

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:  
H. R. 4382. A bill for the relief of Capt. John H. Schmitt and Mildred Schmitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:  
H. R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Floyd L. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1243. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville, Mass., seeking a liberalization of the point system of demobilization for the benefit of prisoners of war in Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1244. Also, petition of Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, upon petition of Boston Chapter No. 10, to clarify and correct the interpretation of Executive Order 9538, regarding eligibles who entered the armed forces to be given probational civil-service appointment; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1245. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of J. Clyde Faries, of Hillsboro, Tex., favoring H. R. 4130; to the Committee on Labor.

1246. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Commander in Chief, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 35; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1247. Also, petition of the Cambridge City Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the abolition of all present restrictions on free Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

A Good Shepherd of the human family, the night becomes as day when from the heart we pray: May Jesus Christ be praised. Thou from whom cometh the highest good, so manifest Thyself toward us that we shall have no memory of gifts withheld or service unrendered that would mar the bliss of an undisturbed conscience. Let there be under Thy guidance, a human response answering the call for human helpfulness in all things just and sympathetic.

We pray for a serious awakening of the soul of America; without it, O God, Thou art mocked and our hope is slain. Forbid that the selfishness of man should sting to death the sanctities of human rights, whose native roots run deep, scenting the eternal water: "Everything, whithersoever the river cometh, shall live," bearing fruit in every good work. Speak through us, dear Lord, through our imperfections and weaknesses, our errors and misconceptions, that our country may know its true riches, its vast outlooks, and inexpressible joys. Teach us to love Thy law

and to walk in the way of Thy commandments. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Thursday, October 11, 1945, the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3466. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The SPEAKER. The Chair trusts that as few Members as possible will ask to proceed for 1 minute, as we have a rather heavy program for today and a special order of 1 hour on Palestine.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Why would it not be better just to go ahead and have the hour special order, then proceed with the 1-minute speeches?

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes it best to proceed as indicated.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

#### STEPS TAKEN FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN FRANCE

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a report.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may have permission to address the House for 15 minutes after any other special orders heretofore entered. The gentleman has time for today which he will not use.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter showing the taxes paid the Federal Government by the Territory of Hawaii.

#### GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if ever a man deserved the complete support of his government and his people, that man is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Our Government should make it plain to all the world that he has that support.

MacArthur has reported that the demobilization of Japan's fighting force of 7,000,000 is complete. The Japanese imperial general staff, from which all of the Japanese imperialistic schemes have been hatched, has been dissolved.

All of this has been accomplished without the firing of a single shot or the shedding of one drop of Allied blood. It will certainly go down in history as one of the greatest military achievements of all times.

MacArthur reports that the people of Japan are in complete humiliation. Their military spirit has been killed.

Let that fact be an answer to that small group of so-called liberals in this country who have been conducting a campaign of petty sniping aimed at MacArthur.

This Government should set at rest any doubts that may exist, either in this country or abroad, by a vigorous and unequivocal statement in support of MacArthur's leadership in the occupation of Japan.

#### VETERANS' PRIORITIES

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill which will give returning veterans priorities and real opportunities to purchase surplus property, not only for business purposes, but for personal desires as well, and without paying dealers exorbitant profits.

An honorable discharge will be the veteran's certificate of eligibility; his priority will be immediately below that given the States and municipalities, and his limit of purchase will be fixed at \$25,000.

The proposed amendment to the Surplus Property Act, if enacted, will give the veterans the opportunity which I am sure we all want them to have.

From expressions heretofore voiced on the floor of the House, I expect immediate action with no opposition to this proposed legislation.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record and include an article by John O'Donnell, appearing in the Times-Herald, regarding General MacArthur.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address delivered by Hon. Paul Jones, judge of the district court, Cleveland, on constitutional government.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a radio address delivered by him.

## RETURNING SOLDIERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution passed by the American Legion, and a letter from the State Department.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on two matters, and to include in the first a resolution and in the second a telegram.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by Millard Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans, entitled "Retirement Review Tips Are Compiled."

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on two subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from the Polish American Congress.

Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

Record and include a letter from a constituent.

## ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the authors of one of the bills for the St. Lawrence waterway canal and power plant. The following article that appeared in the Minneapolis Star-Journal on October 9 on this subject is short and to the point:

Only 258 miles of the water route need to be improved to give Duluth and Minnesota a deep channel to the Atlantic. More than 2,400 miles of the total distance is already deep enough for seagoing ships.

Now with the feasibility and need of the project demonstrated by the war emergency, the prospects for favorable congressional action are brighter than ever before. In his special message and by other encouragement, President Truman has done well by the St. Lawrence seaway proposal.

Still, the undertaking faces tough opposition. In its last appearance before Congress it was defeated in the Senate 56-25. That time it was offered as an executive agreement with Canada, requiring only a majority vote in both Houses. The present bill was introduced by Senate Leader BARKLEY also as an executive agreement.

Some questioners, however, still maintain that a treaty with Canada, which must be ratified by a two-thirds vote in the Senate, is the only legal way to provide the seaway.

But no matter how it is authorized, the project should get started. The President in his message to Congress cited four benefits to be gained by the development:

1. Cheap water transportation.
2. Employment opportunities.
3. Cheap electric power, notably for New York State.
4. Joint defense and added prosperity for the United States and Canada.

The Midwest and the continent would be the richer for the seaway. The war effort would have been facilitated had the waterway been completed before Pearl Harbor. America hopes another war will never come, yet if it does—and for the commerce of peace—the deep waterway is logically urgent.

## DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, before we begin the march into Palestine today, waving a red flag in the face of the British Empire, I desire to say a few words in defense of one of the most patriotic organizations on earth, the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I understand that an hour has been set aside at this time for political speeches on the Palestine question, which, as I said, is like waving a red flag in the face of the British Empire, or hurling an

atomic bomb into our international affairs.

The anti-Zionist Jews, who are also anti-Communist, do not want this Palestine question agitated.

However, if the Zionist Jews really want some place to go, and their alleged friends in the House want some place to send them, that can be arranged without creating a war with the Arabs or stirring up friction with the British Empire.

I understand that Stalin has expressed a willingness to have them settle in one of the States of the Soviet Union, possibly east of the Urals.

I believe such an arrangement can be easily worked out, and since practically every Communist among them came from Russia, I am sure they would not protest—especially after they got over there.

But, Mr. Speaker, I resent, and every decent American ought to resent, the communistic attacks that are now being made on the DAR. When a Member of this House goes into the Associated Press and refers to Mrs. Truman as "the last lady" of the land for having taken dinner with the Daughters of the American Revolution, we have come to a terrible pass.

Mrs. Truman is one of the finest women who ever graced the White House; and to all decent patriotic Americans she is the First Lady of the land.

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

## THE DAR AND RACE PREJUDICE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy at this time to congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] for having written to the chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution with which she is affiliated urging that that chapter condemn the action of the national DAR in refusing the use of Constitution Hall to one of the leading artistes in America, who also happens to be the wife of one of our colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I commend the President of the United States, Harry Truman, also for his action in criticizing the act of the DAR and taking issue with them for drawing the color line in the use of a tax-free auditorium in the Capital City of the Nation.

I join with the Washington Post also in editorially attacking this stand once again taken by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I recall with pleasure that President Franklin D. Roosevelt said at the time that Marian Anderson was denied the use of the hall that that, too, should be denounced. Later the DAR did permit Marian Anderson to sing at Constitution Hall for a charity benefit. I am shocked to learn now that this great patriotic order has reverted to its original attitude.

Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded a war caused in no small measure by racial



pogroms and bigotry inculcating Hitler and the Nazis. We repeatedly inveighed against that illogical and indefensible policy when practiced by our enemies. Let us not encourage it here. Too many of our people are consciously or unwittingly swayed by prejudice and hatred of fellow Americans. Who is there among us who may justly arrogate to himself superiority over fellow citizens because of a difference in race or religion? We must rise above such tendencies. They sow the seeds of destruction. They are harbingers of chaos and disaster. I urge the DAR to recant. Welcome artists of all races and religions. Encourage cultural attainment and knowledge in our people. Open the doors. Let us reread the immortal words on the Statue of Liberty. Let us rededicate ourselves to the Bill of Rights in our Constitution and to the Declaration of Independence. There is no room in our beloved country for first-class and second-class American citizens.

#### PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it seems rather unfortunate that the gentleman from Mississippi would again say that we are waving a red flag at the British Empire just because we are going to consider the condition of the helpless, hapless, and homeless Jews of Europe seeking entrance into Palestine. It is the gentleman's habitual process of red smearing and witch hunting. The one situation has nothing to do with the other—that is, Palestine has nothing to do with the Daughters of the American Revolution, except that Britain has forgotten her pledged justice to the Jew, and the DAR, by its action, has denied justice and equity to the colored people. I deplore the action of the Daughters of the American Revolution denying the use of Constitution Hall to a very celebrated and renowned artist, Miss Hazel Scott. The Daughters of the American Revolution only repeated their very tragic action with reference to Marian Anderson. Certainly there is no monopoly on artistic talents. Surely it cannot be said that only white people can play as beautifully as Miss Hazel Scott or sing as gloriously as Miss Anderson. The certificate of incorporation of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which certificate we adopted in this very Chamber, provides that there shall be equality to all. They deny that certificate and the provisions therein. Refusal of Constitution Hall, the citadel of the DAR, to colored artists is a violation of the certificate of incorporation of the DAR. I shall offer a resolution dissolving that certificate. Congress created the DAR. Congress must now cancel out the DAR because of its outrageous violation of the tenets of decency and fair play.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an editorial entitled "The Constitutionality of the FEPC" from the Shreveport Times.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a radio speech and in the other a resolution of the Milwaukee Common Council.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a Jacksonville paper on the subject of statehood for Territories.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

It is the settled policy of this Government to promote the political, social, and economic development of people who have not yet attained full self-government, and eventually to make it possible for them to determine their own form of government.

It is our pride that this policy was faithfully pursued in the case of the Philippines. The people of the Philippines determined that they desired political independence, and the Government of the United States made provision to this effect.

It is now time, in my opinion, to ascertain from the people of Puerto Rico their wishes as to the ultimate status which they prefer, and, within such limits as may be determined by the Congress, to grant to them the kind of government which they desire.

The present form of government in the island appears to be unsatisfactory to a large number of its inhabitants. Different groups of people in Puerto Rico are advocating various changes in the present form of government.

These advocated changes include different possibilities: (1) The right of the Puerto Ricans to elect their own Governor with a wider measure of local self-government; (2) statehood for Puerto Rico; (3) complete independence; and (4) a dominion form of government.

Each of these propositions is being urged in the island, and each has its own advocates. Uncertainty has been created among the people as to just what the future of Puerto Rico is to be. These uncertainties should be cleared away at an early date.

To this end, I recommend that the Congress consider each of the proposals, and that legislation be enacted submitting various alternatives to the people of Puerto Rico. In that way, the Congress can ascertain what the people of Puerto Rico themselves most desire for their political future.

However, in the interest of good faith and comity between the people of Puerto Rico and those of us who live on the

mainland, Congress should not submit any proposals to the Puerto Ricans which the Congress is not prepared to enact finally into law. We should be prepared to carry into effect whatever options are placed before the people of Puerto Rico, once the Puerto Ricans have expressed their preference.

I hope that this problem can be considered by the Congress at an early date, and that appropriate legislation be enacted designed to make definite the future status of Puerto Rico.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 16, 1945.

#### PALESTINE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in yielding to our majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a splendid article published in the Washington Star of last Saturday, written by one whom I respect very much, Lowell Mellett.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I have spoken in behalf of righting the ancient wrong against the Jewish people. Before I proceed I want it emphatically understood that I do not consider that anyone who speaks here today in this just cause is waving a red flag at the British Empire. It is about time we stopped hearing remarks of that kind. A Member should be permitted to take the floor and speak in the cause of humanity without being accused of waving a red flag against anybody.

When the Wright-Compton resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 24, 1944, I told the House that if there was ever a time when the need was great for a national home for the Jewish people the time was now.

I asserted then that I was persuaded "that as soon as the military situation permitted the Palestine resolution now pending in the United States Congress will be passed overwhelmingly."

Later when hearings were conducted before the House Foreign Affairs Committee I appeared before that body and I strongly urged enactment of the pending resolution. At that time I testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee as follows:

I know that every decent-minded person, without regard to race, color, or creed, has a deep feeling, not only of sympathy but far beyond sympathy, for the unfortunate plight of all persecuted peoples, of peoples who have been maltreated by the Nazi horde, and particularly those of the Jewish faith who have undergone vicious persecution in the past several years. It is the cry of humanity that I have referred to, the cry of justice, and particularly a challenge to Christian justice, that this problem be met. They are human beings just like you and I. They

have their hopes and their aspirations. They have their little families, the men have their wives, and the wives have their husbands, and they have their children as God has blessed them. They are human beings seeking a home, some place where they can live without fear of future persecution.

Nothing has occurred since to cause me to change my opinion about the crying need for a national home for the oppressed Jews of Europe. I am, as a matter of fact, more convinced than ever that the only solution of that tragic problem is through the creation of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

Because I feel so strongly on this subject, it was my pleasure to cooperate wholeheartedly in the incorporation by the resolutions committee of the Democratic National Convention last year, of which I had the honor to be chairman, of a plank pledging our party to creation of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

It will be well to quote right here the full text of that platform. It said:

We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

The Republicans did not use the word "Jewish" before "commonwealth," but unquestionably their intent was the same as ours. The Republican platform said:

In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth.

Later during the campaign, both President Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey, the Republican candidate strongly endorsed the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. In a historic letter to the annual convention of the Zionist organization in Atlantic City on October 15 last year, President Roosevelt declared:

Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as practicable. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization.

A few days earlier, Governor Dewey asserted in a formal statement that, if elected President:

I would use my best offices to have our Government working together with Great Britain to achieve this great objective for a people that have suffered so much and deserve so much at the hands of mankind.

Thus, ladies and gentlemen of the House, there was no political division among Americans last year on the question of justice for the Jews through the establishment of at least one place on this earth where they could go and live as freemen, unbothered either by economic or social or political restrictions and inhibitions.

But long before our political conventions took cognizance of the unhappy plight of these victims of Hitler's barbaric persecutions, this Government and the Government of Great Britain, and later this Congress took cognizance of the need for the establishment in Palestine of a safe, legally created home for the Jews wherein that small people would enjoy peace and tranquility and the good will of the more powerful nations of this world.

On October 2, 1917, the British Government, in a statement known as the Balfour Declaration pledged itself to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. Prior to the issuance of this declaration, Great Britain sought and obtained the approval of the Government of the United States. There was, in fact, prolonged negotiations between President Woodrow Wilson and Mr. David Lloyd George, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain in reference to the issuance of the manifesto which became known as the Balfour Declaration.

There was no question at that time either in the minds of Mr. Wilson or of Mr. Lloyd George or of any of the statesmen and diplomats who had a hand in the promulgation of the so-called Balfour Declaration that as soon as it was humanly possible to transport the necessary number of Jews to Palestine and to establish an orderly economy, that this small tract of land at the end of the Mediterranean Sea would be constituted as an independent nation by, of, and for the Jews, and with, obviously, the majority of the population Jewish people. There was no intent to deprive any other people of any right to which they were entitled, and it was set forth in the Balfour Declaration that the rights of all minority peoples, both religious and economic, would be scrupulously observed. And I might say here, there has never been a contrary thought in the minds of those who are advocating the belated fulfillment of this pledge of the United States and the British Government.

At a peace conference at San Remo on April 25, 1920, the Allied Supreme Council allotted the mandate for Palestine to Great Britain for the express purpose of putting the Balfour Declaration into effect. There was correspondence between the United States and the British Government on the subject and it is of interest to note here, and it is very significant, too, that although the American Government did not participate in the ratification of the Versailles Treaty, this Government did give its approval to the Palestine mandate.

On June 30, 1922, Congress adopted a joint resolution which was signed by President Harding on September 2, 1922, favoring the establishment in Palestine of a national Jewish home. This resolution was sponsored by a very distinguished citizen of my State, the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, who was then the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In 1924, in a treaty between Great Britain and the United States, the terms of the Palestine mandate were formally ratified. In this treaty the United States consented to the

administration, mind you, administration, of Palestine by the British Government pursuant to the articles of the mandate. This treaty set forth that no modification whatsoever should be made in the terms of the mandate unless such prior modifications "shall have been first assented to by the United States." It was very clear that the assent of the United States of America, as one of the World War Allied and Associated Powers was necessary for the validity of the administration of Palestine by Great Britain, and that the United States, on its part, had not relinquished the right to a voice in the disposition of Palestine to which we, as an associated power, not only were entitled to, but which we, as a foremost participant in World War I helped to create.

Unfortunately and most tragically, in the light of developments, Great Britain saw fit to violate the provisions of the mandate. Great Britain undertook, without prior consultation of the United States, to impose what has since become known as the Chamberlain white paper, wherein, arbitrarily, Great Britain undertook to shut off Jewish immigration into Palestine, the only place on earth where victims of Hitler's persecutions could find asylum at a time when the need for Palestine was greatest in its history. Had not Great Britain imposed this policy as a part of the then prevailing appeasement policies of the British Government, Palestine would have been available for hundreds of thousands, perhaps more than a million, of homeless Jews seeking to escape from Germany and the satellite countries where Hitler's anti-Jewish laws had been imposed.

It should be noted here that President Roosevelt stated on a number of occasions that the American Government never gave its consent to the Chamberlain white paper. We were completely ignored in this British assumption of complete authority over the fortunes of a people.

The tragic experiences of the Jews through the long years of the World War are all too poignant to discuss in detail here. Never in all history have a people been more sadly and cruelly abused. It has been estimated by competent authority that approximately 6,000,000 Jewish lives were snuffed out by Hitler and his henchmen during the years of the World War. The disclosures from the various prison camps are still all too fresh in our memory and Hitler's work continues, because although liberation has come to the inmates of the prison camps, their sufferings and their weakened condition is such that hundreds of them are dying daily because of sheer inability to recuperate. I heard over the week end that in 1 prison camp alone, 21,000 emaciated Jews have died since their liberation from their German captors.

We are discussing Palestine today because of the splendid action just taken by President Truman in an effort to persuade the British Government to immediately admit 100,000 of these refugees into Palestine. The prompt admission of these homeless people into Palestine is the immediate objective. The long-time objective—and I hope it will soon come to



pass—is the creation, as was contemplated, of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. We must understand that the Jew who escapes with his life from the concentration camp has almost no hope whatsoever of reestablishing himself in his old home. For the most part, their families have been killed and all of their friends have been killed. In addition, they find themselves without property, without businesses, and without the means of rebuilding their lives. They just cannot pick up where they left off. It is necessary that they begin life anew in an environment where there are friendly faces and no tragic memories.

The feeling of the American people on the question of justice for the Jew, through their establishment in a land of their own in Palestine, is very intense. It is deep-rooted, and it is widespread, and it permeates all classes of our people. Sermons have been preached on this subject in thousands of American churches by clergymen of all faiths. Resolutions have been adopted by State legislatures, municipalities, hundreds of civic organizations. Petitions have gone to the President signed by 44 governors of our land and by the majority of the Members of this House and of the Senate. The American people are great believers in fair play, and they do not think the Jews have gotten a square deal.

The British Government, which, we are informed by the press, is objecting to the fulfillment of President Truman's request that 100,000 refugees be admitted immediately into Palestine, will make a great mistake if they do not appreciate the depth of American feeling on this subject. During the war years, this Congress and our Government acquiesced to the British request that action on Palestine by this Congress and by our Government be postponed because it might interfere with the war effort. We realized that every day of delay in the opening of Palestine meant the loss of Jewish lives; but, nevertheless, in our efforts to further the joint efforts of the war, we heeded the British request.

The war in Europe has been over for more than 6 months, but the white paper restricting immigration is still prevailing. This, in my opinion, is not playing fair either with our Government or with the Jews or with the American people.

Millions of innocent persons, simply because they were born Jews, have been ruthlessly persecuted, murdered, and violated. Only a handful, literally, of Jews remain in Europe. I am told that hardly more than a million and a half Jews are still alive throughout all of Europe. In many communities, the barbaric Nazis wiped out every Jewish child, thereby reducing to the lowest possible number the future Jewish population of those areas.

Every effort should be made by our Government and by other governments of good will to save the remnants of this historic people who have contributed so much to this world's cultural, economic, scientific, and religious welfare. The saving and the rehabilitation of these people constitutes a challenge to mankind. The challenge should be met, not ignored. It should be met immediately.

The suggestion of President Truman to Prime Minister Attlee that these refugees be transported immediately to Palestine is a fair one, a sound one, a necessary one. It is aimed to meet the immediate problem of saving human beings. It is not the long-time solution, but it is the one that is most pressing at the moment.

Certainly every decent man and woman in this country and throughout the world wants every effort made to save these lives and to remove them from the category of hopeless, helpless, homeless wanderers. These people, unhappily and tragically, find sympathy everywhere, but they are wanted nowhere. This constitutes a sad commentary on our civilization and our vaunted Christian generosity. Under the circumstances, Palestine is a natural, as well as a national, homeland. Certainly there should be no objection to permitting these people to go there to re-create their lives as useful men and women.

Let me say again that I have spoken in behalf of Palestine on many occasions in this House, and before committees of the Congress and at mass meetings and on other occasions where the subject of Palestine was under discussion. I hope that as long as the good Lord gives me the strength and the breath to do so, that I will continue to raise my voice and whatever influence I may have either as a Member of this Congress or as an individual citizen in behalf of the righting of one of the greatest crimes in all recorded history. Let me say again that I think President Truman's initiative in this matter is magnificent, and I will be grievously disappointed if our British friends fail for any cause whatsoever to heed his generous humanitarian suggestion.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the question we are discussing today is one of paramount importance to decent men and women, and I emphasize decent-minded men and women. I view the human race as one family. We may be of different racial origins, our consciences may prompt us to entertain different religious beliefs, we may by accident of birth be born of different colors, but so far as I am concerned without regard to the view any other person may take, in my journey through life I entertain the view that the human race is one family and that we have got to view this question from that angle, the angle given to us by God himself, that the human race is one family.

The problem we are discussing today is a challenge to mankind, and the request of President Truman for the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine should be granted by the British Government. Such steps will meet the immediate problem. The long-range problem can only be solved by the establishment of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

[From the Washington Star of October 10, 1945]

"ON THE OTHER HAND"—BRITISH ADVISED TO TAKE NOTICE OF FEELING CONCERNING PALESTINE

(By Lowell Mellett)

It is inconceivable that those who make British policy know the extent of the ill-will developing in this country as the result of their behavior in the matter of Palestine. Word has come that President Truman's proposal for the immediate removal of 100,000 Jews from the concentration camps and makeshift miseries of Germany to Palestine, has met with an unfavorable reception in London. And there is no indication that the new labor government will alter the policy established by the Chamberlain government toward the Jewish homeland.

Now in this country is a British financial mission, seeking a \$5,000,000,000 loan. Negotiations with our State Department are said to have progressed satisfactorily and very soon an agreement on terms may be presented to Congress for its approval. Whatever the merits of the proposal, and however well it may be argued that assistance to our late ally would work to the benefit of our own country, it might be worth while for this British mission to examine the strength of some of the existing prejudices against Britain.

They will find that the prejudice resulting from the British default on its moral commitment in the matter of the Jews, is a very strong prejudice, one capable perhaps of upsetting their hope of monetary aid. It is deeply rooted in Congress.

The last formal action on the subject occurred a year ago, when a resolution was offered asking the British Government to make good the Balfour Declaration, approved by President Wilson, reopen Palestine to Jewish immigration and permit the building of the contemplated Jewish commonwealth. This resolution was held up at the request of the administration because of the war. The thing for the British to note, however, is the authorship of the resolution—Senators WAGNER and TAFT, two men ordinarily as far apart as the poles. When these two agree on any important policy it can safely be labeled American policy. They still agree in this instance and both are pressing for action, as are many other Members.

If other evidence is required to prove the depth of American feeling, it can be found in a letter to President Truman, signed by a majority of the Members of the Senate and House. It can be found in a petition from the governors of 40 States and in resolutions adopted by 33 State legislatures during the past 2 years; likewise in resolutions of the A. F. of L. and the CIO and the individual pronouncements of 818 labor leaders and 2,000 university presidents and professors.

There is no point in discussing the merits of the issue. Rightly or wrongly, opinion in this country has jelled. The case for the Arabs has been discounted in the light of the showing they made during the war, both as friends and as enemies, and their obvious impotence in these days of mechanized warfare. Junketing Congressmen, after visiting the Near East, are convinced that the Arabs never could have been more than a minor nuisance even when the British situation was really precarious.

The case for the Jews has been made as eloquently by British statesmen as by American. Churchill's charge that Chamberlain's repudiation of the Balfour Declaration was "a plain breach of a solemn obligation," is well known in this country. So, too, is the position taken by the Labor Party before the recent election. "There was a strong case before the war," said a party resolution. "There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews

in Europe. \* \* \* The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales."

So, the financial mission might bestir itself to have this American "prejudice" removed by action in London, before the question of the loan reaches Congress. If any such loan should carry a condition that the British first be required to keep their word to the Jews of the world—and to the American Government—a smell would thereby be attached to British statesmanship likely to last a long, long time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may take.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in a world faced with many grave problems that of the Jews of Europe does not, in terms of numbers, loom very large. Of the six or seven million Jews in Europe before the war, the Nazi butchers have left alive no more than 2,000,000. But in terms of our approach to the problems of the postwar world as a whole, there are few issues by which the statesmanship and the sincerity with which we make the peace, can be better measured.

It was with deep gratification that we here learned of the action of our President in supporting the proposal for the immediate grant, as an interim measure, of 100,000 certificates for Jews to enter Palestine. I understand that the British have not received this intervention with unmitigated satisfaction; I am sure they will not object if I recall that Britain was granted authority over Palestine for the purpose, and that was the main purpose, of establishing there a Jewish National Home for the Jewish people. If Britain is in Palestine today, it is because she accepted that trust and that obligation. In that behalf she entered into a covenant, not only with 50 nations of the League of Nations but also in 1924 with our own country, in which the terms of that trust were clearly specified.

Great Britain undertook, and I quote, "to facilitate Jewish immigration into Palestine." Great Britain undertook, and I quote, "to facilitate Jewish settlement on the land in Palestine." These obligations, the Palestine white paper repudiates unilaterally, and without the authority of those by whom Great Britain was entrusted with the administration of the Holy Land.

If we are to have a world in which law, order, and justice among men are to prevail, it is intolerable that pledges solemnly given should, if convenience so dictates, be treated as scraps of paper. I am aware of the many anxieties which today confront the people of Britain, whose cities have suffered the onslaught of Nazi guns and planes, and whose economy has been subjected to an immense strain in behalf of the common war effort, but I cannot believe it is in her own interest or in the interest of the world at large that she should deny her obligations or fail to carry out her duty in regard to this great humanitarian issue.

We all know, of course, of the pressure which has been brought by the different Arab countries to bring about this decision to continue the Palestine white paper. We have heard threats, on the

one hand, that the whole Arab world will rise in flames if another Jew enters the gates of his national home. We have read statements, on the other hand, only this week by the Premier of Iraq, that the establishment of a Jewish state in tiny Palestine would be a "great menace to the neighboring Arab states which are undeveloped along modern lines." I believe that both of these statements are utterly without foundation.

The Arab world has, in the long run, a great future before it, and a great part to play once again in the history of mankind. But today and for many years to come, it is dependent economically, politically, and militarily on the western powers. The threats which some of the more belligerent of the Arab spokesmen—spokesmen who were far from belligerent while the war was on—so liberally dispense today are, realistically speaking, empty threats. If proof is required, let me remind the House that in the worst period of the war, when Britain had neither men or planes to spare, two battalions of British and Indian troops—less than 2,000 men—put a stop to the holy war declared in Iraq by the Grand Mufti with the support of the Iraqi Prime Minister and Iraqi Army.

No; this Arab bogey has no more reality than has that Jewish bogey which has suddenly been invoked by the Prime Minister of Iraq. Does anyone who knows the facts seriously believe for a moment that this Jewish state, when it comes into existence, located in a land no larger than the State of New Hampshire, will dare or will desire to offer a military threat to the neighboring Arab countries occupying vast areas more than 100 times that of Palestine and inhabited by a numerous population. A Jewish state in Palestine can be a bridge between East and West and a fructifying influence for the whole of the backward and poverty-stricken Middle East. I am convinced that once that state is firmly established the interplay of mutual interests with its Arab neighbors will lead to constructive developments of the utmost importance to mankind.

But one thing is certain; the hands of Great Britain and our own hands in this matter should not be tied by any consideration of hollow and unworthy threats. On this question of the future of the Jewish people of Europe and their homeland in Palestine, the world faces a grave moral responsibility. It is a responsibility which cannot be avoided by postponement. The issue is one which must be faced now. I hope and I believe that not only opinion in our country, but the opinion of the man in the street in Great Britain, will unite in pressing for an immediate decision to do away with this infamous white paper and to open the gates of Palestine. We owe it not only to these pitiful victims of Nazi persecution; we owe it also to ourselves as human beings and as members of a civilized society.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak on one of the most important issues before the world today. It is a comforting truth that great moral causes lie at the root of the greatness

of nations. The assistance and friendship which our great country has extended to the world cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Our record of aid to Cuba, to the Philippines, to the starving nations of Europe after the First World War, to the reestablishment of Czechoslovakian independence, to the creation of a Polish Republic, yes, even to the victims of earthquake and flood in Japan, has been a glorious chapter in world history. We stand challenged today by a cause no less great than any we have championed before in our history.

In the Middle East for 23 years the world has been witnessing an experiment of regeneration. A small part of the little land of Palestine has been reclaimed from the desert by the devotion and the back-breaking toil of Jewish immigrants. They have come from every corner of the earth to restore the Holy Land to fertility after hundreds of years of neglect. As a result of their work, they have made Palestine's 10,000 square miles the most attractive spot in the entire Middle East. Let us remember that in 1918 no one wanted Palestine—neither the Arabs nor the Turks, nor the British. The only people who hungered for it and loved it were those to whom it was denied—the Jewish people.

What is the issue today in Palestine? It is time for us to cut through the double talk and speak plainly. The meaningless formalities of diplomatic conversation have no application to Palestine. For here is an issue which is not a pleasant academic subject. It is not something which can be pushed into the background and postponed for some future day. The plain unalterable fact is that in the past 10 years 6,000,000 Jews have been slaughtered, starved to death, or driven into a state of physical and mental despair for which there is no cure. Of an original population of perhaps seven and a half million living in Europe outside of Russia, there remain fewer than one and a half million Jews alive today. These remnants have found neither welcome nor refuge anywhere in Europe. The countries of their origin have been poisoned against their return. They have become wanderers on the face of the earth, hopeless and helpless. The doors of almost every nation are closed to them. The only country which offers the slightest prospect for them is this little land of Palestine.

Why then are they barred from Palestine? Is it for some logical and justifiable reason? Are the boundaries of the country too small for them? Is there some prime consideration of political necessity which stands in the way?

I say that the answer to these questions is clear and unmistakable. There is nothing which can be justified in logic, in justice, or in the name of humanity, to prevent the return of the Jewish people in Palestine in unrestricted numbers.

To those who say that the land cannot be restored to fertility, I say that the Jewish colonists have demonstrated that nothing is impossible in Palestine. On the shores of the Dead Sea where the water is mingled with salt they have established a colony, inch by inch, and foot by foot, draining the soil of its salt.



They have irrigated it dozens and dozens of times.

The desert of the south was once a blooming valley. Our own Agricultural Department's soil expert, Dr. Lowdermilk, reported only last year that the land of Palestine is potentially one of the most fertile in the world. He compared its possibilities to those of our great State of California. He reminded us that once there were orchards of figs and dates in this ancient land. Palestine in the time of the Roman Empire supported a population of at least two millions without modern agricultural methods, without industrialization, without the enthusiasm and self-sacrificing devotion of a people dedicated to the rebuilding of their ancient soil.

In 1930, the British Government issued another white paper. That document declared that Palestine could not support a single additional Jew. It was repudiated by the British Government. More than three hundred thousand Jews have gone to live in their ancient homeland since that date. There is clearly room for hundreds of thousands more. For these are no ordinary people. They go to Palestine, to give of themselves fully and wholeheartedly, to build, to hope, and to dream.

If the land can support them, why all the obstacles? The Arabs are in opposition, we are told. Yet every inch of Palestinian soil which is occupied by Jewish families today was sold to them by Arab land owners. What Arabs are opposing Jewish colonization? Are the Arabs whose children have been saved by the clinics and hospitals of Hadassah opposing it? Are the Arab peasants who have been able to earn a living for the first time in their lives in Palestine opposing it? The Arabic population of Palestine has increased two and a half times since the appearance of Jewish colonists.

There is no such record of increase in any other Arabic country. We know which of the Arabs oppose a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. They are the political Arabs who see their ability to exploit Arabic workers vanishing before their eyes. They are the members of the Arab League, an instrument created by the British to stimulate a Pan-Arabic nationalism, which would maintain British supremacy in the Mediterranean world.

What justification then is there for the Arab fears of domination by a Jewish commonwealth? There is no intention on the part of the Jewish leadership in Palestine to injure in any way the Arabic population. There is every evidence that the blessings of better health, better living, better education for the Arabs are available in Palestine above every other country in the Middle East.

There are Arab states in Egypt, in Saudi-Arabia, in Iraq, in Iran, in Syria, with tremendous lands available for colonization and development.

What possible reason is there for our hesitancy in saying to the Arab world, "This is a matter of humanity which must transcend every other consideration. It is more important than oil; it is more important than imperialism; it

is more important than any other single consideration." A chain of circumstances has been forged which makes it possible to repatriate the Jewish people in our generation without injury to any other group.

If we fail in this, the blood of the Jewish millions who died in Europe will cry from the soil. We shall have made a mockery of all the fine phrases, of all the protests of humanity and friendship which we have uttered so freely in these years.

This is the time for action in Palestine. The day of talk is over. The nations of the earth, including our own, have endorsed the Balfour Declaration of 1917. They have fixed the mandatory authority of Palestine. They have encouraged, directly and indirectly, the expenditure of millions of dollars in Palestine, the immigration of hundreds of thousands of Jewish men, women, and children.

