

liam Oberg, aged 17, of Millinocket, Maine, in recognition of his participation in various public activities. His record of service toward his school,

his town, and his country had resulted in his being elected as one of three Hi-Y delegates from the Nation to attend UNESCO.

182 Veto of Bill To Revise the Laws Relating to Immigration, Naturalization, and Nationality. June 25, 1952

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 5678, the proposed Immigration and Nationality Act.

In outlining my objections to this bill, I want to make it clear that it contains certain provisions that meet with my approval. This is a long and complex piece of legislation. It has 164 separate sections, some with more than 40 subdivisions. It presents a difficult problem of weighing the good against the bad, and arriving at a judgment on the whole.

H.R. 5678 is an omnibus bill which would revise and codify all of our laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality.

A general revision and modernization of these laws unquestionably is needed and long overdue, particularly with respect to immigration. But this bill would not provide us with an immigration policy adequate for the present world situation. Indeed, the bill, taking all its provisions together, would be a step backward and not a step forward. In view of the crying need for reform in the field of immigration, I deeply regret that I am unable to approve H.R. 5678.

In recent years, our immigration policy has become a matter of major national concern. Long dormant questions about the effect of our immigration laws now assume first rate importance. What we do in the field of immigration and naturalization is vital to the continued growth and internal development of the United States—to the economic and social strength of our country—which is the core of the defense of the free world. Our immigration policy is equally, if not more important to the conduct of our foreign relations and to our responsibilities of moral leadership in the

struggle for world peace.

In one respect, this bill recognizes the great international significance of our immigration and naturalization policy, and takes a step to improve existing laws. All racial bars to naturalization would be removed, and at least some minimum immigration quota would be afforded to each of the free nations of Asia.

I have long urged that racial or national barriers to naturalization be abolished. This was one of the recommendations in my civil rights message to the Congress on February 2, 1948. On February 19, 1951, the House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill to carry it out.

But now this most desirable provision comes before me embedded in a mass of legislation which would perpetuate injustices of long standing against many other nations of the world, hamper the efforts we are making to rally the men of East and West alike to the cause of freedom, and intensify the repressive and inhumane aspects of our immigration procedures. The price is too high, and in good conscience I cannot agree to pay it.

I want all our residents of Japanese ancestry, and all our friends throughout the Far East, to understand this point clearly. I cannot take the step I would like to take, and strike down the bars that prejudice has erected against them, without, at the same time, establishing new discriminations against the peoples of Asia and approving harsh and repressive measures directed at all who seek a new life within our boundaries. I am sure that with a little more time and a little more discussion in this country the public conscience and the good sense of the American people will assert themselves, and

we shall be in a position to enact an immigration and naturalization policy that will be fair to all.

In addition to removing racial bars to naturalization, the bill would permit American women citizens to bring their alien husbands to this country as non-quota immigrants, and enable alien husbands of resident women aliens to come in under the quota in a preferred status. These provisions would be a step toward preserving the integrity of the family under our immigration laws, and are clearly desirable.

The bill would also relieve transportation companies of some of the unjustified burdens and penalties now imposed upon them. In particular, it would put an end to the archaic requirement that carriers pay the expenses of aliens detained at the port of entry, even though such aliens have arrived with proper travel documents.

But these few improvements are heavily outweighed by other provisions of the bill which retain existing defects in our laws, and add many undesirable new features.

The bill would continue, practically without change, the national origins quota system, which was enacted, into law in 1924, and put into effect in 1929. This quota system—always based upon assumptions at variance with our American ideals—is long since out of date and more than ever unrealistic in the face of present world conditions.

This system hinders us in dealing with current immigration problems, and is a constant handicap in the conduct of our foreign relations. As I stated in my message to Congress on March 24, 1952, on the need for an emergency program of immigration from Europe, "Our present quota system is not only inadequate to most present emergency needs, it is also an obstacle to the development of an enlightened and satisfactory immigration policy for the long-run future."

The inadequacy of the present quota system has been demonstrated since the end of the war, when we were compelled to resort

to emergency legislation to admit displaced persons. If the quota system remains unchanged, we shall be compelled to resort to similar emergency legislation again, in order to admit any substantial portion of the refugees from communism or the victims of overcrowding in Europe.

With the idea of quotas in general there is no quarrel. Some numerical limitation must be set, so that immigration will be within our capacity to absorb. But the overall limitation of numbers imposed by the national origins quota system is too small for our needs today, and the country by country limitations create a pattern that is insulting to large numbers of our finest citizens, irritating to our allies abroad, and foreign to our purposes and ideals.

The overall quota limitation, under the law of 1924, restricted annual immigration to approximately 150,000. This was about one-seventh of one percent of our total population in 1920. Taking into account the growth in population since 1920, the law now allows us but one-tenth of one percent of our total population. And since the largest national quotas are only partly used, the number actually coming in has been in the neighborhood of one-fifteenth of one percent. This is far less than we must have in the years ahead to keep up with the growing needs of the Nation for manpower to maintain the strength and vigor of our economy.

The greatest vice of the present quota system, however, is that it discriminates, deliberately and intentionally, against many of the peoples of the world. The purpose behind it was to cut down and virtually eliminate immigration to this country from Southern and Eastern Europe. A theory was invented to rationalize this objective. The theory was that in order to be readily assimilable, European immigrants should be admitted in proportion to the numbers of persons of their respective national stocks already here as shown by the census of 1920. Since Americans of English, Irish and German descent were most numerous, intimi-

grants of those three nationalities got the lion's share—more than two-thirds—of the total quota. The remaining third was divided up among all the other nations given quotas.

The desired effect was obtained. Immigration from the newer sources of Southern and Eastern Europe was reduced to a trickle. The quotas allotted to England and Ireland remained largely unused, as was intended. Total quota immigration fell to a half or a third—and sometimes even less—of the annual limit of 154,000. People from such countries as Greece, or Spain, or Latvia were virtually deprived of any opportunity to come here at all, simply because Greeks or Spaniards or Latvians had not come here before 1920 in any substantial numbers.

The idea behind this discriminatory policy was, to put it baldly, that Americans with English or Irish names were better people and better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names. It was thought that people of West European origin made better citizens than Rumanians or Yugoslavs or Ukrainians or Hungarians or Balts or Austrians. Such a concept is utterly unworthy of our traditions and our ideals. It violates the great political doctrine of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal." It denies the humanitarian creed inscribed beneath the Statue of Liberty proclaiming to all nations, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

It repudiates our basic religious concepts, our belief in the brotherhood of man, and in the words of St. Paul that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, . . . for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

The basis of this quota system was false and unworthy in 1924. It is even worse now. At the present time, this quota system keeps out the very people we want to bring in. It is incredible to me that, in this year of 1952, we should again be enacting into law such a slur on the patriotism, the capacity, and the decency of a large part of our citizenry.

Today, we have entered into an alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty, with Italy, Greece, and Turkey against one of the most terrible threats mankind has ever faced. We are asking them to join with us in protecting the peace of the world. We are helping them to build their defenses, and train their men, in the common cause. But, through this bill we say to their people: You are less worthy to come to this country than Englishmen or Irishmen; you Italians, who need to find homes abroad in the hundreds of thousands—you shall have a quota of 5,645; you Greeks, struggling to assist the helpless victims of a communist civil war—you shall have a quota of 308; and you Turks, you are brave defenders of the Eastern flank, but you shall have a quota of only 225!

Today, we are "protecting" ourselves, as we were in 1924, against being flooded by immigrants from Eastern Europe. This is fantastic. The countries of Eastern Europe have fallen under the communist yoke—they are silenced, fenced off by barbed wire and minefields—no one passes their borders but at the risk of his life. We do not need to be protected against immigrants from these countries—on the contrary we want to stretch out a helping hand, to save those who have managed to flee into Western Europe, to succor those who are brave enough to escape from barbarism, to welcome and restore them against the day when their countries will, as we hope, be free again. But this we cannot do, as we would like to do, because the quota for Poland is only 6,500, as against the 138,000 exiled Poles, all over Europe, who are asking to come to these shores; because the quota for the now subjugated Baltic countries is little more than 700—against the 23,000 Baltic refugees imploring us to admit them to a new life here; because the quota for Rumania is only 289, and some 30,000 Rumanians, who have managed to escape the labor camps and the mass deportations of their Soviet masters, have asked our help. These are only a few examples of the absurdity, the cruelty of carry-

ing over into this year of 1952 the isolationist limitations of our 1924 law.

In no other realm of our national life are we so hampered and stultified by the dead hand of the past, as we are in this field of immigration. We do not limit our cities to their 1920 boundaries—we do not hold our corporations to their 1920 capitalizations—we welcome progress and change to meet changing conditions in every sphere of life, except in the field of immigration.

The time to shake off this dead weight of past mistakes is now. The time to develop a decent policy of immigration—a fitting instrument for our foreign policy and a true reflection of the ideals we stand for, at home and abroad—is now. In my earlier message on immigration, I tried to explain to the Congress that the situation we face in immigration is an emergency—that it must be met promptly. I have pointed out that in the last few years, we have blazed a new trail in immigration, through our Displaced Persons Program. Through the combined efforts of the Government and private agencies, working together not to keep people out, but to bring qualified people in, we summoned our resources of good will and human feeling to meet the task. In this program, we have found better techniques to meet the immigration problems of the 1950's.

None of this fruitful experience of the last three years is reflected in this bill before me. None of the crying human needs of this time of trouble is recognized in this bill. But it is not too late. The Congress can remedy these defects, and it can adopt legislation to meet the most critical problems before adjournment.

The only consequential change in the 1924 quota system which the bill would make is to extend a small quota to each of the countries of Asia. But most of the beneficial effects of this gesture are offset by other provisions of the bill. The countries of Asia are told in one breath that they shall have quotas for their nationals, and in the next, that the nationals of the other coun-

tries, if their ancestry is as much as 50 per cent Asian, shall be charged to these quotas.

It is only with respect to persons of oriental ancestry that this invidious discrimination applies. All other persons are charged to the country of their birth. But persons with Asian ancestry are charged to the countries of Asia, wherever they may have been born, or however long their ancestors have made their homes outside the land of their origin. These provisions are without justification.

I now wish to turn to the other provisions of the bill, those dealing with the qualifications of aliens and immigrants for admission, with the administration of the laws, and with problems of naturalization and nationality. In these provisions too, I find objections that preclude my signing this bill.

The bill would make it even more difficult to enter our country. Our resident aliens would be more easily separated from homes and families under grounds of deportation, both new and old, which would specifically be made retroactive. Admission to our citizenship would be made more difficult; expulsion from our citizenship would be made easier. Certain rights of native born, first generation Americans would be limited. All our citizens returning from abroad would be subjected to serious risk of unreasonable invasions of privacy. Seldom has a bill exhibited the distrust evidenced here for citizens and aliens alike—at a time when we need unity at home, and the confidence of our friends abroad.

We have adequate and fair provisions in our present law to protect us against the entry of criminals. The changes made by the bill in those provisions would result in empowering minor immigration and consular officials to act as prosecutor, judge and jury in determining whether acts constituting a crime have been committed. Worse, we would be compelled to exclude certain people because they have been convicted by "courts" in communist countries that know no justice. Under this provision, no matter how construed, it would not be possible for us to admit many of the men and women

who have stood up against totalitarian repression and have been punished for doing so. I do not approve of substituting totalitarian vengeance for democratic justice. I will not extend full faith and credit to the judgments of the communist secret police.

