A bill is now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, which if enacted into law will have a far reaching effect upon the whole question of immigration and deportation of aliens. This bill springs from the celebrated Strecher case so recently decided in the Supreme Court. An effort was made to deport an alien named Strecher on the ground that he was a Communist. The testimony seemed to indicate that he had been a Communist but had dropped his membership in the Communist Party. The Supreme Court sustained Strecher's contention. The bill now pending contains this clause, "It being the intent and purpose of this section that membership in any one of such classes at the time of admission (to this country) is sought or at any time theretofore, of no matter how short duration or how far in the past, shall prevent admission." That clause would prevent any one who had been a member of any group or class which sought to overthrow or oppose the government would be inadmissible to this country, even if he had been a member for five minutes and even though it might have happened a half century ago. The bill also contains a provision which would require that an alien be deported if it was found that he had been a member of a subversive organization. Needless to say, the bill is being watched with a great deal of interest.

To those who have experienced an appendectomy, the appendix is an annoying internal appendage whose usefulness has always been a matter of some doubt. But to those who are regular readers of the Congressional Record, the Appendix is that portion of the Record where appears, articles, speeches, editorials, memorials and a host of other matters which make it a sort of repository of contemporary information. Year after year, week after week, and day after day, efforts are made to limit the matter which is inserted in the appendix by common consent of the House or Senate, but it has never been done. Perhaps the reason is that the information appearing in the appendix is useful in schools, libraries, to business men, organization labor groups, and others and is worth what it costs to have it printed. In a single issue of the Record, the following material appeared in the Appendix: The Meaning Of Civil Liberty, Dare We Break The Vicious Circle of Fighting Evil With Evil, Roosevelt Held Right And Big Business Wrong On Economy Appraisal, The Montgomery County Fish And Game Protective Club, Will Rogers, British Diplomacy In Palestine, American Jobs For Americans, The Taylor Grazing Act, Is There A Democratic Way Out Of Unemployment, The Naming Of The State Of Colorado And The Capital Of Denver, The War Debts, The New Deal Is Sinking, Fox Furs And The Canadian Trade Agreement, California Legislature Endorses Voorhis Bill,
Lend-Spend Program Must End, Hearing Of The Securities And Exchange Commission in San Francisco, Let No One Misinterpret America's Will To Peace, A Suggested Compromise On The Devaluation Measure, American Legion State Convention in North Carolina, Origin Of The Name America, The American Flag, Neutrality, Competition And Free Enterprise, Battlefront Of Democracy, Jitterburg Economics, Campaign Contributions By WFA Workers In Rhode Island. Truly, here is a symposium of modern thinking.

ANOTHER INTER-OCEAN CANAL.

For twenty years, there has been intermittent discussion of another canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific. It has been contended that another canal is necessary. It has been stated that if the Panama Canal should be bombed or blown up, our Navy would be in a grave predicament in attempting to serve both the Atlantic and Pacific. Somehow, there was little enthusiasm for this project and the country was not stirred up by the alleged gravity of the situation. It remained for the Japanese invasion of China and the aggression by the Axis powers in Europe to develop interest in the matter and recently, the President has requested an appropriation for a survey of the proposed canal. A bill is now pending in Congress to provide for a Nicaraguan Canal under the treaty of 1916 with Nicaragua. The bill provides for a Canal Commission of three engineers, one Army officer and one Navy officer to construct such a canal and authorizes the issue of $200,000,000 in 30 year bonds, redeemable after 10 years to pay for construction. Thus does a slumbering project suddenly come to life by the operation of events.

THIS THING CALLED INTERNATIONAL LAW.

When the so-called Neutrality bill came to the floor of Congress for discussion and vote, the real controversy raged around (1) the fact that it contained no provision for an embargo on arms and ammunition whenever the President should find that a state of war existed, (2) the provision in the bill giving the President the right to designate combat areas and (3) the provision relating to cash and carry of supplies and materials to belligerents. For two whole days the measure was debated. Then it was read for amendment and for nearly 12 hours the debate raged furiously as efforts were made to amend the bill. During this time, a movement developed on the floor of the House to repeal all neutrality measures and go back to the provisions of international law. What is international law? In a general way, it is a code of practices which has developed over the centuries in the relationship of nations. Like all law, it is effective only if it is enforceable and enforced. Therein lies the weakness. Somehow, international law was lost in the shuffle when Japan invaded China, when Germany seized Czechoslovakia, and when Mussolini invaded Ethiopia and seized Albania. If we should go back to international law and repeal all existing neutrality provisions, it would mean that arms and ammunition could be freely shipped to war nations subject of course to seizure by the enemy. Our citizens could freely travel into war zones and there might be another Lusitania incident. Enemy submarines might use our ports with impunity. Warring nations might procure loans and credits even as they did in 1914. Thus international law might be the pathway down which we might march to another war. As the proposal to repeal all neutrality statutes came on for a vote, it was defeated by a vote of 195 to 68. Members of Congress still carry the lessons of 20 years ago.