In our own self interest, for the sake of our own self-respect, our Government must recognize that a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would be a lighthouse in the Middle East. It would be an example of the devotion of our country and of the world to the principles of justice and righteousness which were first proclaimed to the world by the prophets of this people whom we have deserted in their hour of need. Let us not fail this time. The day of appeasement is over. The Arabs have not fought and died for the cause of human freedom in this war. They have no claim on our generosity or our good will. The martyrs of Israel have both.

We are the descendants of pioneers who came to this country seeking a refuge from religious persecution. We cannot say to those who seek the same salvation today that America has forgotten. I urge every American to join with me in this effort to restore an ancient people to its homeland. They will preserve the holy places sacred to all of the great religious faiths which have sprung from that soil. They will make the land of Palestine bloom once more as a land flowing with milk and honey. In this crucial moment of Jewish history, let us not do what Hitler did. Let us raise our hands to lift these helpless men and women from the abyss to which our indifference and blindness have condemned them. History sits as our judge, and posterity as our witness. We must not fail those who cry to us for help.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished majority leader has so well said, the Jewish-Palestinian problem is not peculiar to the Jewish people, but is the problem of all humanity. It is the problem of all people whether they be Christians, pagans, Moslems, atheists, or agnostics. For thousands of years the Jewish people have been persecuted. The treatment that they have received at the hands of Hitler is nothing new. For centuries and centuries they have been driven from land to land, from country to country, and across the multitudinous seas that cover the earth. They have seen their families torn asunder. They have seen their aged and

infirm killed. They have been deprived of education, deprived of the right of making a living, deprived of the right of freedom of movement, but above all deprived of the right of freedom of worship. Yet they have toiled on, wishing, hoping, and dreaming that some day they would have a country or a land that they might call their own.

Wherever they went in their forced travels they established and kept alive the laws of the Old Testament, preaching love of God, respect of mankind, love of liberty, and above all the love of the rights of man as an individual. Whenever they stopped they created institutions for the benefit of their fellow men without regard to their color or creed. Not only in the last century but through the ages, they have built institutions for the aged, the blind, the poor, and for all those less fortunate. In the dark days of Europe when civilization seemed to be tottering they did as much as any other people, through their love of the arts and the development of sciences and their determination to keep religion alive, to save civilization.

Coming as I do from a people who for over 800 years were persecuted by the English and who, too, were denied education as well as the right to worship God in the manner that their own consciences dictated, I can feel the plight and sufferings of these unfortunate people.

Sir Walter Scott very well expressed it when he said:

Breathes there the man  
With soul so dead,  
Who never to himself hath said,  
This is my own, my native land!

It is the natural instinct of all people to have a home. A home that is more than an asylum—a home that is a guaranty for freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of worship. A home where man is taught to respect not only himself but his fellow humans. A home where the dignity of man is paramount.

As I said before, having Irish blood in my veins, I well know the chicanery, instability, and fluctuating course of the English Government's foreign policy. A policy where human rights and human liberties are always superseded by the needs, desires, and greed of the Empire. A policy where the commercial aspect of any question is always placed above the human equation. A policy that needlessly sacrifices human lives and looks without pity upon human suffering if commercial gain is to be attained.

The Jewish people through natural and moral reasoning are entitled to a homeland. They are entitled to a larger domain than they already possess in Palestine and they are entitled to determine for themselves the number of migrants who may come to their country. Palestine should not be a vassal state, not having the right to determine its own future without interference from outside powers. It must be given the dignity of an independent nation and the protection that is afforded today to all smaller nations from aggression from stronger powers be they England or any other nation.

It is my sincere hope that our Government may be an instrumentality to the guaranteeing of perpetual freedom to the Jewish people in their desire to establish Palestine as a free and independent nation. It is my hope that this question may be settled in the near future so that the flag bearing the star of David may take its place alongside of the other distinguished banners that recognize freedom and that guarantee its perpetuation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

#### CONCERN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, why so much concern about Palestine? It is smaller than Maryland and has 200,000 fewer people. The Sinai Peninsula is desert, soil in other areas is wasted, it is a land of friction and bloodshed, and it lies far away. But wait!

#### GOOD LAND

It is 4,000 years since Moses looked upon it from a little mountain beyond the Jordan and heard it said that it was a good land, with brooks and fountains, a land of wheat, barley, vines, figs, pomegranates, olive oil, and honey where there would be bread without scarceness and nothing would be lacking.

#### DISPERSION

Much happened to its people since then. They wandered to Egypt for food and were placed in bondage. They were exiled when Babylon conquered that area of the earth. They were driven out by the Romans. They were tyrannized by the Ottoman Turks and delivered in 1917 by the British. They came under a League of Nations mandate. For 25 years and as late as 1939, there were riots and disturbances which wrecked buildings and bridges, border stations and communications and left death in their wake. In that time, seven British commissions investigated and reported. Ten other commissions reported on other matters in that time. Eight white papers were issued dealing with Palestine policy.

#### THE LAND

Much has happened to the land. It was a good land in the days of Abraham. It was gradually eroded and wasted. The forests were destroyed and the rich red topsoil for centuries discolored the blue Mediterranean as it washed away. Once it was prosperous, self-supporting and healthful. It dwindled to poverty and dependence where the fellahin eked out a miserable existence and malaria took a heavy toll.

#### DREAM HAS NOT DIED

But in all the centuries, one thing never eroded or died. It was the dream of Zion and the zeal to make fruitful the very land for which Abraham paid. That deathless hope was revitalized in 1917 when Lord Balfour gave assurances that Britain looked with favor on a homeland for Jews and would facilitate the attainment of that objective. In this very Chamber in 1932, the Congress in a resolution expressed its favor for a national home for Jewish people. That hope was incorporated in the League of Nations mandate. In January of 1944 a

similar resolution was considered by committees of the House and Senate but for military reasons, its consideration was postponed. In June of 1944, both major political parties expressed themselves in support of a free Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. In November 1944, the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House reported a similar resolution but for political reasons action was deferred. And there it stands.

#### DISPERSION STILL OBTAINS

After 4,000 years, the great dispersion still obtains. But the dream has not diminished; the vision of a homeland has not perished; the hope has not abated. These have withstood conquest, friction, and persecution. But this is a time for action. The efforts to find a solution for the Jewish-Arab-British problem in Palestine have failed. The longer it remains unsolved, the more complicated it will become.

#### FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM

Now comes a more fundamental aspect of the problem. Millions have died in a war in which freedom was the issue. How strange now that of all nations, Palestine is the only land where Jews may not enter except in limited numbers and under a quota that now expires; the only country other than Germany where explicit anti-Jewish laws exist; the only land where the Bible is still censored when quoted in the Hebrew press; where strict censorship prevails and where thousands of uniformed and nonuniformed police patrol the whole land. Shall this remain the bitter fruit of sacrifice and a frustrated idealism.

#### HISTORICAL PROBLEM

The historical controversy between Jew and Arab over who has prior rights in Palestine is an endless fabric studded with argument and counterargument and furnishes no clue for a solution. The political problem, with its many implications involving the whole Moslem world, the existence of oil, trade balances, import controls, exchange barriers, and other factors, is equally devoid of hope for a solution.

#### PROMISES OF MEN AND STEWARDSHIP OF LANDS

We must turn back to the solemn promises of men in authority and to the stewardship of the land where people dwell for the answer. A solution must spring from common sense and from the basic right of a people to dwell peacefully in a land with which they have historic, religious, and spiritual ties. It must come from the right of a dispersed minority to dwell in a land to which it does have some valid claim, free from censorship and persecution, free from indefensible restrictions on immigration and land purchase, free from espionage and threat, where an ageless hope can find fruition and where a proven zeal for the land will enable it to enrich and bless all who live therein and definitely elevate the living standards, the health, and the well-being of all who live there.

#### PROOF OF IMPROVEMENT

Where is the proof that this can be done? One need but journey from Dan to Beersheba, from Gaza to Tyre, from

Jericho to Tiberias to see the living proof. Rural electrification is there. It is a monument to Pinchas Rutenberg, who made that his life's work. Industry is there as a testimony to Baron Rothschild, to Dr. Weitzman, to Novomeysky, and others. Hundreds of millions of private funds have been invested to prove that a homeland can be established.

#### LAND IS THE PERSUASIVE EXHIBIT

But the land is the most persuasive exhibit. It can be made the land that Moses saw, a good land where there shall be bread without scarceness. There are hundreds of rural cooperatives and collectives. The annual export production of delectable oranges, grapefruit, and lemons has reached 15,000,000 boxes. Improved strains of cattle, sheep, and fowls have been developed to increase enormously the production of milk, cheese, wool, and eggs. Broad acreages of wheat, barley, and rye in the plain of Sharon and the valley of Esdraelon with improved yields attest the devotion to the land. In the steamy Jordan Valley, one sees evidence of what zeal, courage, and irrigation can do to dispel malaria and make the precious soil produce an abundance. There has been a relentless search for new methods, new techniques, new processes, and all of these have served not only to make the land more fruitful but to benefit the Arab farmers as well.

#### ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY

What does it all mean in terms of a homeland? Simply this. Even as Palestine once supported a million more persons than the 1,600,000 who now dwell there, so it can do so again. Forty years ago, there were but half a million people there. Today there are more than three times that number. The Jewish people occupy but 6 percent of the whole area of Palestine and but 14 percent of the cultivated lands. The devotion and zeal of the people to the land determines what can be done and how many more may be absorbed. It can take hundreds of thousands of people who today seek safe haven, refuge, and peace. By the test of accomplishment, by the standard of contribution to human welfare, by the measure of historic attachment, by the yardstick of freedom, and by the dictates of common sense, why should not this land be reopened to unrestricted immigration and colonization that it may again become a good land where there shall be bread without scarceness and no lack of anything.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the active military phases of the peoples' war against fascism have been brought to a victorious conclusion. In that war, 6,000,000 Jews, one-third that people's total number in the world, were gassed, poisoned, burned, had air bubbles injected in their blood streams, were starved, shot, suffocated, had their heads smashed in with clubs, were boiled down for fat, or murdered in some other slow and ingenious way by the Fascist gangsters who all but conquered the world.



Hitler's armies have been defeated; Hitler himself is reported dead. Yet Hitler's voice is strong in America: Hitler's chief weapons for conquering democracy from within—red-baiting and Jew-baiting—have their echoes even in the Halls of Congress, and Hitler's chief means of dividing the nations—a cunningly inspired hostility toward the Soviet Union—is once again urged, this time by native Americans, as "justification" for rebuilding German industry.

#### NO DEMOCRACY

The plain truth is that there is no democracy unless it is democracy for all, for the Jew and the gentile, for the Catholic and the Protestant and the non-believer, for the black and the white, and for the various political shadings, the reds, the whites, and the blues.

The plain truth is that there will be no freedom from imperialism or from the wars which imperialism breeds as long as we permit the Dutch and the British to use Japanese troops against natives rising for an end to all colonial rule. There will be no free, new world as long as the British divide Moslem and Hindu and use that manufactured division as a pretext for withholding freedom from India. There will be no united and democratic China as long as America keeps gunboats and planes and marines there to reinforce the Chinese faction which has held not a single election nor tolerated a single basic land or tax reform in all the territories under its military rule.

There will be no end, either, to imperialism while powerful groups within the United States and Britain for the sake of oil concessions and commanding positions on trade routes, are permitted to play Arab against Jew and Jew against Arab in Palestine, making contradictory sets of promises to each and keeping neither.

#### BRITISH CONTROL ARAB LEAGUE

The plain truth is that the British created the Arab league and control it. The Arab kings and pashas are willing to give Britain concessions in oil and communications as long as their dictatorial rule over the Arab people is maintained.

It seems to make no difference, either, to some of these hireling princes who pays them. The Arab Brigade, which fought American and British soldiers in Africa, was furnished by Arab chieftains, reportedly paid by the Nazis. And at the San Francisco Conference, it was freely said that these same gentry were living at hotels and riding in limousines paid for by Standard Oil.

There is no inevitable antagonism between the Arab and Jewish peoples. Anti-Semitism in the mouth of an Arab is the plainest evidence of divisive propaganda, for both peoples are of Semitic origin. Both trace a portion of their religious tradition to Palestine. Each can profit from free association with the other. And both have the same reason for demanding of Britain that her mandate over Palestine be brought to an end, that a congress be convened to frame a democratic constitution which will ensure free elections and representation and cultural autonomy for all.

Either we believe in democracy or we do not. Either we encourage its practice, or we surrender the field to its enemies. If the great American melting pot has proved anything, it has proved that there is room in a democratic Palestine for both Arab and Jew.

#### ARABS HELPLESS ALONE

We need not fear that the Arab people themselves will resort to large-scale armed violence. Their hot heads can freely expand into 1,000,000 miles of sparsely settled territories indisputably their own. And it is precisely to prevent the settlement of political questions by force that the United Nations organization has so hopefully and after such suffering been born into the world.

We certainly need not fear any lack of devotion to democracy by the Jews in Palestine, for the citizens of the Jewish National Homeland were democracy's only arsenal in the dark days when the Nazis had all but overrun northern Africa. When General Montgomery and his hard-pressed Eighth Army had been driven almost to the waters of the Suez, 30,000 hardened Jewish combat troops, volunteers, carried their full share of the fighting in that heroic army.

When the German and Italian Fascists controlled the whole Mediterranean, 600,000 Jews in Palestine manufactured munitions, optical instruments, precision instruments, chemicals, sending badly needed supplies to the British armies and their young women as nurses and hospital workers and into the fields as laborers to insure care and food for wounded and hungry soldiers.

#### JUSTICE FOR 6,000,000

Is there any way to do justice now to 6,000,000 Jews murdered, scientifically and calculatingly murdered, as a necessary part of the plan of the Nazi "master race" for German control of the peoples and markets of the earth?

Is there any way now to take the mark of the lash from the backs, and the anguish from the hearts, of 12,000,000 Jews alive in other lands?

We cannot help the dead, but we can extend simple tolerance at home and equal opportunity in the things that count to all our fellow men.

We can also hold out a helping hand to all those Jews who wish to build their own monument to human freedom in a Jewish national homeland in Palestine.

The American people, through countless prominent citizens, public figures, and newspaper editorials, have shown their desire for the abrogation of the British white paper.

#### BRITISH SHOULD ACT

The British people, for centuries the guardians of liberty, have every reason in justice and in humanity to urge their Government to abrogate a decision made when Chamberlain was still appeasing Hitler.

The multi-national peoples of the Soviet Union, having passed from the bitter anti-Jewish pogroms of the Czars to the elimination of all discrimination, are known to be friendly toward Jewish aspirations to develop their life and culture freely in a homeland of their own.

Here is one issue, therefore, in which the Big Three should have no differences. An early solution backed by America, Russia, and Britain and bringing democratic government, cultural autonomy, and suitable and equal economic opportunity to Jew and Arab alike in Palestine, would be the means of satisfying the legitimate dreams of two peoples and stabilizing an important area of the world. It would deal a strong blow at those evil forces still hoping to divide and rule, and it would establish a sound pattern for handling other actual or potential trouble zones.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to raise my voice in behalf of the oppressed and starving people of the Jewish race in Europe. Since the rise of the Nazi Party in Germany, the world has witnessed one of its great tragedies in the deliberate slaughter of this oppressed people. The pictures that we have seen of the infamous German concentration camps have been the most revolting spectacles that people of this generation have ever witnessed. That these pictures are authentic has been attested to over and over again by newspaper publishers, by the members of our armed forces, and by Members of this Congress who have visited these horror camps.

The remainder of the Jewish peoples of Germany and of the German satellite nations are now wandering outcasts in the lands of their birth, homeless, and without any place to go unless the land of their fathers is opened to them. Palestine, the ancestral home of the Jews, it seems to me, is the natural and the logical place for these displaced Jews of Europe to find at last a home and some measure of peace.

Under the former policy of Great Britain, who was entrusted with the mandate over Palestine by the League of Nations, many Jews migrated to Palestine in the period between the two great World Wars, and by their thrift and industry they transformed a barren and inhospitable land into a land of irrigated and watered fields in that portion where they settled and the squalid village which they found into the modern, sanitary, and beautiful city of Tel Aviv. Now Britain has changed her policy and apparently, unless an aroused world opinion changes it again, the Jews are to be excluded from Palestine. Where in the world shall they go? They cannot remain among the hostile populations once dominated by Nazi Germany and no land is open to them. Certainly the only possible place for these miserable and persecuted people is the land of their fathers, and those who are in authority in this country should raise their voices in behalf of these people and their yearning desire to return to the land of Abraham—to the Palestine homeland.

I need but mention the fact that this solution to the Jewish problem settles apparently forever many problems arising through the presence of the dispersed Jewish peoples throughout the world. It is said by some that Palestine will not support the increased population that

would enter there if the prohibition of immigration to the Jews were abolished, but the answer to this, I think, if the remarkable transformation of that land under the industry and intelligent planning of the Jews who have gone there in the last 20 or 25 years. They have shown that it is entirely possible by the application of modern methods of irrigation and industry for Palestine to support a population several times larger than that now there. It is, therefore, entirely possible for Palestine to be open to the Jews and at the same time for the Arab population that is now there to remain, and certainly the Jews, with their thrift and industry and their introduction of modern methods of sanitation, building construction, irrigation, and agriculture can, and will, if given an opportunity, raise the entire standard of living for all the people of Palestine—Arab and Jew alike. The Arabs should welcome them, and in espousing the cause of Jewish immigration to Palestine, we can be sure that we are helping to solve not only the problem of the Jews but also the problems of the Arabs who live in Palestine. I sincerely trust that those who are entitled to speak for the people of the United States shall make it clear that we in America, Jew and Gentile alike, support the legitimate claim of the Jews for a national home in their ancestral homeland.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. Woodhouse].

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is very logical that the House of Representatives is discussing the tragic plight of the Jews in Europe and the possibility that Palestine offers to relieve their situation. The United States has always stood for a policy of equal opportunity. We have opened our doors to the peoples of the world. We now have in this country people of practically every race and religion living together in peace and prosperity. We are only asking other nations to do in a small way what we have done ourselves in a much broader way.

The best estimate indicates that more than 5,000,000 Jews lost their lives in Europe under the Hitler terror. How many of these people could have been saved had the doors of Palestine been opened to them, as was promised in the Balfour Declaration, is, of course, problematical. There is every reason to believe, however, that many hundreds of thousands of homeless, hunted, and unwanted Jews in Hitler Germany and its satellite countries could have found their way into Palestine and been saved had it not been for the illegal restrictions of the Chamberlain white paper. This was another example of a "Munich appeasement," an appeasement with no moral foundation and with tragic consequences.

During the war efforts were made to repeal the white paper and to make it possible for some of the victims of Hitler to escape with their lives into Palestine. But it was claimed by the British Government that admission of Jewish refugees into Palestine during the war years would retard the war effort and endanger our Allied position in the Middle East.

We bowed to this decision. But again, after the British and Americans had cleared the Middle East and north Africa of the Nazi forces, the road to Palestine remained blocked.

The promises made to the Jews by the Balfour Declaration are promises made to all decent people of the earth. They are promises which have been broken. The British people have always held to their contracts. They were not truly represented by Chamberlain. Today we are facing the shaping of a new world—a world in which there must be justice, tolerance, and good faith if any of us are to live in peace and prosperity. There is still a possibility of saving the lives of some of the unfortunate Jews whom Hitler failed to eradicate. Neither we nor the British people will forget that it was a Jewish woman scientist, a refugee, who gave us a vital link in the research which led to the perfection of the atomic bomb.

The war is over. There are, of course, still problems in the Middle East. But they can be solved. The presence of the Jews in Palestine has been an asset in the development of that country. They have been anything but a drain on its economy.

The President of the United States, with his usual direct forthrightness, has requested that immigration certificates for 100,000 refugees be issued immediately in order that the Jewish people still in the concentration camps of Germany, with no homes to which they can return, may go to Palestine and there live as decent hardworking men and women. We have a right to ask this of the British Government. There still exists a treaty of 1924, between the United States and Great Britain, wherein Great Britain agrees to make no change in immigration regulations pertaining to Palestine without the prior consent of the United States. This treaty still exists. But the United States was not consulted prior to the promulgation of the immigration restriction law.

But let us not be content merely with blaming Great Britain. Has our Government done everything it could in order to carry out the pledges made to the Jews? Support has been pledged to them by both political parties and by a majority of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. And yet I understand that the Department of State answers inquiries to the effect that it has received no instructions from the White House as to what the policy of this country is in regard to Palestine.

People who came back from the Middle East report that there is no realization among either the Arabs or the British of how overwhelmingly this country supports the case for entrance of the Jews into Palestine and how deeply it would value foreign concurrence with this policy. The State Department and American representatives abroad should be instructed that the policy as laid down in public statements is in truth the policy favored by the people of the United States and the policy which every member of our foreign service is committed to further.

The President has taken the first step. We in the Congress well know the feel-

ing of the people of America. I am very certain that the people of my district are in favor of opening Palestine to the Jewish refugees in Europe. We should make this feeling of the American people vocal. We should ask that our Government officials charged with administering our foreign affairs be instructed as to this feeling.

There was pending before the last Congress a resolution which declared that the United States shall use its good offices to the end that the gates of Palestine should be opened for free entry of Jews and that Palestine might ultimately become a free and democratic commonwealth with Jew and Arab living together in peace. I understand that the Congress was about to pass this resolution but that for war reasons requests were made that it not do so.

The fighting phase of the war is now over. We are facing the great and difficult task of building a world based on peace. But can we have peace if we do not have justice? We cannot. The time has come when we in the Congress without further delay should pass such a resolution and put ourselves squarely and officially behind this great project of doing justice to a stricken people, of saving thousands of human lives by opening the gates of Palestine to the Jews.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, these are sad days in history. When nations do not carry out their solemn obligations, hope for permanent peace cannot be strong. Great Britain solemnly pronounced the famous Balfour Declaration, and in 1939, even though this Nation and most other nations of the world had already agreed to the Balfour Declaration, Great Britain by its own act had decided to abrogate and nullify the Balfour Declaration.

How much better it would be if today we could rise and say that Great Britain, a democratic nation, had kept its solemnly pledged word? How can we speak of the sanctity of treaties when nations, for the sake of expediency, repudiate their solemnly pledged word?

A promise was made by Great Britain to open the gates of immigration into the Holy Land so that Jews could establish there a national homeland. Had that promise been kept, then thousands upon thousands of Jews whose bones litter the fields of Europe, and thousands upon thousands more whose ashes have been scattered to the four winds, might be living today in peace in Palestine.

No nation can escape its share of the dreadful responsibility for what has happened in Europe. Millions upon millions of Jews were killed, many after horrible tortures, for no reason whatever except their religious belief. It was impossible for us even to believe or imagine that such dreadful acts could be perpetrated on such a large scale by maniacs led by a diseased mind. Today, we plead for the lives of a hundred thousand Jews—who are no more than living skeletons—whom we have liberated in Europe. They can find no peace in the places they once called home. Germany, the Balkan



countries, central Europe are not places of refuge for them. They look to Palestine, and what do they find?

In the face of this tragedy Great Britain dares to shut the gates to their immigration, in spite of its solemn promise.

The Arabs were liberated from Turkish rule by the Allies after World War I. Five Arab states have been set up. Their area comprises over a million square miles—an enormous underpopulated area. And Palestine constitutes not even 1 percent of this total space.

In 99 percent of Arab territory they enjoy national sovereignty. Less than 1 percent has been reserved for the Jewish people in the land of their fathers.

The Arabs who live in Palestine have prospered and multiplied. They are far better off there than even in the states where the Arabs are ruled by their own leaders. They have learned to live side by side with the Jews in Palestine.

Once there were millions of Jews living in Europe; today only a few hundred thousand, perhaps not even that many. None of these is well. What an indictment of the whole world that this could happen in our generation, and how much more horrible it is to contemplate keeping these men, women and children in Europe when they want to go to Palestine, the only place that will receive them, so that they can live decent lives.

It seems incredible that Great Britain should delay granting the hundred thousand immigration certificates that President Truman has asked them to grant. Who is it that seeks to keep them out of Palestine? Is it our allies who fought side by side with us, whose blood was spilled with ours on the battlefields of Africa and Europe in our battle against the Fascist world? On the contrary it is the people whom we freed in 1918, who either cooperated in the recent past with Hitler or who stood by passively even when Rommel stood at the gates of Alexandria.

Winston Churchill denounced the infamous white paper, the repudiation of the Balfour Declaration. On May 23, 1939, his voice rang out, crying:

What will the world think about it? What will our friends say? What will be the opinion of the United States of America? What will our potential enemies think? What will those who have been stirring up these Arab agitators think? Will they not be encouraged by our confession of recoil? Will they not be tempted to say "they are on the run again, this is another Munich"; and be the more stimulated in their aggression?

The Labor Party under Prime Minister Attlee has been just as strong in its denunciation of the white paper. The Republican Party and the Democratic Party in their national platforms have spoken out in favor of Palestine and the establishment there of a national homeland.

What is it that keeps nations from carrying out their solemn obligations? Can it be said that Great Britain is today fearful of the effect on Arab states which are dependent upon the democratic nations for their economic upbuilding? Are the nations that were able to destroy the greatest armed forces in the world afraid now to speak up for what is right?

Great Britain must not refuse to grant this request of our President for immigration certificates for these dying Jews of Europe. The blot on British conscience would be so dark that not even a thousand years would serve to lighten it.

We in the United States owe a duty. We in Congress must pointedly and frankly tell Great Britain we expect that nation to keep its solemn pledged word. We are determined that our voices shall be heard—even in London.

BALTIMORE, Md., October 11, 1945.  
HON. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I know that you receive a tremendous amount of mail, and ordinarily I would not burden you with this note. However, I cannot let the opportunity go by without thanking you and your colleagues for the very sympathetic hearing you extended me and our committee when we called on you last Thursday.

Your promise of unequivocal help is tremendously encouraging, and I am sure will help us to carry on in our difficult task of providing a permanent home for those Jews who have no place in the war-torn countries of Europe.

Respectfully yours,

ISAAC POTTS.

SENATE OF MARYLAND,  
Annapolis, Md., October 12, 1945.  
HON. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOMMY: Your handling of the meeting of the Zionist and Jewish organizational groups was splendid.

Everyone spoke highly in praise of your manner and attitude.

Cordially,

E. MILTON ALTFELD.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, both the United States and Britain are pledged to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. These pledges ought, in justice and good conscience, to be fulfilled without further delay.

Since the Balfour Declaration and American congressional endorsement of the policy enunciated therein 23 years ago, very little progress has been made toward keeping faith. The treatment of Jewish minorities continues to constitute a dark blot on the face of civilization.

Let us grant that Palestine is a problem for the British on account of the Arabs, but it certainly is not insurmountable. The Arabs can hardly have any justifiable complaint if asked to give over to the Jews what amounts to less than 1 percent of Arab lands in Asia alone. Without counting their large possessions in north Africa, the Arabian possessions in Asia are almost a million and a quarter square miles of territory. The Jews, on the other hand, have no territory at all which, as a people, they can call home.

Four million Jews have been murdered in the short span of 3 years. Mass annihilation by violent death, the gas chamber, and unspeakable forms of torture constitutes one of the darkest pages in all the volumes of human history.

Out of all the misery, persecution, and suffering of the past comes the augmented cry for justice to the Jews. The cry

has now swollen to such proportions that it cannot longer be disregarded. As we search for a proper pattern for lasting peace this cry dings in our ears.

American Palestine policy is definitely woven into the very fabric of world peace. Unfortunately anti-Semitism still exists.

The frictions resulting from the last world war, unless alleviated, may well be a contributing factor in the making of another world war.

It is the duty of Britain to repudiate the white paper of 1937 and make good on the promises of the Balfour Declaration. It is the duty of the United States to press vigorously to that end and help bring about the establishment of a Jewish homeland in a free Palestine.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

THE JEWS ASK FOR JUSTICE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we have poured out our blood and our treasure to beat back the fury and the hate which almost conquered us. The battlefields are quiet. Our men are coming home. With a sigh of relief we turn our backs on the war which has been won.

Or has it?

The terrible sights and sounds are gone. The dead are buried. The screams of the wounded and the tortured no longer ring in our ears. We think the war is over.

Even the hideous murder factories at Belchen are quiet. The fires which furnished human beings are out. Instead of preparing the victims for death we have established displaced persons camps on these horror sites, preparing them for what?

We are trying the Nazis for their crimes against humanity, but what solution do we offer to the victims who wait? What victims? The Jews, who were the first and the most appalling sacrifice exacted by the Fascist terror. Over 1,000,000 of these victims wait, suffer, and starve while we, the victors, dally with diplomacy.

These victims are not wanted even in the countries we helped to liberate. They must move on, to somewhere. That refuge is their ancient homeland—Palestine. By every historical, cultural, and religious claim it belongs to them. But the door of escape remains closed. And we are helping to keep it closed, in spite of our conscience, in spite of the moral leadership which we owe to the world. On the one hand, we sympathize with the Jews; on the other hand, we keep an active interest in the private oil lines which runs through Arab countries adjoining Palestine.

We are compromising ourselves by this shameful hypocrisy.

Britain temporarily controls Palestine under a mandate from the old League of Nations. She holds it in trust, as a guardian. But for whom? Arabs or Jews? The Arabs have several independent countries, the Jews none. They have no place else to turn to. I submit that we cannot stand aside and let these unfortunate people suffer and die. After all these years of common effort against a common foe, we have the right to ex-

pect that our ally, Britain, will work with us to achieve a solution to this problem, and not an evasion. For the problem is not alone one of empire security, it has been an age-old problem that now becomes a world problem, the first test of our purposes as we face the task of making a fair and durable peace.

The Balfour pledge of 1917 said that His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment of a home for the Jews in Palestine. Later, the British white paper qualified this to provide for the stabilization of Palestine's population in the proportion of one-third Jews and two-thirds Arabs. Where, then, is the meaning in this promise of a home if the doors are closed to the majority who are seeking sanctuary?

In principle, we, the United States, have endorsed the claims of the Jews. Every President has supported them. Our own Democratic and Republican Parties have committed themselves to this. President Truman has asked the British to admit 100,000 of the homeless. The British have agreed to admit 1,500 a month, a token compromise that falls far short of justice and mercy.

Our intentions have been good. Our performances have been empty. If this be a measure of our approach to the solution of great problems, it is high time that we overhaul our diplomatic machinery. We cannot afford to fail on our promises. Our integrity stands challenged, and must be redeemed.

The rise to power of a Labor Government in Britain gives us hope that a solution to this problem may be nearer than we think. The Tories, holding fast to a policy of "no change," have been replaced by a government that more truly reflects the experience and the conscience of the people. And the common people of Britain know, as we know, that some limitation of national sovereignty, some abdication from yesterday's wrongs, is necessary to gain the true peace which all of us need.

At the peace conference, when it comes, the nations which brought death and suffering to millions, will be represented. The criminals will have a voice. But the victims? The bones of 4,000,000 Jewish civilians, starved, beaten, and murdered in their homes and their synagogues, these bones will have no voice except in our uneasy conscience.

Remembering our Christian martyrs of old, we cannot forget the Jewish martyrs of our time. They stood and died in the name of our common human dignity.

The prayers they offered to God even as they were being butchered, ring in humanity's ears.

That is the voice of the Jew calling upon us for atonement to make sanctuary for the pitiful few who survived.

This is our responsibility.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut spoke of a resolution and the desirability of action by the Congress by resolution. The gentleman from Illinois who preceded me spoke of promises. I want to speak for a moment about resolutions and then

for a moment about promises; some of them broken.

This matter has been before the Congress for quite some time. Resolutions upon which the Congress could act have been introduced. On October 15, 1944, the then Democratic candidate for President, Mr. Roosevelt, addressed a letter to Senator WAGNER of New York in which he used these words:

I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization.

I have been reading from a supplemental report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. That report also refers to a promise made by the Republican candidate for President, Mr. Thomas E. Dewey. Incidentally, the report also contains a letter under date of October 10 from Secretary of War Stimson to Senator TART withdrawing his opposition to the resolution.

What happened? Acting upon that evidence the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House reported a resolution on November 30, 1944, declaring the Congress favoring the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine. That resolution in due course came before the Committee on Rules, of which I am a member, for consideration and determination as to whether or not it should be sent to the floor for consideration. That was in early December of 1944.

I went to the Committee on Rules ready to vote for that resolution. I am convinced that the majority of the members of the Rules Committee felt the same way about it. Action was had in executive session and, of course, I am not permitted to divulge the details of what happened. But I think I can properly say this, to my utter amazement it developed that the Roosevelt administration did not want the resolution passed and it never was reported out of the Committee on Rules. I am right well convinced, in fact I know, that that opposition is the reason it was not so reported out.

Now I ask: If promises are made, what sort of responsibilities do they create? Are we to be marched up the hill and down again?

I say to the gentlewoman from Connecticut that there was before the Committee on Rules exactly the sort of a resolution to which she refers. I agree with her, if I understood her correctly, that a resolution is the formal, effective way by which the Congress may act.

What happened between October 15, 1944, and December 1944 except an election? Nothing, so far as anyone knows.

I rise not in a spirit of political controversy. I have referred to the statement of my candidate for President, who was not elected. I have referred to the things that happened and transpired only because they constitute what seem to me to be clear indications of promises, commitments, and responsibilities.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of June of this year, I had the opportunity of visiting the Holy Land. I was amazed at the progress and development in the modern city of Tel Aviv and the surrounding area. Here in the midst of a poor, backward country, still using the primitive methods of agriculture and transportation of 20 centuries ago, was a modern city and an agricultural area using the methods of today.

The refugee Jews from Europe's ghettos with the aid of financial support from Jewry throughout the world had made this possible. In bringing this development to Palestine, they raised the standard of living of both the original Jewish inhabitants and the native Arabs.

Further increased immigration of refugee, homeless, and stateless Jews will be of further benefit to the Arabs.

The propagandists at this point always raise the bugaboo of conflict between Jew and Arab. I talked with several leaders while there, as well as members of American organizations and it was their opinion that no real foundation existed for this charge. It is true that there are fanatics among the Arabs and trouble-makers among the reactionary original Jewish inhabitants.

There is good reason to believe that these elements have been encouraged and financed by certain British interests, who have consistently refused to comply with the Balfour Declaration or the treaty of Lusanne.

It is time for the Congress of the United States to take a firm stand on this Palestine matter. The compliance by Britain with her pledges and treaties are a matter of world concern.