The realities of a world, only partly free, would again be ignored in the provision flatly barring entry to those who made misrepresentations in securing visas. To save their lives and the lives of loved ones still imprisoned, refugees from tyranny sometimes misstate various details of their lives. We do not want to encourage fraud. But we must recognize that conditions in some parts of the world drive our friends to desperate steps. An exception restricted to cases involving misstatement of country of birth is not sufficient. And to make refugees from oppression forever deportable on such technical grounds is shabby treatment indeed.

Some of the new grounds of deportation which the bill would provide are unnecessarily severe. Defects and mistakes in admission would serve to deport at any time because of the bill's elimination, retroactively as well as prospectively, of the present humane provision barring deportations on such grounds five years after entry. Narcotic drug addicts would be deportable at any time, whether or not the addiction was culpable, and whether or not cured. The threat of deportation would drive the addict into hiding beyond the reach of cure, and the danger to the country from drug addiction would be increased.

I am asked to approve the reenactment of highly objectionable provisions now contained in the Internal Security Act of 1950—a measure passed over my veto shortly after the invasion of South Korea. Some of these provisions would empower the Attorney General to deport any alien who has engaged or has had a purpose to engage in activities “prejudicial to the public interest” or “subversive to the national security.” No standards or definitions are provided to guide discretion in the exercise of powers so sweep-

ing. To punish undefined “activities” departs from traditional American insistence on established standards of guilt. To punish an undefined “purpose” is thought control.

These provisions are worse than the infamous Alien Act of 1798, passed in a time of national fear and distrust of foreigners, which gave the President power to deport any alien deemed “dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States.” Alien residents were thoroughly frightened and citizens much disturbed by that threat to liberty.

Such powers are inconsistent with our democratic ideals. Conferring powers like that upon the Attorney General is unfair to him as well as to our alien residents. Once fully informed of such vast discretionary powers vested in the Attorney General, Americans now would and should be just as alarmed as Americans were in 1798 over less drastic powers vested in the President.

Heretofore, for the most part, deportation and exclusion have rested upon findings of fact made upon evidence. Under this bill, they would rest in many instances upon the “opinion” or “satisfaction” of immigration or consular employees. The change from objective findings to subjective feelings is not compatible with our system of justice. The result would be to restrict or eliminate judicial review of unlawful administrative action.

The bill would sharply restrict the present opportunity of citizens and alien residents to save family members from deportation. Under the procedures of present law, the Attorney General can exercise his discretion to suspend deportation in meritorious cases. In each such case, at the present time, the exercise of administrative discretion is subject to the scrutiny and approval of the Congress. Nevertheless, the bill would prevent this discretion from being used in many cases where it is now available, and would narrow the circle of those who can obtain relief from the letter of the law. This is most unfortunate, because the bill, in its

other provisions, would impose harsher restrictions and greatly increase the number of cases deserving equitable relief.

Native-born American citizens who are dual nationals would be subjected to loss of citizenship on grounds not applicable to other native-born American citizens. This distinction is a slap at millions of Americans whose fathers were of alien birth.

Children would be subjected to additional risk of loss of citizenship. Naturalized citizens would be subjected to the risk of denaturalization by any procedure that can be found to be permitted under any State law or practice pertaining to minor civil law suits. Judicial review of administrative denials of citizenship would be severely limited and impeded in many cases, and completely eliminated in others. I believe these provisions raise serious constitutional questions. Constitutionality aside, I see no justification in national policy for their adoption.

Section 401 of this bill would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. This committee would have the customary powers to hold hearings and to subpoena witnesses, books, papers and documents. But the Committee would also be given powers over the Executive branch which are unusual and of a highly questionable nature. Specifically, section 401 would provide that "The Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall without delay submit to the Committee all regulations, instructions, and all other information as requested by the Committee relative to the administration of this Act."

This section appears to be another attempt to require the Executive branch to make available to the Congress administrative documents, communications between the President and his subordinates, confidential files, and other records of that character. It also seems to imply that the Committee would undertake to supervise or approve regulations. Such proposals are not consistent with the Constitutional doctrine of the separation of powers.

In these and many other respects, the bill

raises basic questions as to our fundamental immigration and naturalization policy, and the laws and practices for putting that policy into effect.

Many of the aspects of the bill which have been most widely criticized in the public debate are reaffirmations or elaborations of existing statutes or administrative procedures. Time and again, examination discloses that the revisions of existing law that would be made by the bill are intended to solidify some restrictive practice of our immigration authorities, or to overrule or modify some ameliorative decision of the Supreme Court or other Federal courts. By and large, the changes that would be made by the bill do not depart from the basically restrictive spirit of our existing laws—but intensify and reinforce it.

These conclusions point to an underlying condition which deserves the most careful study. Should we not undertake a reassessment of our immigration policies and practices in the light of the conditions that face us in the second half of the twentieth century? The great popular interest which this bill has created, and the criticism which it has stirred up, demand an affirmative answer. I hope the Congress will agree to a careful reexamination of this entire matter.

To assist in this complex task, I suggest the creation of a representative commission of outstanding Americans to examine the basic assumptions of our immigration policy, the quota system and all that goes with it, the effect of our present immigration and nationality laws, their administration, and the ways in which they can be brought in line with our national ideals and our foreign policy.

Such a commission should, I believe, be established by the Congress. Its membership should be bi-partisan and divided equally among persons from private life and persons from public life. I suggest that four members be appointed by the President, four by the President of the Senate, and four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The commission should be

given sufficient funds to employ a staff and it should have adequate powers to hold hearings, take testimony, and obtain information. It should make a report to the President and to the Congress within a year from the time of its creation.

Pending the completion of studies by such a commission, and the consideration of its recommendations by the Congress, there are certain steps which I believe it is most important for the Congress to take this year.

First, I urge the Congress to enact legislation removing racial barriers against Asians from our laws. Failure to take this step profits us nothing and can only have serious consequences for our relations with the peoples of the Far East. A major contribution to this end would be the prompt enactment by the Senate of H.R. 403. That bill, already passed by the House of Representatives, would remove the racial bars to the naturalization of Asians.

Second, I strongly urge the Congress to enact the temporary, emergency immigration legislation which I recommended three months ago. In my message of March 24, 1952, I advised the Congress that one of the gravest problems arising from the present world crisis is created by the overpopulation in parts of Western Europe. That condition is aggravated by the flight and expulsion of people from behind the iron curtain. In view of these serious problems, I asked the Congress to authorize the admission of 300,000 additional immigrants to the United

States over a three year period. These immigrants would include Greek nationals, Dutch nationals, Italians from Italy and Trieste, Germans and persons of German ethnic origin, and religious and political refugees from communism in Eastern Europe. This temporary program is urgently needed. It is very important that the Congress act upon it this year. I urge the Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to the bills introduced by Senator Hendrickson and Representative Celler (S. 3109 and H.R. 7376), which will implement the recommendations contained in my message of March 24.

I very much hope that the Congress will take early action on these recommendations. Legislation to carry them out will correct some of the unjust provisions of our laws, will strengthen us at home and abroad, and will serve to relieve a great deal of the suffering and tension existing in the world today.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

NOTE: On June 27 the Congress passed the bill over the President's veto. As enacted, H.R. 5678 is Public Law 414, 82d Congress (66 Stat. 163).

On June 30, the President signed Proclamation 2980 (3 CFR, 1949-1953 Comp., p. 161) revising the immigration quota list.

For the President's message to Congress on civil rights, dated February 2, 1948, see 1948 volume, this series, Item 20.

For the President's message to Congress on aid for refugees and displaced persons, dated March 24, see Item 65, this volume.

183 Remarks to the Washington Student Citizenship Seminar. *June 25, 1952*

IT IS a pleasure again to receive this group, and I hope that they are enjoying their visit, and getting a lot of information about the Government of the United States while they are here.

You are in the White House Rose Garden, where all the greats are received, and where medals are pinned on. I had a medal pinning yesterday.

Behind you is the White House, which is not the proper name for the house. I don't suppose many of you know what the right name of it is. It is "The President's House." All the silver is engraved with "The President's House," and whenever anybody comes to dinner and takes a souvenir—that is, a piece of silver—he can be caught up with because it says "The President's House" on it.

rected by an agency of the Government, the plants and laboratories are operated by leading industrial and research organizations through contracts with the Federal Government. I hope that, in due course, the Government will be able to permit greater participation by private industry in the development of atomic energy. When that time arrives, our industries and research organizations will be well prepared to carry forward the applications of atomic energy which will provide better living and better health for our people.

Secrecy is always distasteful to a free people. In scientific research, it is a handicap to productivity. But our need for security in an insecure world compels us, at the present time, to maintain a high order of secrecy in many of our atomic energy undertakings.

When the nations of the world are prepared to join with us in the international

control of atomic energy, this requirement of secrecy will disappear. Our Government has sought, through its representatives on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, to find a common basis for understanding with the other member nations. However, the uncompromising refusal of the Soviet Union to participate in a workable control system has thus far obstructed progress.

The Atomic Energy Act has stood the test of 2 years of administration. There is no reason to question the sound basis on which it rests. In 2 years, the world has found no ready answers to the problem of war and peace. Atomic energy, therefore, remains a fearful instrument of destruction and a wonderful invitation to progress through peace.

NOTE: The Fourth Semiannual Report of the Atomic Energy Commission is printed in Senate Document 199 (80th Cong., 2d sess.).

165 Message to the Special Session of the 80th Congress.

July 27, 1948

[As delivered in person before a joint session]

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the 80th Congress:

The urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.

Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things: first, to check inflation and the rising cost of living, and second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

These are matters which affect every American family. They also affect the entire world, for world peace depends upon the strength of our economy.

The Communists, both here and abroad, are counting on our present prosperity turning into a depression. They do not believe

that we can—or will—put the brake on high prices. They are counting on economic collapse in this country.

If we should bring on another great depression in the United States by failing to control high prices, the world's hope for lasting peace would vanish. A depression in the United States would cut the ground from under the free nations of Europe. Economic collapse in this country would prevent the recovery throughout the world which is essential to lasting peace. We would have only ourselves to blame for the tragedy that would follow.

In these tense days, when our strength is being taxed all over the world, it would

be reckless folly if we failed to act against inflation.

High prices are not taking "time off" for the election.

High prices are not waiting until the next session of Congress.

High prices are getting worse. They are getting worse every day.

We cannot afford to wait for the next Congress to act.

The 81st Congress will not get under way for nearly 6 months. Before the new Congress could take action against high prices, it would have to draft new bills, study them, hold hearings, debate and decide whether to pass them. It would be at least 8 months from now before the new Congress could pass the laws we need.

Eight months more of inflation would be much too long.

It was 8 months ago—November 1947—that I called a special session of this Congress, and recommended a comprehensive anti-inflation program. But that program was not enacted. If it had been enacted, we would have lower prices today.

Since last November, prices have gone even higher. As every housewife knows, food prices rose rapidly throughout 1947. They are climbing even faster now. Month after month, the cost of clothing, fuel, and rent keeps on going up.

The cost of living is now higher than ever before in our history.

There are not many very rich men in the Congress of the United States. You all—most of you—have to live on your salaries. All you need do is just go home and ask your wife how living costs are now, as compared to what they were January 1st, 1947.

We cannot risk the danger, or suffer the hardship, of another 8 months of doing nothing about high prices.

Prices are already so high that last year more than one-fourth of the families of this

country were forced to spend more than they earned. Families of low or moderate income are being priced out of the market for many of the necessities of life. They are not able to buy as much as they could buy 2 years ago, and they are paying a lot more for what they can buy.

At the same time, industrial prices, which affect all business and employment, are rising, and rising fast. Large price increases have recently been announced by industries that set the pace for the whole economy. Just within the last few days, the steel industry, for example, increased its prices, on the average, by more than \$9 a ton.

