



VOLUME 31, NO. 4358 Entered at Post Office in Denver, Colo., as Second Class Matter PUBLISHED TRI-WEEKLY AT DENVER, COLORADO 6¢ copy 75¢ mg: \$3.75 6 mos: \$7.00, year. Thursday, Sept. 6, 1945

## CONGRESSMAN DECLARES BACK DOOR IS OPEN TO UNDESIRABLE ALIENS

**LOS ANGELES.** — Representative Samuel Dickstein, Democrat of New York, says some congressmen "fight day and night to keep open the door to undesirable aliens," yet they leave the back door wide open for them to pour in."

Chairman Dickstein alighted at a subcommittee hearing on immigration matters that alien quotas are "cockeyed and ridiculous."

His comments followed testimony by District Immigration Director Albert Del Gueiro that almost 100,000 alien Mexicans are in Southern California. Del Gueiro termed them mostly "border jumpers."

"The international opposition to statehood for Hawaii was expressed by Eldred L. Meyer, past grand president of the Native Sons of the Golden West, describing the 1940 census shows

### 'Not Guilty' Please Made in Dui Case

**SACRAMENTO.** — Pleas of not guilty were entered in Federal Court here yesterday by 17-year-old Edward W. Wiles, and his mother, Claude, 35, charged with illegal possession of dynamite and conspiracy in connection with the attempted dynamiting of property owned by Sunbeam Dui in Placer County.

Federal Judge Martin L. Welsh set October 2 as the date for their trial.

## Alien Loses Land Title in Court

**SALINAS.** — In a decision against Yezo Ikeda, Japanese alien Superior Judge H. G. Jorgensen has ruled that title to approximately 160 acres of land, the family land, goes to the state under the alien land law.

District Attorney Anthony Brazil charged Mr. and Mrs. Ikeda bought the land in 1928, placing it in the name of a friend, Toshi Hanasome, until their daughter, Atsuko, became of age.

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

168,000 of Hawaii's 440,000 inhabitants are Japanese, he stated.

Should Hawaii be granted statehood, the territory not only will be dominated by Japanese, but the 168,000 Japanese would have perfect freedom to migrate to the mainland.

### CADET NURSES OPEN FACTORY JOBS IN PA. IN ROUNDABOUT WAYS

**PHILADELPHIA, Pa.** — The 31 Cadet Nurses training in Philadelphia hospitals do more than assist the patients with their gentle manners and efficient actions. They recently helped open up jobs for Nisei and Issei in manufacturing plants in Philadelphia.

One manufacturer met Japanese Americans at a Methodist Hospital conference with one of the doctors about them, and promptly called the Philadelphia WRA office offering jobs to 30 or 40 people. Another manufacturer, while a patient at the hospital, asked the nurses to lay the Nisei Cadet Nurses there that he asked WRA's help in filling several jobs, both clerical and semi-skilled, at his plant.

Philadelphia textile manufacturers recently expressed a desire to employ 300 evacuees. The production foreman decided, on his own initiative, to present the plan to his workers so that there would be no misunderstandings between the rest of the employees. He figured if one's arguments showed that the employees a "square deal," in his talk to the foreman pointed out that he himself was of German descent, as were many of the other workers in the plant. Some of them were Italians, too. He stated: "I would have resented being put into a center just because my parents happened to be born in Italy." He added, "I am sure that all of you who have Italian or German parents would equally resent such procedure."

When the foreman told the WRA office of the meeting, he was very much impressed by the argument and agreed that the Japanese Americans were deserv-

ing sympathetic treatment.

They all hope, he added, that some evacuees will soon become their fellow workers.

**BRIGHTON CHILD HIT Playing in Street**

**SACRAMENTO.** — A sentence of two years in federal penitentiary was imposed by Federal Judge W. M. Tamm on Sadao Banjirō Taunoda, 21, taken to St. Luke's hospital last week, suffering from a possible skull fracture incurred when she ran into a car while playing in the street near her home.

Yukiyama was arrested in New York City following his release from the relocation center. He was indicted last month by the federal grand jury here.

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

## PING & GEORGE MOTOR SERVICE

Complete Truck and Auto Repairs

**TEXACO PRODUCTS — AUTOMOTIVE REPAIRS**

Operated by Ping Oda and George Kuramoto



20th & Lawrence Sts.  
Denver 2, Colorado  
Phone: MAIN 9332

Washing  
Greasing

Open 7 A.M. — 11 P.M. Every Day

The Name to Remember in Denver when ordering flowers for any occasion is THE BLOSSOM SHOP

And The Names to Remember for personalized service on your orders are Johnnie Fukushima, Jimmie Nakai, and Miki Fukushima.

### The Blossom Shop

Niles Main 1895 221 E. 7th Ave. Day: Tabor 8291  
"For your convenience, just phone us & charge your orders" thru the Armed Forces

## ARAPAHOE Truck & Auto Service

21st and Arapahoe Sts., Denver 2, Colorado

TEL: MAIN 1866

**TEXACO PETROLEUM PRODUCTS**

Official Brake & Light Inspection Station, No. 1280

Tire Recapping Service

PROMPT SERVICE AT REASONABLE RATES

## Lucky Florist

1330 20th St., Denver Phone MAIN 7404

Expert Floral Designers From Los Angeles

Our Specialty

Corsages \* Wedding Bouquets \* Funeral Designs

Orchids \* Gardenias at Reasonable Prices

## Coast Ban Lifted On U. S. Japanese

**WASHINGTON.** — The Army Tuesday night removed all bars against loyal Japanese Americans returning to the Pacific Coast.

It promised them the same treatment and privileges "accorded other law-abiding American citizens and residents."

Mass exclusion ended in December, 1944, and the restrictions were placed on an individual basis.

The action, effective at midnight, Pacific war time (1 a.m. MWT), formally terminated the mass exclusion program under which persons of Japanese ancestry had been banned from the coastal areas of California, Oregon and Washington since early in the war.

At the same time, the WRA announced that its eight relocation centers will be closed gradually beginning next month, with the last scheduled to shut down Friday, Sept. 7, at 8:00 P.M.

**Japanese Physicist Helped Toward A-Bomb**

**BOULDER, Colo.** — Ironically, a Japanese natural scientist helped pave the way for the development of the atomic bomb. Dr. James W. Bixson, University of Colorado physicist, said here.

Dr. Bixson, who took part in the research work on the weapon, said that in 1935 M. Yukawa, a Japanese physicist, was instrumental in the existence of the meson, which was later found to be a "significant contribution."

Far from regarding Japanese scientists as "cops' cats," Dr. Bixson said other nations "may well consider the possibility that the Japanese may develop an atomic bomb of their own."

**Brighton Child Hit Playing in Street**

**SACRAMENTO.** — A sentence of two years in federal penitentiary was imposed by Federal Judge W. M. Tamm on Sadao Banjirō Taunoda, 21, taken to St. Luke's hospital last week, suffering from a possible skull fracture incurred when she ran into a car while playing in the street near her home.

Yukiyama was arrested in New York City following his release from the relocation center. He was indicted last month by the federal grand jury here.

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would be just as much against public policy as to allow them to remain the first year."

The court held that the statute of limitations could not be applied in the case because "to allow an ineligible alien to remain in possession of agricultural land after 10 years would