We ask for humane and simple things in humane and simple language. But above all, they ask for justice—justice for the Hebrew and justice for the Arab.

I would like to add a word of strong approval of the policy of a democratic Jewish Palestine. This seems to be the right policy not only because Palestine was promised to the Jews and because they deserve this reward for all the sufferings they have gone through, but also, if I may be frank, because such a policy seems to me to be most in accord with American interests.

A lot of nonsense is being spoken about the extreme need for this country to prove itself a friend of the Arabs on every question. May I ask why? We certainly should support the Arabs wherever they are in the right, just as we ought to support anyone else who happens to be right. But why are we under any compulsion to embrace the Arab cause, irrespective of whether it is right or wrong?

The Arab peoples are poor and undeveloped. They need money, machinery, and disinterested assistance in raising their cultural and economic standards. We know, and, what is more important, the Arabs know that we are the only great power able and willing to give them such assistance and guidance without plotting to obtain political control over them. This is why the Arab countries



are so anxious to give their oil concessions to us, to invite our teachers and our engineers to help them along on the road to development. To put it shortly, they need us more than we need them. It is preposterous, therefore, to maintain seriously that the attitude of the Arab peoples, whether in Saudi Arabia or in Syria, or in Egypt, or anywhere else, would be seriously affected by our position with regard to Palestine. The Arab peoples invited American cooperation in the first place in their own interests, and not for the sake of Palestine, and they will continue to desire American cooperation above all. However, the future of Palestine is decided by the great powers of the world.

It should be evident to anyone who is not a babe-in-the-woods that the attempts of Arab politicians to threaten us with the loss of Arab friendship in case the United States joins Great Britain in deciding that the pledge to the Jews regarding Palestine be carried out is merely a bluff. We in this House can see through this bluff without difficulty, and I do not see why the experts in the Department of State cannot see through it just as easily.

Even more childish are the threats which we are reading currently in newspapers of the Arabs starting a war against the Jews of Palestine or against the nations which would admit the justice of the Jewish case. I understand that in Palestine proper, despite vicious German and Italian propaganda conducted by that Axis agent who used to occupy the position of a Mufti in Jerusalem, two to three thousand was the largest number of Arabs who ever took any part in the riots against the Jews, and that even of that small number a goodly portion had to be hired by the gang leaders at so much per diem. As for the Arabs outside Palestine, I understand that their armies are ill-trained and ill-equipped; that most of the arms which they possess they got from us on a lend-lease basis—certainly not for the purpose of fighting Jews. And I further understand that a full-fledged attempt to wage war on England which was undertaken by the Arab country of Iraq in the middle of the war was suppressed by the tremendous force of two British battalions. Our Government has participated in some territorial and political decisions in recent months in which the justice of the decision arrived at was much less evident and in which the dangers were far more serious. I do not see why we should permit ourselves to be bluffed out of supporting a solution of the Palestine question which most people in this country consider just and to which our Government and both the Democratic and Republican Parties are pledged.

The Hebrew in Europe, behind the wire of his camp, sees only one future of promise, a free and democratic life in Palestine.

The Arab, in his miserable field, sees himself the victim of the cruellest feudal system left on the face of the earth. He looks forward to the day when he, too, may have fertile fields, prosperity, and good health.

The hopes of these two peoples are not in conflict—they are identical. They

can be described in one word—democracy.

The Hebrew people of Europe should have a chance not only for survival but for decent and dignified existence; and give to the Hebrews and the Arabs in Palestine the opportunity to carve a decent future in harmony and amity.

Oil, imperialism, prejudice are walls of desert sand before the mechanized forces of outraged American public opinion. Our duty is simple. We must answer the call of humanity.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, a great humanitarian principle is involved in the movement to rehabilitate the Jewish race in its historical home, Palestine.

To permit all Jews who so desire to return to their traditional homeland where they can find opportunity for economic self-development, establish their own homes unhampered and pursue happiness in their own way, is a right that should not be withheld.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that those who have been permitted to reestablish themselves in Palestine have laid the ground work of sound economic order that will bring happiness to those who may follow. They have applied modern methods of irrigation to reconvert desert lands into thriving farms.

It is the obligation of civilized nations of the world to remove every restriction and encourage their return to Palestine.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I join those of my colleagues on both the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle in support of the pending resolutions as an expression that the House of Representatives of the Congress favors the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish homeland.

In that respect, I am proud to follow on the road laid out ahead of me by such distinguished American statesmen as the late Woodrow Wilson and the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill when he was a member of His Majesty's opposition, Sir Clement Attlee when he was a member of the Labor Party as a minority and before he became Prime Minister, and such distinguished statesmen in American public life as Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, Gov. Thomas Dewey, of New York, and President Truman, our present President of the United States.

The Labor Party of Great Britain, when offering itself to the people of the British Isles in the recent elections set forth one of the most decisive and plainly worded planks it has ever been my pleasure to see, in which they pledged to the British people and to the Jews throughout the world that they would actually carry out the pledges that have been made since 1917, or in fact, at least since 1924, that Palestine should become the homeland of the wandering and stateless Jews of the world. I quote the exact words:

Here we have halted halfway, irresolute between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish

national home, unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish to, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe.

Here, too, in Palestine is the case on human grounds, and to promote a stable settlement for the transfer of populations, let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organized and generously financed.

The Arab has many wide territories of his own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area—Palestine—less than the size of Wales.

Indeed, we should reexamine also the possibility of extending the present boundaries by agreement with Egypt, Syria, or Trans-Jordan. Moreover, we should seek to win the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments for the execution of this Palestine policy.

We recently fought a war, one of the main reasons for which was to help the persecuted peoples of Europe emerge from the thralldom imposed by the Hitlers and the Mussolinis.

Mr. Speaker, we should exercise every possible influence on the British foreign office in a sedulous endeavor to make it see the light. We should try our utmost through every honorable means to induce our British Allies to keep the promises made to the Jews that Palestine would be their homeland. It was on that basis that 52 nations signed the agreement whereby Great Britain was given the mandate over Palestine. Over 400 Congressmen and Senators have in writing subscribed to this viewpoint. Thirty governors have likewise urged it. We must not let the subject of oil interfere. The Arabs have vast quantities of oil within their borders. The indications are that the welfare of the Jews and promises made are being subordinated to the scheming whereby this Arab oil may be exploited by British and American oil interests.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken here several times in behalf of the establishment of a free Jewish democratic commonwealth. Hardly more than a week ago I urged our Government to take immediate action to resolve this vital question and open the doors of Palestine to the millions of sorely afflicted Jews who are wandering over the face of Europe today seeking a haven and refuge from cruel persecution and destitution.

I am honored once again to join with so many of my distinguished colleagues in urging our President and our State Department to intensify their efforts to solve this vital problem and enable our Jewish brethren not only to enjoy their own homeland, their own free government but what is of greatest immediate concern—escape from a European winter which holds for them nothing but starvation and suffering.

Let us act at once. Let England act at once to keep its pledged word to this great race. Let the pleas of humanity be heard. Let Palestine be opened at once as a Jewish homeland and a Jewish refuge from harm and destitution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank my colleagues for their compassion as well as statesmanlike views on the subject of Palestine.

Britain is asking our largesse. Britain asks us to do justice to her. I say to Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax, her representatives now in Washington, before you seek aid from America, let Britain do justice. It is only just that Britain redeem her pledges with reference to Palestine and help the helpless and stateless Jews get into their homeland of Palestine, as was promised by Great Britain when she received the mandate over Palestine. Tell your Government, Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax, that the American Congress resents the action of Britain in Palestine. Indeed, the perfidy of Britain with reference to Palestine sticks in the eye of the Congress like a cinder.

It is very significant that Herbert Stanley Morrison, in the House of Commons—and Herbert Stanley Morrison is now one of the leaders of the Labor Cabinet—said in connection with opposition to the nefarious white paper, which slams the door of Palestine against the driven Jew:

We regard this white paper and the policy in it as a cynical breach of pledges given to Jews and the world, including America. This policy will do us no good in the United States.

Indeed, this policy of the Labor Government is doing it no good in the United States. Mr. Churchill made similar remarks against this damnable white paper when he was in the opposition benches. He called it the "filing of a petition in moral bankruptcy." Mr. Attlee made similar remarks when he was campaigning for election. Those high promises have gone for naught. They have vanished into thin air. Shall we say, as did the savant, "Alas, a friend in power is a friend lost."

Jews are generally law-abiding, but will not abide injustice.

They do not recognize the white paper of 1939, just as they refused to recognize the Nuremberg laws. They will flout that white paper just as the American colonists set at naught the Stamp Act and the tea tax—just as Gandhi rejected the salt tax. The white paper was a bribe—baksheesh—for the Arab aid in the war. That aid was not forthcoming. Instead, the Arabs in Iraq revolted against Britain, and the Arabs in Saudi Arabia would not even give a donkey.

The Jews will not break the law. They will help downtrodden refugees to enter Palestine. There will be shooting. The responsibility is Britains. Britain will reap a whirlwind.

I doubt whether the enlightened people of the world will stand idly by and see the remnants of a martyred people shot at by British police and soldiers—shot at in cold blood as they approach their

historic homeland. The Jews in Palestine have weighed well the consequences. They are willing to make the necessary sacrifices. They will defend to the death their right of asylum in Palestine—their right to make it a homeland for their distressed and displaced brethren.

There is an old Moslem-Turkish law still in effect in Palestine. Anyone who settles on and works on uncultivated wasteland becomes its owner. We shall settle the European Jew on these desert lands. Let the British or the Arabs try to dislodge them. The Jews will accept the challenge of British imperialism. The Jewish DO-day is near at hand. There is great tension. Decency and justice bid Americans to stand by the brave band of Jewry in Palestine.

We do not want a Laval firing squad to kill the MacDonald white paper of 1939. We want an outright killing of the damnable white paper. Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison must be forced to use a revolver of abrogation and aim and shoot it directly at the head of the nefarious white paper.

Britain is pouring wealth into the Laval to stir up Arab antipathy to the Jew. Unfortunately, America is lending such aid, although indirect. As of June 30, 1945, we had transferred to Saudi Arabia under lend-lease, goods valued at \$9,492,000. These goods consisted of industrial and agricultural commodities. As of the same date we had furnished lend-lease aid amounting to \$4,144 to Iraq. If the United States made its position clear, these Levantine countries would not want to escape out of the orbit of the United States good will. The artificially stimulated antagonism between Jew and Arab would evaporate quickly if these countries were firmly advised that we have dropped the role of appeasers.

A letter I received from one Frank I. Hogan makes very interesting reading. It states:

If you want to know the reason why the Jews in Palestine, with the aid of the modern Herod (Ibn Saud, no doubt a lineal descendant of that scoundrel), who was also an Arab or Edomite, descendants of Esau, the son of one of the patriarchs from Abraham, from whom the Arabs (really Jews, but Moslems) claim descent will not get home rule under British rule, read this from the morning paper and then form your own conclusions:

" \* \* \* Standard Oil Co. of California today announced definitely that \* \* \* company \* \* \* and the Texas Co. (owned by the former Secretary of the Treasury under Hoover—born in northern Ireland) will build a 1,000-mile Arabian pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. The cost, estimated between \$70,000,000 and \$100,000,000, will be borne by the two companies without government aid. (Isn't that just too bad.) \* \* \* Clearance has been assured by the British Government (not the Jews, mind you) and \* \* \* documents are ready for signature. These will provide the green light for crossing the Trans-Jordan (the country mandated to the Arabs by the British and ruled by the eldest son of Ibn Saud Herod. \* \* \* Oil will pour through it from Arabian reserves estimated to total between two and twenty billion barrels \* \* \* controlled jointly by the Standard and Texas Co. King Ibn Saud (Herod) receives 21 cents a barrel and he has granted a concession covering an area as large as

California, Oregon, and Washington combined."

Very truly yours,

FRANK I. HOGAN.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this subject at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to have this opportunity to add a few words in behalf of the cause of providing a refuge and a home for the oppressed Jewish peoples, particularly those unfortunate victims of this war who are suffering so much today on the continent of Europe.

This is not a Jewish problem, one that is to be solved by the Jewish people. It is a problem that lies at the threshold of every Christian community in this Nation. The treatment that has been accorded the Jewish people, particularly in Nazi Europe, is a blight on the picture of a civilized world.

America should use her good offices to assist in the solution of this problem. We should urge that the British Government carry out its promises made long ago to provide a home for the Jewish people.

A year ago the House Committee on Foreign Affairs approved a resolution through which Congress could express its sentiments on behalf of this cause. My colleague [Mr. HALLECK] has told the House how, following the Presidential election, that resolution was held in the Rules Committee and has never been permitted to receive the consideration of the House. I am sure that it would have overwhelming support from this House if it had not been pigeonholed in that committee a little less than a year ago.

Our hope is that we may have the sincere support of our Government in behalf of this cause. We earnestly plead for the establishment of this homeland. Only in that way can we discharge our responsibilities as a Christian nation.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to understand why there should be opposition to the use of Palestine by the Jews of the world. I know of no more logical place for a homeland. For thousands of years that small part of the great continent of Asia has been identified with the Jews; and certainly since biblical times the majority of those living there have been Jews.

Perhaps the economic deficiencies are such that standing alone Palestine can never hope to become as great and powerful a nation as our own. And certainly the territorial limitations are most definite. But there is no good reason why this land should not be made a refuge where the oppressed people from many parts of the world could find a haven and a home.

This Government can well afford to acquaint all the Allied Nations with our feelings in this matter since we cannot possibly be charged with having any designs on that territory. I believe a strong stand by the United States today



will obviate turmoil and suffering in the days to come.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the time allotted this morning for a general discussion of the Palestine question has been limited to 1 hour. I am not justified in demanding the attention of the House merely to repeat what I said on October 11: The Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A4270, clearly records my position.

Indeed, I made my position clear when I sought election to Congress in 1944. I have never hesitated to make it clear since election. The people of my district have no reason to doubt where I stand.

I am proud to be a member of the American Christian Palestine Committee. I shall continue my fight for a Palestine open without restriction to Jewish immigration. I am ashamed of the past quarter century of broken promises.

The time for action is now, and toward that action I shall make every contribution which is within my power.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Government will exert its full influence to find asylum for the Jews in Europe who have become entirely displaced through the wanton cruelty of the Nazis. It is difficult to realize what it must be to feel homeless in every sense of the word, as these people must as they wait in camps for some action to be taken in their behalf. Let us do what we can to open Palestine for their immigration.

Let us lend our full effort to the formation of the United Nations Organization, and press it to speed more permanent solutions for the oppressed and hopeless of the world. There are no new continents to be opened up, but there are still new ways of life to be developed. Let us pray and work for a world in which men may live and move about in friendliness and freedom. These barriers have been made by man, and they must be removed by him.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that Great Britain has no moral right to bar the return of the Jewish people to their homeland. I believe that the President and Great Britain should act to accomplish that purpose without further delay. They can and should act now without further promises and delays. I call attention to the following letter I received from one of my distinguished constituents Rabbi Solomon Jacobson and a fine editorial on this subject appearing in the Waukegan News-Sun with which I agree:

CONGREGATION AM ECHOD,  
Waukegan, Ill., October 11, 1945.

The Honorable RALPH CHURCH,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my deepest appreciation for the courtesy of the appointment with you on Thursday last. It was good of you to grant me the time to discuss Palestine with you.

I do hope that you will find it possible to bring your effective support to any and all measures designed to open the gates of Palestine for the unrestricted immigration of the remnant of the Jewish people now left in Europe, and for the establishment of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine in accordance with Great Britain's

pledge in the Balfour Declaration and in accordance with the platform pledges of both our political parties.

To convey to you the sense of our Waukegan community, Jewish and Christian alike, I am enclosing herewith clippings from our local paper bearing upon the reaction of our community to the situation.

With every appreciation, I am,  
Respectfully,

SOLOMON JACOBSON.

P. S.—I am indeed sorry I was unable to avail myself of your kind luncheon invitation. It would have been a pleasure.

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun of  
October 4, 1945]

#### OPEN PALESTINE

While much of the civilized world is watching for British action toward opening Palestine to the Jewish victims of the Hitlerian viciousness of prewar and wartime periods, the consensus in Waukegan and vicinity is that returning their homeland to the Jewish people is one of the vitally necessary steps toward solution of the postwar problems.

Jewish people have been herded into refugee camps, housed temporarily in German homes, and thousands of them are facing the future with no place to go, no program for living, and little hope for anything but a bare and meager existence. The people have suffered untold horrors at the hands of the Huns. Their families have been scattered, their homes destroyed, their belongings taken from them, and thousands have been slain simply because they were Jews.

The time is long past due when the Jewish people of Europe are given a chance to live. By far the greater number of innocent victims of the war have been the Jews. In the name of humanity, they must be provided with a place to settle where they can handle their own affairs, create their own government, and revive the culture that has been theirs and which they have given for the enrichment of the civilized world.

The failure of Britain to take action on the opening of Palestine to Jewish settlers has been an enigma to most Americans. The theory that the peoples of Palestine will uprise against the incoming Jews has been repeated time and again. Britain maintains control of the area and is established there to maintain peace. Britain has no moral right to bar the return of the Jewish people to their homeland.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to record my voice and to give my total support for the objective sought by Jewry throughout the world. In the brief few moments allotted to me, as a Christian and an American, I want to state pointedly that unless we assume our place on the side of right and justice, we, particularly in America, will stand adjudged in history as having failed our conscience in the fulfillment of the prophecy which promised unto the Jew and his progeny the assumption and the fruit of the Holy Land. America fought for the liberation and the rights of all nations, particularly for the weak and the oppressed.

Palestine, like a score of other countries, is entitled to self-determination, to independence, and to formulate, free of outside interference, her policies while building for the future. She shall shape her own destiny in the world, plan and assume responsibilities in the family of nations. There is no earthly superpower to circumvent or deny what God Almighty ordained and declared in the Bible. The time is here and now. Let

us shoulder our responsibility, let us act faithfully, fearlessly, and positively.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, the world rehabilitation, we have set for ourment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine is more obvious and more imperative today than ever before. The historical oppression of the Jewish peoples of Europe became so accelerated in the past several years under the inhuman Nazi policies that the present suffering of these homeless people is now beyond description.

As the natural leaders in a program of world's responsibility for the establishment of the task of easing the pain of a war-torn world and assisting in great measure in reestablishing those unfortunate people of every race and nationality in their homes with a view toward stamping indelibly upon the entire surface of the earth the Godlike principles of the Atlantic Charter. We all know that we have set for ourselves a difficult task. Certainly the official insistence of this Government that necessary immigration certificates be issued now to European Jews and that the United Nations lend its complete support to the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would go far toward the realization of that objective.

Measures now being taken by the United Nations in Europe represent at best an honest attempt to bring relief to suffering, homeless people. These attempts are merely temporary stop-gaps and do not represent a full measure of rehabilitation. The suggested establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would successfully answer the age-long justifiable plea of world Jewry and would immediately decrease the staggering problem of rehabilitation in Europe itself.

As we glance into the pages of history, have we not every reason to believe that our failure to take immediate determined steps in this direction now inevitably would lead to the same problem under which European Jews have suffered for centuries.

Under our sacred principles of democracy, under the Atlantic Charter, under the motives for which we fought and won this great world war, these people, as well as any others, must have the right to determine their own destinies. Today, in its position of world leadership, the Government of the United States if it so chooses, can promptly attain these objectives.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the victorious close of the war makes this an appropriate time to test our determination to establish a peace upon the stable foundations of justice and democratic equality.

Other speakers here today have dramatically recited the tragic story of the atrocities perpetrated upon the Jewish people by our inhuman enemies during the long, bitter years of the war. That frightful record need not be repeated by me. It is sufficient to emphasize again the fact that the Jews suffered beyond all other peoples in the terrible world conflict which has finally been terminated, and that they and their problems are entitled to the immediate sympathetic

consideration of all civilized peoples, now that peace has been restored in the world.

During the war, while the Nazis were proceeding systematically upon their program to exterminate Jews—a program in which they were horribly successful, and would undoubtedly have carried to completion but for their military overthrow—immigration into Palestine was restricted to a bare minimum, and at times completely shut off. Millions of Jews were massacred during the war, but only a paltry few thousands were permitted to seek refuge in their ancestral homeland. Today the doors of Palestine are closed to hundreds of thousands of wandering Jews whose present lot is still desperate, and who have no future assurance of rest from their wanderings or permanent security of mind and body.

Civilized thinkers throughout the world have long recognized the justice of the Jewish cause in Palestine. They have joined in a universal demand for an honest fulfillment of the pledges made to the Jews in the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine mandate.

Every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson has asserted the support of the American Government for the reconstitution of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth. This Congress, nearly a quarter of a century ago, endorsed that policy, which was reaffirmed by the American-British Conference of 1924. In the last Presidential campaign both of the major political parties of America declared in their national platforms their unqualified indorsements of this policy and three-fourths of the State legislatures of the Union have adopted resolutions in support of Jewish aspirations in Palestine.

The time for action is now. With world-wide hostilities at an end, all the powers of our Government should be exerted toward the immediate fulfillment of the policy to which America is so definitely committed.

I earnestly hope that this Congress will use all of its great influence to persuade the Government of Great Britain to open the gates of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization in the immediate future.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity of joining with my colleagues in an expression and reaffirmation of belief that Palestine should be opened to the Jewish peoples of the world as a homeland.

Last year I had the privilege of testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee in behalf of the Palestine resolution at a time when the world was at war and the tragic persecution of the Jews offered one of the most concrete and terrible examples of the philosophy against which we fought. It was our avowed purpose in fighting that war to pledge to all peoples and all minority groups the right to live and work in their own lands in freedom from fear and persecution, there being no recognized boundaries to human dignity.

That war is now over, but the principles for which we fought need constant redefinition, and it is increasingly necessary that we daily reaffirm those faiths unless they are to become a thing of the past.

I have recently returned from a two months' observation tour of Europe, during which time I studied the operations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration on the Continent. As you know, one of the major problems that UNRRA has had to face is the disposition of the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons. At the center of this problem is what might be called a hard core of some one hundred thousand homeless Jews. The reopening of Palestine and the removal of immigration restrictions presents a partial, immediate solution to that problem. Palestine has indicated her willingness and ability to absorb these people. There is already a well-established economy and a large Jewish community. There is room for expansion in both industrial and agricultural development.

I believe that our Government and its representatives should take a firm stand in advocating the removal of immigration restrictions. In so doing, however, I think it even more important that we do not glibly propose and sponsor such a course merely as an easy answer to a troublesome problem. There is too apt to be something a little dogmatic and a little patronizing about presenting a solution *per se*. What we are emphasizing is the right of the Jewish people to a homeland. We are not delegating them to a corner of the globe. We are recognizing the right of all peoples to work out their own salvations, to cultivate their own lands, and to live in dignity and equality with other peoples of the world.

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, the administration of the territory of Palestine was allocated to Great Britain by mandate based upon the assumption by Great Britain of responsibility for placing Palestine under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, the development of self-governing institutions, and the safeguarding of the civil and religious rights of all inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion. This obligation Great Britain clearly expressed and unequivocally assumed by the Balfour Declaration, the covenants of the mandate, and by the representations made by Great Britain to the United States in the course of extended negotiations which preceded both.

By treaty ratification, official statement, and congressional resolution the United States has placed beyond question its complete reliance upon the obligation thus assumed by Great Britain.

That Great Britain's so-called white paper which ended all Jewish immigration into Palestine on April 1, 1944, is a violation of the obligation assumed by Great Britain with reference to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine is too manifest to require argument. Indeed, Mr. Churchill himself has called it a "sacrifice of our declared purpose" and an act of "moral and physical bankruptcy." Regarding this renunciation of a sacred obligation, the United States was never consulted and its consent to it has never been granted.

There is no occasion now to examine the merits of the Jewish claim to a home-

land in Palestine. These were conceded and established by the assumption of the obligation of which the white paper is a renunciation and violation. But it is worth bearing in mind that the large import of Jewish capital into Palestine has worked a general improvement of the economic life of the whole country, the expansion and improvement of Arab industry and citriculture have been largely financed by the capital thus obtained, Jewish development and enterprise have increased the employment of Arab labor in urban areas, and particularly in the ports, institutions founded with Jewish funds have also served the Arab population, and Jewish cultivation and development of the country's resources and improvement of living conditions have vastly increased the capacity of the country to sustain a growing population, with the result that the Arab population has almost doubled under Jewish development of the country.

To say that our insistence upon the fulfillment of Great Britain's obligation with reference to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine is an interference by us with British territory is utter nonsense. Palestine does not belong to Britain. The British have no more rights in Palestine than we have or than anyone else has. Great Britain controls Palestine under a trusteeship which imposes upon Great Britain obligations of a trustee not only for the benefit of the Jewish people but for the benefit of every nation, including the United States, which consented to the mandate upon the assumption that Great Britain's solemn obligations would not be dishonored. The characteristics of a trusteeship do not pertain to any rights claimed by the trustee; the essence of a trusteeship consists in the solemn obligations which the trustee has undertaken to fulfill. An honorable nation having given its word will not reckon the cost of keeping it.

Among the nations entitled to insist upon the performance by Great Britain of its obligations with reference to Palestine, the position of the United States is of special validity. Victory has just been achieved in a great war in which, but for our intervention at great cost of life and blood and treasure, Great Britain would have been destroyed. Our purpose in fighting the war was to establish permanent universal peace. It has always been understood that this peace would be based upon international agreements and cooperation. We may find that we have wasted our substance and our effort if our principal ally in the war just concluded persists in a policy calculated to convince the world that international agreements cannot be relied upon and that international cooperation is a snare for the unwary.

America must insist upon the fulfillment of the Palestine commitment.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great disappointment to one who is sincerely interested in the solution of the so-called Palestine question that an aggressive and definite attitude was not assumed by the President at the recent conference at Potsdam. This whole matter could have been decided with the representatives of Russia and Great



Britain and the details could have been left to the respective Secretaries and Ministers of State. It is perplexing to those of us who want something accomplished to have to contend with the rather negative attitude of the British Government. One is forced to the conclusion that inasmuch as Great Britain seems unable to solve this perplexing problem or because of some sinister reason she refuses to grapple with it, the whole question should be thrown into the lap of the United Nations without further delay. Whether this would be a satisfactory solution or not, time alone will tell but it would be an effort to solve the matter from a world-wide point of view and take it out of the control of selfish interests.

There can be no doubt that the Jewish emigrants to Palestine have done and are doing a remarkable job in transforming that poor portion of Asia into a modern state. This has been accomplished by hard work, self-sacrifice, and a determination which should command the admiration of the world. The Jewish people want to found a Jewish commonwealth which is the natural instinct of a free people. Because of the enthusiasm with which a start of this Jewish commonwealth has been made, it becomes increasingly evident that Palestine as it is now bounded, will not be large enough, which is another reason why this question must be solved by the United Nations gathered around a table in peaceful assembly. The whole matter should be taken out of the control of the British; it is definitely a matter for the United Nations.

A most pressing need for prompt action is the relief of those thousands of stricken and homeless Jews in central Europe. They long to go to a Jewish commonwealth of their own where they may establish themselves and make a definite contribution to their own rehabilitation, and it seems only logical that this desire should be encouraged.

I include as part of my remarks a letter that I wrote to the President of the United States under date of June 29, 1945, shortly before he left this country for the Potsdam Conference. This letter was not prompted by any suggestion from outside sources but was the result of my own intense feelings on the subject of a Palestine commonwealth. In about 3 weeks time I received a reply from the State Department, signed by the then Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Joseph C. Grew. The reply said, in effect, that the State Department knew of the urgency of the matter and would give it thoughtful study and close attention. The truth is that our State Department has no policy on this question and sometimes it is difficult to learn what its policy is on many other grave international problems.

It is much to be desired that a clearly stated and comprehensive American foreign policy will soon be adopted, particularly on such questions as whether the United States will insist that governments established in the former enemy satellite nations shall be representative and that the rights of freedom of speech and assembly shall be guaranteed; whether the United States plans to extend substantial financial aid to

England and Russia and any other country and if so, upon what terms, in what amounts and for what purposes; whether the United States plans to allow Russian participation in the occupation of Japan, and there are many other similar questions. I feel, however, that our country's attitude toward the so-called Palestine question ranks among the most important matters to be considered at this time and the sooner a definite attitude is adopted in place of the nebulous, wishy-washy uncertainty of the present policy, the sooner our country will be able to hold up its head high among the nations of the earth.

My letter to the President under date of June 29, 1945, follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1945.  
The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,  
The President of the United States,  
White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of writing you to urge that you discuss the Palestine question at your approaching conference with Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin. The San Francisco Conference has resulted in a long step toward establishing international peace and understanding, but as yet no workable and acceptable solution of the settlement of Palestine by the Jews has even been proposed.

Appeasement is no longer the order of the day in dealing with matters of international justice, and it is high time that the undoubted will of the American people to end the expediency of the Chamberlain white paper and to enact the provisions of the Balfour Declaration for a Jewish home in Palestine should be consummated.

You are doubtless aware that many of us in the Congress urged this policy on our Government a year or more ago, but our efforts were necessarily restrained because of the statement by the authorities that serious military and diplomatic questions were involved. A lot of water has passed over the dam since then, and now is the time to grapple with the problem and solve it. Further delay would be too late.

You are well aware of the pressure placed on Members of Congress by groups of citizens in matters of this kind, but I want to assure you that this letter is not prompted by any such influence. My stand on this question is well known by my many friends of all religious beliefs, and I am sure that the people whom I represent approve thoroughly of my attitude. I feel confident, Mr. President, that your good common sense and the high standard of statesmanship which you have displayed will guide you in the leadership in this matter to the end that an honest conclusion with justice for all may be reached soon.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, for over 12 years we have heard on the radio and read in the public press of the persecution and the barbarous treatment of the Jewish people in Germany. This persecution started with the rise to power of Hitler and the Nazi Party. From the time Hitler came into power, he began his inhuman and tortuous treatment of these unfortunate and defenseless people. He not only tortured the Jewish people in Germany, but as his armies conquered other European countries, their first object was to inflict their cruel treatment on those of the Jewish faith.

We know, now, how millions of Jews died. They were starved, tortured beyond human endurance, beaten to death, and executed in gas chambers. This treatment was meted out to men, women, and children regardless of age.

We know that people of the other conquered nations also suffered indescribable tortures, and our heartfelt sympathies go out to them; but of all of those who have suffered from the bestial treatment of the Nazis and their collaborators, the Jewish people were the first to be singled out, upon whom the Nazis inflicted these barbaric tortures which were so gruesome that the thoughts of them shocks the decency of mankind.

These unfortunate people were robbed of their life's savings and belongings, driven and uprooted out of their homes, and thrown into concentration camps. From there, those who were able to work were taken as slave laborers and under the lash of the Gestapo were forced to slave long hours, undernourished and underfed on starving rations, until they became too weak and exhausted to work. Then they were taken to the extermination prisons where they were brutally murdered.

We all hoped that when the Nazis were defeated these unfortunate people would find a place to go where they could earn a living and live in peace, and the hopes of millions of Jewish people was that they might be able to go to Palestine and there settle and make it their homeland. Those who have been fortunate to get to Palestine in the early days of the war have developed the country and made it a thriving community.

I believe there is room for several more millions to settle in Palestine but they are not permitted to enter. I feel that our Government should intercede in behalf of these Jewish people and help those who want to go there to obtain permission to enter, so that they may be able to have a homeland and live a useful and peaceful life.

Under unanimous consent, I insert a resolution passed by the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, of Chicago, into the RECORD:

Conscious of the spiritual and physical homelessness of the Jewish survivors of nazism and fascism in Germany and other places in Europe, and responsive to the simple demands of humanity, decency, and justice, the Decalogue Society of Lawyers endorses and vigorously supports the efforts of President Truman to facilitate the immediate immigration of Jewish refugees in Europe to Palestine—the land that wants them and the land to which they wish to go. Palestine alone, of all countries of the world, welcomes them and offers to share with them her bread, her homes, her farms, and factories. Palestine affords them an opportunity to rehabilitate their tortured lives and be restored to mental and physical well-being.

The Decalogue Society of Lawyers, speaking for its 1,200 members of the bar and judiciary, respectfully urges President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, Senators Scott W. Lucas and C. Wayland Brooks, and all Members of the House of Representatives from Illinois to use all means at their disposal and the great moral influence of the United States to permit all Jewish refugees in Europe desiring to do so to make their homes in Palestine as free men, with full democratic rights for the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Adopted unanimously by the board of managers of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, October 5, 1945.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish people have been denied too long the opportunity to immigrate to Palestine, where they have proved to the world that they can develop the resources of the land and establish a free and democratic nation. Since the surrender of Germany they have been left stranded by an arbitrary rule by England that the white paper must be left standing in spite of the fact that the war is over and won by the Allies. What greater proof of independence, industry, willingness to cooperate with all nations of the world is needed to convince the British that the Jewish people are entitled to free entry into Palestine.

As a member of the American Christian Palestine Committee, I have developed a keen interest and high regard for the Jewish people's case to return to Palestine. The terrible persecution they suffered in Europe during the war years, the suffering they are going through since the war is over, should bring to their aid the respect and regard of all citizens of the United States to help them gain their objective. England with her present liberal government, which is devoted to helping the common lot of mankind, should prove what they stand for, and under Clement Attlee and his party now in power open Palestine to the Jewish people which they have earned and are entitled to.

#### PALESTINE FOR THE JEWS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century ago the British Government through the Balfour Declaration promised Palestine to the Jews for their homeland. Fifty-three nations of the world, including the United States, joined by resolution in the Balfour Declaration.

In failing to redeem this pledge, the British have violated international law. Consequently millions of Jews became the victims of Nazi bestiality. However, there is still time for the Christian world to save the 100,000 Jews now living in concentration camps throughout Europe who face a winter of starvation, misery, and death. I have appealed to Prime Minister Attlee to abrogate the infamous British white paper of 1939 and fulfill the pledge of his party made recently to give Palestine to the Jews. I appeal to my Christian colleagues in this Congress to join with me in my plea to Prime Minister Attlee. These destitute Jewish men, women, and children seek only a home of their own. This can be accomplished without any cost to world society.

As part of my remarks I include a copy of my letter addressed to Prime Minister Attlee under date of October 4, 1945, on the Palestine problem:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1945.  
The Honorable CLEMENT R. ATTLEE,  
Prime Minister of Great Britain,  
London, England.