The rise in industrial prices is just as important, in the long run, as the high cost of living. It is already squeezing the independent businessman. It threatens to destroy a fair balance between industry and agriculture. It can end only in catastrophe if it is allowed to continue.

In the face of these facts, it is foolish to point at every feeble straw as a sign that the danger is disappearing. In February, some people said that the break in commodity prices meant that inflation was almost over. They were wrong. Prices rose again.

There are still some people who repeat the old argument which was used by those who killed price control 2 years ago. They said that if we would only take controls off, production would increase, prices would go down, and there would be more for everybody at lower cost.

The record shows unmistakably that this argument was false.

Production has increased somewhat, and we want it to increase still more. But even with full employment, full use of available materials, and practically full use of plant capacity—all of which we have today—prices are still climbing much faster than production. It is obvious that we cannot rely solely on more production to curb high prices. In-

stead, we must attack inflation directly.

If we do not stop inflation, production and employment will both fall sharply when the break comes.

Positive action by this Government is long over-due. It must be taken now.

I therefore urge the Congress to take strong, positive action to control inflation. I have reexamined the anti-inflation program I proposed to the Congress 8 months ago. In its essentials that program is as sound now as it was then. It has been revised and strengthened in the light of changing circumstances. The program I now propose is as follows:

First, I recommend that an excess profits tax be reestablished in order to provide a Treasury surplus and to provide a brake on inflation.

Second, I recommend that consumer credit controls be restored in order to hold down inflationary credit.

Third, I recommend that the Federal Reserve Board be given greater authority to regulate inflationary bank credit.

Fourth, I recommend that authority be granted to regulate speculation on the commodity exchanges.

Fifth, I recommend that authority be granted for allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production, or the cost of living.

Sixth, I recommend that rent controls be strengthened, and that adequate appropriations be provided for enforcement, in order to prevent further unwarranted rent increases.

Seventh, I recommend that standby authority be granted to ration those few products in short supply which vitally affect the health and welfare of our people. On the basis of present facts, and unless further shortages occur, this authority might not have to be used.

Eighth, I recommend that price control be authorized for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living. I have said before, and I repeat, that many profit margins have been adequate to absorb wage increases without the price increases that have followed. Rising wages and rising standards of living, based on increasing productivity and a fair distribution of income, is the American way. Noninflationary wage increases can and should continue to be made by free collective bargaining. Where the Government imposes a price ceiling, wage adjustments which can be absorbed within the price ceiling should not be interfered with by the Government. The Government should have the authority, however, to limit wage adjustments which would force a break in the price ceiling, except where wage adjustments are essential to remedy hardship, to correct inequities, or to prevent an actual lowering of the living standards.

The measures I have recommended make up a balanced program to attack high prices. They are all necessary to check rising prices and safeguard our economy against the danger of depression. If they are made the first order of business by the Congress, as they should be, they can be promptly enacted. Every week of delay will mean additional hardship for the American people.

The second reason why I have called the Congress back is that our people need legislation now to help meet the national housing shortage.

We desperately need more housing at lower prices—prices which families of moderate income, particularly veterans' families, can afford to pay. We are not getting it.

Even more urgently, we need more rental housing—especially low-rent housing. We are not getting it.

Most of the housing now being built is for sale, or for rent, at prices far above the

reach of the average American family.

I have recommended time and again that the Congress pass a comprehensive housing bill which would help us obtain more housing at lower prices—both for sale and for rent.

A good housing bill, Senate Bill 866, known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, passed the Senate on April 22. This bill would provide aid to cities in clearing slums and in building low-rent housing projects. It would give extensive aid to the private home building industry. It includes provisions for farm housing, and for research to bring down building costs. It contains many other provisions, all aimed at getting more housing at lower prices and at lower rents.

This is the bill we need. We need it now, not a year from now.

If this legislation is passed this summer, it will be possible to start immediately the production of more houses of the kind our families need, and at prices they can afford to pay. If it is not passed now, the 81st Congress will have to start all over again with a new housing bill. In that case, we might lose a full year in meeting our national housing need.

This Congress can complete action on this comprehensive housing bill in a few days. And I strongly urge that it do so.

I have called the Congress back primarily to deal with high prices and with the housing shortage. Delay on either of these items would be most dangerous. In addition, there are other important legislative measures on which delay would injure us at home and impair our world relations.

I therefore recommend that the present session, without allowing anything to interfere with its vital work on legislation concerning high prices and housing, take action on certain other important measures. These measures can speedily be enacted now because of the amount of study already given

to them by the Congress.

First, the Congress should provide Federal assistance to the States in meeting the present crisis in education. The children in our schools, and the men and women who teach there, have been made the victims of inflation. More children are entering school than ever before. But inflation has cut down the purchasing power of the money devoted to educational purposes. Teachers' salaries, for the most part, have lagged far behind the increased cost of living. The overcrowding of our schools is seriously detrimental to the health and the education of our boys and girls. Every month that we delay in meeting this problem will cause damage that can never be repaired. Several million children of school age are unable to attend school, largely because of lack of facilities or teachers.

To meet these vital educational needs, the Congress should complete action on Senate Bill 472, which passed the Senate on April the 1st. All that remains to be done is its passage by the House of Representatives.

Prompt action by the Congress is also needed to help another group of our people who are suffering from inflation. These are the workers who depend on the protection of the minimum wage law. The present minimum wage law is pitifully inadequate in the face of today's high prices. Proposals to raise minimum wages have long been before the Congress. I urgently recommend that the minimum wage be raised to at least 75 cents an hour at this session. Senate Bill 2062 and its companion House bills would be suitable measures for this purpose.

I also urge that action be taken by the Congress to relieve other victims of inflation. These are the people who depend upon the benefits being paid under the old-age and survivors insurance system. The average old-age retirement benefit for a man and his wife is only \$39 a month. For a widow

with two children, the average monthly benefit is only \$49. These benefits are utterly inadequate. I urge that they be increased by at least 50 percent and that the age at which women can receive benefits be lowered from 65 to 60 years. I also hope that the protection of this system will be extended to the millions who are not now covered.

In our relations with the rest of the world, action is also needed at once, and can be taken quickly, to afford additional proof that we mean what we say when we talk about freedom, humanity, and international cooperation for peace and prosperity. Three measures are involved.

First, the Displaced Persons Act in its present form discriminates unfairly against some displaced persons because of their religion, land of origin, or occupation. These provisions are contrary to all American ideals. This act should be promptly amended to wipe out these discriminations. Furthermore, the present act permits the entry of only 200,000 persons, and charges them against future immigration quotas. I believe strongly that this act should provide for the entry of 400,000 persons over a 4-year period, and they should be outside the normal immigration quotas. The act can and should be amended promptly.

Second, many people in the world must wonder how strongly we support the United Nations when we hesitate to assist the construction of its permanent home in this country. Legislation can and should be passed at once to authorize a loan by the United States Government to the United Nations, for the construction of its headquarters buildings in New York City.

The International Wheat Agreement is another vital measure on which the Congress should act. This agreement is designed to insure stability in the world wheat market in the years ahead when wheat will be more plentiful. It would guarantee American

farmers an export market of 185 million bushels of wheat at a fair price during each of the next 5 years. Since the agreement is in the form of a treaty it requires only ratification by the Senate. Although this agreement should have been ratified by July 1st of this year, we have good reason to believe that it can still be made effective if it is now ratified promptly.

Also, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to three other problems on which action can and should be taken at this session.

The Congress should reconsider its recent actions which cut sharply into our national electric power policy. There is an acute shortage of electric power in this country now. I am therefore re-submitting to the Congress appropriation requests for certain power projects which must be provided right away. These requests include the TVA steamplant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., and certain other projects on which congressional reductions, if allowed to stand, will delay the production of power for a year or more. These appropriations should be promptly enacted, and at the same time certain crippling limitations should be removed from the law.

In the final days before adjourning in June, the Congress passed a bill raising the salaries of some Federal employees. However, this bill neglected long overdue reforms in the Federal pay scales and discriminated unfairly against certain groups of employees. The Congress should take this opportunity to enact more equitable and realistic Federal pay legislation.

Finally, I again urge upon the Congress the measures I recommended last February to protect and extend basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty. A number of bills to carry out my recommendations have been introduced in the Congress. Many of them have already received careful consid-

eration by congressional committees. Only one bill, however, has been enacted, a bill relating to the rights of Americans of Japanese origin. I believe that it is necessary to enact the laws I have recommended in order to make the guarantees of the Constitution real and vital. I believe they are necessary to carry out our American ideals of liberty and justice for all.

I hope that there is no misunderstanding of the recommendations I have made. I have asked the Congress to return, first of all, in order to meet the urgent need of our people for relief from high prices and the housing shortage. I urge the Congress not to be distracted from these central purposes.

At the same time, as I have stated, the Congress can and should act on certain other important items of legislation at this special session.

There are still other problems of great moment which vitally affect the welfare of the Nation. I have discussed them in previous messages to this Congress. I have made recommendations for legislation to meet them. I do not repeat them now—because the purposes and limited time of this special session do not readily permit action on them.

However, I feel just as strongly as ever that all these measures are necessary. If the Congress finds time to enact any of them now the country will greatly benefit. Certainly, the next Congress should take them up immediately.

These include: a comprehensive health program, based on health insurance; a fair and sound labor-management relations law—in place of the Taft-Hartley law which has proved to be unfair and unsound and which should be repealed; a real long-range farm program; a stronger reciprocal trade agreements act; a universal training program; a national science foundation; strengthened

antitrust laws; and the approval of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty.

The vigor of our democracy is judged by its ability to take decisive actions—actions which are necessary to maintain our physical and moral strength and to raise our standards of living. In these days of continued stress, the test of that vigor becomes more and more difficult. The legislative and executive branches of our Government can meet that test today.

The American people rightfully expect us to meet it together. I hope that the American people will not look to us in vain.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. His address was carried on a nationwide radio broadcast.

On August 12 the White House released the following "Summary of Action by the Congress on the President's Recommendations at the Special Session":

A. Major recommendations:

1. Anti-inflation program:

a. Excess profits tax. (Failed to act. Ways and Means Committee held no meetings; permitted no administration witnesses to testify.)

b. Consumer credit controls. (Enacted, but for a shorter period than recommended.)

c. Bank credit controls. (Enacted in part.)

d. Regulate speculations in commodities. (Failed to act. No administration witnesses permitted to testify.)

e. Authority for allocations and inventory controls. (Failed to act. House committee refused to hear administration case; Senate Committee cut hearings short.)

f. Strengthened rent control. (Failed to act. No administration witnesses permitted to testify.)

g. Authority to ration. (Failed to act. House committee refused to hear administration case; Senate Committee cut hearings short.)

h. Authority for price controls. (Failed to act. House committee refused to hear administration case; Senate Committee cut hearings short.)

2. Housing program. (House leadership refused to permit House to vote on Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Emasculated housing bill enacted instead.)

B. Other recommendations:

1. Aid to education. (Failed to act. House committee held no meeting. Bill had previously passed the Senate.)

2. Increase minimum wage. (Failed to act. Committees held no meetings. Hearings had previously been held.)

3. Increase social security benefits. (Failed to act. Senate committee held no meeting. Bill had previously passed House (in inadequate form).)

4. Amend Displaced Persons Act. (Failed to act. Senate leadership refused to permit action.)

5. Loan for United Nations headquarters. (Enacted.)

6. Ratify International Wheat Agreement. (Reported by Senate committee, but Senate leadership refused to permit ratification.)

