farm laborer works from a few weeks to 8 or 9 months. The same argument would apply to the manufacturing of cement. In fact, nearly all business has a rush season. The growing and processing of sugar beets and sugarcane furnishes more work than the average agricultural crop.

If I could write a sugar law to suit myself, it would provide that the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands could grow as much sugar as they wished. I would prorate the balance of our requirements in a way that I thought would be of most benefit to our own people. With a price of \$2.94 for raw sugar, duty paid in the United States, there is not much chance of expanding, or even continuing, our present production.

I have never been an advocate of high prices for sugar. I realize that it is a necessary food and should be kept within the reach of our lowest wage earner. A staple price of \$5 to \$5.50 would result in an increase of at least 50 percent in continental production of sugar. On the ratio of their food value sugar would be a cheaper food at 5½ cents per pound than butter at 9 cents per pound, bacon at 8 cents, ham at 5 cents, lamb at 3½ cents, sirloin steak at 3 cents, eggs at 2½ cents per dozen, chicken at 2½ cents per pound, and milk at 2½ cents per quart. I think we all realize it would be impossible to produce the articles of food I have just mentioned at those prices.

A ruling by the Secretary of Agriculture increased the cost of hand labor in 1938 over 1936 on 15 tons of beets, which is the average yield per acre in the irrigated sections, \$5 per acre. The average price of refined sugar in 1937, the year the present law was enacted, was \$4.66; in 1938, \$3.948 per hundred. This shows a reduction of 71.2 cents per hundred pounds, which means a decrease in the value of sugar produced on an average acre of \$24.92. If you will add to that the \$5.09 increase in the cost of labor, you have \$30.01; and if you add to this \$30.01 a further reduction of 15 cents per hundred pounds on raw sugar, that I am told the Department of State is considering, you will have another reduction of \$6; total \$36.01.

A few farmers in the Corn Belt can grow a crop of corn yielding about 40 bushels per acre, which, if sold at 50 cents per bushel, would be \$20 per acre. If you grew a crop of 30 bushels of wheat and sold it on the present market, you would get about \$18 per acre. In other words, this decrease in the value of an acre of beets is more than the total value of the average farm crop in the United States. We harvest about a million acres of beets on an average per year. This makes a loss in round figures of some \$30,000,000.

It is impossible to grow sugar in the United States in competition with the world. Most of the sugar is grown in the tropical countries and produced by the cheapest class of labor. For the crop year of 1922–23 the world production of sugar was 20,878,000 tons. In 10 years, 1923–33, it had increased to 29,145,000 tons, or an increase of 8,270,000 tons. From 1933–38, a period of 5 years, it has increased from 29,145,000 tons to 36,000,000 tons, or an increase of 6,855,000 tons. [Applause.]

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think we ought to have a tariff on sugar, so that we can protect the sugar beet industry of Colorado?

Mr. CUMMINGS. You cannot protect the sugar business of the United States with a tariff, for this reason: We cannot levy a tariff against Hawaii; we cannot levy a tariff against Puerto Rico; we cannot levy a tariff against the Virgin Islands. You will never be able to levy a tariff against the Philippine Islands so long as our flag flies over that country. Hawaii and Puerto Rico will produce probably 3,000,000 tons of sugar. Cuba has produced more than 5,000,000. The Philippine Islands can produce two or three million tons. They have produced 1,200,000 tons. You cannot levy a tariff against those countries. They will produce practically all of the sugar we consume in the United States, and a tariff will be of very little benefit.

Mr. RICH. Call it anything you want, but we want to protect the farmers of Colorado and the farmers of Michigan and the Louisiana cane sugar growers. If we can give the market to our own people for our own products, we will go places.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am with the gentleman 100 percent.