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: I am sadly disappointed in the policy of the British with respect to Palestine. As a Member of the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses, I have heartily endorsed the entire war program, including

lend-lease to our allies. I most vigorously supported aid to and cooperation with Great Britain. However, during the war I hesitated to criticize the white-paper policy of the British as I knew that such criticism would give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Now the war is at an end, and I can no longer sit idly by without voicing my protests to the present policy in not opening the gates of Palestine to the Jews. With your Labor Party in control, I had hoped that favorable action would be taken in behalf of the 100,000 Jews now living in concentration camps throughout Europe. I expected favorable action because of the denouncement by your party leaders in May 1939 of the Chamberlain government's white paper. At that time the Right Honorable Herbert Morrison declared that:

"If we do this thing today we shall have done a thing which is dishonorable to our good name, which is discreditable to our capacity to govern, and which is dangerous to British security, to peace, and to the economic interest of the world in general and of our own country. Moreover, it will not work \* \* \* the Government must understand that this document will not be automatically binding upon their successors in office, whatever the circumstances of the time may be."

Mr. Prime Minister, you are the successors in office. Your Labor government is in power in Britain. Your party is now in control of Palestine's destinies. As recently as May 1945 your party adopted a resolution declaring:

"There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. \* \* \* The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales."

A splendid declaration, Mr. Prime Minister. The American people acclaimed your action. The Jews—at long last—looked with hope for tomorrow.

Yet, the doors of Palestine are closed to millions of stateless and homeless Jews facing starvation, misery, and death in Europe. They live in desperation filled with bitter recollection of past horrors. They are badly clothed. They are tragically underfed. They look to you for relief. They simply ask for a home which is rightfully theirs by tradition, by biblical history, and by the mandate of the Balfour Declaration which was endorsed by resolution of 53 nations of the world a quarter of a century ago. The Christian world demands full recognition of Jewish rights to Palestine. Patience is at an end.

Unless Great Britain practices the equity and justice toward others as she seeks for herself, I assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, that I shall oppose every measure that comes before Congress that would give relief and assistance to the British, and I shall urge my colleagues to do likewise. You cannot expect sympathy for the social advancement of Britain's masses when you withhold the right to a life of self-support and self-respect from the first victims of nazism. You cannot pledge or talk of social or economic progress and at the same time bolster the reactionary pro-Fascist, feudal Arab rules in the Middle East. I plead with you to keep faith with the Jewish people and with the nations of the world. I plead with you to redeem Britain's pledge to the Jewish people now. Otherwise, I intend to speak the length and breadth of America and tell the American people the facts.

Very sincerely yours,

SAMUEL A. WEISS.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, we have just fought and emerged victorious from the greatest war in the history of the world. Yet can we, or any other nation, say the war has been won as long as millions are suffering untold misery and are denied the promised blessings of the "four freedoms."

Peace on earth will never prevail as long as man fears the aggressor's tread on his threshold.

I have seen the transient and stationary millions in Europe plagued by disease, disaster, and damnation, and I feel that common decency demands that all countries support President Truman's recommendation that 100,000 Jews be admitted to Palestine. These surviving Jews have been abused, tortured, and degraded, and the civilized nations of the world should offer sanctuary to all oppressed peoples.

We know that the United States could not endure half-slave and half-free. Neither can this now small world endure half-slave and half-free. If nations can be forced into slavery why can they not be encouraged into freedom?

Now is the time to settle the Palestine question. The provision of the Balfour Declaration, establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine, should be carried out. Not tomorrow—not in 1965—but today. Such action will prove to all minority groups that their future rights will be protected.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I favor the opening of Palestine to the Jewish people. Some 4,000 years ago this land was promised them as an inheritance. There should be no interference with their right of occupancy today. I believe the Congress should go on record asking the British Government to repeal the so-called white paper and reestablish the Balfour resolution so Palestine will again be open to the Jewish people.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Jewish people, I call attention to the wrong perpetrated against them by continuing to bar their immigration into Palestine. Now, that victory has been achieved, it is ironical that great numbers of "liberated" Jews find themselves unable to enter the one land where history records their right to live as free men.

Unqualified praise is due President Truman for his great humanitarian effort in urging Great Britain to allow 100,000 Jews to enter Palestine at once. As an immediate emergency measure, this would provide relief for many Jewish survivors of Nazi atrocities. But it does not constitute a solution of the basic problem.

The right of the Jewish people to establish a National homeland is historically established. The Balfour Declaration enunciates a policy to which the government of Great Britain committed itself without reservation. Our Government has repeatedly expressed its approval of Jewish aspirations in Palestine. Yet the British Government issued in 1939 a white paper in repudiation of its duty as the mandatory power and of its obligations under the Balfour Declaration. Efforts made from time to time to have this white paper set aside were



met, during the war years, with the statement that exigencies of military strategy required that it remain in force. Though military considerations no longer apply, the present British Government has shown no intention of dealing justly with the Jewish people in this matter. The British Labor Party officially condemned the white paper and committed itself to the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. However, since its accession to power, it has done nothing to redeem these solemn pledges. On the contrary, reports indicate its intention of continuing the present restrictive immigration policy, with but slight modification.

Our Government has not only the right but the duty to make its position unmistakably clear. Both the Democratic and the Republican Parties, as well as many of our Senators and Representatives, have from time to time expressed themselves in favor of opening the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration. The dictates of simple justice and humanity demand amelioration of the horrors inflicted upon European Jews. The vast majority of American Jews cherish the hope for a Jewish commonwealth.

I urge that our Government announce at once its approval of President Truman's suggestion for immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine; its urgent insistence that the British Government repudiate the white paper of 1939 and permit free entry into Palestine of those Jews who wish to settle there; and, finally, that we exert our influence to the utmost with our British ally, to the end that steps be initiated now and carried forward at the Peace Conference for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the British white paper of May 1939 has practically closed Palestine to all Jewish immigration. At a time when millions of European Jews have been massacred by the Nazis, the chief and almost the only door to escape will be slammed in the face of those hundreds of thousands who still survive and whom the Nazis have starved, impoverished, uprooted from home and occupation.

The Palestine white paper followed by a few months the Munich surrender. It reflected the same crisis in world statesmanship and international morality. The League of Nations mandate by virtue of which Great Britain governs Palestine made her responsible "for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home" and obligated her specifically to facilitate Jewish immigration. By abandoning these obligations to the Jewish national home, Britain hoped to secure the support of the Arab world in the great struggle that was clearly about to begin.

The white paper is not and cannot be the last word on the future of Palestine or of the Jewish people, linked to Palestine by the unbreakable bonds of history, tradition, and international recognition. It remains for the conscience of the democratic peoples, for an enlightened statesmanship in a world which has been through the crucible of a terrible war,

fearlessly to face a problem which has challenged mankind through 2,000 years of history. The problem is that of the national homelessness of the Jewish people, a minority everywhere with no land which it may call its own and to which it may turn for escape from the recurrent persecution to which it is subject. In a wise and courageous solution of this problem, the white paper can have no part.

During the six long and bitter years of the war—while the Jews of Europe were being systematically exterminated by Nazi bestiality—immigration into Palestine was for periods completely shut off by the British administration, and, when permitted, restricted to a bare minimum at best. While millions of Jews were being massacred, not more than ten or twelve thousand were permitted to enter Palestine each year since the promulgation of the Chamberlain white paper in 1939. Today the certificates of immigration have been exhausted and still the doors of Palestine are closed to the hundreds of thousands who are waiting in the desperate hope of at last finding rest from their wanderings and of attaining permanent security of mind and body in the Jewish homeland.

There is no valid economic reason for keeping the Jews out of Palestine. During the last 25 years Jews all over the world have bent their energies toward the upbuilding of Palestine and have poured in great resources of capital, labor, and scientific knowledge to increase the absorptive capacity of the country.

Many people throughout the world have all along recognized the justice of the Jewish cause in Palestine. They have been resolute in their demand for a repudiation of the 1939 white-paper policy and for an honest fulfillment of the pledges made to the Jews in the Balfour Declaration and in the Palestine mandate.

From the time of President Wilson, who played a creative role in obtaining the Balfour Declaration, every succeeding President has reiterated support for the Jewish national home. In 1922, shortly before the approval of the Palestine mandate by the League of Nations, the Senate and the House of Representatives in a joint resolution expressed themselves, in the language of the Balfour Declaration, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. Although the United States was not a member of the League of Nations, it became party to the terms of the mandate through the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, in accordance with which our Government consented to the administration of Palestine by Great Britain.

On March 9, 1944, President Roosevelt gave assurance that "the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939," and expressed the belief that full justice would be done in the matter of the Jewish national home.

The traditional American position on the Palestine question has been reaffirmed and strengthened during the past 2 years by planks included in the platforms of both the Democratic and Re-

publican parties and by President Roosevelt's statement of October 15, 1943—historic pronouncements pledging support for the Jewish people's aim to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

We of Maryland call upon the leaders of the United Nations no longer to neglect the pressing Jewish need, and we appeal for an immediate decision on Palestine on the two minimum requisites of any solution of the Jewish problem:

First. To abolish without further delay all restrictions on free Jewish immigration into Palestine and all limitations on the right of Jews to purchase and settle the land.

Second. To make simultaneously a definitive announcement, in the spirit and purpose of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate, of the determination to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, hostilities have ceased. Suffering, torture, death, privation, and starvation have been visited upon the many. Surely no one will deny that horrors have been visited upon the Jews, both before and during hostilities.

One need not travel throughout the devastated areas of our war-torn world to realize the chaotic conditions that follow in the wake of the world's mightiest conflagration. The multitude of displaced persons are hungry for food, for habitation, and for freedom. Those who have suffered the hardships of war look hopefully and patiently for a haven of rest, where the wounds of war may be healed, where they and their loved ones may look forward to the opportunity of living out their lives in a world in which they may enjoy the four freedoms.

Not for one moment do I underestimate the gravity and complexity of the problems confronting the leaders, the governments, and the peoples, displaced or not, throughout this troubled world.

It is my firm belief that the provisions of the Balfour Declaration should be fulfilled.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, never before in human history has the need been so acute for practicing the Golden Rule, which is the very heart of Christianity. Never before has the impact of great and shattering forces made so clear the role religious values must play in human life if human life is to survive on this planet. Christianity today faces perhaps the greatest challenge in its history; it must make the Golden Rule work in a world that has grown cynical and callous.

If we are to attempt—and it is young people upon whom the burden of that attempt will fall primarily—if we are to attempt to remake our world in the image of true Christian faith, we cannot fail to see as one of the test problems confronting us, the question of the future of the Jewish people. It was out of Judaism that Christianity grew; it was on the Old Testament as well as the New that this country and democracy throughout the world were based. It was because of their undeviating adherence to their Old Testament heritage that Jews remained a group apart through the ages, and it was because their life was so bound up

with the words and the vision of the Book of Books that during 20 centuries of dispersion they continued to see the goal of Jewish history as the restoration of Jewish national life and the renaissance of Jewish ethical and cultural values in the promised land of their ancestors, the land of Israel—Palestine. For over six decades now, Jews have been returning to the land of Israel. They have done noble and extraordinary things there. A British chaplain, Ronald Grange-Bennet, who served for 3 years with British forces in Palestine, said recently that "The Jews of Palestine are the most fascinating collection of human beings on earth." They are indeed unique; they are in their overwhelming majority workers and farmers, but they have not lost the intellectuality and the esthetic gifts so characteristic of their people. They base their education and their lives upon the ancient writings of their people, but they are evolving a co-operative agricultural and industrial economy which has much to give by way of example to the rest of the world. Writing of the Jewish collective and co-operative villages in Palestine, Sir E. John Russell, England's greatest agricultural expert says:

The Jewish settlers have done far more than making a home for themselves and their community; they have lighted a torch to show the way through some of the obscure and difficult problems awaiting us in the postwar world.

Jews in Palestine today are making the Bible's prophecies come true; they are consciously attempting to build a society worthy of their ethical heritage. Because they know that spiritual values must pervade every aspect of life, they have made a religion of labor and have applied themselves with self-sacrificing zeal and devotion to the reclamation of the neglected soil of Palestine. Theirs is "the greatest ameliorative project of this century," says Dr. Norman Maclean, former moderator of the general assembly of the Church of Scotland. The most remarkable example of soil conservation in the modern world, says Dr. Walter Lowdermilk, assistant chief of our United States Soil Conservation Service. The interests of the Jews of Palestine and those of their Arab neighbors are complementary rather than conflicting; the standards of those Arab neighbors has already been appreciably raised, and the effect of Jewish progress in Palestine is destined, impartial observers feel, to be a force of revolutionary significance in the underdeveloped and underpopulated lands of the Near East.

Palestine—

To quote Dr. Lowdermilk again—

can serve as the example, the demonstration, the lever, that will lift the entire Near East from its present desolate condition to a dignified place in a free world.

All this is, so to speak, the positive aspect of the Palestine question. There is enough in this positive aspect to make every progressive American an ardent supporter of the great democratic and cultural effort Jews are putting forth in Palestine. Peace and democracy are both indivisible, and peace and democracy will both be imperiled by the continuance

in the strategic Middle East of the present semifederal, reactionary regimes under which national wealth is concentrated in the hands of some few percent of the population and illiteracy, disease, and grinding poverty are everywhere rampant. What Jewish Palestine has already done by force of example to change these conditions gives us assurance as Americans that it is the key to the democratization of the Arab lands and that its development is, therefore, to America's own interest.

But there is a compelling and tragic and very timely aspect to this Palestine question that I have not mentioned thus far and that is, I am certain, in the minds of every one of you. The unsolved question of the Jewish position in the world has reached a ghastly climax in our day—a climax so inhuman and staggering in its cruelty and complete disregard of moral values that it is still—despite the documentation of newspapers, judicial trials, and testimony by many witnesses—almost inconceivable. No reader of the daily press needs to be told any longer how methodically the Nazis proceeded to exterminate the Jews of Europe, using new scientific and economical equipment carefully prepared for that purpose. They succeeded better in this than in any other of their aims, and the ashes of 6,000,000 Jewish dead fertilize fields in Poland and Germany. There is no Jewish family left intact in any land from France and Holland in the west of Europe, to Greece, Yugoslavia, and Russia in the east. There are no economic positions, no homes, for the few shattered survivors to come back to. But there is something Hitler left that they return to—a poisonous legacy of anti-Semitic doctrine that is making life in Europe impossible for the million and a half Jewish survivors of Hitler's holocaust. In the Poland Jewish partisans helped to free, the Poland nine-tenths of whose Jews were murdered, Jews must today flee from pogrom, assassination, intimidation. The ancient urge for a home of their own in the land of their fathers has been invested with a new and terrible urgency for these remaining Jews of Europe. You need only read Earl G. Harrison's report submitted to President Truman on the condition of the hundred thousand Jews still in camps in Germany to realize how for them Palestine is the magic name, the desired goal, the one place on earth which offers home and refuge. It is the land where most of them have relatives living, eager to shelter them; the land where a new productive civilization, with room for millions of more working hands, is being built up; the land sacred in tradition and prayer; the land solemnly promised as the national home of the Jewish people in the Covenant of the League of Nations—a fact too often obscured in the interests of British appeasement politics, of Arab chauvinist propaganda.

The Allied statesmen who made the last peace intended to give the Jews the opportunity to reconstitute their national life in their historic homeland. Lloyd George's memoirs make that uncontestedly clear, as do any number of statements by men like Woodrow Wilson, Arthur James Balfour, Robert Cecil,

The spokesman of the Arabs at the Versailles Peace Conference assented to this point of view. It was clear to him, as to the Allied statesmen, that Palestine was no Arab land; it had a universal character as the birthplace of Christianity, a historically Jewish connection as the ancient and never forgotten home of a people which had never severed its ties, either physical or spiritual, with it.

What was true at the end of the last war is equally true now—equally true and even more essential to human decency and human progress. The case has been put very strikingly in a resolution adopted only last December by the British Labor Party, whose leaders now govern Britain and cannot, it seems, find in themselves the moral strength to carry out the pledge they gave with full understanding of all its implications only a short time ago. Last December a resolution adopted by the annual conference of the Labor Party said:

There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war, and there is an irresistible case for it now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold-blooded, calculated German-Nazi plan to kill all the Jews of Europe.

Last April, reaffirming this pledge, another resolution called upon the British Government "to remove the present unjustifiable barriers on immigration, and to announce without delay proposals for a future Palestine, in which it has the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments."

Will this be done now when a hopeless future stares in the face of European Jewry, when every consideration of mercy, justice—yes, and even political logic—calls for a Jewish Palestine?

I can end only by telling you of a little report from Palestine I saw the other day which left an indelible impression on my mind. It was written by a woman who had gone to meet a train bringing some 1,300 new refugee immigrants to Palestine. She stood with an old man waiting with tears in his eyes for a granddaughter, the only living member of the large family he had left behind him in Europe; with a physician, whose wife had been gassed to death in Germany but whose son had somehow escaped and was coming to him; with hundreds of other tremulous, bereft human beings, waiting for some one miraculously rescued relative. Then the newcomers began to descend from the train—an orphaned girl from Italy, an orphaned lad from France, a youth who, when asked from where he came, replied: "What difference does that make? What matters is where I have come to, not where I've come from. I've come home." And he stretched out his hands in joy, and the woman saw the number scorched into his flesh—108,223—his slave number in a labor camp. There were such numbers on the hands of all the 1,300 newcomers; on the hands, too, of a little boy of 6, who came shyly up to the woman and told her, in reply to her question, that he had come from a town in Poland. He was 6 years old and his



8-year-old sister was with him. "She and I," he said simply, "are the only Jews left of all the thousands in our town. Just she and I."

And to help to give new life to these children in the land of their people's beginnings is without question an integral part of our responsibility as Christian Americans dedicated to the building of a better world.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked and outraged by the stories which have come to me concerning the persisting persecution and killing of the Jewish people in Europe. I blame our inaction on House Resolution 268, which provides for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, and hope that we will have the foresight to act upon it in the immediate future.

The United States must make recommendation to Britain to open Palestine to these poor, homeless souls. We will have been a party to the annihilation of the Jews in Europe if we take no action. Our military forces there seem unable to cope with the problem; therefore, I feel it must be done on the diplomatic level.

I note that President Truman has acted on the request of many, including myself, and recommended to Britain that she take the only just action and live up to the Balfour Declaration.

The historic connection of the Jewish people with Palestine dates from Biblical times. In our own day, in 1917, Great Britain, recognizing this historic connection, issued the Balfour Declaration pledging the development of Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people.

In July 1922 the League of Nations gave to Great Britain the mandate over Palestine to facilitate Jewish immigration, and close settlement by the Jews on the land, for the purpose of establishing a Jewish homeland. In September 1922 the Congress of the United States, by joint resolution, gave its recognition and approval to the Balfour Declaration. In 1924 Great Britain and the United States signed a treaty ratifying the Balfour Declaration and the mandate, requiring the assent of the United States to any modification of the mandate.

In 1939, contrary to these legal guarantees and in violation of its agreement with the United States, Great Britain issued a white paper nullifying the terms of the mandate, and closing the doors of Palestine to further Jewish immigration and land purchase. As a direct result of this action, hundreds of thousands were barred from the Palestine haven and left to ruthless slaughter by the Nazis. Protests to Great Britain went unheeded. The excuse was always, "Military expediency."

In 1944, however, both the Republican and Democratic Parties, recognizing the great wrong that had been done to the Jewish people, included in their platforms pledges supporting the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

With the ending of the war, the Jewish people had every reason to expect that Great Britain would immediately reverse its white-paper policy of 1939.

Six million Jews have perished—victims of the Nazis. A million and a half—100,000 still in concentration camps—remain in Europe. The vast majority of them look to Palestine as the answer to their homelessness.

I feel that these victims of Nazi oppression should be given not pity, not words, but justice through action. The time for action is now.

Every dictate of law, humanity, and national honor—every principle for which this war was fought—demands that the gates of Palestine be opened to unrestricted Jewish immigration and to the establishment there of a free and democratic nation based on the right of self-determination.

The British Government has proved its incapacity to handle this problem with either justice or discretion. They have secretly armed the Arab people and then fomented riots to create an incident. They have been anything but fair and honest in this matter.

I hope that the Congress will see fit to remind Britain of its former commitments in this regard, and forcefully recommend that the Balfour Declaration be restored and earnestly put into practice.

The alternative to this is that the United Nations Organization take control of the area and allow self-determination of the peoples in Palestine.

I do not feel that we can sit back any longer. In the name of human decency we must act to protect these people who have suffered so at the hands of Fascist tyrants.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for us to conceive of the misery, hopelessness, disaster and despair which has pervaded the world. The wholesale starvation and torture as suffered by the Jews in Europe during the past decade is almost beyond our comprehension. Nothing can be done for the thousands who have fallen under this horrible carnage. The job of restoring the survivors to normal living is being undertaken by Allied military and civil authorities. It is no easy task, but it is an issue that must be met and handled in the same manner as are other international problems. In our attempt to make a permanent world structure, these homeless and hopeless people cannot be temporarily disposed of or overlooked. They were liberated by the joint efforts of the Allies, and, as in all disputes which have arisen and shall continue to arise among the victor nations in their efforts at maintaining a peaceful world, this problem will have to be settled so that prejudice may never again be the springboard of another maniac to ignite the world in flames of hate.

We as individuals have met the challenge and shown our disposition to give succor to these unfortunate people by temporary measures, through UNRRA and other organizations; we as a Nation must soon take a stand as to a fixed policy of restoration leading to self-sustenance. Our Government should take active steps directed toward the opening of Palestine as a homeland for the Jews of Europe. It would be a logical and humane solution and in keeping

with the principles and declarations of a civilization based on the "four freedoms."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I had expected to obtain time today to express my thoughts and convictions concerning the plight of the Jewish people insofar as the situation in Palestine is concerned. I have listened with great interest to the learned and eloquent remarks of the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and to the addresses of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. I thoroughly concur in their expressions on this subject and am in entire accord with their every remark. They are entitled to public commendation for their forthright views. I trust that President Truman's request of Great Britain will be granted, and that the original intent of the Balfour Declaration will be carried out immediately.

AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, war is a ruthless violator of human dignity and inflicts sorrow and despair on the victor and the vanquished. Shattered bodies and shadowed minds are a grim reminder of the desolation that is visited upon many of those who escape with their lives; while their dead comrades by the tens of thousands are a symbol of the futility of man's uncontrolled desire for world domination. The anguish, sorrow, and death that war adopts as its boon companions are not confined to the battlefield, but are inflicted upon millions of defenseless civilians unfortunate to be caught in its path.

When the history of World War II is written the world will learn of countless atrocities to peoples of all nations, but I venture to assure you that no account of willful persecution and ignominious torture and cruel death will surpass the sufferings of European Jews. It is estimated that from a population of 12,000,000 Jews in Europe at the beginning of World War II and exclusive of the 3,000,000 now in Russia slightly over 1,000,000 persons of the faith of Abraham have survived the cruel persecution bent on complete extermination of the oldest of all human races.

Millions of defenseless Jews have disappeared from the face of the earth as completely as though atomic energy had reduced them to a state of nothingness; while tens of thousands lie forgotten in crude and nameless graves. The depravity of those responsible for these wholesale murders of a defenseless race is beyond description and certainly the God of us all will mete out stern justice when these international murderers make their appearance before the seat of judgment.

Death is a heavy cross to bear even when fortified by the knowledge that it is but the door to the happier state of eternal life. When such a sorrow overwhelms us we are consoled to a degree by the comforting words of our relatives and friends and their presence in the months that follow in counseling us very often is of great assistance in aiding us to become

accustomed to the loss of a loved one. With this thought in mind it is not difficult to realize the barbarous treatment accorded adherents of the Jewish faith in being subjected to infamous torture and death and their loved ones unable to learn a shred of knowledge concerning their departure from this life. In countless cases survivors often followed in quick succession in joining their dead or they were obliged to undergo a living hell in filthy concentration camps where they welcomed death as an escape from their tortured existence. Truly the greater part of this world has been literally a weeping wall to the Jewish race since the crazed brains of world dictators pronounced their doom. Surviving Jews looked confidently to the day when an all-merciful God would hearken to their prayers and restore peace to a troubled world.

Today with the dove of peace figuratively hovering over the international peace table, world Jewry finds that homeless European Jews are certain to die by the thousands this very winter if the Christian nations of the world do not decide to do something practical concerning their plight.

They have looked with confidence to the discarding by Great Britain of the white paper promulgated in 1939 and whose terms have abrogated the Balfour Declaration to open Palestine to the Jewish people. We are all familiar with the action taken by Great Britain in restricting the number of Jews admitted to Palestine to 1,500 monthly. President Truman's appeal to admit 100,000 has been answered by the plan to admit 1,500 monthly which in terms of the urgent need reveals that a mere handful are to be admitted and the remainder of homeless Jews are to be left to perish as vagabonds without home or country anywhere on the face of the earth.

World Jewry for the past 25 years has contributed money and material things and as a result Palestine has been developed in a remarkable manner with its wasteland reclaimed and other marked achievements that have astonished the world. Given the opportunity to continue the program of reclamation and national development the Holy Land is destined to provide a haven for the oppressed Jews of the world and at the same time guarantee liberty and equality to all other races who may now inhabit Palestine.

Civilized nations who boast of being Christianized have a wonderful opportunity now to raise their voices in behalf of a defenseless race and at the same manner to the teachings of the Lowly Nazarene who once trod the hallowed ground of Palestine. The age-old Biblical question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" can be answered in the affirmative time to give allegiance in a practical by the Christian nations of the world by the use of their combined voices in a sincere effort to aid a stricken and homeless race. Those of us privileged to call the United States our home have a clear concept of liberty for it has been purchased and preserved to us by the blood of American martyrs from the bleak winters of Valley Forge to the burning sands of Okinawa. We speak of

Christian charity as being a great virtue and one of the most desirable attributes. In this particular instance we have a splendid opportunity to heed the divine admonition, "Let us not love in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and in truth."

One of the many exhortations of St. Paul was his appeal for charity in our daily lives as evidenced when he spoke to the Corinthians:

Brethren, if I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And if I should have prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains and have not charity, I am nothing. And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned and have not charity, it profiteth nothing. Charity is patient, is kind; charity envieth not; dealeth not perversely; is not puffed up; is not ambitious; seeketh not her own; is not provoked to anger; thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth; heareth all things; believeth in all things; hopeth all things; endureth all things. Charity never faileth away, whether prophecies shall be made void, or tongues shall cease, or knowledge shall be destroyed. For we know in part and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child I spoke as a child; but when I became a man I put away the things of a child. We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known. And now there remain faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

Then, too, our Christian religion reminds us of the answer Jesus made to a certain lawyer who asked him what he must do to gain eternal life:

The pharisees came to Jesus, and one of them a doctor of the law asked Him, tempting Him: "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus said to him, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole mind. This is the greatest and the first commandment. And the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments dependeth the whole law and the prophets." And the lawyer wishing to justify himself said to Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?" Jesus took him up and said, "A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho and he fell in with robbers, who after both stripping him and beating him went their way, leaving him half dead. But, as it happened, a certain priest was going down the same way; and when he saw him he passed by. And likewise a Levite also, when he was near the place and saw him, passed by. But a certain Samaritan as he journeyed came upon him, and seeing him, was moved with compassion. And he went up to him and bound up his wounds, pouring oil and wine. And setting him on his own beast, he brought him to an inn and took care of him. And the next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper and said 'Take care of him; and whatever more thou spendest, I on my way back will repay thee.' Which of these three in thy opinion proved himself neighbor to him who fell among the robbers?" And he said, "He who took pity on him." And Jesus said to him, "Go and do thou also in like manner."

These references to the need for charity and our understanding of the clear-cut definition of "And who is my neigh-

bor?" are timely reminders that God has revealed the sacred dignity of the human body and it is also referred to in Holy Scripture as "the temple of the Holy Spirit."

The plight of world Jewry is the common problem of all nations and with true Christian charity I am hopeful that the United States will lend its voice in a sincere effort to rescue a perishing race by assisting in convincing the civilized world that the doors of Palestine should be opened immediately to the Jewish race if we are to practice the tenets of the Christian religion and answer affirmatively the Biblical query: "Am I, my brother's keeper?"

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in what is being said here on the House floor in favor of opening the gates of Palestine to the Jewish race.

For years I have been one of the sponsors in favor of this just and humane movement.

We have just finished a victorious world war and millions have died that all men may be free. We did not fight it for all races except the Jews, but for all mankind. If we give freedom to all people except the Jews, who knows what race will be next on the list. It is a terrible threat to democracy itself to ostracize one race.

Promises have been made to the Jewish race and broken. Now is the time for Congress to act and I, for one, am ready to stand up and be counted in favor of the resolution for a free Palestine. We cannot enslave millions of Jewish people and make them wanderers on the face of the earth, homeless and nationless, without crippling civilization itself.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has directed the attention of the world to the immediate need of opening the doors of Palestine to 100,000 homeless European Jews. I have myself recently returned from Europe where I studied some of the problems of the so-called stateless persons. The poignancy of their needs today, added to the tragic persecution which they have suffered with growing intensity during the last decade, makes me welcome the hundreds of letters I have received from Illinois, urging support of the President's appeal.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous telegrams and letters within the last few days in reference to the Palestine mandate. The purport of these messages is that the Jewish people from all over Europe should be allowed to enter Palestine and to settle in this land which is under the protection of Great Britain. These are the people who in a large measure were persecuted by the totalitarian powers immediately before and during the Great World War which has just been brought to a conclusion. They are now looking for a place of refuge and a land to call their home.

From the time when the mists of antiquity lifted from the annals of history, Palestine has been known as the land of the Jews. Anyone who reads the story of the creation and development as portrayed in the Old Testament must realize that Palestine is the land which the Jewish people can, and should, call their



homeland. As indicated by the letters and telegrams reaching me, they now want to return to their heritage in Palestine; and I think the British Government, which has the mandate over this land, should respond to the call and allow free emigration.

Britain has many colonies and much territory. Much of it is well settled and a large part of it needs settlement and development. I have never been fortunate enough to be able to travel through the Near East, but I am of the firm conviction that Great Britain should listen to the call of these persecuted peoples and grant them free access into Palestine and the right to live and develop this little land which lies on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that this time has been secured to give Members of Congress an opportunity of expressing their hopes that the Baldwin white paper may be modified so as to permit immigration to Palestine. I wish that more time had been secured so as to give Members an opportunity of speaking at greater length on the subject.

There is little doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American people and of their Representatives in Congress are insisting on action to relieve the present distressing situation. The blunt facts are that almost 6,000,000 Jews have lost their lives in Europe during the past few years and only about 1,500,000 are left. A large part of these are still living in concentration camps. They have no homes to which to go. They have no opportunity of being restored to a decent life in the countries where they now exist. The doors of all nations are practically closed to them.

The Jewish colonists at Palestine have shown what can be done if they are given an opportunity. It is right and proper that this great Christian and democratic Nation should exert its influence toward giving the Jewish people of Europe aid in finding a new life in Palestine. I hope that early consideration will be given to the resolution now pending in Congress. Furthermore, we should support and applaud President Truman in his position.

I wish to here read a letter I wrote to him on October 6, 1945:

OCTOBER 6, 1945.

THE PRESIDENT,

*The White House, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing clipping from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, which contains a letter to me from George Berke, chairman of the Chattanooga Zionist Emergency Council. Mr. Berke sets forth, in very persuasive language, the justice and necessity of British Government allowing 100,000 homeless Jews to enter Palestine.

I was glad to know the strong position you have taken in the matter. I hope that you will continue to use your influence in the interest of enabling these people to find refuge from persecution and the concentration camps in which so many are still living. I think the people are behind you in the stand you have taken. We should exert every available effort, if for no other than humanitarian reasons, to bring relief to these unfortunate people. Unless they are allowed

to enter Palestine there is little hope for the survival of countless thousands of them.

With good wishes,  
Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

Mr. Speaker, this country is a legal party to the mandate over Palestine. The least we can do is to exert every possible effort and influence toward seeing that these unfortunate people have an opportunity for a new life in this country which has been set aside for them.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic aftermaths of the war which has just concluded in Europe is the terrible dislocation of the Jewish people. It is quite unnecessary for me to relate the crimes which have been committed against these people by the Nazi overlords of Germany. Though these men have been shorn of their power and most of them are now in custody of the Allied War Crimes Commission, the poison of anti-Semitism has spread through the greater part of continental Europe. I was not a little shocked when Edvard Beneš, of Czechoslovakia, whose adherence to the principles of democracy cannot be denied, said in effect that Jews would be unlikely to find a haven in Europe for some time to come.

President Truman recently recommended to the British Government that Palestine should be immediately opened to the migration of 100,000 Jews. It is my understanding that no reply has yet been received from the British Government.

It is entirely proper that the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States take cognizance of this situation. It is extremely doubtful that the Chamberlain white paper promulgated in 1939 restricting immigration to Palestine is valid under existing international agreements. Palestine is held in trust by Great Britain under the Covenant of the League of Nations. Britain is not a sovereign authority in Palestine. Inasmuch as the United States was not a party to the League of Nations Covenant, a bilateral agreement was entered into by our country and Great Britain and promulgated in December of 1925. Under this agreement Great Britain was obligated to consult with our Government as well as those of League members when any substantial change in this trusteeship was anticipated. The British Government under Mr. Chamberlain sought no such consultation and its action at that time was one of appeasement—a policy which was demonstrated to be tragically fallacious.

We will not be able to obliterate the filthy philosophy of nazism in the immediate future. Germany held control of the greater part of Central and Western Europe for over 4 years. A studied policy of exterminating all decent elements and influences in this territory was practiced during this occupation. Until the results of this policy can be removed we must provide for the protection and refuge of persecuted peoples.

Since the capitulation of Germany I have been informed that over 1,000 Jews

have been killed in pogroms in Poland. This in spite of the fact that the fighting elements of the Polish underground were composed in a substantial degree by Jews. None of them dare live in Poland except in the larger cities. Many of them have fled Poland to live in American and Russian-occupied Germany.