7. Restore vital power appropriations and remove crippling restrictions. (Failed to act. House Appropriations Committee refused to hear administration witnesses. Senate defeated amendments when they were offered by Democratic Senators.)

8. Reforms in Federal pay scales. (Failed to act. House and Senate committees did not meet; permitted no administration testimony.)

9. Civil rights legislation. (Failed to act. Senate briefly considered antipoll tax bill, took no action.)

166 The President's News Conference of July 29, 1948

THE PRESIDENT. Ladies and gentlemen, I have no announcements to make. If you have any questions, I will try to answer them.

[1.] Q. Mr. President, General Bradley said he favored segregation in the lower echelons of the Army. Is that consistent with your Executive order regarding the Armed Forces?

THE PRESIDENT. I haven't seen what General Bradley says, but I am informed by the Secretary for the Army that he made no such statement.

[2.] Q. Mr. President, Mr. Bevin made a statement today regarding the next approach to Moscow regarding the Berlin situation. Held out, too, his hope for settlement of the whole European problem. I wonder if you could give us any American view—

THE PRESIDENT. I haven't seen Mr. Bevin's statement, and I have no comment to make on it, or on the European situation.

[3.] Q. Mr. President, in the antipoll tax method, would you have any preference for a constitutional method, or the bill?

THE PRESIDENT. That is a matter that the Senate will have to act on, and the House. The House has already acted, I think.

[4.] Q. Mr. President, to go back to the first question, does your advocacy of equality of treatment and opportunity in the Armed

Forces envision eventually the end of segregation?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

[5.] Q. Mr. President, do you consider that the Senate has acted in good faith in starting its work upon the controversial—

THE PRESIDENT. I have no comment to make on the Senate. The Senate stands before the country just the same as I do. They will have to take the consequences of their acts.

[6.] Q. Mr. President, would wages necessarily be frozen under your anti-inflation program?

THE PRESIDENT. Not necessarily.

[7.] Q. Mr. President, in connection with the congressional session, do you plan to ask Governor Dewey to use his influence as the leader of his party to do something about getting some action?

THE PRESIDENT. No. [Laughter]

[8.] Q. Mr. President, what persuaded you some months after the Federal Reserve Board first made its proposal about bank credit restraints, to endorse most of them?

THE PRESIDENT. The change in the situation.

Q. How is the situation changed?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, consumer credit is rapidly rising.

Q. Were you in favor of reinstitution of Regulation W?

288 Address at Memorial Hall in Buffalo.

October 9, 1952

THE WELCOME you have given me reminds me of the welcome I received when I came here in 1948. I shall always remember that. And I shall also remember the good majority that Buffalo gave me in that election.

Now, this year I want you to give an even bigger majority to Adlai Stevenson. Also, I want you to turn in good majorities for the Democratic ticket in this great State. You people here have a chance to send three good Democrats to Congress. Two of them have represented you in Congress before. They have good, liberal records. They did a fine job for you in Washington. They are Anthony Tauriello and Chester Gorski. I hope you will send them back again, and I believe you will.

In the 42d District, you have a candidate who knows all about the needs of this area. He is E. Dent Lackey, and if you send him to Congress, you will have someone who will look out for your interests and not just the interests of the big business lobbies.

For the Senate, you have John Cashmore of Brooklyn. He is an able, well-qualified, and a good man, and I hope you will elect him. You have one Senator in the Senate of whom I am very fond already, and that is Senator Lehman. He is a wonderful Senator. He is always on the side of the people.

This year I am not campaigning for myself—but for something I believe to be necessary to the progress and prosperity of this country. It is vitally necessary for the welfare of this country that we have a Democratic victory in November.

I am not asking for anything for myself. I have had a rugged 4 years since I saw you last, and I have received a lot of mud and brickbats. But I don't feel too badly about those attacks that have been made on me, because I know the reason for them. It is that I have been working for the interests of the people.

If a President is truly working for the people, the special interest lobbies and the one-party press are sure to start smearing and slandering him. If he resists the big interests—if he tries to keep price control on the big corporations, for example, if he tries to prevent the oil companies or the gas companies from robbing the public—then it doesn't matter how decent he is, or how honest, the editorials and the hatchet commentators will try to make him look like a monster. My daughter never thought I looked like one.

On the other hand, if a President, or even a candidate for President, is on the side of the big interests, then no matter how he may behave, or what preposterous things he may say, the newspaper publishers will try to cover up for him and present him to the people as a great statesman. That is what they are doing for their Republican candidate this year.

So, on the whole, I am proud of the attacks that have been made on me. I have made my fair share of mistakes, I know; but I am confident that while I have been President, I have represented the 150 million people who don't have a lobby down there in Washington working for them. There's the oil lobby, the real estate lobby, and the National Association of Manufacturers lobby, and the railroad lobby, and the American Medical Association lobby. There's a lobby for this, that, and the other thing, so the President has to look out for the interests of the 150 million people who can't afford lobbyists in Washington.

And I know Adlai Stevenson will do that for you when you elect him, just as I have done it.

One of the things for which I have been most savagely attacked is my effort to preserve the Bill of Rights, the greatest part of the Constitution of the United States, and the spirit of mutual tolerance and fair play

that we must have to hold this Nation together.

Ours is a nation of many different groups, of different races, different national origins and different religions. The American principle is that all men shall have equal rights before the law and that all men have equal rights in our economic life. This is the idea that holds us together, and it has made us the greatest nation in the history of the world.

But, my friends, this principle is always under attack. Some people are always trying to cut down the liberties of others—or block the progress of racial or national groups different from their own.

Let me tell you this; the President, whoever he may be, is, in many cases, the last line of defense against those attacks on your freedom. And it is better to be sure that you have a man in the White House, these next 4 years, who understands what it takes to preserve your rights. It is better for you to have a man who is not afraid to use the powers of his office to veto measures that endanger your liberty. For I believe the pressures are going to be heavier than ever, these next 4 years, to break down the principles of the Bill of Rights. And, quite frankly, this is one part of the job of being President that you better not turn over to a professional military general.

Now I want to tell you tonight about a fight that has been going on, during my term of office, over this question of equality and freedom. I want to show you how the Democratic Party in Congress has been on the side of the people in this fight, and the Republican Party in Congress has been against us.

Many of us have ties—of kinship or national origin—with lands beyond the sea. We feel deeply the trials and troubles those nations are experiencing. We are distressed by the terrible ordeal of the people of Poland and Hungary and other countries of Eastern Europe behind the godless Iron Curtain. We know the struggles of the people of such

nations as Italy and Greece, to withstand communism and find employment and prosperity.

We want to help these people and we have been helping them. We have been helping them through our Government and through the efforts of individuals and private organizations. We have sent relief to them. I understand that the people of Buffalo did an extraordinary job of sending clothing for overseas relief; and I congratulate you on it.

We have helped displaced persons from some of these countries.

Our whole foreign policy is designed to strengthen these countries where they are still free, and to work toward the day of freedom for those that are enslaved.

We are engaged in a great effort around the world to hold back the godless forces of Communist aggression, and to prevent another world war. We helped the Greeks to defeat the Communist invasion of their soil, and our aid has kept Turkey free and independent. Through the Marshall plan and military aid, we strengthened the free countries of Europe. We have helped them to crush the Communist conspiracy within their borders, and to build defenses against the Communist threat from without.

One of the great victories in this fight was the support we gave to the cause of freedom in the elections in Italy in 1948. The letters that citizens of this country wrote to their friends and relatives in Italy that year, did a great deal to turn the tide against communism in Europe. Those letters showed that the people of this country, as well as this Government, have made common cause with free men around the world in the fight against communism.

We have done more than this. We have built the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and helped to set up a unified army to defend Europe. We have brought a new Germany back into the community of nations. In the Far East, we have helped to set up a group of new and independent nations, from India to the Philippines. We

are strengthening them against communism. We have restored Japan to its place on the side of freedom.

At the point where Communist armed aggression threatened to break through, in Korea, we have held the dyke. This has cost us much, and the sacrifices still go on. But if it checks the Communist plan of conquest, and prevents a third world war, it will have been worth all the losses and all the pain.

This is what we have been doing, around the world, and it has brought new life to free men everywhere. It has brought new hope and courage to the hearts of those who still must live under the Communist yoke.

But we must not encourage rash adventures. We are not going to ask the unarmed people of the Iron Curtain countries to rise up against their aggressors, and sacrifice themselves before firing squads of the Kremlin. That may be what the Republican candidate for President and his foreign policy advisers are urging—in order to get votes in this country. But we are not going to do it. It might lead to war, and it would certainly be a useless slaughter of brave men and women behind the Iron Curtain.

There is, however, one more thing we want to do, and we find it very hard to do, because of Republican opposition. That is to find new homes and new opportunities, particularly in our own country, for some of the people of those lands.

Our immigration laws bar the way to this kind of help. They keep us from doing what we should for the refugees from the Soviet terror, and for the victims of overcrowding in the free countries.

Now, I want to tell you something about these laws.

Our immigration laws are based on the National Origin Quota System. This system limits the immigration quotas of each European country, in accordance with the past contribution of that country to the population of the United States. Under this system, we can admit over 65,000 British sub-

jects every year, although very few want to come over. But we can only admit 6,500 from Poland or 5,600 from Italy or 308 from Greece—countries where the need is great and pressing.

This National Origin Quota System is a Republican invention. It was conceived and written into law under a Republican President and a Republican Congress in the 1920's. It is based on a discredited and un-American theory of racial superiority. That theory considers the so-called nordics from England and Northern Europe to be superior to persons born in Italy, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Poland, or any other country of Southern or Eastern Europe. It's all wrong.

Now the Republicans took full credit for this discriminatory policy. They boasted of it, as one of their achievements, in their 1932 platform.

It is, of course, necessary to regulate the flow of immigration and to have some kind of limitation on numbers. It is also necessary to exclude undesirable individuals. But I think it is un-American to exclude a qualified, worthy individual just because he comes from Poland or Italy or Hungary. And that is exactly what happens under this Republican law.

The policies of the Republican Party haven't changed very much since they wrote this law in 1924. Let me prove that to you.

After the Second World War, I wanted to do something to help the millions of uprooted and homeless persons in Europe. At my urging, the 80th Congress adopted the Displaced Persons Act. That was necessary to get around the restrictions of the National Origin Quota System, and let a substantial number of those people in. But the 80th Congress wrote in to the Displaced Persons Act provisions that deliberately discriminated against Catholics and Jews.

I made those provisions a campaign issue in 1948, and after we won, the Democratic 81st Congress repealed them.

Now the Displaced Persons Act has expired. There are still people in Europe that

need our help. First, there are the brave men and women who manage to escape the Soviet terror and cross the Iron Curtain. Then, there are thousands of desirable immigrants in Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, and Greece. But we cannot help these people as we want to because of the old Republican National Origin Quota System.

So, this year—get this, now—so this year I asked the Congress to modify our laws again to let some of these people in. And what did they do? They passed a bill which does nothing for this emergency problem in Europe, and which reenacts the National Origin Quota System.

This new law—which is just as unfair as the old to the people of Southern and Eastern Europe—had the support of the Republicans in the Senate, 4 to 1. I vetoed that law, and they passed it over my veto.

Now this law bears the name of a Democratic Senator. And I'm sorry that it does, but he is not my kind of Democrat. My kind of Democrat was fighting against that law, and the leader of that fight was your own brave Senator Lehman.

He has done more to expose the whole injustice of our immigration laws than anyone else. And he has had a lot of good Democratic support.

Now the Democratic Party is not going to give up on this issue. Our platform this year pledges us to work against the unfair and unjust features of the present law, and to get a decent law in its place. And I have appointed a commission to study the present law in operation, and to report to me before the next Congress meets.