This uncivilized and inhuman situation cannot be permitted to continue. Both of the major parties in the United States pledged themselves in their platforms of 1944 to call for unrestricted immigration to Palestine. The British Labor Party and many of its leaders have urged the same action. The Labor Party has formed the present British Government and I feel that our Government should continue in its representations to the British Government until action is taken to provide refuge for the harassed Jewish people.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who is our able majority leader on the floor of this great House, stated in substance that he viewed the human race as one family and that we had to face the Palestine question, under discussion today, with that relationship of men of all the world in view, he stated that it is the foundation stone upon which we can choose and have an enduring peace, or we can again have world wars. When, and only when, we view men of all races, creeds, and colors and origins as belonging to the brotherhood of man, will be sufficiently set in motion economic and social thinking and planning which will preserve democracy against devastating attacks from other parts of the world resulting from fear, starvation, poverty, daily hunger, intolerance, and ignorance, superstition, and prejudice.

I am happy to emphatically raise my voice in unison with the other distinguished members in this House who have already spoken or will yet speak in support of the worthy objectives of emphasizing and urging fair and just and humane treatment to the homeless Jewish people of Europe who have been driven from pillar to post and are asking a place of reasonable security in which to live back in their fatherland of Palestine. The white paper should not be continued a scrap of paper, and the declaration and pronouncement of the Balfour document should have immediate opportunity to have practical application in terms of humane and civilized treatment to people of Jewish birth or descent, who ask this reasonable opportunity to enter Palestine.

I commend President Truman for his expressed request of England that 1,000 certificates be granted to the Jewish people at this time that they might enter Palestine and there settle and live. But while this request can only be considered an interim request it will stop hundreds of thousands of people from suffering starvation and further privation.

This war has catapulted us into a world neighborhood, and from which we cannot emerge nor apart from which we cannot safely live unto ourselves. No physical or material or artificial boundaries can again cause eradication of our

relationships or responsibilities as living in this world neighborhood. Therefore whatever relates to the hunger or security or daily mistreatment or abuse of the masses of people anywhere in the world relates to the safety and security of we folks of the American continent. Therefore, it is soundly and sanely our duty and responsibility to speak up in behalf of and to the end that these Jewish world neighbors of ours, wherever they now are, shall have justice done unto them. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is fundamentally not less a necessity to the Jews—or to any other people in the world—than it is to us in our great Nation. It is not enough that we think that the freedoms and that the justice and that the security of America is made only for ourselves. We must be willing that all people shall have the same for themselves. Enduring spiritual values will never set in motion nor perpetuate as a result of promulgation of prejudice or hatred or ill will against other people on account of their race or creed or color. Neither is material prosperity or progress permanently made as a result of applications of such undemocratic principles or thinking or action. These citizens about whom we are speaking today are neither voters nor residents of the United States. But they are citizens of the world in which we must live. They are a minority people it is true. But only as the rights of the minority are respected and fought for by the majority will democracy endure. This is true in world thinking and action as well as in the experience of our own Nation. My own son and millions of other sons of America were either killed or injured or disabled for life on account of the need and necessity of fighting to preserve the democratic way of life. They have died that such a way of life might have a new birth and renewed vigor. We who live after them, we who live because they died, cannot now safely, or at all, refuse or neglect to continue to give our best endeavor by consecrated patriotic thinking and action to the end that these homeless, persecuted minority peoples shall have this place which is their desire; and which should be made available to them.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, some days ago a delegation called on me from my congressional district to discuss the Palestine problem. Among the delegation were some of the leading citizens of my community. They were extremely anxious that everything be done in order to provide a commonwealth for the homeless Jews in Palestine. I heartily agree with this objective. I want to, by my voice, by my vote, and my every act, do everything I can to persuade those in authority in the United States Government, as well as to persuade those in authority in the British Government, to act, and act quickly, to see that this worthy objective is brought about at the earliest possible moment.

Recently I enjoyed seeing the March of Time, in which was portrayed the excellent work done by the Jewish people in Palestine—great land developments,

beautiful homes, beautiful public buildings, the establishment of institutions of learning, the reclamation of what was considered a lost land; altogether, a vast amount of public improvement.

If in the short time allotted to those people such magnificent results can be accomplished, would it not be to the interest of Jewish refugees, would it not be to the interest of the Arabs themselves—yes, to civilization—to reclaim lost land, to put it to good use, and to bring about such remarkable, successful results?

I hope that every Member of this great body will join with me in lending their every aid to see that this problem of Palestine is solved, and solved properly, by the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth.

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, I include a talk which I delivered at a protest meeting held under the sponsorship of the Zionist Emergency Committee of New Haven at the Commercial High School last Sunday evening:

Nowhere at the present time are the Jews in the majority and the masters of their own fate. Everywhere they are in the minority, easily subject to discrimination, indignities, and even attack. This is not a normal condition for the Jews or for any other people, and this disability must be corrected. This can only be done through national independence.

The Jews are a nation. They possess all the attributes of a nation. They have a history, a national tradition, a powerful urge for nationhood, a language, a common religion and culture. They possess all the attributes of a nation except one—a free land. This is not normal and demands rectification.

Now that the war is over, it will be absolutely necessary to provide opportunity for resettlement of some millions of Jews. No place will be open to them, except as yet wild and undeveloped territories. Only Palestine begins to fill the requirements necessary to meet this problem. It has the room, the basic development, and as far as the Jews of Palestine are concerned, the welcome sign is on the door. These prospective immigrants need Palestine; Palestine needs them for its further growth. But the basic condition for that growth is sovereignty, and it is this condition which must be established and recognized by the nations. The Jews have proved such excellent nation builders that they have surprised everybody. They have given the lie to the charge of their detractors that they are not pioneers and creators, but can only utilize the labor of others to make profits as middlemen. They have achieved results in Palestine that have astounded the whole world. They might have achieved results in some other territory, but there can be no question but that Palestine has been the real stimulus for the accomplishment of so much in so short a time.

Jewish devotion of the soil of the ancient homeland, all of its sacred and historical associations in the memory and faith of the Jewish people, the omnipresent urge to return and redeem the land and, not least, the utter necessity for doing so, are the basic factors which have made possible the results. If the Jews are given the opportunity freely and under their own authority to further the development of the country, who can now doubt but that they will ultimately build a nation, a civilization, a culture, and produce a social order which will be a source of honor and satisfaction to not only themselves but to the world.

The persecution of the Jews under the Nazis and under other governments has made the problem of a Jewish national home urgent. From 1942, when the Nazi extermination began, to June 1944 between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 European Jews were killed. Even since VE-day injustices have continued to exist and inhumane methods have not been eliminated. In Slovakia many returning Jews are being refused certificates of political and moral reliability, which are needed in order to obtain employment. In innumerable instances returning Jews have not been allowed to reenter their homes, shops, or factories, and according to Mr. Earl G. Harrison, in his report on conditions in Europe to President Truman, it is estimated that in February of 1945 there were 1,500,000 Jews still in Europe, and that not more than one-third of them would wish to return to their former homes.

It is true that there are still thousands of displaced persons in Europe, but I am of the opinion that the Jews among these displaced persons present a much more touching problem than their fellow sufferers, because Jews have always been more severely victimized than the non-Jews and also because many of these Jews are stateless or do not wish to return to their previous homes; as a result, they have seen many instances of quick return of liberated people to their homes, while liberation has meant little improvement in their own position, but rather continuation of their plight as internees living behind barbed wire in concentration camps, in buildings unfit for winter use, wearing their concentration camp garbs, with high death rates continuing, living on a very poor diet, separated from their families and with little or no opportunity to make use of their capacity for productive work.

The main solution, and in many ways the only real solution, of the problem lies in the quick evacuation of all nonrepatriable Jews in Germany and Austria who wish to go to Palestine.

Some people will ask, but will these Jews want to leave their native land now that nazism is defeated? The answer to this by a number of qualified, realistic observers of the European scene is that the desire will be overwhelming among most of the Jews of central Europe, just as they know that most of the statesmen of Europe will be glad to see them go.

But the Jewish needs come last. Even if physically present, economically the Jew has been expelled. Any and every attempt on the part of a well-meaning government to admit or reintegrate them into the economic community will meet with approximately the same respect that would be accorded to a policy of large-scale physical immigration. We all know how unthinkingly fanatic populations become in time of stress on the subject of immigration and how ill-advised a government would be to disregard these needs. The attempt would never succeed, were it seriously tried.

Another argument advanced by those who oppose further Jewish immigration into Palestine is its limited absorptive capacity. But the absorptive capacity of any country is a dynamic and expanding conception. It changes with the ability of the population to make the maximum out of its land. It is clear, however, that full utilization of the Jordan Valley depression for reclamation and power will in time make possible the absorption of at least 4,000,000 Jewish refugees, principally from Europe. Therefore, limited absorptive capacity may be looked upon as a red herring drawn across the trail of those who are trying to design a sound policy for the United States to pursue in relation to Palestine. Some arguments are entirely contrary to American tradition for the American people have always believed in the creative



ability of man to master his destiny by new economic development through invention and enterprise.

Although there is opposition from the Arab Federation at the present time to the Zionist program, it is nevertheless true that the building up of the Jewish population in Palestine has resulted in economic advancement for the Arabs, and in this connection it should also be noted that at the peace conference held following the last war that the proposals submitted by the Zionist organization were approved by the Arab delegation when, speaking through their chief, Emir Feisal, they stated, "we regard them as moderate and proper." It might be well at this point to review British policy and position on this question because no satisfactory solution of the problem can be reached without full and complete cooperation of the British Government. In 1917 the British Government, by reason of the Balfour Declaration, declared that the establishment of a national home in Palestine was the policy and object of the British Government, and that this privilege should be extended to them without prejudices to the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish residents of the community. In September of 1923, as a result of a previous Allied agreement at the peace conference, Palestine was declared to be a mandated territory with Great Britain as the overseer. The terms of this mandate stated specifically that the mandatory power was to create a national home for the Jewish people. But the British did not pursue firmly the purposes underlying the Balfour Declaration and the terms of the mandate, but whittled down the idea of a national home in order to attempt to satisfy the Arab nationalists. Arabs are more numerous and evidently more important to the British Empire than Jews and oil is thicker than blood. An example of this was when in 1930 the British proposed to limit Jewish immigration into Palestine as a relief for Arab unemployment, and the further instance is the recommendation of Lord Peel's commission in 1937 to partition Palestine and establish an independent Arab government there in order to stem the increasing tide of Jewish immigration, which developed during the years of Nazi oppression.

This policy of appeasement on the part of the British Government encouraged the Arabs to hope that violence would stop Jewish immigration, and Fascist and Nazi sources gave financial aid to the Arabs to carry out their sinister purposes. The climax came, of course, in 1939 with the issuance of the infamous white paper in which the principles of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate's constitution were abandoned, and which further proposed that Jewish immigration end in 5 years unless the Arabs acquiesced to further immigration, and that no more than 75,000 immigrants be allowed in that period, and that Jewish purchases of land be limited.

Neither the United States nor any other member of the League of Nations, by whose authority and consent England was given the mandate, was consulted prior to the issuance of the white paper, which was evidently not only done for the purpose of appeasing the Arabs but to gain for themselves certain special commercial and strategic advantages in the area.

It may be argued that even though all of these contentions are true, just where does the United States fit into that picture? What is our responsibility? Are we not meddling in affairs which do not concern us? The answer is an emphatic "No." Because in 1920 the United States asserted its right as a participant in the First World War to be consulted regarding the terms of the Palestine mandate and the British Government concurred. Congress then, by the adoption of a joint resolution, affirmed this Government's approval of the establishment in Pal-

estine of a national home for the Jewish people without prejudice to the civil and religious rights of the other inhabitants. Further, on November 17, 1930, Lloyd George, in a report to the House of Commons, declared that the United States Government had been consulted and had given its consent to the Balfour Declaration before it was announced. Following the Balfour Declaration and prior to the granting of mandatory powers to Great Britain, President Wilson also stated, and I quote, "I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our Government and the people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth." And at an earlier date, in his Fourteen Points Wilson said, and I quote, "The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured of secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development."

In 1924 a trade convention was held between the United States and Great Britain as a result of which an agreement was entered into extending equal trade rights to the United States in Palestine which Great Britain and the other members of the League enjoyed under the mandate. This convention quoted the no discrimination article of the mandate and stipulated that nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States, and President Roosevelt told the Zionist leaders on March 9, 1944, that the United States had never given its approval to the white paper of 1939, which abrogated the terms of the mandate and nullified the Balfour declaration. We all are familiar with subsequent events when, as a result of platforms adopted by both major political parties, resolutions were introduced into the last session of Congress which restate the position of the United States regarding Palestine and the establishment of a homeland for the Jewish people therein. These resolutions in the last Congress were not passed by reason of a request from the War Department that passage of the resolution would be prejudicial to the prosecution of the war. Subsequently, Secretary of War Stimson stated that military considerations were now not as strong as they had been and that in his judgment political considerations now outweigh the military, but at a later date Secretary of State Stettinius appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and requested postponement of consideration of the resolution at that time.

Similar resolutions were before introduced in this session of Congress, one by me; and now that the war is over our representatives are meeting with representatives of the other Allied Nations of the world, in which boundaries of nations are being established and other matters of vast importance concerning the world of tomorrow are being determined, and I certainly think that the Congress should at this time adopt this resolution and declare to our representatives thereby what the feeling and attitude of the American Nation is toward the establishment of a homeland for the Jewish people, and reemphasize our traditional policy that all people should be free and independent to rule themselves in their own land, in a democratic manner.

#### CAN GREAT BRITAIN CONTINUE TO DISREGARD ITS MANDATE OBLIGATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am in honor bound to congratulate the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] and all of the Members who have spoken today on the unfortunate Palestine situation.

I know that the Jewish people of this country and the world over, as well as all fair-minded men and women, will applaud and be grateful to all of them for their straightforward reasoning and splendid expressions in behalf of the Jewish people who have dreamed for centuries that many of their brethren might finally reestablish a home in the Holy Land.

There is nothing that I can add to what has been said on this question, but I hope the expression of so many outstanding Members of Congress will strengthen the determination of President Truman to pursue this cause. And I also hope today's demonstration will have some effect upon Great Britain, who has willfully violated the obligation it assumed under the mandate.

With respect to the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] on the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House in the last Congress, I wish to say that the Committee on Rules was ready to act favorably, to provide for its immediate consideration by the House. Only upon the urgent request of the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, who stated he feared that it would increase the friction between the United States and Great Britain, was action deferred. Though vitally interested in the resolution I myself felt that it was my country first and I could not be a party to anything to bring about discord and hamper the war's prosecution or that might delay the defeat of Hitler and the Japs.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, numerous members here have expressed their desire that Palestine be opened as a national home for the Jews.

For several years I have urged that our Government take a more active part in pressing the British to recognize their Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, which confirms the Balfour Declaration, and which would bring about the desire of many Jewish peoples of the world.

I speak not for the purpose of repeating those things which we have heard here today. I desire principally to point out that it is a solemn obligation of the British Government to fulfill both the Balfour Declaration and the treaty. If it is necessary to afford temporary military protection that these people might establish themselves peacefully, then I contend that it is likewise an obligation of the British Government.

America has an unusual lever at this particular moment. Britain is in need of American funds for postwar stability. American intentions in world operation for peace and American hopes in postwar international trade set up certain pertinent desires which should be a part of our definite foreign policy. Among these various concessions which we should demand there seems to me to be ample reason for the demand for the fulfillment of Palestine. I cannot escape the feeling that there is a moral obligation on the part of the American Government to make such an inclusion. Yes, we will help Britain, but we have every right to expect that full responsibility and performance will be given by Britain in the recognition of her treaties.

I was one of the original members of the American Palestine Committee, now known as the American Christian Palestine Committee, and I propose to share my responsibility in helping to push toward this worth-while goal.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are many individuals, in fact a majority I presume, who feel that the widely discussed issue of reopening Palestine for Jewish immigration does not concern them.

I feel the Palestine question is one sore spot in today's world about which something can and should be done quickly. These sores are the breeding spots of the international wars that do affect all of us, as we of this generation know only too well.

Thus it behooves all of us to move toward real solutions. Too long have we been content merely to talk pros and cons, putting off final decision or action. That has been true of the Palestine issue.

The Jewish people have built a tremendously progressive new civilization in the Palestine area. They have turned barren land to miraculous new fertility. The job they have done in giving new life to that previously worn-out area is one of the startling developments in Near East history.

I recently visited Palestine. I saw the wonderful development by the Jewish people. I saw it from the air. I saw young forests and crops of various kinds being planted and growing, new irrigation and hydroelectric projects, all in an area that had been desolate and unproductive for a thousand years. This was the land which Moses saw, the Promised Land for the Israelites. It was then productive. For subsequent generations it was barren under Arab rule. It was again promised the modern Israelite under League of Nations jurisdiction.

Due to political considerations, the British saw fit in 1940 summarily to prohibit further Jewish immigration to the world homeland the Jewish people themselves had worked hard to create in the Palestine area. The British had no real authority to issue this white paper edict. But ticklish wartime relations, particularly in regard to oil reserves controlled by the Arabian peoples, permitted the edict to stand. Other nations, for similar reasons, failed to interfere.

Now the war is over. In the meantime thousands of Jewish people have been made homeless, in addition to infliction of persecutions on them on a scale hitherto unparalleled in history. The minority who have survived have, in part, no homes to which to return. In part, they do not wish to return, due to massacre of relatives and other reasons.

A portion of these people should be permitted to settle in the one world homeland which is their own. Our own United States experts estimate that the Jewish homeland in Palestine is capable of absorbing between four and six million more persons. So it is not a question of overcrowding in Palestine, at the expense of the Arabian peoples in the same area. The issue is not between Arabs and Jews in Palestine; it is a political issue between the rulers of the other nations surrounding Palestine, a question of

maintaining the "traditional" balance of power in that region.

Here are thousands of displaced people, and here a short ways away is their homeland, where at least a portion of them could find good homes and a useful future—a best possible chance to start again under welcome conditions.

In our endeavor to help provide real solutions to some of the many problems of this world, here is a place to start. Now is the time to resume immigration into Palestine. I hope the resolution before the House and Senate, urging such action, will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has acted in the best of American traditions in urging that the British Government permit 100,000 dispossessed Jewish people of Europe to enter Palestine. Our country was founded by men of ability and character who were not given a chance to exercise their talents and worship as they saw fit in Europe. We know that when such people are given a chance in a new land, they, the land, and the whole world will profit from the experiment.

The civilized world owes the Jews the opportunity for a new life. For 12 years the Nazi Party used them as its chief scapegoat. Long before Hitler had the strength to mobilize his attack on other countries he had developed his theory of racial superiority and was teaching the brutal and ignorant people who made up most of his immediate following to persecute the Jews. It gave them a feeling of superiority to have someone to bully. The Jews were hounded and harried, robbed of their possessions, driven from their jobs, denied the exercise of their religion, systematically starved, beaten, and murdered.

We have just fought and won a great war against nazism in all its forms. It is only fair and fitting that we should now give every aid to the first and worst victims of nazism, the people whose stand for intellectual freedom brought upon them the foulest persecutions of modern times.

Between five and six million Jews have lost their lives, most of them through infamous torture. Many more are mental or physical wrecks from what they have been through. One of the most vivid pictures in my memory is a description by a correspondent early in 1940 of elderly Jews sitting in cold, dark rooms hopelessly waiting for death. They were allowed no heat or light or food rations; they had no longer the strength to creep out and forage in garbage cans. They simply sat there until they died.

But there are many who somehow survived, with the strength and ability to start life anew in a new land, where their skill and character can help build a fine civilization. The achievements of the Jews who returned to Palestine under the Balfour Declaration prove what can be done. It is up to us to see that as many as possible of the Jewish victims of Hitler who want to go to Palestine and start life over can do so. Palestine is able to absorb many more than are now there. Europe does not have a place for them at present. Emigration

may have had to be stopped during the war, but there is no excuse for not encouraging and aiding it now. What are we waiting for?

Members of Congress and others who have been to Palestine recently bring back glowing reports of the Jewish colonies there. With the use of modern methods of irrigation and soil culture, the desert has been made to bloom and bear fruit. Many industries have developed, all of which were important to the United Nations in the war against Hitler. Likewise the Palestinian Jews furnished many thousands of valuable troops in the successful military struggle against nazism.

I sincerely hope this House will show its appreciation of the debt all lovers of democracy owe the Jews. The President has led the way. Soon, very soon, we should pass a resolution indicating our disapproval of the infamous white paper and urging that Palestine be opened for settlement by those brave survivors of the Hitler fury. It is the least we can do for those who suffered from the extreme barbarism of the Nazis.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in PM.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial, a letter, and some short excerpts.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks on the Palestinian question, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter that I wrote.

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

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL AID AIRPORT ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 371 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities; that, after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted, if any, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto, if any, to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

\* This rule makes in order the bill (H. R. 3615) providing aid and assistance to



the States to build and construct airports greatly needed throughout the United States.

If I am not mistaken, the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The rule provides for 2 hours' general debate, after which it will be taken up for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill is endorsed by nearly every organization in the United States and, as you all know, President Truman is very anxious to have this legislation enacted, because he feels it is needed; that all phases of air service are bound to increase, and that the additional construction, expansion, and improvement of airports will be of great benefit to the commerce of the people of the United States.

The Senate has passed a bill similar to this one. I want to commend the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for having, after careful consideration, improved the Senate bill. Originally, I was fearful that the Senate bill might restrict and preclude some of the larger cities from being able to obtain the cooperation of the Department or Commission in expanding or improving their airports. But the House bill eliminates any doubt pertaining to that and makes provision whereby any municipality can, of its own volition, make direct application, if it is shown that expansion and improvements are necessary.

I am not going to explain the provisions of the bill except to say that it provides for \$650,000,000 to be expended within the next 10 years. Three million dollars is provided to be used for surveys and preliminary work. I am of the opinion that within a short space of time many sections of our country, alive to the advantages of having air-service facilities, will be greatly benefited.

I do not know and I hesitate to call attention to one fact, but for the year 1945 we are spending \$35,000,000 for air-mail service; for 1946, it is estimated that domestic air-mail service will be subsidized to the extent of \$43,000,000 and foreign air mail in the amount of \$7,000,000. For 1947 it will be \$50,000,000 for domestic air mail and \$7,000,000 for foreign air mail. I wish to leave the thought with the committee, with the House, and with the country that we have a large number of airplanes which I feel could be used to great advantage to carry our mail, and in all likelihood if properly handled might effect a saving of 50 percent or perhaps even 60 percent of the tremendous amount we are paying to the air lines.

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

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois is aware of the fact that in the fiscal year 1944 air mail provided a profit to the Government of about \$50,000,000?

Mr. SABATH. It did?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; according to the report of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SABATH. At any rate, it was collected from the people because of the increased cost of air-mail service.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; that is not altogether because of the increase. It caused a part of it, to be sure.

Mr. SABATH. But it was partially responsible.

Mr. HINSHAW. It was a collection by the Government.

Mr. SABATH. Furthermore, because the Department handled the matter economically and gave the country splendid service, savings were made and that amount of profit was shown to the Government, but it was not a direct profit; there was a residue after we had increased the cost of air-mail service. Is not that right? The gentleman is well informed, I know.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is in part correct; yes.

Mr. SABATH. We cannot be 100-percent perfect in everything.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the gentleman has stated correctly the amount paid the air lines for carrying air mail, but the Government charged an additional amount of postage which was in excess of that by more than double.

Mr. SABATH. All right. Why do I call attention to it? Because I read in the newspapers only yesterday an article to the effect that efforts are being made, or a contract has been entered into by one company to obtain control of another. Should this continue, instead of having four or five air lines we would have but two or three.

Let me mention the fact also before I yield the floor that an effort was made on the part of some gentlemen, among them being the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], to embody in this bill a provision that would compel the Commission to grant permits to railroads, steamship lines, truck and bus lines. We felt such a provision had no place in this bill, especially in view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who presented the application for the rule to the Committee on Rules, assured the Committee on Rules that his committee has been considering this proposition and that within a short time they would submit to the House legislation to take care of these needed permits for these various shipping, railroad, and transportation companies.

I feel that these opportunities should not be restricted to the four air lines, and that the railroads, the shipping companies, or the bus lines, be excluded from obtaining the privilege and the right also to enlarge and increase their facilities through obtaining a permit, because, in my opinion, there will be a tremendous increase in air transportation.

Knowing how thoroughly the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will explain the bill and its details, I am not going to impose upon the House further and delay consideration of this extremely meritorious prop-

osition. I will conclude my remarks by saying that I hope the resolution providing for the consideration of the bill will be approved and that the bill itself will be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of H. R. 3615, which is a bill to furnish Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities. The rule provides for 2 hours' general debate, after which it shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It also provides for one motion to recommit.

The basic purpose and objective of the proposed Federal Aid Airport Act is to bring about, through a program of grants-in-aid, the establishment of an integrated Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics in the United States and its Territories and possessions. This airport system is to include not only the large terminal airports needed to accommodate commercial air transportation but also the many smaller airports needed for private or personal flying.

It is needless for me to say that the airplane has demonstrated its usefulness. It is now regarded as one of our larger industries. It will continue to contribute to our economic progress. The need for the passage of this bill is urgent. Greater airport facilities are needed in order to serve the ever-growing needs of the public. This program will materially advance the general welfare by bringing about improved transportation facilities and service; it will make available the advantages of air-mail service to a larger proportion of the population; it will make the flying machine of more value and use. It will benefit the communities served by the airports, and protect and promote the public health and safety.

As far as I have been able to learn there is not anyone of the minority who is opposed to this rule. However, I understand that several amendments will be offered which are entitled to your attention and thoughtful consideration.

I have asked permission to speak out of order. Of late I have received many letters from young men in the naval service. In most instances these young men have given long and commendable service. In no uncertain terms they have denounced the policy of the Navy relative to discharge. I now ask your in-

dulgence in the reading of one of these typical letters. Unquestionably you have all received similar ones. I am frank to confess that I personally have been dissatisfied with the actions of the Navy Department regarding demobilization of its personnel. Many times I have vigorously urged a more equitable consideration on their part in the discharge of seasoned veterans. Undoubtedly many of you read *The Washington Merry-Go-Round* today pertaining to the discharge of Navy personnel. I quote:

On September 10, Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal stated that the total size of the United States Navy was 3,389,000 men. Seven days later, September 17, Admiral Lou Denfeld, in charge of Navy personnel, told the House Naval Affairs Committee that the Navy totaled 3,415,000 men. In other words, at a time when men were supposed to be discharged, the Navy increased 26,000 men in 1 week.

I would ask you if there is any justification for this position on the part of the Navy. There is only one way to stop this unjustifiable condition and that is by congressional action on our part. This is the letter that I received from a very admirable young man. I know that it will be of interest to you.

OCTOBER 2, 1945.

MR. LEO E. ALLEN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEO: It has been quite some time since I have written you, but, believe me, I wouldn't be writing this letter unless I figured you could help me and a few million other fellows in the service with enough points for discharge from the Navy.

I have known you for quite some time, and I'm sure you realize that this is an important matter for you as well as for me.

The question is this: Why is it that we are not getting home the way we were promised? There surely isn't any efficiency in the Navy Department or else we would be on our way home. I can't for the life of me understand why the Army can get its men back and not the Navy. We have been here in the Pacific for almost 2 years and we have not as much as seen a liberty port or a white woman.

Truly the war is over and millions of us have answered the call to our country in her need. We have served her faithfully and well. Now all we ask is a little consideration for us. If you men in Congress expect to be reelected to office you people better get on the ball. Truly, these have been trying times for all of us, and one cannot expect a miracle, but, after all, Leo, I hate to be lied to continually. All I'm asking is the opportunity to get home to my wife. We have been apart for almost 2 years and I know if you were in my shoes or anyone else's you would feel the same as I.

If you men in Congress expect us to sit idly by—well, Leo, I'm afraid you are mistaken.

Truly the war is over; what a marvelous victory for us; with all our high ideals and equality and justice, if you call being left holding the bag after we have done our part, I'm afraid we have lost the victory for which this war was fought.

Can it be possible that you men in whose hands rests the fate of a Nation sit idly by and leave us the ones who have really sacrificed ourselves to preserve this, our United States, be left in an out-of-way place so that whenever the Navy Department gets ready it will release us to return to our loved ones? Why is it that men who have been stationed Stateside since the war began be released with a total number of 35 points before us who have served at sea since our enlistment. If that is justice, equality, and

the pursuit of happiness, then it cannot be the United States, the country in which I was born and brought up to uphold the traditions on which our country was founded. I'm sorry I had to write this way, but, believe me, this is the viewpoint of a few million men. Hoping that you men in Congress can help settle this issue but quick, I remain, Sincerely,

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this Federal-aid airport bill—H. R. 3615—which proposes to provide aid for the development of public airports.

The bill authorizes an aggregate appropriation of \$650,000,000 to be spent over a period of 10 years beginning with the next fiscal year.

I have always been a strong advocate of the development of our air facilities to their maximum efficiency. Air development is a guaranty toward our national security, as the history of the recent war clearly proves. It is likewise a valuable asset in the development of our peacetime economy.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a relief to every Member of Congress who is interested in the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine to know that this act will be administered by the Civil Aeronautics Authority rather than the Civil Aeronautics Board. As I have heretofore pointed out, there are four interdependent principal links in the chain of our national defense—the Army, the Navy, the merchant marine, and our Air Forces. By its action in refusing the right to American ship operators to operate air lines parallel to their surface routes, the Civil Aeronautics Board has clearly demonstrated its inability to recognize this fact. On the contrary, its policies and actions tend to destroy one with the other. Too few people realize the seriousness of this situation. The United States Maritime Commission at the present time has 19 excellent passenger ships to sell which cost some \$304,000,000. Each of these ships will carry more than 500 passengers. They are excellent ships to compete with foreign ship operators on surface routes. Because the Civil Aeronautics Board will not give the right to operate air lines parallel to surface routes, the Maritime Commission cannot find American ship operators to purchase these 19 ships. This is but a single illustration of the vast harm being done to our American merchant marine by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. Speaker, it was hoped by many Members of Congress that this bill might have been brought in with a rule sufficiently broad to lift the heavy hand of injustice that has been placed upon the American merchant marine by the action of the Civil Aeronautics Board in denying American shippers equal opportunity with every other maritime nation in the world. No other nation would tolerate such action.

It is to be hoped that first consideration will be given by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in administering this act to publicly owned and financed terminal airports, which are international in their service.

The city of San Francisco has been one of the most forward-looking in regard to airport facilities. Strategically located at the air crossroads of the Occident and the Orient, it has one of the finest airports in the world. Although some \$20,000,000 has already been spent in its development, the voters of San Francisco will go to the polls next month to authorize another \$20,000,000 bond issue for the further development of its airport facilities. Just as the port of San Francisco has been one of the world's greatest ports of embarkation in the war, so its great airport will be one of the keys to our future national defense in the air.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be speedily enacted into law.

Mr. SAEATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include communications on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the rule, but, Mr. Speaker, I favor the Howell amendment to this bill because the Federal-city pattern can only serve to create a competition between various units of the State for Federal aid. The Federal Administrator would be required to bargain separately with thousands of municipalities and other subdivisions of the various States. What we might find is a high-pressured campaign put on for Federal funds to support excessive and extravagant projects. Larger projects contemplated by the large cities would not be coordinated with plans of the State governments for a State-wide system, conferring maximum benefits on the State as a whole and on the Nation.

A Federal-State pattern has worked successfully under the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916, as carried forward under the Federal Highway Act of 1944. Our experiences under these highway acts certainly indicate that we should continue the Federal-State pattern for airports. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the attorney general of Maryland, the Honorable William Curran; a letter from the Council of State Governments; a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; and a telegram from the State Aviation Committee of Maryland:

ANNAPOLIS, Md., October 16, 1945.

HON. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, JR.,

Member of Congress:

Urgently request your favorable consideration of proposal for establishment national system of airports to provide that Federal airport agency should operate through States in accordance with long-established successful pattern of Federal-States cooperation. This proposal unanimously backed by Council of State Government, by Governors' Conference, and by National Association of State Aviation Officials. Understand Congressman HOWELL has introduced amendment to House bill making this provision. Would appreciate your helpful support.

HERBERT O'CONOR,  
Governor of Maryland.



THE STATE LAW DEPARTMENT,  
Baltimore, Md., August 29, 1945.  
Hon. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, Jr.,  
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR TOMMY: I am in receipt of a bulletin from the Council of State Governments, which I think should be brought to your attention. I am attaching a copy of it. The matter is self-explanatory, and I do think it is of considerable importance.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,  
WILLIAM CURRAN,  
Attorney General.

[Enclosure]

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS,  
Chicago, Ill., August 24, 1945.  
To All Attorneys General:

Two bills are now pending in Congress having to do with a national system of airports: Senate bill No. 2 in the Senate (commonly known as the McCarran bill), and House bill No. 3615 (commonly known as the Lea bill).

The States—through the Council of State Governments and its affiliated agencies and the National Association of State Aviation Officials—while strongly supporting a Federal program for the establishment of a national airport system, nevertheless, have opposed certain features of these bills which, in their opinion, would be very detrimental to the program itself and to the States.

The House bill provides that the National Government in the development of a national airport program would deal directly with the thousands of political subdivisions of the States, without any reference to the States whatever; while the Senate bill provides that the national administration would deal directly with all of the larger political subdivisions (numbering more than 800) and would deal through the States only with respect to the smaller airports.

If either of these bills were enacted, they would:

1. Abandon the long-established pattern of Federal-State relations that has been used in practically every continuing cooperative service, such as agriculture, highways, vocational education, public health, social security, etc.

2. Establish a new principle of intergovernmental relationships on a continuing basis, a principle which in large part short-circuits all State governments; and this principle, if established with respect to airports, would without a doubt be advocated as an administrative pattern for all future programs participated in by the Federal Government, many of which are now under consideration, such as education, hospitals, general public works, etc.

3. Establish a duplex system of administration—Federal-State on the one hand, Federal-local on the other—and such a duplex system of necessity would be ineffective in operation, extravagant in the use of public funds, and a source of widespread controversy.

4. Require the enormous expansion of a Federal agency, the employment of thousands of additional Federal workers who, in large part, would duplicate the very work that can be done—in fact, is now being done—by State institutions and agencies already established.

5. Establish over a very short period of time just a Federal system—Federal policy, Federal program, Federal direction and operation. That has been the history of practically all of the emergency programs which were attempted on a Federal-local basis.

The bills are now pending on the floors of the House and the Senate, and action upon them can be expected soon after Congress reconvenes early in September.

I, therefore, urge that you study these bills, copies of which have been sent to you, and advise your congressional delegation about this subject.

This is a most important matter, involving not only the development and construction of a national airport system but also the gov-

ernmental pattern which we are to adopt with respect to all postwar public works.

Action on this is badly needed now.

With best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

FRANK BANE,  
Executive Director.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, D. C., October 13, 1945.  
Hon. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, Jr.,  
Member of Congress,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When you have an opportunity to vote on the Lea airport bill, H. R. 3615, which is scheduled to be brought up in the House very soon, we would greatly appreciate your favorable consideration of certain proposed amendments:

1. An amendment to require Federal aid to be handled through the States in the same manner as highway aid.

2. An amendment which would cause all airport projects to be initiated by the States in cooperation with local authorities, the Federal Administrator to have power to approve or require modifications.

3. An amendment which would restrict the use of Federal funds to grading, runway construction, lighting and other safety features. With such a change, State and local authorities would be obliged to pay for buildings, as well as lands, thereby making possible substantial reductions in Federal appropriations.

4. An amendment eliminating from the bill the provision which would authorize the use of the Federal power of condemnation in the acquisition of airport sites.

The foregoing proposals would bring the pending bill into conformity with basic principles adopted by referendum vote of the member organizations of the United States Chamber of Commerce. We respectfully request your support of appropriate revisions in the bill which in other respects is in satisfactory form and should be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD L. VOLGENAU.

BALTIMORE, MD., October 2, 1945.  
Hon. THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.:

Copy has been received of telegram dated September 27 sent by the mayor of Baltimore presumably to each of Maryland's Representatives in Congress. Previously I have urged you to support amendments to the Lea bill similar to the Brewster amendment to the McCarran bill in the Senate so that channeling of Federal funds in aid for the construction of airports will be kept on the State-Federal Government level. What Baltimore's mayor is contending for will create a hodgepodge development of airports in this State and hamper public airport construction which will serve the entire State. I repeat my request that you advocate amendment of the Lea bill in the manner I have previously suggested.

CHARLES H. BUCK,  
Chairman, State Aviation Commission of Maryland.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this airport bill involves an appropriation, I believe, of about \$700,000,000 to build airports all over the country. I think it is very distinctly a case of putting the cart before the horse because at this time the Civil Aeronautics Administration has not settled their policy about who is going to use these airports that the taxpayers' money is going to build. Ref-

erence has been made to it in this debate. At the present time, ship companies, railroad companies, bus companies, and so-called feeder companies have never been able to get an established policy from the Civil Aeronautics as to whether they are going to be able to operate or whether they are not going to be able to operate. I have no complaint against the four big air lines, but it does seem to me to be a rather remarkable situation that the Federal Government should be spending \$700,000,000 to build airports for stopping places for the four big air lines, who are the only air lines up to now who seem to have obtained an established policy of who can use these airports. It does seem to me that before we can proceed with this program all the transportation lines of the country ought to know whether we are building a billion dollars' worth of airports for the four big air lines or whether we are building them for the benefit of all the transportation systems in the country. I hope some thought will be given to the question of getting a definite policy of whether or not these airports are going to be used just for the four big air lines or whether they are going to be used for the benefit of the country generally before we spend all this money for that purpose.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 167]

Adams	Ellis	Kearney
Bailey	Ellsworth	Keogh
Baldwin, Md.	Elsaesser	Kilburn
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ervin	King
Bates, Mass.	Flannagan	Kinzer
Bennet, N. Y.	Fulton	Kirwan
Bishop	Gamble	LeFevre
Blackney	Gardner	Lesinski
Bloom	Gary	Luce
Bolton	Gerlach	Lynch
Bradley, Mich.	Gifford	McConnell
Bradley, Pa.	Gillespie	McGehee
Brumbaugh	Gillie	McKenzie
Buckley	Gordon	Madden
Burgin	Gore	Maloney
Butler	Granger	May
Byrne, N. Y.	Griffiths	Morrow
Campbell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.
Canfield	Hagen	Miller, Nebr.
Cannon, Fla.	Hall	Monroe
Clason	Edwin Arthur	Mott
Cole, Kans.	Hall	Norton
Cooley	Leonard W.	O'Neal
Corbett	Hare	Outland
Courtney	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Ga.
Cox	Hart	Pfeffer
Curley	Hartley	Phillips
Daughton, Va.	Heffernan	Plumley
Dawson	Henry	Powell
De Lacy	Herter	Price, Fla.
Dickstein	Holmes, Mass.	Quinn, N. Y.
Dingell	Holmes, Wash.	Rains
Dolliver	Hope	Rayfield
Doughton, N. C.	Izac	Rich
Douglas, Calif.	Jensen	Rivers
Drewry	Johnson	Rizley
Durham	Lyndon B.	Robertson
Eaton	Judd	N. Dak.

Robinson, Utah Stigler  
Roe, N. Y. Stockman  
Rogers, Fla. Tarver  
Rogers, N. Y. Taylor  
Rowan Tolan  
Savage Torrens  
Short Vinson  
Simpson, Pa. Voorhis, Calif.  
Starkey Vursell

Wadsworth  
Wasielewski  
Weiss  
Whittington  
Winter  
Woodrum, Va.  
Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 293 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT ACT

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 3615, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss briefly some of the principal provisions of this bill.

The bill proposes a national airport program. It has in contemplation a synchronized system of airports covering the country. Those airports are intended to provide for commercial aviation as well as private flyers.

You may divide the airports provided for into two general classes. One would be what is called class 4 or larger and the other would be what are called class 3 or smaller. There will be approximately 6,200 airports in the program, of which about 800 will be of the larger type and 5,400 small ones for private flying and for local and domestic commerce.

The plan proposed is to be formulated by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. It will be the duty of the Administrator under this bill to consult with the Civil Aeronautics Board in formulating this program, and with the States and municipalities of the country. He shall also confer with the War and Navy Departments, for two purposes: one, for consulting with the War and Navy Departments as to how these new airports may serve national-defense purposes so far as is feasible; and the other purpose of consultation with the War and Navy Departments is to procure so far as feasible the use of military airports for civilian purposes when peace is fully restored.

The grants to be made by the Federal Government are limited entirely to funds already provided for that purpose. The total appropriations authorized by this bill would be \$703,000,000. Of this sum \$3,000,000 is to be appropriated for im-

mediate use in planning surveys and preparing preliminarily for the institution of this program.

The program is to cover 10 years, to begin this year under the terms of this bill. Not exceeding \$650,000,000 is authorized for airports in the States, at a rate not to exceed \$100,000,000 a year. This gives the Committee on Appropriations a wide discretion as to when and how much shall be appropriated for these purposes. All the way through the bill it provides that not exceeding the specified sums may be authorized.

The advantage of a long-time program for this purpose is apparent. This is a great program. It probably marks a great change in the transportation system of our country. It is not at all improbable that the changes that will occur in the next decade or two as affecting aviation will be similar to what was accomplished in this country when we gave Federal aid to public roads.

This plan gives the Committee on Appropriations complete control of the money that is simply authorized in this bill. The time for carrying out the program will give the country the benefit of experience as it progresses. It will permit the Federal Government to proceed cautiously and with regard to the changing conditions that may develop as the program advances. In the end, it will make it possible to have a complete, comprehensive, and practical program for the advancement of aviation. Within a few years the passage of this bill will be a landmark in the progress of aviation in our country.

Not exceeding 5 percent of the amount appropriated for these projects will be used for surveying, investigating, and preliminary purposes including administration. There is also a provision for the authorization of \$50,000,000 for the Territories and possessions of the United States to develop aviation fields in those areas. Of this sum, there is authorized not exceeding \$10,000,000 for the 10-year program for Alaska, \$15,000,000 for Hawaii, and \$10,000,000 for Puerto Rico, and \$15,000,000 for places not specifically named for the possessions of the United States. That might include any mandated territory that the United States may take as the result of treaties following the war.

The plan provides that after an appropriation is made, the Administrator will apportion among the various States of the country 75 percent of the funds available for projects. Fifty percent is to be allotted in the proportion of the population and area of each State to the total population and area of the United States. That formula was adopted in an attempt to assure every State in the country that it would have a reasonable and fair share of the money appropriated for this purpose. Naturally, the fundamental purpose is to provide airports where they are needed and not to provide them unless they are needed.

This particular formula to a certain extent is an abstract one. It does not with absolute accuracy reflect the purpose of the bill to provide airports where needed, but it does serve the purpose of guaranteeing to each State a fair share of the funds appropriated. In order to

cover cases where there might be an unfair or unnecessary apportionment of funds or where there would be an im-provident apportionment of funds if this formula were followed strictly, the bill provides that 25 percent of the funds appropriated for projects are to be spent at the discretion of the Administrator in sections of the country where they are most needed. But money used out of the discretionary funds must be matched by at least a 50-percent contribution by the sponsors of the project.

Approvals of projects and therefore for Federal funds must provide for no more than 50 percent as the share of the Federal Government.

The agencies that may apply for these aid funds may be a State or Territory, or an agency of the State or Territory, or a county or municipality, political subdivision, or a tax-supported corporation.

Two or more qualified sponsors may join in an application. Undoubtedly, that will frequently occur. Municipalities near each other will join in applying for the funds to establish a jointly used airport. States may also cooperate with municipalities. We hope they will.

Under this bill as it is written, it should be distinctly understood that it does not bar any appropriate sponsor from applying for these funds. The State itself can apply. A State ordinarily has power to prohibit municipalities from applying for such aid. So far as the bill is concerned, it permits a municipality, State, county, or city, or political subdivision to qualify as a sponsor. It would permit a State and any other qualified sponsor to apply jointly.

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

Mr. LEA. Very briefly.

Mr. HEBERT. I just want to get a bit of information. Where a municipality wants to apply, then it does not have to go through the State, provided the municipality provides the funds to match the Federal fund. Is that right?

Mr. LEA. That is right.

Mr. HEBERT. Suppose a State also has a similar set-up? If a State wants to locate an airport in a municipality, the State would have to furnish the funds to match the Federal fund?

Mr. LEA. It would. Yes. At least there must be a sponsor who will match the Federal funds. Airports are for municipalities. Ordinarily a State will not own these airports. They are for the municipalities of the country and they will be maintained by the municipalities and operated by the municipalities, as a usual thing. Of course, a State could, if it wanted to, have an airport of its own, maintained at its own expense, but I think it is likely that many States will be little disposed to go in, and out of the State treasury, build State airports, or support municipal airports.

Mr. HEBERT. That is the point I am getting at. The city puts up the money and the city controls the airport, with the Federal Government?

Mr. LEA. That is right. This goes on the theory that the man who pays the bill ought to have something to say about



how the money is spent. He ought to get what he wants for the money he puts up.

Every project must be approved by the Administrator before any money can be spent by the Federal Government. In addition to that, after an agreement is reached, it must be reduced to writing. No money can be spent by the Federal Government until it is in writing, and that contract must provide a specific and definite sum of money as the total maximum liability of the Federal Government. We put that in there to avoid running up costs on contracts after they are made.

The Administrator must determine that the funds for the Federal Government's share are available before he approves it. He must ascertain that matching funds are available and that all the sponsorship requirements have been met. In addition to that, after it is proposed to build one of these airports, a public hearing is had, at which any person, or community, or organization substantially interested has the right to appear in support of or in opposition to the establishment of the airport.

I should mention in passing that the only exception to this 50-percent matching requirement of Federal funds is in the case of Alaska. Provision is made that the Federal Government may contribute 75 percent of the project costs in Alaska. One reason for this is because of the meager population of Alaska and its wealth is so limited in proportion to its area. In addition to that, all authorities on aviation agree that Alaska is going to be a very important part of the world in future aviation. There is a national necessity to take care of that situation.

One of the sponsorship requirements, among others, is that the air field will be subject to undiscriminating use by the public on reasonable terms; that it will be suitably operated and maintained; that the aerial approaches will be cleared and kept clear; that the facilities of the airport will be available at all times, without charge, to the United States Government, except for expenses in repairing damages that the use of the airport may suffer, or a reasonable charge where there is substantial use of the airport for military purposes.

The sponsors must also agree to give the Government space, without charge, in the airport buildings for air-traffic control, for weather-reporting service, and for communications. The airport authorities must keep records.

One provision of this bill that has excited some criticism is the provision providing that on request of the sponsor of an airport to the Administrator he may bring suit in the Federal court to condemn property, as provided in the Federal Act of 1931.

The municipality or whoever owns the airport must bear all the expense of that condemnation proceeding. They can proceed that way only when the Administrator determines that there will be unreasonable delay or no practicable method of condemning the property without that procedure.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I was just wondering as I listened to the gentleman's able presentation, is not this a complete departure from the general rules of Federal aid, inasmuch as it permits a municipality to deal directly with the Federal Government?

Mr. LEA. No; we have been doing that in airports up to date. Ordinarily the Government deals in direct contracts with those who assume their obligations.

Mr. REED of New York. I am talking about other Federal-aid projects.

Mr. LEA. It is not similar to roads. The roads belong to the State; the State draws the money and builds the road. These airports belong primarily to the municipalities.

Mr. REED of New York. Suppose a State has worked out an aviation plan which they believe is suitable for that State. Could this municipality totally disregard the State plan and deal with the Federal Government?

Mr. LEA. It could. It could only in case the State law permitted it to do so and if the representatives of the Federal Government saw fit to accept its application. It might be that the city offered a better plan than the State. If here were two applicants for the same airport it would be for the Administrator to determine which would be accepted.

Mr. REED of New York. I am not quarreling with the bill necessarily; I do not know enough about the bill at this time, I have not had an opportunity to study it, but I should like to clear the atmosphere a little bit as I go along.

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

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I may state to the gentleman from New York that if the State law requires a channeling of funds through a State agency we feel that matter should be settled between the States and the municipalities as to which law should govern. Is not that correct?

Mr. LEA. Yes; the State has complete control of it. If the State does not want its municipalities to apply it has the right to prohibit them.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I may call the gentleman's attention to the fact that fewer than half the States have any of these acts at all.

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

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. On page 3 of the committee report appears the statement that the funds shall be channeled through the aeronautics commission of a State or other State agencies in the event any State has legislation setting up its own aeronautical commission, and providing for the funds to be disbursed under the direction of that State commission. Can the gentleman point out in the bill itself the provision in law to which that statement in the report makes reference? I have gone through it rather hurriedly but I confess I have not found it in the bill.

Mr. LEA. That statement in the report is the legal conclusion from the provisions of the bill. No exclusive privilege is given to the municipalities or to the State. The State, however, has power to prohibit a municipality from applying if it so desires.

Mr. KEEFE. Then we understand the situation to be as stated in the report, that as to those States which have legislatively set up aeronautical boards or commissions the funds will be channeled through such State agency.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Just a minute, if the gentleman from California will permit. The State's authority would have to go a little further than just setting up the board, the State would have to provide for the channeling of funds through that board.

Mr. KEEFE. Then do I understand the situation to be that unless the State has by legislation directed that all funds to come through this bill shall be handled by a State agency that they will be handled directly with the sponsors, each municipality? Is that right?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is unless the State acts as a cosponsor.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not get a good answer.

Mr. LEA. I believe the situation is simply that this bill does not provide any exclusive approach to either the State or the municipality in applying; either may apply until there is some law that disqualifies one from applying. Whichever applies must arrange to pay the bill.

A sponsor must be legally qualified to assume its obligation under the Government grant. The sponsor must be legally qualified under State law and meet the Federal requirements of a sponsor.

Ordinarily a State would have no legitimate reason for wanting to deprive a municipality of the right to build an airport by using its own funds to match Federal funds.

One of the deplorable features of the present situation is the strenuous efforts being made by agents of States to secure State channeling in States that are unprepared to match Federal funds.

I am afraid if we compel State channeling by the States, we will definitely delay aviation progress. In fact, I think it is very improbable that many States, in any large measure, are going to buy these airports for the municipalities.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to get this clear. I think it is the most controversial thing in the entire bill, and for this reason I am asking the question. Assume that the State of Wisconsin, one of the districts of which I represent through its legislature passes legislation setting up an aeronautical board in contemplation of the enactment of this legislation, and in that legislation provides and directs that any moneys obtained under the sponsorship of either the State or municipality shall be channeled through and be subject to expenditure under the direction of this State body.

Mr. LEA. That would give the State sole jurisdiction.

Mr. KEEFE. That would give the State sole jurisdiction. Is there anything in this bill that would permit the State to do that, or is there anything in here that would prevent that?

Mr. LEA. Yes. The State can do that. It can decide that question for itself.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot find language in here either way.

Mr. LEA. There is, because a municipality is legally disqualified in view of that situation. It lacks legal authority to assume the responsibilities of a sponsor.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. REED of New York. Suppose we have a situation such as exists in the case of some of the airports in my State, where they have runways already erected and in operation, as well as certain other improvements, can the Federal Government step in and say, "You will have to build these approaches as we suggest before you get any more money," or are they going to get any more money under this bill?

Mr. LEA. If they will comply with the Federal requirements, they can qualify for funds. The theory of Federal aid here, as in case of public roads, is that the standards of construction must conform to Government specifications, or matching funds are not provided.

Mr. REED of New York. They must comply with the Federal requirements to get any further benefits?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. Those are conditions precedent?

Mr. LEA. And they must have the approval of the Administrator for the money that is spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has given long and serious consideration to all matters that have a direct or indirect bearing upon the development of an adequate and efficient postwar system of air transportation.

The committee is fully aware of the important part that aviation can and will take in the postwar period in promoting the general welfare, economic prosperity, and a system of national defense.

The bill, H. R. 3615, now before the House makes provision for the development of one of the most essential features of postwar aviation, namely, a system of Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States.

The bill, generally speaking, accepts the fundamental principles recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in connection with the national airport plan it presented to Congress in November 1944—House Document No. 807, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

I am of the opinion, after listening to the testimony of many distinguished and informed persons in aviation matters before our committee, and who have given this bill their approval, that such an airport program as provided for in this bill would give civil aviation a real chance to expand rapidly, now that the war is over,

and will, in addition, provide a public-works program of Nation-wide proportions which can be undertaken immediately so as to provide thousands of jobs for ex-war workers during the period of reconversion from war work to civilian industry.

An analysis of the bill, by sections, follows:

#### TITLE I—FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

By this section title I is given the title of "Federal-Aid Airport Act."

##### SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS

This section defines he terms "Administrator"; "airport"; "airport development"; "airport hazard"; "project"; "project costs"; "public agency"; "public airport"; "sponsor"; and "possessions."

The term "airport development" includes, among other things, the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administrative buildings, but such term does not include the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars. While the Administrator will be authorized to pay not in excess of 50 percent of allowable project costs in the case of airport administrative buildings, he will be authorized to grant such aid only to the extent that expenditures for such buildings are reasonable and necessary in connection with the operation of the airport in question.

By reason of a limitation in the definition of "project costs" the Administrator will not have authority to pay any part of the cost of acquiring land or any interest therein, or any easement through or other interest in air space.

##### SECTION 3. NATIONAL AIRPORT PLAN

The Administrator is directed to prepare, and revise annually, a national plan for public airports in the United States and its Territories and possessions.

The plan is to specify general location and types of development, adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics.

The plan shall take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying and the probable growth of civil aeronautics.

The Administrator shall consult and consider recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the States, Territories, and possessions and their political subdivisions; also the War and Navy Departments, and he shall determine the extent to which the military and naval airports and facilities will be available for civil use. The War and Navy Departments are required to consider the views of the Administrator to the end that military fields may be used for civil purposes to the extent feasible.

##### SECTION 4. FEDERAL AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

To carry out the national airport plan, the Administrator, within the limits of available appropriations, is authorized to make grants to public agencies for public airports.

##### SECTION 5. APPROPRIATIONS

###### *Appropriations for preliminary expenses*

(a) An immediate appropriation of \$3,000,000 is authorized to cover preliminary planning and surveys by the Administrator incident to the initiation of the program.

###### *Appropriations for projects in States*

(b) For projects in the States, there is an authorization for annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to \$650,000,000 over a period of 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The appropriation for any one fiscal year may not exceed \$100,000,000. Not to exceed 5 percent of the annual appropriation is to be available for planning and research and administrative expenses. The appropriation

for each year is to remain available until June 30, 1956, unless sooner expended.

###### *Appropriations for projects in Territories and possessions*

(c) For projects in the Territories and possessions, there is an authorization for annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to \$50,000,000 over a period of 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. Not more than \$10,000,000 will be available for Alaska, not more than \$15,000,000 for Hawaii, and not more than \$10,000,000 for Puerto Rico. Provisions similar to those in subsection (b) are included as to administrative expenses and as to availability of appropriations.

###### *Administrative expenses*

(d) This subsection defines the type of administrative expenses for which funds may be expended.

##### SECTION 6. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR PROJECTS IN STATES

###### *Apportionment of funds*

(a) This subsection provides for apportioning among the States 75 percent of the funds available for projects under the program for the States, one-half in the proportion which the population of the State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. Amounts apportioned for a State may be used only for projects in that State.

###### *Discretionary fund*

(b) The funds, amounting to 25 percent, which are required to be apportioned among the States will constitute a discretionary fund which may be used by the Administrator in carrying out the airport plan, regardless of the State in which the projects are located. In using these funds the Administrator is directed to take into account the needs in the various States for airport facilities.

##### SECTION 7. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR PROJECTS IN TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

The funds appropriated for the Territories and possessions may be used in carrying out projects deemed appropriate under the airport plan, subject to the limitation regarding Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico indicated above.

##### SECTION 8. SUBMISSION OF PROJECTS

###### *Submission*

(a) Any public agency, or two or more public agencies, may submit an application for approval of a project included in the then current national airport plan. Proposals are to conform with standards established by the Administrator, including standards for site selection, airport lay-out, grading, drainage, seeding, paving, lighting, and safety of approaches.

###### *Approval*

(b) The Administrator may approve a project if satisfied that the proposal is sound; that sufficient funds are available; that the project will be completed without undue delay; and that sponsorship requirements have been or will be met.

###### *Hearings*

(c) Applications shall be public documents. Any person having a substantial interest may file a memorandum in support of or in opposition to an application. A public hearing with respect to the location of the airport as to which airport development is proposed shall be accorded upon request. Hearings will be held in accordance with the Administrator's regulations.

##### SECTION 9. FEDERAL SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS

The Federal share of project costs may not exceed 50 percent except in the case of Alaska, in which the share may be not to exceed 75 percent.



## SECTION 10. SPONSORSHIP

As a condition precedent to approval, the Administrator shall receive written assurances, satisfactory to him, that—

(1) the project will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms without unjust discrimination;

(2) the airport will be suitably maintained;

(3) aerial approaches will be protected and the creation of future hazards prevented;

(4) the facilities will be available to the United States by Government aircraft at all times without charge other than (a) for damage done, and (b) if the use by military or naval aircraft be substantial, a reasonable charge based upon such use;

(5) the owner or operator of the airport will provide the Government with space in airport buildings, free of charge, for traffic control, weather and communication activities;

(6) a standard accounting system prescribed by the Administrator will be maintained;

(7) annual or special airport reports will be made as the Administrator may reasonably request;

(8) the airport and its records will be available to the Administrator's inspection.

To insure compliance with sponsorship requirements, which the Administrator is directed to prescribe, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with public agencies on behalf of the United States. Such contracts will be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

## SECTION 11. GRANT AGREEMENTS

The Administrator may offer to pay not exceeding 50 percent of allowable project costs. The offer shall state the maximum obligation of the United States and stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the project sponsor. Such offer and acceptance in writing by the sponsor shall comprise a grant agreement.

## SECTION 12. ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS

The United States is not obligated to pay any part of a project cost unless the Administrator has first determined that such cost is allowable. A project cost shall be allowable—

(1) if it was incurred for airport development conforming to plans for an approved project and according to the terms of the grant agreement;

(2) if it was incurred subsequent to the grant agreement, unless the cost related to necessary preliminary work;

(3) but only to the extent that it is determined by the Administrator to be reasonable in amount.

## SECTION 13. PAYMENTS

The Administrator determines at what time and in what amounts payments shall be made, the aggregate of which at any time is not to exceed 50 percent of the project costs of development already performed. If excess payments are made they may be recovered by the United States.

## SECTION 14. PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION WORK

Construction work shall be subject to inspection and approval by the Administrator. Regulations shall require cost and progress reports by the sponsor.

## SECTION 15. ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR SPONSORS

Where the Administrator is of the opinion that necessary property cannot be acquired without undue expense or delay, he may, at the request of the sponsor, exercise the Federal power of condemnation to acquire the property for the sponsor. He is authorized to use the procedure of the act of February 26, 1931, under which possession and title may be taken in advance of final judgment. The entire cost is to be borne by sponsor, and the necessary funds are to be made available by the sponsor as needed.

## SECTION 16. USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

*Requests for use*

(a) When the Administrator determines the use of lands owned or controlled by the Government is reasonably necessary, he shall file a request with the agency having control of such land that the needed property (which may be any interest in land, including easements through or other interests in air space) be conveyed to the public agency sponsoring the project.

*Making of conveyances*

(b) The agency to which request is made shall determine whether compliance with the request is inconsistent with the agency's needs, and is to notify the Administrator within 4 months. If compliance is not inconsistent with such needs the agency is authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, to convey the property requested. The interest conveyed shall automatically revert to the United States if not developed or it ceases to be used for airport purposes.

## SECTION 17. REPORTS TO CONGRESS

The Administrator shall report to Congress as to his activities on or before the 3d day of January of each year.

## SECTION 18. FALSE STATEMENTS

Any employee or agent employed by the United States or any public agency in connection with the submission of plans, contracts, and estimates of costs, who shall knowingly make any false representations in any report required to be made with intention to defraud the United States, is punishable by not to exceed 5 years' imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000, or both such fine and imprisonment.

## SECTION 19. EXISTING AIRPORT PROGRAMS

The enactment of this bill is not to interfere with any existing airport program.

## TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAWS

## SECTION 201

This section amends the Civil Aeronautics Act by clarifying the definition of "airport" and provides for the use of that term in the Civil Aeronautics Act wherever the term "landing area" is now used.

## SECTION 202

(a) This subsection amends section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

The principal change relates to the power of the Administrator to establish, operate, and maintain air-navigation facilities. Paragraph (1) of section 302 (a) now provides that air-navigation facilities may be established, operated, and maintained along the civil airways. The amendment would permit the Administrator to establish, operate, and maintain these facilities "wherever necessary." In addition, the present subsection is amended by requiring the Administrator to provide such airways and air-navigation facilities as may be necessary for the operations of air carriers under certificates of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(b) This subsection amends section 302 (c) of the Civil Aeronautics Act to give the Administrator power, in carrying out section 302, to acquire property through gifts or other methods of acquisition, including condemnation, and to dispose of property.

Such condemnation would be directly in behalf of the Government for its own air-navigation facilities and conducted under the act of February 26, 1931, hereinbefore referred to.

## SECTION 203

(a) This subsection amends section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act, which now forbids the expenditure of Federal funds (other than those expended for military purposes or under the Civil Aeronautics Act) on airports or air-navigation facilities without a written

certification by the Administrator that the landing area or facility upon which the funds are to be expended is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense. The principal amendment to this provision makes it perfectly clear that the Administrator also has jurisdiction under section 303 with respect to airport buildings and other airport facilities and that he must find that the facilities are safe and adequate for present and prospective aeronautical use. Other amendments are made for the purpose of facilitating the exercise of power under this section and making it more effective.

(b) This subsection adds to the Civil Aeronautics Act a new section 304, to condition expenditure of Federal funds on airports under the Civil Aeronautics Act upon the giving of assurance to the Administrator that the airport will be open for public use on fair and reasonable terms, that it will be operated and maintained suitably, and that the approaches will be cleared and protected.

The new section 304 also deals with the granting of exclusive rights to the use of civil airways, airports, and other air-navigation facilities. It forbids the granting of an exclusive right for the use of any civil airway. This prohibition is now contained in section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act and is merely being transferred to this new section for the purpose of better placement in the statute. The section also forbids the granting of an exclusive right for the use of an airport or other air-navigation facility upon or in connection with which Federal funds have been expended. This provision is contained in section 303 of existing law, but has been interpreted to permit the granting of an exclusive right if it is required in the interest of safety and the granting of such a right to the Government of the United States. In rewriting this provision the committee retained the exception which would permit the granting of an exclusive right to the Government of the United States by writing it into the law specifically. However, the committee omitted a provision contained in H. R. 3170 which would have expressly authorized the Administrator to permit the granting of exclusive rights in the interest of safety, it being the committee's intention that exclusive rights should not be granted, even under such circumstances.

## SECTION 204

This section amends section 305 of the Civil Aeronautics Act to conform to the existing law by virtue of which the Weather Bureau is placed within the Department of Commerce instead of the Department of Agriculture.

## SECTION 205

This section adds a new section 804 to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, imposing upon the Coast and Geodetic Survey duties in connection with the preparation of aeronautical charts. The addition of this section is for the purpose of clarification since under its general powers the Coast and Geodetic Survey has been performing this work for many years.

## SECTION 206

This section amends section 5 (d) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926. This section now provides that any Government agency having jurisdiction over an airport or emergency landing field owned or operated by the United States may provide for the sale of fuel, oil, equipment, supplies, shelter, and mechanical service. Under the present provision such sales or other assistance may be provided only if, by reason of an emergency, it is necessary to the continuance of the aircraft to the nearest airport operated by private enterprise. This limitation has been changed so that sales and other assistance may be provided at any Government airport or emergency field located outside the continental United States or in a Territory or possession when comparable services and assistance are

not readily available from any other source. Such sales and other assistance may be provided within the continental United States only if, by reason of an emergency, such action is reasonably necessary to permit the continuance of the aircraft on its course. Limitations in this section do not restrict the Administrator's power under existing law with respect to the Washington National Airport.

## SECTION 207

This section amends existing law to provide that funds appropriated for air-navigation facilities shall remain available for two fiscal years. This section does not apply in the case of appropriations made pursuant to title I of the bill, which contains its own provisions as to the availability of appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, every witness appearing before the committee on this legislation was in favor of the Federal-aid airport construction and improvement program which this bill authorizes. There was some difference of opinion as to the method to be pursued in channeling Federal funds for the purposes of the act, but there was no difference of opinion as to the desirability and necessity of legislation to accomplish the broad objectives sought by this bill.

The witnesses in support of the bill represented different Government agencies, Federal, State, and municipal, having responsibility in the development of aviation. Airport operators, airport users, aircraft manufacturers, aviation insurance, veterans, general business, and construction industry also gave unanimous support to the purposes and fundamental principles of the bill.

These witnesses included, among others, representatives of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the United States Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Association, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, the Port of New York Authority, the Air Transport Association, the Feeder Airlines Association, the National Aviation Trades Association, the National Aeronautics Association, the Aircraft Distributors and Manufacturers Association, the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Associated General Contractors of America, the American Road Builders Association, and the American Legion.

The testimony before the committee clearly and forcibly demonstrated that the proposed airport program is a matter of national necessity in that it would serve many national needs and prove of great benefit to the public in many ways.

It was evident that such a program of airport development would stimulate and improve commerce, create a strong and efficient air-transportation business, stimulate aircraft manufacturing, and allied industries, and the many airport businesses such as the servicing and selling of aircraft and aviation materials and supplies. Furthermore, it would undoubtedly, by stimulation of aircraft and transportation business, increase permanent employment, stimulate private investment, and increase the national income.

It is equally clear that the development of airfields will create improved

and cheaper transportation facilities and services; make available the advantages of air-mail service to a larger portion of the population; bring private flying within the reach of the general public and make the private plane more useful; benefit the communities served by airports, and, in general, it would stimulate commerce by providing a new growth industry for personal and commercial transportation.

It was also pointed out that such a program as contemplated by this bill would prove valuable to our national defense as it would provide facilities needed for use by the armed forces, both in times of war and in peacetime, by ensuring a strong and efficient aircraft manufacturing industry; by making possible a larger and more efficient air-transport system; by stimulating pilot and mechanic training; by providing a proving ground for military aviation; and by generally making the Nation more air-minded.

In conclusion, may I also bring to the attention of the House that the committee, probably with exception as to one point, is in favor of the adoption of this bill. I trust that it may have the support and approval of the House.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. When the chairman of the committee the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] had the floor, he indicated that Alaska would get \$10,000,000, Puerto Rico \$10,000,000, Hawaii a certain amount, and so forth. Why was the District of Columbia left out of this bill?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am of the opinion that, under the provisions of the bill, it would be included. If there is any doubt as to the effect of the language in the bill, then I would favor any necessary amendment to make such purpose clear and definite.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that an assurance from the gentleman that the District of Columbia will be included in this and can participate?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am certainly in favor of it. If it is not already provided for by the language of the bill, then an appropriate amendment should be made to accomplish the purpose.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the provisions of this bill have been pretty well explained in general. I notice the Members of the House have a good many questions to ask. I am prepared to offer myself for their questioning. To the best of my ability I will answer them.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLE of New York. In view of the gentleman's willingness to cooperate with us by answering questions, can he advise us whether the bill contains any reference which would either permit or

prohibit the charge of a landing fee to any federally owned airplane at an airport constructed from these funds?

Mr. HINSHAW. The bill provides that at such airports as are covered by the bill, where Army and Navy planes stop as an occasional matter, no charge shall be made. However, if the Army or the Navy establishes a base at any airport or uses it as a base, in other words, makes frequent use of it beyond what might be considered ordinary transit, that is, organized use, it shall pay a reasonable fee to the owner and operator of the airport, generally a municipality, in order that it may maintain that airport and carry on its functions.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does not that privilege extend also to the airplanes of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and other Federal agencies?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is not limited just to the Army and the Navy?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. The language used is "Government aircraft."

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

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

Mr. JENKINS. I should like the gentleman to clear up the jurisdiction of the States and the municipalities. I understood the gentleman from California to say that the State is prior, and yet the municipality has authority. If the State is prior, how could the municipality have authority in case of a conflict?

Mr. HINSHAW. Permit me to discuss that briefly to the best of my ability. The gentleman will realize very clearly that there is a great conflict between the jurisdiction of the States and the municipalities when it comes to the business of receiving Federal contributions. Of course, both groups insist that their rights shall be maintained. The committee did its utmost to compromise the matter fairly. In other words, the jurisdiction of the bill is such that wherever a State passes a law or has a law in effect stating that all such contributions shall go through the State, naturally it will go through the State. If there is no such law on the statute books, then the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is required to be sure that the sponsorship for the airport shall meet certain conditions. The principal qualifications for sponsorship is contribution of funds. Wherever the State legislatures desired to make appropriations for the contribution of funds toward the airport, naturally they would join in the sponsorship of the airport. Without that sponsorship, the municipality would have to do it alone. So there is this encouragement, that wherever a State desires to make a contribution, of course the State will be consulted, but if the State refuses to make a contribution, refuses to have anything to do with it in any way, the Administrator is then permitted to proceed directly with the municipality or the municipalities.