But the Republican platform doesn't even have the word immigration in it. The fact is the Republicans are well satisfied with the unfair immigration law we now have. It could not have been enacted without their almost solid support in the Congress. And I know it couldn't have passed over my veto without their support.

The Republican candidate for President was asked about immigration, but he didn't

have any views on the subject. The Republican candidate for Vice President was one of the Senators who voted in favor of this unjust law, and he voted to override my veto.

So now you know where the top Republicans stand. They're just against us, as usual.

If you want that law changed—if you want a decent break for the brave anti-Communist people of Europe—you'd better vote the Democratic ticket.

The National Origin Quota System isn't the only bad feature of this new immigration law. The whole statute breathes prejudice against the foreign born—alien and naturalized citizen alike. It establishes a cruel and restrictive procedure against aliens, and a second class status, before the law, for naturalized citizens. And that, my friends, is an outrage of the worst sort.

Now the excuse for these discriminatory and restrictive provisions is the fear of communism. Because we are opposed to communism, we are asked to adopt restrictions that violate the spirit of our institutions—restrictions that bear most heavily on persons from such countries as Italy, Greece, and Poland, who are just as opposed to communism as we are here in this country. Now what is the logic in that?

I'll tell you—there just isn't any.

There is no logic in it—but there is plenty of prejudice—prejudice against people with foreign names and foreign backgrounds.

Why is it that the politicians who make the loudest noise about being against communism are usually the ones who oppose foreign aid, and favor new legal restrictions on aliens and on naturalized citizens? I wish somebody would answer that question for me.

Why, in this country, every good citizen is opposed to communism. We have taken firm measures against it. We have prosecuted the leaders of communism for breaking our laws, and we have a complete security system for our Federal Government.

We have the FBI, which is doing a good job—and we have counter-espionage activities that I can't talk about because they are secret. And our intelligence agencies are constantly on the alert.

What then, is all this current oratory on the Republican side about?

Well, I am going to tell you.

There is a group of hotheads—mostly Republicans, with a few Democrats—who want to break down all our constitutional guarantees in dealing with the problem of communism. They want to do away with the Bill of Rights, whenever a man is accused of communism. They want to be able to deport a man on the basis of mere suspicion. And they are trying heroically to do it. I don't call it very heroic, either. This immigration law that I vetoed was a step in the direction of such lawless and unconstitutional procedures.

But I am not going to yield to this pressure to weaken the Bill of Rights—and neither, if I know him, will Adlai Stevenson.

Because the Bill of Rights protects us all. Once it is broken down in one direction, the irrational forces of prejudice and hate will break through, and endanger all of us. And the first people to suffer, if this happens, will be naturalized citizens and those of foreign parentage—and all those whose roots in this country are relatively new.

This sort of thing has happened before in our history. It happened in the days of the "Know-Nothings," a secret party dedicated to hatred of immigrants and of the Catholic Church. It happened after World War I, when a wave of hysteria about communism led to violent and illegal acts against aliens and persons of foreign extraction and labor organizations.

It could happen again, unless we hold firm

against prejudice and racial hatred—unless we stand on the Bill of Rights and hold a man innocent until he is proved guilty.

I have been trying to stand firm on that principle. I have been abused and criticized for it. But I am sure that it has been in the best interests of my country.

So now I say to you tonight, beware of the candidate whose sole stock in trade is self-proclamation of anti-communism. Beware of a party that tries to make votes out of false charges about communism. The hysteria, the irrational fear, that they are manipulating in one direction today, may turn against other groups tomorrow.

Once these deep forces of prejudice and unreason are set loose, no man can tell where they will go. They could tear our Nation apart, setting group against group, creed against creed, the older immigrant stocks against the newer.

Let us recognize this menace, and defend our American principles against it—our principles of tolerance and equality before the law, and adherence to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

The way to do that, my friends, is to vote for the party that has stood firm for civil rights and civil liberties and a decent immigration law. The way to do that is to vote for a man whose career shows that he understands our system of constitutional liberty, and that he has the courage to defend it, and that man is Adlai Stevenson of Illinois.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 p.m. in Memorial Hall at Buffalo, N.Y. During his remarks he referred to Anthony F. Tauriello, Chester C. Gorski, and E. Dent Lackey, Democratic candidates for Representative, John Cashmore, Democratic candidate for Senator, and Senator Herbert H. Lehman, all of New York.

*Annual Message to the Congress on the
State of the Union Feb. 2, 1953*

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1953

¶ 6

Commissioners to broaden representation of all elements of our local population. This will be a first step toward insuring that this Capital provide an honored example to all communities of our Nation.

In this manner, and by the leadership of the office of the President exercised through friendly conferences with those in authority in our States and cities, we expect to make true and rapid progress in civil rights and equality of employment opportunity.

There is one sphere in which civil rights are inevitably involved in Federal legislation. This is the sphere of immigration.

It is a manifest right of our Government to limit the number of immigrants our Nation can absorb. It is also a manifest right of our Government to set reasonable requirements on the character and the numbers of the people who come to share our land and our freedom.

It is well for us, however, to remind ourselves occasionally of an equally manifest fact: we are—one and all—immigrants or sons and daughters of immigrants.

Existing legislation contains injustices. It does, in fact, discriminate. I am informed by Members of the Congress that it was realized, at the time of its enactment, that future study of the basis of determining quotas would be necessary.

I am therefore requesting the Congress to review this legislation and to enact a statute that will at one and the same time guard our legitimate national interests and be faithful to our basic ideas of freedom and fairness to all.

In another but related area—that of social rights—we see most clearly the new application of old ideas of freedom.

This administration is profoundly aware of two great needs born of our living in a complex industrial economy. First, the individual citizen must have safeguards against personal disaster inflicted by forces beyond his control; second, the welfare of the people demands effective and economical performance by the Government of certain indispensable social services.

argued for authorizing the transfer of unused quotas to other areas.

But the House April 25 rejected by voice vote Celler's amendment to distribute the unused quotas of Britain, Germany and Ireland among other countries. Also rejected, along with 18 other liberalizing amendments, was one by Rep. Jacob K. Javits (R N.Y.) to allocate quotas on the basis of the U.S. population makeup in 1940, rather than 1920. Principal amendment accepted by the House, before passing HR 5678 by a 206-68 standing vote, gave legal status to the Board of Immigration Appeals established by executive order.

The Senate Judiciary Committee Jan 29 had reported a revised version (S 2550) of McCarran's bill that was essentially a duplicate of HR 5678. In a minority report filed March 13, Sens. Estes Kefauver (D Tenn.), Warren G. Magnuson (D Wash.), Harley M. Kilgore (D W.Va.) and William Langer (R N.D.) assailed S 2550 on grounds that it "would inject new racial discrimination into our law, establish many new vague and highly abusable requirements for admission, impede the admission of refugees from totalitarian oppression, incorporate into law vague standards for deportation and denaturalization, and deprive persons within our borders of fundamental judicial protections." They urged support for a substitute bill, S 2842, introduced March 12 by Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.) and 12 others, which based quotas on the 1950 census, authorized the "pooling" of unused quotas, and abolished the mortgage provision of the DP Act.

Senate debate on S 2550 began May 7 with McCarran charging that efforts to "sabotage" his bill were led by those who had opposed his Internal Security Act of 1950. He said those opposing S 2550 "would wittingly or unwittingly lend themselves to efforts which would poison the bloodstream of the country." Humphrey moved to recommit the bill with instructions to hold hearings on his own bill (S 2842), but the Senate rejected the motion, 28-44 (D 20-21; R 8-23), May 19. Sen. Herbert H. Lehman (D N.Y.) then offered a brief substitute for S 2550, containing the main provisions of S 2842, but this too was rejected, 27-51 (D 19-26; R 8-25). The Senate then passed S 2550 by voice vote May 22 and gave it the number of the House-passed HR 5678. The conference report was adopted by the House June 10 and the Senate June 11.

On June 25 President Truman vetoed the McCarran-Walter bill, calling some of its provisions "worse than the infamous Alien Act of 1798." He said the bill contained some good features, such as the repeal of racial barriers, "imbedded in a mass of legislation which would perpetuate injustices of long standing against many other nations of the world, hamper the efforts we are making to rally the men of East and West alike to the cause of freedom, and intensify the repressive and inhumane aspects of our immigration procedures." And he again asked Congress to authorize the entry of 300,000 additional immigrants over a three-year period.

The House, responding to Rep. Walter's charge that the veto message was "fictional and amateurish," voted June 26 to override, 278-113 (D 107-90; R 170-23; Ind. 1-0). The Senate followed suit June 27, 57-26 (D 25-18; R 32-8). As enacted, the 302-page Immigration and Nationality Act (PL 82-414) retained the quota system based on the national origins of the U.S. population in 1920, as well as non-quota treatment for most immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, the spouse or child of an American citizen, and former U.S. govern-

ment employees with 15 years' service. The law established priorities for the allocation of visas within each country's quota, as follows: first 50 percent to those whose "high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability" would benefit the U.S., and to their spouses and children; next 30 percent to the parents of U.S. citizens 21 or over; last 20 percent to spouses and children of aliens admitted for permanent residence, with unfilled quotas then open to other preference categories.

The law extended the grounds for excluding or deporting aliens, and made a conviction for contempt for refusing to testify before a Congressional committee regarding subversive activities grounds for revocation of citizenship for 10 years following naturalization. It also established a Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality to "make a continuous study" of the law and its application.

President Truman also ordered a study of the law, by a seven-man Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, headed by former Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman whom he appointed Sept. 4. The pros and cons of the McCarran-Walter Act created sparks in the Presidential campaign as well, when President Truman Oct. 17 assailed Gen. Eisenhower for "an attack of moral blindness" in having "embraced" Sen. Richard M. Nixon and other Republicans who had voted to override his veto. Truman's implication that Eisenhower was anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic brought violent reactions from Republicans; Eisenhower himself said he opposed the McCarran-Walter Act and that a new law "was certainly needed." British, French and other foreign shipping lines added their protests when the law became effective Dec. 24; its provisions for screening foreign seamen threatened to deny them shore leave in U.S. ports.

Legislation Under Eisenhower

More than 300,000 additional refugees were admitted to the U.S. under special programs sponsored by the Eisenhower Administration, designed to help liquidate the "hard core" problem, to ease population pressures in Western Europe, and to deal with a mass exodus from Hungary in 1956. And as before, the U.S. continued to give financial support to international refugee relief and resettlement programs. But President Eisenhower was no more successful than his predecessor in persuading Congress to revise basic immigration policy. By 1960, national interest in the issue had slackened perceptibly, reflecting among other developments a decline in emigration pressures in Europe.

1953 In a 316-page report Jan. 1 to President Truman, the Perlman Commission said the McCarran-Walter Act should be "reconsidered and revised from beginning to end." President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union message Feb. 2, said the law "does, in fact, discriminate," and asked Congress to write a new one "that will at one and the same time guard our legitimate national interests and be faithful to our basic ideas of freedom and fairness to all." But Sen. Arthur V. Watkins (R Utah), chairman of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality, with the backing of both McCarran and Walter, argued that the law should be observed in operation for several years before being

(Continued on p. 228)

(Continued from p. 223)

revised. Rep. Walter said President Eisenhower had "joined the army of critics of the law who have failed to read the Act they criticize."

Meanwhile, Rep. Celler Jan. 26 introduced a bill to admit 328,000 non-quota immigrants from Europe over a three-year period. Then, on April 22, the President asked for "emergency" legislation to admit 240,000 immigrants within two years, to consist of 125,000 expelled and escapees from Eastern Europe, 75,000 Italians, 20,000 Dutch and 20,000 Greeks. The three latter blocs, not restricted to refugees, were included primarily to relieve population pressures in those countries.