Mr. JENKINS. In that connection, then, after the arrangement has been made, the bill provides that whoever asks for the airport must come forward with at least 50 percent of the expense thereof.



Mr. HINSHAW. They must contribute 50 percent of the expenses excluding lands. The bill specifically excludes land from that 50-percent provision. The funds are precluded from being used for the purchase of land.

Mr. JENKINS. The municipalities then must provide the land?

Mr. HINSHAW. They must provide the land and clear the approaches.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In other words, the municipality or the local sponsors must provide the land plus 50 percent?

Mr. HINSHAW. They must supply the land plus 50 percent and clear the approaches.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does this bill do anything to unfreeze the Army air bases that have been inactivated but which have not been made open for civilian plane use?

Mr. HINSHAW. This bill does not deal directly with that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does deal with the use of bases where there is some continued use. I will say the gentleman referred to that a minute ago.

Mr. HINSHAW. According to my present information, may I tell the gentleman the Surplus Property Disposal agency is now making arrangements with reference to the naval airfields which are declared surplus or soon will be, and the military fields, for the disposition of those fields in accordance with the degrees of priority that were set forth in the Surplus Property Disposal Act.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The question posed by the gentleman from South Dakota, I think, is important, and I think it should be pointed out that it is expected and hoped that the military airfields that are no longer needed for military purposes will be available in this program and it is specifically provided in the bill that in formulating the program the Administrator shall confer with the Army and Navy to the end that those airports be made available and a demand made as to those that are available.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, they would become part of the over-all airport plan as soon as they are made available. The committee, I know, is of a mind to encourage these agencies to dispose of their surplus fields in that way.

Mr. HALLECK. May I make one further suggestion. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] inquired as to the charge for the use of airports for federally owned planes. I think it should be pointed out also that we provide in this bill that the sponsors of the local airport shall provide space for Weather Bureau equipment and operation and other things incident to the operation of the airport provided by the Govern-

ment and that it shall be provided free of charge to the Federal Government.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct within the limitations placed in the bill. There are three services, the weather service, the airways traffic control, and the communications incident thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had the time, in the 5 minutes allotted to me, to express my regard for the great committee which reported this bill, and especially for the distinguished chairman of the committee. I have served with him for many years and on that account regret all the more that I have to oppose the bill reported by the committee. I also regret having to oppose the bill because of the strong sentiment in favor of the bill in some parts of my own State. A lot of people out there want the Government to continue to build their airports for them and to continue to furnish the money to provide other facilities and advantages which they should furnish for themselves.

But the bill is an anachronism. It harks back to the old WPA days before the war when this program was started and when the Federal Government was contributing large sums to the States and municipalities to prime the pump. Those days are gone—let us hope forever. This bill would have been in order at that time. It would have been an appropriate part of that program. But it is out of place and wholly obsolete in this modern day when WPA programs have been discarded and the States and cities have funds with which to finance their own improvements. The bill should not be passed.

In the first place, this bill should not be passed because we do not need it. At the beginning of the war we had a very complete system of airports, numbering 1,857, distributed strategically throughout the United States, as of July 1, 1940. To that number we have added during the war CAA airports, War Department ports, and naval ports until we have today a total of 3,774 airports, as of September 1, 1945.

That we do not need further airports at this time is demonstrated conclusively by the fact that the representatives of the War Department testified before the Committee on Appropriations last week that they are now arranging to return all of the 305 airports which they have operated during the war except 152. They say the 152 which they will retain are ample for all their needs and the rest are being turned over to the local authorities and municipalities without compensation.

The Navy is also returning all the ports which they have built or owned or operated during the war with the exception of 96. They testify that 96 will more than supply their requirements in time of peace. The remainder of the 3,774 airports—most of which have been built and all of which have been enlarged during the war—are available for any pur-

pose for which this bill proposes to provide.

It should also be noted that few if any of our commercial planes will require as long runways and as commodious facilities as required by our largest war planes. In fact it has been repeatedly testified by the highest authorities that in contravention with the views expressed here this afternoon, few if any of the war planes to be declared surplus can be used or reconditioned for use as peacetime planes. They require too much fuel, too much oil, and the cost of reconversion is higher than a new and better adapted commercial plane would cost. We not only have enough airports but we have as large and as adaptable airports as civil aviation will require for many years to come. In fact the principal purpose for which any funds made available under the pending bill would be used would be merely to enlarge and enhance and aggrandize existing ports to promote the commercial and civic interests and ambitions of enterprising municipalities and chambers of commerce. Pork—in large and luscious chunks—at the expense of the taxpayers and the United States Treasury.

In fact, the report on the bill plainly states that there is no present need for this money, but that it is to provide "airports adequate to anticipate the needs of civil aeronautics in the United States." In critical times like these when we can't balance the Budget this bill proposes to spend money we have not got to anticipate alleged needs—which the bald statistics of the CAA, the War Department, and the Navy Department show we do not need.

In the second place, we should not pass this bill and authorize this Arabian Nights program for the simple reason that we have not the money.

Mr. Chairman, we must get down to earth again. We must realize that we are operating under quite a different financial status from that we knew in the old days before the war. Then we were a rich nation. Money was plentiful. We could afford to buy whatever we needed or whatever pleased our fancy. If we incidentally wasted a billion dollars or two, it was not such a serious matter. There was always more where that came from.

Today the situation is drastically different. We owe nearly \$300,000,000,000. We are short billions of dollars of balancing our Budget. We must pay our debts. We must practice some elemental economy. We cannot spend money for a program merely because the money would be advantageously spent. That day has gone by—for the present at least. We can now spend money only for that which is indispensable. And this diamond tiara airport program is not indispensable. We can use the 3,774 airports and get along very well in the language of the classical legal adage. We must be just before we are generous. We must pay our honest debts before we make a gracious present to these favored cities of half the cost of these glittering airports refurbished at Federal expense to attract local business.

In short, the program to be promoted by the pending bill is an unholy combi-

nation of two ancient institutions with which we have had long experience—WPA and the pork barrel. The program here sought to be continued was initiated and had its beginning in the WPA of pre-war days. This bill proposes to resuscitate the WPA program when most of us had hoped to avoid another WPA, or at least defer it until every other resource had been exhausted. It also includes the old pork-barrel program under which favored localities dipped their hands deep in the Federal Treasury for local benefits and free contributions.

But the most serious menace of this bill is that it opens the doors to unlimited deficit spending. We have before us the warning example of what deficit spending will do in the present precarious condition of the English exchequer. They began spending money they did not have even before the war—living on borrowed capital. This bill proposes to adopt the same vicious policy of deficit spending for America. For every dollar of the money to be spent under this bill will have to be borrowed. We are already preparing on a gigantic scale for the Eighth War loan. We have not enough money to pay even our legitimate expenses. We must float a huge loan to pay a portion of our current obligations. If we add to our obligations the money proposed in this bill, we will have to borrow it. That is the road England took and which has led to her present embarrassing state. A vote for this bill is a vote for deficit spending, a vote for the strongest inflationary influences that can be brought to bear against our fiscal system, an undermining influence upon our national credit. And for what purpose? To turn over millions of dollars to States and municipalities which are in far better financial condition than the National Government. The Federal Government is in the red—approaching \$300,000,000 in the red. And the States and municipalities are without exception in the best financial condition in their history. If anyone doubts that, let him go out and check up on the financial condition of his State or city as of September 1, 1945. And then, if he has the heart to do it, let him check up on the condition of the United States Treasury.

And, Mr. Chairman, this bill is but the entering wedge. It opens the way to endless extension. Read the report on this point. Here it is on page 2 of the report:

This airport system is to include not only the large terminal airports needed to accommodate commercial air transportation but also the many smaller airports needed for private or personal flying.

The bill specifically provides for a favored few favored cities.

But the CAA some months ago issued the report of a survey listing all the potential airports in the country. It comprised a book the size of a telephone directory. It listed towns all over my congressional district and every other congressional district and right after breakfast the next morning, when the newspapers carried excerpts from the report, commercial clubs and chambers of commerce in my State began writing me to send them the money. They thought

it was already here waiting for them and they prepared to spend it. They are still waiting. And when the towns provided for by this bill begin to get their money every town listed in the CAA survey will begin to get impatient for like favors and the line will begin to form on the right. Billions of dollars would not suffice to care for this program extended to its ultimate conclusion. The time to stop it is right now. We do not need these airports. And we have not the money to pay for them. And we must protect the country from the inflation which inevitably accompanies such expenditures.

Every Member of this House favors economy—at least he favors economy as an abstract virtue when approached on the subject by constituents or newspaper reporters. There is not a man who favors this bill who did not vote last week to cut \$5,000,000,000 out of our national revenues. And the newspapers in reporting the debate reported a general demand on the floor for retrenchment. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means especially—for whom I have the deepest respect and affection—is reported to have demanded, both on the floor and in the lobby, that the Committee on Appropriations cut down expenditures. And here the next bill on the floor is a proposition—not to retrench—not even to hold expenditures in status quo—but to increase expenditures.

My friends, spending money does not begin with the Committee on Appropriations. It begins with the legislative committees. It begins in bills just like this, to which nobody pays any particular attention. When the point of no quorum was made here this morning there were less than 30 people on the floor. The Members did not have enough interest in the bill to be here. But a committee brings in a report and everybody takes it as a matter of course and it is passed practically by unanimous consent. Then they come to the Committee on Appropriations and say, "This bill was passed by a large majority. You are under a mandate to appropriate the money."

The war is not over. War expenditures are still continuing. Billions of dollars must be spent, because of the war, in the next 2 years. War incomes are still flowing. War wages, prices, and profits are still accruing and accumulating in vast amounts. We are still spending war money. We are still drawing war incomes. But we are cutting down war taxes. This generation which made this debt ought to pay it. We ought to pay it while we can pay it, while our national income is high, while everybody has the money to pay it. But we vote to cut \$5,000,000,000 off of taxes and off the national income. And the alibi we offer is that we are going to economize and the Committee on Appropriations is admonished to cut down expenditures. Then you bring in a bill like this. Instead of economizing you propose to increase expenditures.

The trouble with this Congress is that it has got used to spending money, and it is going to be hard to get down to a plane of not spending money. If we are not going to repudiate our debts, if we are not going to go into a great tailspin

of inflation; if we are to get back on a sound common-sense business basis, we must stop throwing money around in this profligate way.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have not more time. The bill ought to be defeated. The country wants it defeated.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I believe it appropriate, because of the remarks made by our friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to review quickly, but factually, what has happened in the United States through the action of the Congress in reference to Federal-aid highway legislation, and is now proposed for airport development, and which has become a recognized part of the American system of transportation.

In 1911, 1912, and in 1914 measures were brought before the Congress to initiate a Federal-aid highway program for this Nation. On those occasions the legislation was defeated and it was not until 1916, on the fourth attempt, that Congress realized the necessity for a coordinated system or pattern by which we would construct the Federal-aid highways. You will recall the time in America when you would ride on a hard-surfaced road for 30, 40, or 50 miles and then drop off literally in the mud and rocks, and after 50 miles of that sort of transportation condition you encountered another short stretch of improved or surfaced road.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It was not until 1921. I had charge of the bill that created this Federal highway system. Up until that time there was not an organized highway system in this country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Would the gentleman from Kentucky, disagreeing with the date I have used, agree with my statement as to conditions?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In 1916 we merely authorized a little money to build some test roads over the country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct, and is what I desired to say. The Congress embraced the theory, and began the practice, of our Federal-aid highway system. I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky for his interest then in such legislation and his continued support since when such legislation has been considered.

We came out of World War I and because of these roads that were being constructed and the automobiles that were being developed, became a nation on wheels. We were then and have continued since as the No. 1 transportation country of the World. We are emerging from the present global struggle not only a people on wheels but, more than that, a nation on wings.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.



Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. At the time they said that Federal-aid road legislation would bankrupt the country. It has instead proved a wonderful thing for the country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. When we provide a dollar in contribution to a Federal-aid highway or a Federal-aid airport system we are spending a dollar that will return multiplied dividends in the advantages it brings back to this Nation and to the people's well-being. Such values could never have been gained by a hodge-podge or a hit-and-miss system of development such as took place prior to our Federal-aid highway program and such necessary airport construction as we have had in this country.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] should recall that Federal aid to air lines brought back to the Government \$50,000,000 profit from air mail.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from California is correct in that observation. I return to observe a case in question, in Missouri, for my fine colleague from that State. In the year 1928 the city of St. Louis decided to issue \$2,000,000 in bonds for the construction of an airport. Those who desired the issuance of the bonds felt that the building of that project was in the public interest, but there was a group of individuals in St. Louis who believed that it was a private project and fought the program on that score.

What happened? In view of what our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has said, I read the declaration which was made by the spokesman in opposition to that airport development:

It will afford a starting and landing place for a few wealthy, ultrareckless persons, who own planes and who are engaged in private pleasure flying. They may pay somewhat for the privilege. It will afford a starting and landing place for pleasure tourists from other cities, alighting in St. Louis while flitting here and yon. It will offer a passenger station for the very few persons who are able to afford, and who desire to experience, the thrill of a novel and expensive mode of luxurious transportation. The number of persons using the airport will be about equal to the total number of persons who engage in big-game hunting, trips to the African wilderness, and voyages of North Pole exploration.

In the very nature of things, the vast majority of the inhabitants of city—a 99 percent majority—cannot now, and never can, reap any benefit from the existence of an airport. True, it may be permitted to the ordinary common garden variety of citizen to enter the airport free of charge, so that he may press his face against some restricting barrier, and sunburn his throat gazing at his more fortunate compatriots as they sportingly navigate the empyrean blue. But beyond that, beyond the right to hungrily look on the ordinary citizen gets no benefit from the taxes he is forced to pay.

It is noteworthy that the Missouri Supreme Court did not hold to that view-

point, and replied to the plaintiff with this opinion:

An airport with its beacons, landing fields, runways, and hangars is analogous to a harbor with its lights, wharves, and docks; the one is the landing place and haven of ships that navigate the water, the other of those that navigate the air. With respect to the public use which each subserves, they are essentially of the same character. If the ownership and maintenance of one falls within the scope of municipal government, it would seem that the other must necessarily do so. We accordingly hold that the acquisition and control of an airport is a city purpose within the purview of general constitutional law.

This very airport, the facilities of which were to be used by so few, according to the short-sighted opponents, brought to St. Louis on scheduled air lines last year the number of approximately 175,000 individuals. The figure does not include departures. We arrive at the basis of some 35 scheduled departing planes each day, multiply the figure by the 365 days of the year, and use 20 passengers per plane. The over-all total is conservative, but canceled flights due to weather, and so forth, have been considered.

Justice Cardozo, in 1928, gave the following view in connection with the desire of Utica, N. Y., to issue airport bonds:

We think the purpose to be served is both public and municipal. A city acts for city purposes when it builds a dock or a bridge or a street or a subway. Its purpose is not different when it builds an airport. Aviation is today an established method of transportation. The future, even the near future, will make it still more general. The city that is without the foresight to build the ports for the new traffic may soon be left behind in the race of competition. Chalcedon was called the city of the blind because its founders rejected the nobler site of Byzantium lying at their feet. The need for vision of the future in the governance of cities has not lessened with the years. The dweller within the gates, even more than the stranger from afar, will pay the price of blindness.

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Members, let us not be blind to our responsibility for leadership. The country calls for us to display realism in a world where the plane has shrunk distances.

We must remember that for many years a large part of our airport construction has been, first, a part of the work-relief program and, later, a part of the defense program. But we are now approaching a period when civil aviation is to be so important a part of our peacetime national economy, that airport development is a necessity to insure in the near future that aviation can maintain its rightful position as a major form of transportation along with the highway, water, and rail systems of our country.

It seems fair to use as an analogy the growth of the automotive industry after the last war. The Government provided the roads that the automobile needed, while today the airplane needs airports. These highways created traffic and, as a result, thousands of small service and repair stations came into existence, as they will come into existence at future airports. As road construction increased, the use of the automobile increased, and

sales mounted rapidly. These sales were followed by an increased number of better jobs in manufacturing plants, service and repair stations. This employment increase created a greater ability to buy. Thus was established a creative circle, with city, county, State, and Federal Governments providing the road facilities and law enforcement. Private industry contributed the manufacturing, service facilities, motortruck and bus transportation that meant an ever increasing demand for motor vehicles.

When we bring this type of legislation here, it is not truth to charge that in building airports we will benefit the air lines alone. We know that in 412 city communities with a population above 25,000 in this country, there are 602 airports. Only one-third of the 6,300 towns with 1,000 to 25,000 population have any airports whatsoever. Yet the gentleman from Missouri says we have too many airports today. We know that the metropolitan districts cover about 1.5 percent of the land area of this country, and they average one airport for 80 square miles, while in the remainder of the United States we have only one airport for approximately 1,230 square miles.

This legislation before us today is not primarily in the interest of the operation of the air carriers of this country. It will be to the benefit of the private flyer, and by "private flyer" I do not mean for pleasure travel; I mean by "private flyer" the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker in the conduct of their business, and these boys who are returning by the hundreds of thousands from the armed services, who will want to fly, and they will not expect to drive 50, 60, or 75 miles in order to pilot an airplane. They want that facility to be in their own community, and they have a right to expect it. These airport facilities will also provide for the feeder lines which are absolutely necessary to fit naturally into the system of the great air transport carriers of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is well for us to remember that in the Presidential message of our late Chief Executive in January of this year he made this statement:

To avail ourselves fully of the benefits of civil aviation, and if we use the automobiles that we can produce, it will be necessary to construct thousands of airports and to overhaul our entire highway system.

When President Roosevelt made that observation and challenge it was not alone for himself but he voiced the feeling of an awakening American people, as I believe this Congress will speak for the air era now on us. Aviation has come of age and we who believe in aviation, and certainly this Congress as individuals and as a collective body believes in aviation, are strongly in favor of the purposes of this bill.

Turning aside for a moment, a very dear friend became 75 years of age. He became interested in taking a flight not so long ago and wanted to fly over his friends below. A little two-place aircraft was secured and he climbed in with the pilot. After he had flown over the com-

munity for approximately 20 minutes, the pilot brought the ship in and he said to his passenger, whom we call "Uncle Dudley" affectionately: "Uncle Dudley, were you frightened?" Uncle Dudley replied, "No, but I never did let my full weight down in it."

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of the United States have literally placed their full weight of approval for this plan of providing the airport facilities that are absolutely necessary if America is to continue, as it has in the past, as a great forward-moving Nation. Whenever we bring peoples closer together, whenever we let communities rub shoulders, as they will through aviation, then we are doing a good job for better business relationships and mutual understanding. When we build an airport in a community we widen the circumference of living for each and every person there and that airport becomes the focus of radiating lines of communication with other cities, States, and countries. Such is the backbone and the basic philosophy of this legislation.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Speaking of the St. Louis proposition, the air lines are now meeting railway competition and a businessman can come to Washington from St. Louis in less than half of the time he would if he used the railroad. If we take a plane to St. Louis, it takes some of us longer to get down to our homes from St. Louis than it takes to go from Washington to St. Louis. That is why we want these airports scattered throughout the rural sections so we can have these facilities.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is quite correct. I recently flew from Chicago to Kansas City in less time than it took to drive from Kansas City to Maryville, a distance of 93 miles. An airport is ready for personal plane use in Maryville, but it can be improved under the help from this bill so that a feeder airline can operate successfully. Hundreds of like instances could be cited as proof that we need now coordinate the planning and construction of airports for the travelers who are ready to use this speedy and safe means of transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in many years I can see some hope of our being able to balance the Budget in the near future. For years there has been a little group in this House, led by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has constantly fought to protect the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States. But you will recall that every attempt that we made in these years to reduce appropriations was beaten down by a group of spenders led by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. We now welcome him to our ranks. He is going to be a tower of strength to those of us who have been looking with yearning eyes to

the balancing of the Budget. So, do not tell me that a leopard cannot change his spots. But there is another aspect to this matter. Where are we going to get the money for these enormous expenditures? I need not tell you that the national debt is now about \$270,000,000,000, which is a sum that is astronomical in its proportions and will require 10 to 15 generations to pay off. I am not decrying this particular appropriation, because I realize that we are on the threshold of the air age and must make provisions for it. It may be necessary, but I am wondering whether we could not prolong this program a little longer than is provided for in the bill before us. Six hundred and fifty million dollars is not a sum to be sneezed at, and I need not remind you Members that every State treasury in the Union is better able to finance local improvements than is the Federal Treasury. As a matter of fact, we are now scraping the bottom of the Federal bin. Let me ask you this: How can you expect tax reductions on one hand while constantly increasing appropriations on the other? The two do not mesh. When appropriations go up taxes must of necessity also go up, or deficit spending must be resorted to, and we want to get rid of deficit spending. We have had this unhealthy situation for about 14 years, and it is high time that we place our house in order. To attain that objective, which we strive for, I am going to suggest that we set up a Budget committee of the House, to be composed of members of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, as well as members of other committees, and let that committee meet yearly and determine just how much we must and can afford to spend during the current fiscal year. Then let the Congress keep within that budget. We cannot continue along the present line of loose spending when committees act on their own initiative in bringing in bills that call for the expenditure of hundreds of millions, if not of billions. We are going to have a tremendous load in taking care of those who come back from this war wounded and ill and the dependents of our heroic dead, also in servicing the debt, in addition to the ordinary expenditures of the Government. This is the hour to begin a program of real economy through retrenched spending. Henceforth expenditures must be kept within receipts. Any other course can only lead to a bankrupt Treasury.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think probably one of the most important questions in the minds of many Members today is whether or not the Federal Government is authorized by the provisions of this bill to circumvent the jurisdiction of the State government and to make its allocations and its designation of funds direct to the political subdivisions of a State. If any of you have any doubt about that, I direct your attention to page 3, line 7, of the bill wherein "public agency" is defined:

"Public agency" means the United States Government or any agency thereof; a State,

Territory, or possession of the United States, or an agency thereof; a municipality or other political subdivision; or a body politic, public or quasi-public corporation, or tax-supported organization.

Under that definition, according to the testimony of Mr. Charles B. Donaldson, Assistant Administrator for Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Federal Government might very well find itself doing business with 4,300 different units of Government. I quote Mr. Donaldson:

As the bill is presently drawn it would require that the Administrator deal directly with the sponsors of each project undertaken under the program. This would require direct dealings with approximately 4,300 units of Government. It is obvious that from an administrative point of view this would be extremely difficult and cumbersome.

We believe that a better solution would be a division of the program into two parts—an urban program and a State program.

In a bill recently passed by the other body such provision is made. Thirty-five percent of the funds go direct to the urban population for class 4 and 5 airports and 65 percent of the funds go to the States for class 1, 2, and 3 airports; but not under the terms of the House bill. The entire amount of not to exceed \$100,000,000 which is available in any one year—\$650,000,000 for 10 years—might very well be siphoned off entirely by a large municipal airport such as New York, or by our new airport in the city of Chicago, whereby those municipalities could go in and take practically all the funds, and your States and your rural communities would have little left available to them. So when the proper time comes, I propose to offer an amendment to this section which would cause all these funds to be channeled through the State governments, because after all our whole program over a period of years has been predicated upon this Federal-State cooperation.

As pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, over a period of 30 years the Federal Government and the States have developed cooperative programs in a number of different fields: in agriculture, highways, public health, vocational education, and social security. In the main, these programs have followed the same pattern—a Federal-State pattern. Such programs have, on the whole, been effectively and economically administered; and when the Congress in 1944 generally revised the National Highway Act, it re-established and reaffirmed the same pattern—this, after 28 years of experience in this public-works program.

At the present time some 44 States have created the necessary agencies to handle aviation matters and are ready to act. On page 332 of the hearings you will find an outline of the 42 States which already have those agencies created. Certainly, this represents a far greater realization of the obligation and responsibility in the development of a sound aviation program. So when the statement was made a minute ago that less than half the States had appropriate agencies to deal with the Federal Government, it is contrary to the publication made in the hearings themselves



and contrary to the latest tabulation of States that have resolutions pending at the present moment to establish appropriate agencies to do business with the Federal Government in the development of a Federal-State aviation program.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there was an accord in the committee with respect to the purposes of this bill. All the members of the committee hold the view that a national airport program should be set up. If this program is to accomplish its purpose, it must be an extensive program for the purpose of carrying air facilities to all the communities in the United States. It is my purpose to support this bill. There was some disagreement, however, with reference to the procedure. Some of us felt that before we set up a national airport program calling for the expenditure of very large sums of money, the Civil Aeronautics Act, under which the national airport program is to be administered, should be modified, brought up to date, and put in a condition which the Members feel it should be in order to accomplish an effective administration of the program. If the law is not brought up to date in advance of the establishment of the airport program, then it should be done concurrently with the establishment of the program. That is a view which some of us have held and do now hold, but under the parliamentary procedure, amendments to the general provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which do not relate to the airport program would not be germane and, therefore, such amendments cannot be offered. There are two important considerations in connection with the modification of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. One is the question of whether we should go back to the independent Civil Aeronautics Commission which existed before it was made a part of the Department of Commerce under one of the reorganization proposals. The other is determining the question of whether surface transportation should have a right to make application for air transportation certificates of convenience and necessity under such regulations as the law itself might set up by which the Commission could be guided in determining those applications. As many Members of the House and all the members of the committee of which I am a member understand, I am one who feels that the widest opportunity should be given for the development of civil aviation and that no organization or individual should be barred from the opportunity of making application and having that application considered on its merits by the Civil Aeronautics Board under the authority granted to the Board by the act itself. Otherwise, we are apt to get a transportation system which will be out of bounds and thus greatly jeopardize one of the important branches of our transportation system, which I am sure none of us want to do.

I think that in establishing an extensive CAA program in advance of deter-

mining these important questions which have to do with the basic law under which such a program is to be administered, there is danger of jeopardizing our unified transportation system. There is a possibility, as the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has stated on this floor many, many times, that we might drive the American merchant marine off the seas. Our merchant marine might be unable to operate successfully in competition with foreign lines which engage in air transportation in connection with their shipping operations unless it is permitted to likewise do so. None of us wants to do that. I, for one, am greatly disappointed that we at this time are not given an opportunity to determine those fundamental questions in relation to this problem at the same time we are considering setting up a national airport program. However, I have been assured by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], that he will hold hearings at a very early date on a bill dealing with those problems. Since that is the case, I am reconciling myself to going along with the enactment of this bill in setting up an airport development program at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, permit me to call attention to the fact in the consideration of this bill by the committee that most extensive and exhaustive hearings were had. The record shows some 500 pages of testimony. I do not know of any interest for or against this bill that was not heard to the fullest possible extent.

I want to say further in support of this bill that I have never seen a bill brought to the floor of this House so completely and fully rewritten as was this bill by the committee following the hearings. I recall that we had the hearings and then took the printed suggestions made by the various witnesses and went over them and rewrote the bill as it was originally introduced by the chairman of our committee the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

In passing, let me say that I believe this airport bill starts out on a sound basis of setting up and creating an over-all aviation picture for the development of the air. It is a sound approach that has been made upon a program which is dealing not particularly with the consideration of the larger air carriers, but the over-all picture of the various private, semiprivate, and public uses that our airports of the Nation may be used.

Permit me to say this with reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to the effect that many of the Army and Navy airports will be turned back to the communities and therefore there is no need for additional airports to be built. I do not know what power the gentleman exercises as to having military and naval airports in his own district, but I can say that in the State of Minnesota not

only in my own district but the State as a whole we had two airports which were used by the military. One of them was the largest commercial airport in our State, which was used jointly by the Army and the Navy. The other was a small naval air-training base which happened to be in my district and was for light training planes only. That is the trouble with the entire picture in this country. The Army and Navy set up these air training bases on which millions, yes, billions of dollars were expended usually in the southern part of the country because they felt it gave them more flying and training time. We did not have that consideration in the North, and let me say that I do not know of any State that needs an over-all development of airports more than Minnesota. There is so much need of further air development that I think this program will be of tremendous benefit to all.

I believe I can say frankly that one difficulty in the committee turned on the question of whether the funds were to be channeled through the State or through the individual sponsors. When it came out of committee we were in practical agreement upon it. Since that time the State group have put on quite a drive to impress the need of having the funds channeled through the State government. Let me say that my own aeronautical commissioner and at least the attorney general of my State support that view.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me point out that there is disagreement between municipalities and State officials on this question. If we do not have an over-all program developed by the national administration are you going to divide it up and have 48 different viewpoints as to what the over-all picture should be and will run into conditions that are rather inconsistent?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, from the beginning of civilization progress has moved forward on transportation. From the creation of the wheel to the development of the jet motor man's advancement has been measured by the form of transportation used. So, today we come to the problem of whether or not our Nation is going to contribute to the development of a new and expanding form of transportation and stay abreast of the world. It is my opinion from a study of this question that it is our duty and our responsibility to see that this country stays in the foremost ranks in the development of the highest form of transportation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Or would it interrupt him to yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The statement the gentleman is making is important. I recall that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], spoke about the Civil Aeronautics Administration bringing to Congress this tremendous program. The gentleman from Arizona is a member of the committee which brought out a resolution that the House passed, calling upon the CAA to bring an airport plan to the House and that is the reason for this bill.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is true. We have contributed to the various forms of transportation down through the years that this Nation has progressed. The last appropriation to rivers and harbors was \$1,000,000,000; for highways, to be expended over a period of 3 years, \$1,500,000,000, or \$500,000 per year, and I understand that for flood control \$800,000,000. We are providing in this bill for a development program equal to \$650,000,000 to be expended over 10 years.

This means more than the creation of airports for people to land on. It is the creation of a new industry; it is the creation of jobs in the factories which will manufacture airplanes; it is the creation of jobs for men who will facilitate the movement of traffic, both passenger and freight. It is a contribution toward the enlightenment and improvement of this great country of ours. It will keep us abreast of the rest of the world in aviation. When another war strikes we will be a leader in transportation.

It should not be necessary to go on explaining that the expending of this money will create wealth. The improvement of transportation always creates new wealth. I am amazed at the pennywise and pound-foolish attitude of some people who would defeat this legislation. We know that if we had taken that attitude in 1911, 1916, and 1921 and since that time, we would be a backward nation. I dismiss that attitude as not a sound, fundamental, and progressive one.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested particularly in one feature of the bill and that is the retention of the provision which will channel the funds through either the State or municipality. I am interested not only because my State does not yet have a State agency, and it will be 1947 before my State legislature meets and could take advantage of a bill which would limit funds to a State agency. There are many States that do not have State agencies. Many States do not have the funds to match the Federal funds provided for in this bill.

If the gentleman from Illinois were afraid of the actions of Chicago when dealing with a board so remote from Illinois as the CAA I should say he should be more concerned if Chicago had to deal with a State agency which by all means could be influenced by the political power of this great city.

I call the attention of my distinguished friend from Illinois to the fact that after careful and thorough consideration the committee determined that at this time it would be better to leave the avenue open for both the State and the municipality to apply.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a deep appreciation for the work the committee has done during these many months in connection with bringing a bill to the House dealing with expansion of airports in the United States. Those of us who have had considerable to do with appropriations for the Department of Commerce, in which the CAA is located, know something about your troubles. Only recently I visited nine States on a tour of inspection in connection with aviation and I corroborate what the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] had to say about the tremendous interest in the possibilities of expansion in aviation.

I visited one airport where over 400 men from the Army Air Corps were undergoing tests in order to secure pilot licenses. I talked to many of those men and every one of them wanted to go into some phase of aviation, either in flying, charter work, or the mechanical end.

I predict that by the end of this year the CAA will have issued at least 400,000 civilian pilot licenses. I believe that this airport bill is of national necessity. However, I am one of those who does not agree entirely with your committee, especially in the matter of channeling these funds through the various subdivisions of the States.

My State of Nebraska has been a leader in aviation and the construction of airports. We have an aeronautical commission in my State, most of the members of which are trained aviators. They have had much experience. We have cooperated with the CAA. We raise money by the taxation of aviation gasoline. That money is used for the purpose of assisting various towns with their airport problems. That money is used for the purpose of developing some landing areas, furnishing blueprints, specifications and plans. The Nebraska State aviation program has been in operation and doing well for a long time. If you are going to channel all these funds through every town or county in my State, my aviation commission might just as well fold up. You may have a hodgepodge administration of these funds. I hope, however, that when this bill goes to conference there will be some compromise. This is the real controversial part of this legislation.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman's interest in aviation matters is well known and deeply appreciated in this House. I hope the gentleman realizes that under the terms of the pending measure, where a State has an authority which is contributing funds, that that State will, of course, join in the sponsorship of this

program, and consequently the funds would be channeled through the State.

Mr. STEFAN. Not unless legislation is passed by the States as shown on page 3 of the report.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman does not suppose that the people in his State are going to come direct to the Federal Government for funds when they can get part of them from the State, does he?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Indiana propounded a question of the gentleman from California in reference to the airports to be declared surplus. I am reliably informed that those are going to be turned over to the RFC for sale in cooperation with the CAA. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that those airports should be considered in this bill, and when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, I hope the gentleman from Indiana has an amendment prepared in order to clarify that situation.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see this Federal aid for airports bill brought up as early as it was. I have a deep interest in this bill because for the past 2 months, I have been in daily contact with the CAA and the CAB pertaining to a bill which I had prepared which would provide funds for the erection of a class IV airport at Superior, Wis., dedicated to the memory of Maj. Richard I. Bong, the world's ace of aces, who so bravely and gallantly gave his life for our country.

I have contacted every Member of Congress of the Wisconsin delegation and they all enthusiastically supported such a bill. I have also contacted more than 200 Members of Congress personally, asking their support of the bill. More than 120 Members of Congress told me that they would support such a bill.

However, it was after getting the consent of 120 Members that I ran into trouble because the vast majority of the Members of Congress felt that the Federal aid for airports bill, which is under consideration, would provide ample funds to the city of Superior for the construction of a class IV airport. The members of the CAA and the CAB also felt that this Federal aid bill under consideration would provide ample funds for the construction of such an airport. The majority of the Members of Congress felt that the entire cost of such an airport should not be borne by the Federal Government because the State and the local community should also have a share in the construction of such a memorial.