Following hearings by its Immigration Subcommittee, the House Judiciary Committee July 27 reported a bill (HR 6481) to admit 240,000 non-quota immigrants along the lines of the Administration's request. In House debate July 28, Rep. Walter led the opposition to the bill, which he said "destroys the national-origins system." The House agreed to amendments reducing the total number of immigrants to 217,000, but rejected Walter's motion to strike the enacting clause, by a 77-114 standing vote, before passing the bill, 221-185 (R 132-74; D 88-111; Ind. 1-0).

The Senate Judiciary Committee July 23 reported its own bill (S 1917), authorizing 220,000 non-quota visas over three years. But the blocs of visas set aside for Italians, Greeks, and Dutch were restricted to those qualifying as "refugees," such as Italians repatriated from former colonies in Africa. On the insistence of a six-member minority led by Sen. McCarran, who threatened a filibuster, the Committee agreed further to reduce the total number of visas to 209,000 and to oppose amendments from the floor to increase that number. In voting July 29, the Senate rejected an amendment by Irving M. Ives (R N.Y.) and others, to open the Italian visas to "nationals" of Italy in general, 29-62 (R 13-32; D 15-30; Ind. 1-0). The Senate then substituted provisions of S 1917 for those of HR 6481 and passed the bill, 63-30 (R 38-8; D 24-22; Ind. 1-0).

The conference report, agreed to by the House July 31 and the Senate Aug. 1, authorized issuance of 209,000 special immigration visas by Dec. 31, 1956, distributed as follows: 55,000 German-ethnic expellees and 35,000 escapees living in West Germany, Berlin or Austria; 10,000 escapees in other countries; 2,000 Polish veterans in England; 45,000 Italian refugees from Venezia-Giulia or the African colonies; 15,000 Italians with close relatives in the U.S.; 15,000 Greek refugees; 15,000 Dutch refugees; 2,000 Greeks and 2,000 Dutch with close relatives in the U.S.; 3,000 Asian and 2,000 non-Asian refugees in the Far East; 2,000 Chinese "cleared" by the Nationalist Government in Formosa; 2,000 Arab refugees; 4,000 orphans under 10 adopted by Americans. The bill also authorized permanent entry for 5,000 aliens admitted to the U.S. temporarily.

Like the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 required assurances from U.S. citizens of jobs and housing for those admitted (except those with "close relative" visas). Applicants were also required to obtain certificates guaranteeing that they would be readmitted to the countries where their visas would be issued, in case they were denied entry to the U.S. or deported. The Act called for elaborate screening procedures; no person was to be admitted unless there was "complete information" about him for "at least two years" prior to his application for a visa. Administration was placed in the hands of the State Department's

Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, then headed by Scott McLeod (PL 83-203).

No action was taken in 1953 on the President's request for revision of the McCarran-Walter Act, but on the last day of the session, Aug. 3, seven Democrats in the Senate (including John F. Kennedy) and 24 in the House introduced bills (S 2585, HR 6820-43) to replace the national-origins formula with a new, world-wide immigration quota of 251,000 per year.

1954 Administration of the Refugee Relief Act came in for rising criticism in 1954; one year after enactment, only 8,000 visas had been issued, while less than 2,000 refugees had reached the U.S. Much of the delay, however, stemmed from the procedures and criteria set out in the law itself. Experience had shown, moreover, that the large blocs of visas set aside for Italians, Dutch, and Greeks qualifying as refugees were in small demand, while the smaller blocs reserved for persons with close relatives in the U.S. were oversubscribed.

To correct this situation, Congress agreed to amend the Act to permit the State Department to issue visas in either category according to demand. In effect, this opened the bulk of the visas for Italians, Dutch and Greeks to nationals with close relatives in the U.S. As passed by the House by voice vote March 15, the bill (HR 8193) also exempted orphans from the requirement concerning certificates of readmission. At Sen. McCarran's insistence, the Senate amended the bill to require "close relative" immigrants to possess the same assurances of employment and housing as were required of refugees, then passed the measure by voice vote Aug. 12. The House concurred Aug. 16 (PL 83-751).

As it had since 1951, Congress agreed to contribute funds to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, including \$10 million for that purpose in the Mutual Security appropriation. As enacted Sept. 3, however, the bill carried an amendment, offered by Sen. McCarran and agreed to by the Senate, barring use of the funds to aid in the migration to any nation in the Western Hemisphere of persons without a security clearance based on "reasonable standards to insure against Communist infiltration" (PL 83-778). McCarran died on Sept. 28.

1955 The dismissal April 10 of Edward J. Corsi as a special adviser on refugees in the State Department added fuel to controversy over administration of the Refugee Relief Act. Corsi charged that "an intolerant minority both in Congress and within the Department" had sabotaged the program, which he said should be taken from "the hands of policemen." During hearings by a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, Scott McLeod denied Corsi's charges, but acknowledged difficulties in administering the Act. In a special message to Congress May 27, President Eisenhower asked for 10 changes in the law, all of which were designed to make it less restrictive. Major changes requested would have authorized transfer of an unused quota in one category to any other category, repealed the requirement for a two-year history of refugees and escapees, and permitted welfare groups to sponsor visa applicants without guarantees from individual U.S. citizens.

Following hearings in June on the President's proposals, a Senate Judiciary subcommittee July 7 reported an amended version of the Administration bill (S 2113)

to the full Committee, without recommendation. No further action was taken in 1955. On Oct. 21 Scott McLeod disclosed that applications had been received for only one-half of the 90,000 visas allocated to expellees and escapees in Germany and Austria. Up to Oct. 14, McLeod reported, 58,000 of the 209,000 visas authorized had been issued.

Meanwhile, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, with U.S. backing, had launched a five-year program aimed at the assimilation of Europe's "hard core" refugees, with the aid of loans for vocational training, housing, etc. Approved by the General Assembly Oct. 21, 1954, the program was financed by private as well as public funds, including \$1.2 million in the 1955 Mutual Security Appropriation Act (PL 84-208).

1956 In his State of the Union message Jan. 5, President Eisenhower cited "the urgent need" to revise the McCarran-Walter Act and to "approve without further delay" the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act that he had requested in 1955. "Because of the high prosperity in Germany and Austria," he said, quotas for these areas would not be used and should be redistributed. Detailed proposals for changes in the McCarran-Walter Act were sent to Congress Feb. 8. Five of the 17 immigration and three of the 10 refugee proposals were approved by the Senate, but the House failed to act on the measure.

The President avoided a direct challenge of the national origins system, but the effect of his proposals would have been to alter it drastically. He asked that the formula for quota immigration of one-sixth of one percent of the population be applied to the 1950 rather than 1920 census, thereby raising the annual quota total from 154,657 to about 220,000, and that the additional 65,000 be distributed in proportion to actual immigration since 1924, except for 5,000 to be allocated to aliens with special qualifications without regard to national origin. The President also asked that unused quota numbers (almost entirely British, Irish, and German) be reassigned in the following year to natives of the same general area on a first-come, first-served basis, and that Congress repeal the mortgage provision of the Displaced Persons Act.

Other changes requested by the President would have repealed or modified various restrictions on the entry of aliens, given the Attorney General some discretionary authority to handle hardship cases in order to relieve Congress of the private-bill burden, and limited an alien's right to repeated judicial review of deportation orders in cases "involving as they often do the depraved and confirmed criminal."

During hearings in April before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles supported the President's proposals, saying that "the impact of this situation is felt in our relationships with friendly nations every day. It is particularly awkward and difficult to explain when, year after year, large numbers of authorized quota numbers go unused." But Sen. James O. Eastland (D Miss.), chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, was as much opposed to the proposed changes as was Rep. Walter, and no action was taken on the President's requests in committee.

However, a bipartisan group in the Senate including Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas) and Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen (R Ill.) worked out a 13-point bill, incorporating some of the President's proposals,

which was offered as an amendment to a minor immigration bill (HR 6888) that had passed the House June 30, 1955. Major provisions of the compromise would have permitted the pooling and redistribution of unused British, Irish, and German quota numbers, cancelled the mortgages required by the DP Act, authorized carryover of an estimated 40,000 unused numbers under the Refugee Relief Act, and increased from 4,000 to 9,000 the number of orphans to be admitted under that Act.

The Senate took up HR 6888 on July 27, last day of the session. A move to strike the provision for redistributing unused quotas was rejected by a standing vote. The Senate then agreed to the compromise amendments, offered by Sen. Dirksen, and passed the bill by voice vote. Rep. Kenneth B. Keating (R N.Y.) attempted to secure House consideration of the bill the same day, but the effort failed for lack of approval by the Judiciary Committee.

Interest in the matter was revived in dramatic fashion just before the Presidential election, when a popular revolt in Hungary -- crushed by Soviet troops -- led to a mass exodus of "freedom fighters." Within 30 days, more than 100,000 Hungarians fled to Austria, placing an intolerable burden on that country. With the Refugee Relief Act due to expire Dec. 31, President Eisenhower Nov. 8 ordered the allocation of 5,000 visas (reserved for escapees) to the Hungarians, then on Dec. 1 increased the number to 6,500 and announced that the U.S. would allow an additional 15,000 Hungarians to enter under a little-used provision of the McCarran-Walter Act permitting the Attorney General to "parole" aliens into the country under special circumstances. Vice President Nixon was dispatched to Vienna Dec. 18 to survey the situation and make recommendations.

1957 By the end of January, when the President asked Congress for special legislation to deal with the situation, more than 170,000 Hungarians had entered Austria, of whom 105,000 had been evacuated to other countries -- including 24,000 to the U.S. In his Jan. 31 message, the President requested permanent authority to admit up to 67,000 escapees each year under the parole provision, and to give the Attorney General discretionary power to permit such parolees (including those Hungarians already admitted) to remain permanently. The President also repeated his 1956 requests for changes in the quota system and other areas of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Public sympathy for the "freedom fighters" was insufficient, however, to overcome extensive opposition in Congress to any substantial revision of immigration law, and only five of the President's 20 separate requests were incorporated in a bill approved on the last day of the session. This was a measure (HR 8123) sponsored by Rep. Walter and reported by the House Judiciary Committee Aug. 19. A similar bill (S 2792), introduced by Sen. Kennedy when it appeared that no other legislation could be enacted, was reported in the Senate Aug. 20 and passed next day, 65-4. The House passed S 2792 with amendments Aug. 28, 295-58, and the Senate concurred by voice vote Aug. 30.

As sent to the President, S 2792 cancelled the mortgages imposed on East European quotas under the DP Act; authorized issuance of visas not used under the Refugee Relief Act to German expellees, Dutch refugees, and others fleeing persecution; authorized unlimited entry until June 30, 1959 of alien orphans adopted by U.S.

citizens; gave non-quota status to spouses and children of skilled aliens "following to join" their families; and granted discretionary power to admit aliens convicted of minor crimes (if relatives of U.S. citizens), to admit tubercular relatives of citizens, and to waive fingerprinting requirements for temporary visitors. President Eisenhower signed the bill Sept. 11, but called it "a disappointment, in that it fails to deal with many serious inequities" (PL 85-316).

On Dec. 28, the White House announced termination of the Hungarian refugee program. Of the more than 200,000 who had escaped to Austria and Yugoslavia, 38,000 had been admitted to the U.S. -- all but 6,130 under the parole provision. The U.S. had contributed more than \$70 million (including \$20 million from private sources) for refugee relief and resettlement purposes.

1958 As the tide of Hungarians ebbed, so did Congressional interest in immigration matters. Abroad, the plight of the refugee was still a matter of serious concern in certain areas. East Germans fleeing to West Germany, for example, numbered 279,000 in 1955, 252,000 in 1956, and 264,500 in 1957. But the Federal Republic was able to absorb the vast majority of these escapees. Pressures for emigration from Western Europe had also slackened by 1958.

President Eisenhower again asked Congress to enact the various changes in law which he had proposed in 1956 and 1957, but neither in the Administration or on Capitol Hill was much pressure applied. Only one of his 15 separate requests was approved. HR 11033, passed by voice votes of the House May 5 and the Senate July 15, authorized the retroactive adjustment of status for the 32,000 Hungarians who had entered the U.S. under parole, thus permitting them to qualify as permanent residents and apply for citizenship (PL 85-559). Another measure enacted in 1958 (HR 13451) permitted aliens entered on temporary visas to readjust their status without having to leave and reenter the country -- a requirement that affected more than 7,000 aliens in fiscal 1958 (PL 85-700).

1959 On Dec. 5, 1958, the UN General Assembly had voted to observe a World Refugee Year "to focus interest on the refugee problem and to encourage additional financial contributions" to refugee aid programs. Operations of the UN Refugee Fund ceased at the end of 1958, but there remained an estimated 150,000 refugees unsettled in Europe. U.S. participation in World Refugee Year, beginning July 1, 1959, was outlined May 21-22 at a White House Conference on Refugees, attended by 160 religious, civic and business leaders. Attorney General William P. Rogers May 25 renewed Administration requests for increased quotas and other changes in immigration law, including extension of expiring authority to admit orphans and tubercular aliens.

Only these two requests were granted by Congress. HR 6118, as passed by the House May 4 by voice vote, extended until June 30, 1961 the authority given the Attorney General in 1957 to admit tubercular aliens. The Senate Judiciary Committee July 7 reported the bill with an amendment extending for one year the 1957 provision permitting orphans adopted by U.S. citizens to enter

without limit, and the Senate passed the amended bill by voice vote July 15. The House July 16 concurred with an additional amendment requiring the Attorney General to investigate adoptive parents, and the Senate Aug. 27 accepted the amendment (PL 86-253).

The Mutual Security Act of 1959 authorized use of \$10 million of contingency funds for U.S. participation in World Refugee Year (PL 86-108). But in reporting the foreign aid money bill (HR 8385) the House Appropriations Committee expressly prohibited the use of any funds for that purpose. This provision was deleted on the House floor, however, by a 144-113 teller vote July 28, and no restriction was included in the bill as finally approved.

1960 Entering his final year in office, President Eisenhower repeated the substance of his earlier requests for changes in the McCarran-Walter Act in a special message March 17. Ideally, he said, immigration should be governed by flexible standards, but "such a departure from the past is unlikely now." For immediate action, he proposed doubling the annual total of quota immigration, distributing the increased quotas in proportion to actual immigration since 1924, and redistributing unused quotas among countries with over-subscribed quotas. And in recognition of World Refugee Year, he asked Congress to enlarge the Attorney General's parole authority. Administration draft bills would have authorized him to admit 10,000 refugees and escapees annually, with provision for increasing the number in case of emergency.

Rep. Walter called the President's requests "just a warmed-over version of what was offered four years ago." He accused the President of "seeking political dividends by catering to groups representing special interest." In fact, politicians of both parties laid siege to the McCarran-Walter Act in election years, in their search for the votes of various nationality groups, and 1960 was no exception. But neither the candidates nor the platform writers possessed the power of Walter as chairman of the House Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee. His judgment that President Eisenhower's program had "no chance" was a statement of fact.

Walter did consent to a limited version of the Administration's request for parole authority. As reported by House Judiciary March 29, H J Res 397 authorized the Attorney General to parole into the U.S. certain refugees under the mandate of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, in a number not to exceed 25 percent of those resettled by other countries. This would involve "in all probability not more than 2,500 to 3,000 people" annually, Rep. Arch A. Moore Jr. (R W. Va.) assured the House April 4 before voice-vote passage of H J Res 397.

The Senate Judiciary Committee added provisions of two other House-passed bills (HR 9385 passed Jan. 18 and HR 10419 passed March 7), one of which extended the adopted orphan program for one year, before reporting H J Res 397 June 22. The Senate passed the bill by voice vote July 1, after adding an amendment by Hiram L. Fong (R Hawaii) extending parole authority to 4,500 Asian refugees, but this provision was dropped from the conference report approved by voice votes of both chambers July 2. As enacted, the bill provided for termination of the special parole program by mid-1962, extended the orphan program to June 30, 1961, and increased the number of special visas for Dutch nationals expelled from Indonesia (PL 86-648).

the country. Their solution is of importance to the entire nation which now enjoys all the benefits of economic progress but, except when it is part of the employee group affected, now bears very little of its burdens.

For these reasons, it is my intention to appoint a Presidential Commission on Automation, composed of the ablest men in public and private life, and charged with the responsibility of

(1) identifying and describing the major types of worker displacement, both technological and economic, which are likely to occur during the next ten years, and the social and economic effects of these developments on our economy, our manpower, our communities, our families, and our social structure and human values; and

(2) recommending, in addition to those actions which are the responsibility of state and local government and private management and labor, specific administrative and legislative steps to be taken by the Federal Government in meeting its responsibility to share the costs and alleviate the losses of automation job-displacement, in such a way as to assure both the continued advance of our technology and the continued well-being of our people.

This Commission should undertake the most comprehensive review of this complex and many-sided subject ever ventured, and

report no later than the close of next year. Its report must pioneer in the social, political and economic aspects of automation to the same extent that our science and industry have pioneered in its physical aspects. For the pending railroad dispute is likely the first of many, and a comprehensive long-range policy will be needed. I have no doubt, let me add, that such a policy will embody the basic elements of the measure recommended today—encouraging the advance of technology while protecting the security of the workers, encouraging private bargaining while protecting the public interest.

Thus the prompt enactment of this measure by the Congress will help launch a new national effort to meet the growing challenge of worker displacement by technological and economic change. Both the proposed bill and the new Commission are actions that will benefit both labor and management—but above all, they will benefit the public interest, and that is our primary test.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: For the President's statement upon signing a joint resolution "to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees," see Item 337.

The report to the President by the special subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy on the railroad rules dispute is printed in House Document 142 (88th Cong., 1st sess.).

311 Letter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House on Revision of the Immigration Laws. July 23, 1963

Dear Mr. _____:

I am transmitting herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, legislation revising and modernizing our immigration laws. More than a decade has elapsed since the last substantial amendment to these laws. I believe there exists a compelling need for the Congress to re-examine and make certain changes in these laws.

The most urgent and fundamental reform I am recommending relates to the national

origins system of selecting immigrants. Since 1924 it has been used to determine the number of quota immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year. Accordingly, although the legislation I am transmitting deals with many problems which require remedial action, it concentrates attention primarily upon revision of our quota immigration system. The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all of our important problems in the field of immigration

law. It will, upon which immigration interest and principles of equity which our nation

Elimination of National Origin

Present legislation annual quota each country quota immigration United States upon the basis of the United States year 1920 is that this system the last prior of a national in either logic a national national independence an anachronism applicants for States on the

Because of limitation in 1924 in favor of Europe and from southern other parts citizen with wait at least here to join son or daughter Italian cannot them for any many thousands needed by them they are assisted

I recommend the national governing immigration which takes immigrant

law. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our nation subscribes.

Elimination of Discrimination Based on National Origins

Present legislation establishes a system of annual quotas to govern immigration from each country. Under this system, 156,700 quota immigrants are permitted to enter the United States each year. The system is based upon the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920. The use of the year 1920 is arbitrary. It rests upon the fact that this system was introduced in 1924 and the last prior census was in 1920. The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations, such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

Because of the composition of our population in 1920, the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world. An American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister, is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for them for an even longer time. Meanwhile, many thousands of quota numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

I recommend that there be substituted for the national origins system a formula governing immigration to the United States which takes into account (1) the skills of the immigrant and their relationship to our

needs, (2) the family relationship between immigrants and persons already here, so that the reuniting of families is encouraged, and (3) the priority of registration. Present law grants a preference to immigrants with special skills, education or training. It also grants a preference to various relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens. But it does so only within a national origins quota. It should be modified so that those with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare, no matter where they were born, are granted the highest priority. The next priority should go to those who seek to be reunited with their relatives. As between applicants with equal claims the earliest registrant should be the first admitted.

Many problems of fairness and foreign policy are involved in replacing a system so long entrenched. The national origins system has produced large backlogs of applications in some countries, and too rapid a change might, in a system of limited immigration, so drastically curtail immigration in some countries the only effect might be to shift the unfairness from one group of nations to another. A reasonable time to adjust to any new system must be provided if individual hardships upon persons who were relying on the present system are to be avoided. In addition, any new system must have sufficient flexibility to allow adjustments to be made when it appears that immigrants from nations closely allied to the United States will be unduly restricted in their freedom to furnish the new seed population that has so long been a source of strength to our nation.

Accordingly, I recommend:

First, that existing quotas be reduced gradually, at the rate of 20 percent a year. The quota numbers released each year would be placed in a quota reserve pool, to be distributed on the new basis.

Second, that natives of no one country receive over 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized in any one year. This will insure that the pattern of immigration is not

distorted by excessive demand from any one country.

Third, that the President be authorized, after receiving recommendations from a 7-man Immigration Board, to reserve up to 50 percent of the unallocated quota numbers, for issuance to persons disadvantaged by the change in the quota system, and up to 20 percent to refugees whose sudden dislocation requires special treatment. The Immigration Board will be composed of 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 members appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and 3 members appointed by the President. In addition to its responsibility for formulating recommendations regarding the use of the quota reserve pool, the Board will make a continuous study of our immigration policy.

All Quota Numbers Used

But it is not alone the initial assignment of quota numbers which is arbitrary and unjust; additional inequity results from the failure of the law to permit full utilization of the authorized quota numbers. While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 quota numbers are wasted each year because the countries to which they are assigned have far more numbers allocated to them than they have emigrants seeking to move to the United States. There is no way at present in which these numbers can be reassigned to nations where immense backlogs of applicants for admission to the United States have accumulated. I recommend that this deficiency in the law be corrected.

Asia-Pacific Triangle

A special discriminatory formula is now used to regulate the immigration of persons who are attributable by their ancestry to an area called the Asia-Pacific triangle. This area embraces all countries from Pakistan to Japan and the Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand. Usually, the quota under which a prospective immigrant must enter is determined by his place of

birth. However, if as much as one-half of an immigrant's ancestors came from nations in the Asia-Pacific triangle, he must rely upon the small quota assigned to the country of his ancestry, regardless of where he was born. This provision of our law should be repealed.

Other Provisions

In order to remove other existing barriers to the reuniting of families, I recommend two additional improvements in the law.

First, parents of American citizens, who now have a preferred quota status, should be accorded nonquota status.

Second, parents of aliens resident in the United States, who now have no preference, should be accorded a preference, after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens and alien residents.

These changes will have little effect on the number of immigrants admitted. They will have a major effect upon the individual hardships many of our citizens and residents now face in being separated from their parents.

In addition, I recommend the following changes in the law in order to correct certain deficiencies and improve its general application.

1. Changes in the Preference Structure. At present, the procedure under which specially skilled or trained workers are permitted to enter this country too often prevents talented people from applying for visas to enter the United States. It often deprives us of immigrants who would be helpful to our economy and our culture. This procedure should be liberalized so that highly trained or skilled persons may obtain a preference without requiring that they secure employment here before emigrating. In addition, I recommend that a special preference be accorded workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply in this country.

2. Non-quota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago should be granted. Under existing law, no numerical limitation is imposed upon the number of immi-

grants coming from Haiti, the Dominican Republic, or any island in the Caribbean or South America. The statute restricting the number of persons born in countries which gained independence after the date of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952. This act of Congress provides for the newly independent nations of the Western Hemisphere.

3. Persons with mental problems should be able to obtain standards of admission. Afflicted with a defect, psychomotor defect, and any person of mental illness. If a private bill is introduced, families which are forced to choose between the United States and leaving the country and not living in the United States. Mental illness is treated like other diseases. That the Attorney General and under proper authority to waive those provisions which prohibit the admission of persons with mental defects who are close relatives of citizens and lawfully resident.

4. The Secretary of State is authorized, in his discretion, to issue visas to certain persons.

312 Remains of the "Boys"

Gentlemen:

I want to introduce the Joint Chiefs of Staff this morning. to say hello to

grants coming from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or any independent country in Central or South America. But the language of the statute restricts this privilege to persons born in countries in the Caribbean area which gained their independence prior to the date of the last major amendment to the immigration and nationality statutes, in 1952. This accidental discrimination against the newly independent nations of the Western Hemisphere should be corrected.

3. Persons afflicted with mental health problems should be admitted provided certain standards are met. Today, any person afflicted with a mental disease or mental defect, psychotic personality, or epilepsy, and any person who has suffered an attack of mental illness, can enter this country only if a private bill is enacted for his benefit. Families which are able and willing to care for a mentally ill child or parent are often forced to choose between living in the United States and leaving their loved ones behind and not living in the United States but being able to see and care for their loved ones. Mental illness is not incurable. It should be treated like other illnesses. I recommend that the Attorney General, at his discretion and under proper safeguards, be authorized to waive those provisions of the law which prohibit the admission to the United States of persons with mental problems when they are close relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens.

4. The Secretary of State should be authorized, in his discretion, to require re-registration of certain quota immigrant visa ap-

plicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees. This authority would bring registration lists up to date, terminate the priority of applicants who have refused to accept a visa, and end the problem of "insurance" registrations by persons who have no present intention to emigrate. Registration figures for oversubscribed quota areas are now inaccurate because there exists no way of determining whether registrants have died, have emigrated to other countries, or for some other reason no longer want to emigrate to the United States. These problems are particularly acute in heavily oversubscribed areas.

Conclusion

As I have already indicated the measures I have outlined will not solve all the problems of immigration. Many of them will require additional legislation; some cannot be solved by any one country. But the legislation I am submitting will insure that progress will continue to be made toward our ideals and toward the realization of humanitarian objectives. The measures I have recommended will help eliminate discrimination between peoples and nations on a basis that is unrelated to any contribution that immigrants can make and is inconsistent with our traditions of welcome. Our investment in new citizens has always been a valuable source of our strength.

Sincerely,
JOHN F. KENNEDY

NOTE: This is the text of identical letters addressed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

312 Remarks to Delegates to the 18th Annual American Legion "Boys Nation." July 24, 1963

Gentlemen:

I want to introduce to you members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who are visiting here this morning. I knew that you would want to say hello to them and they would want

to say hello to you: General LeMay, who is head of the Air Force; Admiral Anderson, who is head of the Navy, General Wheeler, who is head of the Army; and General Shoup, who is head of the Marine Corps.

fact, I want to read what Senator Goldwater said and then conclude. He said, "I wouldn't comment in detail until I have read it." Normally you would want to read something before you talked about it. But he said, "It is my impression that he out-Roosevelt'd Roosevelt, and he out-Kennedy'd Kennedy and even made Truman look like a piker." What finer compliment could be paid!

I am just going to say *there* is a good patriotic man who just had a little difficulty understanding the President's program when he tries to do something for all of the people, but we are going to do something for all of

the people. We trust with your help, the good Lord's help, and the help of all of the people in this country that it will be more understandable to him at the end of the year than it was at the beginning of the year.

We want each person here from each State of the Union to know that this is your house, that you are not only welcome here but that we are very grateful to all of you for what you did in making it possible for us to be here.

NOTE: The White House reception for Democratic committeemen and committeewomen, in Washington for a series of business meetings, was held in the State Dining Room at 6 p.m.

97 Remarks to Representatives of Organizations Interested in Immigration and the Problems of Refugees. *January 13, 1964*

Members of the Senate, Members of the House, my fellow Americans:

We welcome you to the White House this morning when it is very difficult to get here. We are very pleased that so many of you could make the sacrifice to come through the snow and come here and join us today.

We have met for the purpose of pointing up the fact that we have very serious problems in trying to get a fair immigration law. There is now before the Congress a bill that, I hope, can be supported by a majority of the Members of the Congress. This bill applies new tests and new standards which we believe are reasonable and fair and right.

I refer specifically to: What is the training and qualification of the immigrant who seeks admission? What kind of a citizen would he make, if he were admitted? What is his relationship to persons in the United States? And what is the time of his application? These are rules that are full of common sense, common decency, which operate for the common good.

That is why in my State of the Union Message last Wednesday I said that I hoped that in establishing preferences a Nation that was really built by immigrants, immigrants from all lands, that we could ask those who seek to immigrate now: What can you do for our country? But we ought to never ask, "In what country were you born?"

President Roosevelt and President Truman and President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have all asked for a revision in the present statute. The present statute has overtones of discrimination. President Truman said that the idea behind this discrimination was, to put it boldly, that English or Irish names were better and made better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names. And such a concept is utterly unworthy of our traditions and our ideals.

Now I would hope that each of us—and all of us are descended from immigrants—I hope we would ask ourselves this question: How would we feel, if we were put in the

other fellow's place? Maybe by doing that and engaging in a little introspection for a time we would find it a good feeling to apply the Golden Rule and do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

Great Britain has a quota of 65,000. It uses less than half of that quota. Germany has a quota of 25,000 which it never fills. Italy has a quota of 5,645, but it has a current backlog of almost 300,000. Greece has a quota of only 308, but it has a current backlog of over 100,000. So I think that the immigration statutes require very special examination.

I would hope that we would do nothing hasty and makeshift, but I hope that we would apply the tests that I have outlined and the standards that I have suggested, doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, and asking them what contribution they could make to their country, and asking yourselves how you would feel if some of your very special members of your family were involved and were facing what now appears to be almost insurmountable obstacles.

So instead of using the test of where the immigrant was born, I would hope that we could apply a somewhat more nondiscriminatory test of the very special training and qualifications of the immigrant and his relationship to the persons in the United States and, actually, the time that he applies for admission. These objective standards, I believe, would serve the national interest and I would hope that the Congress at this session would find that a majority of its members could follow this path.

I want to thank each of you for coming here this morning. I want to ask you to dedicate such time and effort and your talents as it may be possible to helping us reason together and achieve the standards that

history will record as being fair and just and that we, ourselves, can be proud that we played a part in helping to achieve. I particularly thank the Members of Congress who have come here this morning and who hear many conflicting viewpoints, but who, I believe, all were elected on a platform of doing what they believe to be right and who, I am confident, when the chips are down will see that fair and just legislation is written, that if they used it to apply to themselves they would feel they had had at least a fair shake.

Thank you very much.

Senator Hart is the coauthor of the legislation and it may be that he would want to make a brief observation. He is starting his hearings today and I read his announcement.

[At this point Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, spoke briefly, offering a salute to the President for "his courage in stepping up and swinging on an issue that really isn't politically good" although right. He expressed hope that the American people would respond.]

[Following Senator Hart's remarks, Monsignor John F. McCarthy, representing the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, expressed the appreciation of the group for having been called to the White House for a briefing on immigration matters. The President then resumed speaking.]

In this day, when it is quite important, in the light of the troubles that we face around the world, that America close ranks and that we be free men and Americans and public servants before we are party members, and when this Government is really dedicated to a government of strength to defend ourselves wherever we may be called on, a government of solvency so we will have the wherewithal to do that, and a government of compassion so that we can extend the hand to the fellow that has not done as well as we have, I think that this legislation will meet all those standards.

I think it will give us strength, I think it will promote solvency, and I think it will ex-

tend the hand of com-
need it and seek it.

Congressman Feighan
subcommittee in the H
ask him to make an o

*[Representative Michael A. ...
man of the Immigration Su-
Judiciary Committee, ex-
there should be a revision
and that a complete and
immigration policy, its
internationally, should be
subcommittee would coop-
on the immigration bill a
The President then resumed*

Now I would like to
members of the Judicial
a brief observation.
of them notice, but
portant part in the e-
lation that is passed.
judiciousness and fair

So I am going to
Chairman of the Jus-
friend of long stand-
and the distinguish-
New York, Senator
a brief statement he
lation knows no pa-
times to be patriots
be partisan and I am
ing will go along wi-
this morning. We
later in the year.

98 Remarks at Ceremony

*Members of the
House, distinguish-
ladies and gentlemen*

Nothing could
wintry day than
Medal of Science.
tant than what we

tend the hand of compassion to those that need it and seek it.

Congressman Feighan is chairman of the subcommittee in the House. I would like to ask him to make an observation.

[Representative Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio, Chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, expressed agreement that there should be a revision of the immigration laws, and that a complete and thorough investigation of immigration policy, its impact domestically and internationally, should be made. He added that his subcommittee would cooperate and conduct hearings on the immigration bill as expeditiously as possible. The President then resumed speaking.]

Now I would like to ask two distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee to make a brief observation. I haven't given either of them notice, but they will play an important part in the enactment of any legislation that is passed. And they will display judiciousness and fairness, I am confident.

So I am going to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, my friend of long standing, Senator Eastland, and the distinguished junior Senator from New York, Senator Keating, to both make a brief statement here for you. This legislation knows no partisan lines. There are times to be patriots and there are times to be partisan and I am sure that Senator Keating will go along with me in being a patriot this morning. We may be partisan a little later in the year. Senator Eastland.

[At this point Senator James O. Eastland, of Mississippi, spoke very briefly, concurring in Representative Feighan's remarks, saying that they were "going into the matter very carefully and very expeditiously." The President then resumed speaking.]

And now with great pleasure I present to you my friend and colleague of many years the distinguished junior Senator from New York who has taken an intense interest in this field of legislation for many years, Senator Keating.

[Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, responded by expressing gratitude for the meeting and for "giving an impetus to these hearings which are starting today and to the final enactment of legislation." He said he hoped the President's "very powerful and very effective" drive would result in "getting the Congress off dead center on this problem." Stressing non-partisanship in such a matter, he stated that "there are many men of good will on both sides of the aisle who feel that something needs to be done in this area to remove discrimination or injustice from the present immigration laws." He added that he and Senator Hart would do everything in their power to see that effective legislation was enacted at this session of Congress. The President then concluded his remarks.]

Thank you very much for coming and I hope that the time and effort we spent this morning will be rewarded in the days to come in a good bill and we can meet here again to sign that bill at some future date.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The group met at the invitation of the President in the Cabinet Room at the White House at 10:30 a.m.

98 Remarks at the National Medal of Science Award Ceremony. January 13, 1964

Members of the Senate, Members of the House, distinguished, honored guests, and ladies and gentlemen:

Nothing could warm me more on this wintry day than to present the National Medal of Science. Nothing is more important than what we seek to do today and that

is to give national recognition to the outstanding achievement in science and technology. Your endeavors are important not only to your country, but we think to humanity everywhere.

The complex fabric of today's society demands that we give increased attention to