Therefore, I am very happy that this Federal airport aid bill is up for passage today. From my observations, it is going to pass this House overwhelmingly. I am especially happy because the thing that is uppermost in the hearts and minds of all the people of northern Wisconsin is that an airport be built at Superior, Wis., as a memorial to Maj. Richard I. Bong. I see in this bill, if the State and the city of Superior cooperate, where they can get \$800,000 from the Federal Government as their half of the \$1,600,000 needed for the construction of a class IV airport in the city of Superior. I am in hopes that the State government will share at least 30 percent so that the cost to the city of



Superior will not be more than 20 percent. I am in hopes that the State of Wisconsin will go even higher than 30 percent, making the cost to the city of Superior as little as possible.

Besides the appropriation of \$800,000 from the Federal Government for this airport, I am positive that the CAA will, when the case is presented to them, assume the responsibility of maintaining this airport. As a lasting memorial to Major Bong and because such an airport would have great utility in the national aviation progress, I am sure that the CAA will assume that responsibility.

I have contacted the Federal Works Agency in Chicago to speed approval of the money applied for by the city of Superior for planning purposes. I expect a favorable reply within a few days.

I want to thank the Members of this House for speeding the passage of this bill. The citizens of Superior and all northern Wisconsin are deeply eager to start the construction of this memorial to Maj. Richard I. Bong. I know that if the city of Superior acts under this legislation with the cooperation of the State that their application will receive immediate consideration because of its nature and because of the great need for a class IV airport in the city of Superior. I have been thus assured.

For the reasons mentioned above, I am withholding my bill which I had prepared, awaiting to see what progress is being made under this bill. If for some reason things work out so that immediate construction cannot be started on this memorial airport, I shall beg and prevail upon the Members of Congress that the Federal Government owes a debt to Maj. Richard I. Bong and introduce the bill and hope that it will be passed.

I want to remind the Members of this House that Maj. Richard I. Bong is not only a national but a world hero. When the going was tough, his fighting in the Pacific resulted in downing 40 Japanese planes. Major Bong was called to the States when he had 28 Jap planes to his credit. He was given the choice of staying in the States at that time. But this was not Major Bong's spirit. He volunteered instead for additional duty in the Pacific and within a short time he downed 12 more Jap planes. This made him the world's ace of aces. At that time he was called to the States again and was told that because of his medals which he had, he was eligible for a discharge from the armed forces. This boy had every golden opportunity to be discharged from the armed forces. Several aviation companies tried to get a discharge for him over Major Bong's wishes but Major Bong volunteered to stay in the armed forces until the bitter end.

Before that fatal day that Major Bong was killed, he was advised by his superiors that he did not have to fly that plane because he had every requisite for a discharge so that he could enter civilian life. But Major Bong's response was "This fight is not finished for me until it is finished for everybody. If these planes are not safe enough for me, they are not safe enough for any GI."

This was the spirit behind Major Bong. He sought no favor ever and he would not accept any favors ever. His record has

no equal and most unfortunately, he has been taken from our midst.

It was in the city of Superior that Major Bong first became interested in aviation at the Superior State Teachers College. It was in the city of Superior that his wife graduated last January. For these reasons, I feel that a memorial is due Major Bong. Since his field was aviation and since he was a credit to the field of aviation, I feel that a memorial should be in the category of aviation. What more splendid and convincing reason need there be for the construction of an airport as a memorial at the city of Superior?

I think we have made some progress by passing this bill. I am waiting to see what the results will be with the State and city of Superior cooperating before I take further action. If, as a result of this bill, little or no progress is made, I then feel that this Congress ought to take action by way of passing a separate bill for such a memorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this bill—H. R. 3615—because it provides a uniform program Nation-wide for the development of aviation and the construction of airports with financial aid from the Federal Government.

I believe we should encourage greater use of air transportation for the commercial and industrial development of the Nation.

The bill authorizes the Administrator to pay not to exceed 50 percent of the allowable costs of an approved project except with respect to projects in Alaska, in which cases the Federal share may be as high as 75 percent. Project costs which may be shared by the Government include all necessary costs incurred in constructing, improving, or repairing a public airport, including the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administrative buildings and the removal, lowering, relocation, marking, and lighting of airport hazards, but do not include the cost of constructing, altering, or repairing hangars or the cost of acquiring any interest in land or air space.

Any public agency, or two or more such agencies acting jointly, may submit a project application to the Administrator. Each project is subject to approval by the Administrator, which can be given only if, first, Federal and non-Federal funds are available for the development proposed; second, the project is within the scope of the national airport plan; third, the public agency submitting the application has legal authority to engage in the development as proposed; fourth, the plans and specifications are satisfactory to the Administrator; and, fifth, the project sponsor has met the sponsorship requirements prescribed for him.

The Administrator may require project sponsors to enter into agreements insuring, among other things, the continued availability of the airport for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination, proper maintenance of the airport, protection and clearing of its aerial approaches, use of

the airport by Government aircraft on certain terms, and the availability of adequate airport building space to civil agencies of the Government, without charge, for use in connection with their air-traffic control, weather reporting, and communications activities.

Once a project is approved, the Administrator will enter into a grant agreement with the public agency or agencies which submitted the application, which will then proceed to procure the accomplishment of the work, usually by contract. Payments will be made by the Government only as work proceeds and all project costs are subject to review by the Administrator to determine that they are allowable.

The Government shall be obligated to pay only the Federal share of allowable project costs, several requirements for which are prescribed. All work is subject to inspection and approval by the Administrator, although the primary responsibility for engineering supervision of construction is on the public agency or agencies to which the Federal grants are made.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I think we should not overlook the fact that in dealing with this legislation we are dealing with a national airport system. There has been a lot said about the States and the different localities and the "pork barreling" and what have you; but the main purpose of this legislation is to develop a national airport system for the benefit of the people, the public of the United States, in order that we may continue to prevail as a world leader.

I do not believe there is anyone in this House who has any greater claim to the interest of the public, any greater claim to the interest of economizing and the interest of our taxpayers, than I or other members of this committee. I cannot agree with some of the thoughts expressed by some Members of the House that this is purely a piece of "pork barrel" legislation.

I recall that not so long ago, last year, 1944, this House debated and passed the war mobilization and reconversion bill. We knew the purposes and policies of that legislation. I do not recall hearing certain gentlemen get up on the floor of the House and say that this matter would cost the taxpayers a lot of money and therefore it should be defeated. When we passed the flood-control authorization bill of more than \$800,000,000 last year I did not hear certain gentlemen in this House get up and protest that it would cost some money to the taxpayers; nor, Mr. Chairman, did I hear a voice raised when the rivers and harbors bill was passed in this House authorizing a billion dollars for what? For the interest of the people and the public and our development throughout this whole country of ours. Neither did I hear certain gentlemen in this House get up and criticize it as a "pork barrel" proposition when this Congress authorized the postwar highway program of \$1,500,000,000. Why, Mr. Chairman, when we have an airport program, a national airport-development plan, do certain people come

forward and say it is not needed because it a "pork barrel" proposition?

Transportation has played an important part of our winning this war. We have the finest and most efficient system in all history, and it is because we have made it so. Everyone knows what an even greater handicap we would have had if we had not already provided an airport program. The future is going to demand the development of aviation and it will take airports. We must provide for an adequate national defense.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman correctly calls attention to the highway program. I believe it is important that the membership of the House remember that the highway legislation is only a 3-year proposition. The highway bill provides for a 10-year development. It is a modest approach.

We provided \$1,500,000,000 of Federal funds to be matched in a \$3,000,000,000 highway program for 3 years. I did not hear the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KAWSON] and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] raise their voices against that legislation last December. In fact, the matter was so unanimously accepted that there was no roll call taken.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly the gentleman is correct. Carrying out the mandate of this Congress, the Civil Aeronautics Administration made a national survey and reported to this Congress last year. Extensive hearings were held in which every phase of the national airport plan was thoroughly gone into. From that investigation and from the knowledge that we had as to the need of a national airport program, we have brought this bill here. I want to again remind you it is not a sectional nor a State nor a local airport program, but it is a national airport program.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, some years ago an old friend of mine told me a little incident of his boyhood days in Iowa. A railroad was building westward across the State. I believe it was the North Western Railroad. The people in the community where he lived were a little disturbed about this evidence of progress, and they were afraid of what was going to happen to their fields. They proposed to stage what we would now call a sit-down strike and go out there and sit on the right-of-way and prevent the railroad from being built. This old gentleman, a veteran of the Civil War when I knew him, said he went out and gave a little talk to the people on this theme: "You can't stop the cars." From that he developed a lecture which brought him some fame. The lecture was entitled "You Can't Stop the Cars."

Within the last 24 hours I have been in four of the larger municipal airports of the country, and, judging from the jam of people in every one of those airports

seeking transportation by air, I want to say that today, "You can't stop the planes."

They are coming. They are here.

In every community there are boys who are coming back from the Army and the Navy wearing wings which they have won by hard work. Those boys are going to fly planes and their friends and relatives are going to be riding those planes.

The fact is that this airport program is modest as compared with the highway program. I want to call your attention to one point. The \$1,500,000,000 authorized for a 3-year highway-construction program carries with it contractual authority. The Appropriations Committee will have no right to reduce whatever obligations are legally incurred by the States or by the Federal Government under the highway program. There is a program on which the Committee on Appropriations will be helpless. The \$1,500,000,000 can be expended. The contractual authority is carried in the act. Here, however, only a parliamentary authorization for appropriations is established.

The Appropriations Committee will have the authority to reduce the amount in any one year. They have it in their hands to control the situation.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Appropriations of this House. He has done very distinguished service during the past several years in connection with the War Department appropriations. I think the gentleman could well tell the House that the advance of aviation which this bill is intended to produce will be of material aid in the preparation of our young men in the event we should again have to defend our shores.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, that is true; and it is a point worthy of consideration. If one were to take the time, he could make a very definite national-defense case for such a program as is here visioned.

It may be that some will feel that an authorization of \$650,000,000 for 10 years might be reduced; it might be \$500,000,000, or something like that. But actually the appropriations will be passed upon each year. The House each year can determine whether it shall be \$5,000,000 or \$50,000,000, or \$65,000,000, but not in excess of \$100,000,000 in any one year, nor in excess of \$650,000,000 in the aggregate for 10 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I wonder if the gentleman could explain something to me that I cannot seem to make much sense of in this bill. That has to do with the channeling of funds. According to the report, it states that—

Regarding the operation of the program in the States, if a State has legislation requiring that all Federal grants for airport development for that State be channeled through its aeronautics commission or other State agency, that law will control.

That is in the report at the bottom of page 3.

Then, under title I, section (g), on page 3 of the bill it states:

"Public agency" means the United States Government or an agency thereof; a State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or an agency thereof; a municipality or other political subdivision; or a body politic, public or quasi-public corporation, or tax-supported organization.

What I am trying to get clear is this: Are these funds to be channeled through the State alone, or are these other public agencies mentioned in the bill, channels through which these funds can be channeled also?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not being a member of the committee in charge of the bill, I would hesitate to give an answer on that, because it would not be authoritative. I would prefer to have the chairman, the gentleman from California, or some member of the committee answer the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, of course, in the proposition before us we have for primary and first determination the question as to the responsibility, if any, on the part of the Federal Government to participate in the accomplishment of an airport program for the Nation. There are some who contend that it is no part of the responsibility of the Federal Government; that the building and development of airports should be left to the States and their subdivisions. There are others who very earnestly contend that it is a matter for Federal attention, intervention, and participation, and that only in that way can the desirable result which is sought by all be adequately and fairly achieved.

I hold to that latter view. It is my view that it is not only the right of the Federal Government but the responsibility of the Federal Government to participate in the development of a national airport program. There is ample precedent in our history for such participation. The entire history of the country reveals the fact that by the participation of the Federal Government in the development of the different systems of transportation have we achieved that efficiency and completion that enabled this great country of ours to become the greatest Nation on earth and, more recently, meet the crisis of war.

But for the splendid accomplishment of the great transportation system who is there among us who would contend that we would have been able to bring our enemies to the defeat which they have suffered? We need efficient transportation in all fields, we need the development of transportation to the end that the economies of each type of transportation be brought to the benefit of the country and all of our people.

In working on this bill we have given careful consideration to all of the different viewpoints. To my mind one of the



important features of the bill is the formula by which the money is to be distributed over the country, 75 percent of the Federal money to go according to a formula giving 50 percent attention to area and 50 percent attention to population. Because a formula cannot be inflexible for the purposes of a real national program we provide in the bill for a discretionary apportionment of 25 percent of the money. I believe that will make for a proper distribution and will avoid the concentration of the expenditure of funds in certain preferred areas against other areas which for some reason or other in the past have not been able to obtain their fair share of moneys to be spent in such development.

We have provided in this bill for the payment of land acquisition costs by the sponsors, that is, the States or municipalities. There is some objection to that provision, but as far as I am concerned I still believe it is a good provision. It is something of an added brake upon reckless or excessive or unnecessary expenditure of money.

Question has been raised about the channeling of funds through the State organizations. At the time the subcommittee and the full committee were working on this bill there had not been much said about that. Since the bill was reported, however, there has been great controversy, and I am frank to say that the representations and statements that have been made to me by persons who have given careful thought to this matter, including people in my own State, have led me to the conviction that I should support the amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]. I might suggest parenthetically that in my State the governor and the newly appointed State aeronautics commission, and the mayors of the cities and their organizations conferred about this proposition and the governor informed me in a telegram that there was agreement on the part of the mayors of many of the municipalities that a better result would be achieved in my State if the funds were channeled through the State commission.

There is another proposition about which I wish to speak. I urged it as vigorously as I could in the committee, but without success. It has been said that this bill was reported unanimously. I do not know that that is quite correct, for I believe perhaps I voted "no" on reporting the bill because I thought before we undertook this great program—and it is a great program—we ought to re-create the Civil Aeronautics Administration as an independent agency of Government, that we ought to know where the responsibility would lie for the accomplishment of the program. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] pointed out in connection with another matter in which he is interested, I seriously doubt whether an amendment at this time would be germane, but I shall have to determine that later, as will he. I have had assurances that this is a matter that will be taken up by the committee. I know how the majority of the members of the committee feel about it. They feel now as they did when they opposed the reorganization order and when

they reported the omnibus air transport bill a short time ago, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should be an independent agency of the Government. And again may I state that the then Senator Truman felt the same way about it when he opposed the reorganization proposal in the Senate.

Let me just point out to you how ridiculous this situation is. We are told that reorganizations are had to avoid duplication of effort and division of responsibility. I am for reorganization on that basis, but when the Civil Aeronautics Administration was put under the control of the Department of Commerce we did not achieve unified responsibility, and did not avoid duplication. We did not cut down on personnel. What we did was to bring about a situation under which you cannot tell who will be responsible for this program.

Now, read the bill. It says that the Administrator shall lay out this program according to certain requirements that are written in the act. Will the Administrator have that responsibility? Why, no. The language of the bill is a misnomer. Anyone who might read the bill and think that the Administrator would have the decision to make is completely in error because under the reorganization bill there is superimposed upon the judgment of the Administrator the judgment of the Department of Commerce acting through the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BURDEN, who is Under Secretary of Commerce for Air—a worthy, able, estimable gentleman; I have no quarrel with him; I quarrel only with this ridiculous arrangement—appeared before the committee and I wanted to find out what the score was. So I said:

Now, what I want to know is if this bill becomes law, is the Administrator free to exercise his own judgment or is there superimposed upon his judgment the determination and decision of the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. BURDEN. He is under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce in the same way as any other bureau of the Department of Commerce is.

Mr. HALLECK. That simply means then that any final determination that is to be made is made by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BURDEN. The determination is made by the Administrator but the Administrator, of course, would come under the Secretary under the reorganization plan.

Mr. HALLECK. In the event of a dispute under the conditions that now exist, in the event of a dispute or difference of opinion between the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce, whose opinion would prevail?

Mr. BURDEN. The opinion of the Secretary, of course, would prevail. He is the senior officer.

Mr. HALLECK. And has not that Executive order resulted in the situation under which the CAA as an independent agency of the Government has disappeared?

Mr. BURDEN. It certainly is not an independent agency of the Government now, under the present system.

We just passed a reorganization bill in the course of the consideration of which I argued as vigorously as I could for exemption of independent agencies that I did not think ought to be subjected to political control and domination of Cabinet positions and political departments.

We were not successful in our effort. But here we are with reorganization sold to the country on the basis of unified responsibility and avoidance of duplication and we see in this very instance before us that that is not what has been accomplished.

We are setting out to put into effect a program to spend \$650,000,000, and I am supporting it. I think it is necessary for the development of the country. Apparently we place a great responsibility on the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, yet when we get down to the truth of the matter we find out that when we undertake to determine just who should lay out the program the ball will be kicked back and forth between the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator. I do not think that is good government and I think it ought to be corrected.

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] as he may desire.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 3615, has been fully discussed already; I shall not trespass on the time of the membership by endeavoring to review the provisions of the bill.

I do know that this legislation has been considered in a very thorough, painstaking and conscientious manner over a long period of time; the bill has not been hastily drawn. Objective No. 1 has been and is "to provide Federal cooperative aid for a national system of airports."

No division of our military service has been less criticized throughout the war and since than the Air Corps; likewise no sector of industry has been criticized less than our civil aviation industry; its efforts have been universally successful and efficiently carried out.

It is impossible, I feel, to accurately evaluate the importance of civil aviation to military aviation. Suffice it to say, had it not been for the relatively advanced position of civil aviation in this country at the beginning of World War II, our military effort would have been significantly slowed, perchance to a much closer approach to disaster. In short, what civil aviation did before the war determined in a great measure what aviation was able to do during the war. To the extent to which we fail to go forward in civil aviation from a domestic and foreign standpoint, to that extent we retard our ability to go forward in aviation for security purposes.

It may be urged by him who does not look into the future that we are authorizing to be spent for airports a sum of money entirely too large. Our bill is a most reasonable one in this respect. This is no pump-priming proposition although it will mean work for many people; this authorization is a worth-while investment in potential industrial expansion and national security just as practically all the money we have spent for good roads and other transportation facilities has been an investment in industrial expansion and national security.

At present we as a nation are out in front in aviation in its many aspects; by



being out in front when the war began we were able to win in record time the hardest and most difficult war the world has ever known; we cannot afford to fail to be out in front in aviation even for a day. I honestly believe that country which gets behind in aviation in the future stands a chance very quickly thereafter to be behind as a world power; this bill, H. R. 3615, is a good bill; it is needed now. What we do today to keep our own civil aviation out in front will determine what our aviation is tomorrow. The bill is constructive, in my opinion. I am glad to support it and trust that all the Members of the House will do likewise.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this bill has received a very full discussion of all its provisions this afternoon. It has been exceedingly well explained from the opening statement of the gentleman from California, Chairman LEA, down through other discussions by various members of the committee. I want to emphasize what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] just said, that the bill did receive the most careful attention of a subcommittee that studied every phase of it. Every argument that has been presented or will be presented in favor of or against the channeling of funds or any other provision of the bill already has been very seriously considered in committee. I believe that all of us here are anxious to preserve the rights of States, and I want to emphasize at this point that when the subcommittee finally reached the point of determining what should be the procedure for channeling funds, it was an agreement among all members of the subcommittee that we had arrived at the best possible State-rights solution, and at the same time the best possible formula in the interest of a national airport program.

I know that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] is very much interested in the amendment that he will offer on the question of channeling funds, providing that a portion of the 75 percent of the total shall be channeled through a State agency. But I just want to emphasize once more that under the terms of the bill as it has been presented by the committee, if a State requires such procedure, then there is nothing in the bill to prohibit such procedure, and it would be channeled through State agencies. The gentleman from Illinois, my good friend and colleague, mentioned that at least 44 States had set up some sort of commission or board to handle aviation problems, but the gentleman did not state how many of these 44 States had been authorized to appropriate money for the purpose of matching Federal funds for the construction of airports.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HALLECK. I was really seeking information, because I was disturbed at the suggestion made in some quarters that, if the money was to be channeled through the States, that the States

themselves would have to put up all the money. However, it has been reported to me that the effect of such an amendment would still leave to the States the right to insist upon the municipalities putting up the money, the amendment referring only to the channeling of the funds.

Mr. PRIEST. I think that would be true under the amendment. I think, however, as the bill is now drafted, and even if the amendment should be adopted, there would still be required among many of the States legislative action to deal with the question of the handling of matching funds. Even though the States may have an aeronautical commission or a board for the purpose of handling aviation, I think enabling legislation still would be necessary by the State legislature in order to provide for matching funds and for cooperation with municipalities in an airport-construction program.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In the great State of California, which is exceedingly aviation-minded, such a commission was refused by the State legislature at the last session. We do not have an aviation commission.

Mr. PRIEST. You do not have an aviation commission in the State of California. Do you have any agency in the great State of California that could properly represent the municipalities or other subdivisions of that State in matching funds of the Federal Government for airport construction?

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe that in the proceedings that have been had so far the suggestion was made that such funds shall go through the department of public works, which department is engaged in a wholly different occupation.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say, in conclusion, that this matter has been very carefully studied; that every argument relating to this question of channeling funds came before the subcommittee, and before the House takes any action to change that procedure and that formula let us be very certain that we are not taking action which will delay considerably, and create a great deal of confusion in, the national airport program.

Under the provisions of this bill, no State is told by the Federal Government that it must handle the Federal-aid funds for airports. On the other hand, no State is denied the right to maintain jurisdiction over such funds.

I hope the amendment to be offered later by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] will be defeated.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said here this evening about the channeling of the funds. Mr. William P. McCracken whom many of you know, appeared before the committee and filed with the committee in connection with his remarks statements from the different States in the Union. Thirty-three States have no legislation necessary to enable them to match or to handle the Federal

funds. Ten States do. This is what I said a little while ago when the gentleman from Illinois said it was not in the record.

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

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

Mr. HOWELL. Since that time a number of legislatures all over the Union have passed such legislation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; the gentleman cannot make that appear to be the case because that statement ran up to May 7 of this year, and at that same place in the record it is stated what legislatures had adjourned before then. That is one reason we had the trouble, that we realized in the committee that if this thing was to go into effect it would be 2 years before some of the States could possibly set up any agency, and what were you to do about it? Would you say just to wait until the State did do it, with 33 States not having it?

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

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Do the State laws of those 33 States authorize or permit the municipalities which are creatures of the State, to apply for and accept direct contributions from the Federal Government?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I doubt if it is mentioned in any State law in the United States, but I will tell the gentleman that during the WPA days and the other days we took up this program of airport construction direct with the municipalities from the Federal Government, and that was done.

I call this to your attention, not because it makes a great deal of difference, except that if you want a real airport program for the United States you must be willing, because if you would leave out one State it is not a complete program. Leave it to the States. That is what we did. If they pass the necessary legislation to take charge of this, then that is for them to do. I call to your attention the State of Wisconsin, which went further and under its legislative enactment provided that its municipalities could deal with the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we spent a great deal of time on this bill and I think it is a good bill. In all frankness, I would say that it is a much better bill than the bill which came from another body. I say that with all modesty. But be that as it may, when the bill is read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, if there is anything that anyone does not understand about it, I know the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] or any other member of the committee will be glad to explain it fully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,*

#### TITLE I—FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

##### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. The title may be cited as the "Federal Aid Airport Act."



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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will withdraw the point of order, I will move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has already been recognized.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this bill and have been one of the protagonists in defense of civil aviation. I want to see airports built and airport facilities provided in this country. But there are one or two questions which I would like to have resolved before being compelled to vote for this bill. This bill follows the general pattern of Federal aids. It is expected that upon the passage of this bill the Federal Government will provide up to 50 percent of the construction costs and some other costs of the building of an approved airport project. It provides that the municipalities may set up the projects as well as the States themselves, if they see fit to do it. It is hoped that under this bill great stimulation can be given to the construction of airport facilities.

I am realistic about this thing, Mr. Chairman, because I have had some experience in the last 2 years in my own district, and I know how municipalities operate. I am not quite as optimistic as some of you gentlemen are in the rather grandiose statements that have been made as to what may be expected under this program. Under this program, if my town or another city in my district wants to initiate an airport program and construct an airport, they would first have to acquire the land and pay for it themselves under the terms of this bill. They will have to build a hangar and pay for it themselves under the terms of this bill. Do not get the idea that this is a 50-50 proposition, where the Federal Government is going to go in 50-50 with the municipality. When the municipality finds that it is going to cost \$150,000 to acquire the site and that it is going to cost them more money to build the hangar and that they have to pay that out of their own pocket whereas the Federal Government only comes in and pays 50 percent of the construction cost to put in the lighting and landing areas and runways and some incidentals in connection with the construction of the administration building, you are going to find as a realistic proposition the people in the towns and cities would like to have an airport, will raise the question that the local community cannot afford to make this large expenditure of money, and they have been somewhat misled in the idea that the Federal Government is going to go 50-50 with them on this program. So what are they going to do? They are going to turn to the pattern that has been in vogue with

them for years under the highway-construction program where they say, "Why, we are building this airport not alone for the city of Sheboygan or Manitowoc or the city of Racine or some other city, but we are building it as a part of a national program and the whole State is interested in it just as much as it is interested in the highways that go through the State. We are going to ask the State to come into this proposition and bring in State funds to assist the local municipalities in order to see that this project comes to a complete fruition."

Then, what happens? Then when they come to the State legislature and ask for an appropriation of funds by which the matching funds of the State will be provided by the State and the local community that sponsors the airport, you are going to find that the State legislature is going to insist upon some control over the expenditure of these funds under an integrated State-wide program. I know that the State of Wisconsin has been in the forefront in this program.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The situation is this: For example, to show our interest in this program, we have a constitutional provision which prevents the State from making expenditures of State funds for improvements of this character.

Some years ago we amended that so as to permit the State to come into the highway program. We further amended the constitution by popular vote, so as to permit the State to expend moneys in forestry development. Last April we amended our State constitution to permit the State to make expenditures of money in connection with the aeronautical development program. The legislature passed a law setting up a State aeronautical commission that will integrate the program in the State in connection with the Federal program so that we may have a well-organized program. The legislature did not appropriate any money. Why? Because it did not know the character of the law that would be passed by this Congress.

I am raising this for your consideration because I am fearful that you may have in other States of this Nation the same situation confronting you that confronts us in Wisconsin. Municipalities are going to demand that the State share with State funds in the development of this aeronautical program. They want the State to assume its share of responsibility and to pay its proportionate share of the cost of building these airports which are of State-wide concern, national concern, if you please, as well as merely local. Unless you can make provision whereby the fund will be channeled through the administration of the State agency, under those circumstances,

you will find that the State legislatures will not respond.

Under the terms of this act, as explained by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the State legislature has it within its power to say whether or not, in the event there is State contribution to this fund, they will make that expenditure without State control of the fund, or whether they will permit it to be channeled through the local municipality. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. And if a State sees fit to make an appropriation to assist local communities who sponsor an airport program, and if they see fit to make the expenditure, they may in the same legislative enactment, determine how much control the State will determine to exercise. That is right, is it not?

Mr. LEA. The State legislature could; not the Congress.

Mr. KEEFE. So, as I understand this program, you have left the matter very fluid and flexible so that any State can control the channeling of the funds as the State legislature of that State determines. Is that right?

Mr. LEA. That is true. If you will refer to the bill which passed the Senate, I think you will see that in substance they confessed the plan will not work, and they allowed 3 years for adjustment of the plan, such as you suggest.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say that when the legislature in my State passed upon this question, while they provided for the channeling of funds through a State agency under certain conditions, they did provide that "nothing in this section shall prohibit any local unit of Government from dealing directly with the Federal Government in any transaction involving Federal aid for any airport or aeronautical facility owned by it or hereafter acquired or constructed."

The fact of the matter is, am I correct in the legal assumption that any municipality is the creature of the State sovereignty? The State gives power to the municipality and the municipality has only such power as the State confers upon it. It can enlarge that power or it can rescind or revoke that authority. So, after all, are we not up against this proposition: That the whole program is dumped into the lap of the various State legislatures; and if they insist, by legislative enactment, that the fund must be handled by a State board, then the legislature of the State has the right and authority to so act?

Mr. LEA. The municipality will have that authority unless it is denied by State law.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, under leave obtained in the House, I include at this point in my remarks a letter from Mr. M. W. Torkelson, director of the State Planning Board of the State of Wisconsin, and a copy of chapter 513 of the laws of 1945:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,  
STATE PLANNING BOARD,  
Madison, September 22, 1945.

DEAR WISCONSIN CONGRESSMAN: As the executive officer of the State planning board, which has been the official State agency concerned with airport development in the State

of Wisconsin for the last 4 years, I have been requested to present to you my views regarding the merits of S. 2 and H. R. 3615 in connection with your consideration of the Federal aid for airports legislation now pending in Congress.

It is appropriate to state in this connection that the State planning board will not remain the official State agency for airport development in Wisconsin after June 30, 1947, at the latest, and that the writer has no personal ambitions in the matter since he will soon reach the age of retirement and is, therefore, in a position to consider the subject objectively. Also, our 1945 legislature enacted legislation (ch. 513, Laws of 1945), copy of which is attached hereto, which creates a State aeronautics commission whose powers and duties are set out in sections 114.31 and 114.32, pages 5 to 10, inclusive, of the printed act. It is especially requested that you read section 114.32, beginning on page 7 of the printed act. Although the members of the commission have been appointed by Governor Goodland, the commission has not yet met to organize, and it is reasonable to expect that it will be a month at least before it can be functioning. In the meantime, the State planning board is the only operating State agency having had experience, or in any other way concerned with aeronautics.

I do not have copies of either S. 2 or H. R. 3615 before me and am, therefore, at a disadvantage. It is my understanding, however, that both of these provide substantial amounts of Federal aid for the construction of airports on a national system, the annual appropriation being allocated to the States on a matching basis according to a formula which would give our State slightly in excess of 2 percent of the appropriation. The amount so allocated to the State would be reallocated for airports to be built by subdivisions of the State.

One important difference between the two bills, as I understand them, is that S. 2 provides that the money allocated to the State shall be channeled from the Federal administrative agency to the subdivisions of the State through the State aeronautics agency, while H. R. 3615 provides that this money shall be channeled directly from the Federal administrative agency to the subdivisions of the State, without the State aeronautics agency having anything to do with the handling of the money. This, as I understand it, is the principal question which has to be decided by Congress in the legislation now pending.

Of course, we have the experience of 29 years in the administration of Federal aid for highways which well may serve as a guide. Right from the beginning, this Federal highway aid has been channeled to the subdivisions of the State through the State highway department. I was in a position of intimate connection with the administration of Federal aid for highways for about 16 years, and have been fairly familiar with its operations during the entire period. I think it must be said that the administration of Federal aid for highways with the money channeled through the State highway departments has been entirely successful, so successful, in fact, that no other procedure has ever been suggested.

An airport development program is not essentially different from a highway development program. Both are projects whose administration and operation are within the field of the civil engineer. Each requires a certain specialized knowledge regarding the particular branch of civil engineering applicable to that particular kind of work. But the development of an airport is no more the function of an airman than the development of a highway is the function of a motor vehicle operator. The development of a highway system and the development of an airport system both require a strong administrative organization to carry out a program

in which a specialized knowledge of civil engineering is necessary for planning the work and the administration of its execution.

While it is true that the larger cities in Wisconsin—Milwaukee, for instance—could get along without the services of a State department, it will be quite difficult for any other community in Wisconsin to do so. The services of a well-organized State aeronautics agency, well staffed and well equipped, will be invaluable to the subdivisions of the State in dealing with the various problems which will arise in connection with an airport development program, and particularly as an aid in dealing with the Federal administrative agency. And, furthermore, it would seem to me that the Federal administrative agency would greatly prefer dealing with the subdivisions of the State through a single State administrative agency which would become familiar with its procedures and requirements, thereby greatly facilitating administrative processes.

The foregoing, however, is not the most important reason, in my opinion, for channelization through a State aeronautics agency. That is the following:

There will be in every State a demand for State financial participation in the Federal aid airport program. The subdivisions of the State will demand that the State provide a portion, at least, of the funds that are necessary to match the Federal aid allocated to the State, and it seems that the legislatures will, in most cases at least, be inclined to comply with this demand. As you probably are aware, article VIII, section 10, of the Wisconsin constitution, which provides that the State shall never contract any debt for works of internal improvement or be a party to carrying on such works, which was amended in 1908 as to highways, and in 1926 as to forestry, was again amended in 1945 as to airports. The joint resolution providing for amendment, which was approved by the legislatures of 1943 and 1945 by practically unanimous votes in each case, was approved by the people by a vote of 187,000 to 101,000 at the last April election, and while the 1945 legislature did not enact any State aid for airports law, it seems certain that such legislation will be introduced into the 1947 legislature. It is most highly improbable, in my opinion, that the State would participate in a Federal aid airport program unless on such conditions as the legislature might see fit to set up, and one of these most certainly would be the channelization of the Federal aid through the State treasury for administration by the State aeronautics agency. This is the only way that the State possibly could have any knowledge of the uses to which the funds were put and the manner in which they were being administered.

That our 1945 legislature, in enacting chapter 513, expected that Federal aid for airports would be channeled through the State aeronautics commission, seems plain from a reading of section 114.32, to which special attention has already been directed. The State Aeronautics Commission is authorized, among other things, "to accept, receive, and receipt for Federal moneys and other moneys \* \* \* for and in behalf of this State or any municipality thereof, \* \* \* for the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of airports and other aeronautical facilities," also "to act as agent for any municipality of this State upon request of such municipality in accepting, receiving, and receipting for such moneys in its behalf for airports, and in contracting for the acquisition, improvement, maintenance or operation of airports financed in whole or in part by Federal moneys." It is further provided that all moneys accepted for disbursement by the commission shall be deposited in the State treasury. The commission is authorized, whether acting for the State or as the agent

of a municipality, to disburse such moneys for the designated purposes.

It is true, of course, that the law is drafted in such a manner as to permit the municipalities of the State to deal directly with the Federal Government, and such provision was very wise in view of the fact that the legislature had no means of knowing just what the procedure set up by Congress might be, and especially in view of the fact that no State money was made available by the 1945 legislature for airport development. It seems entirely clear, however, that it was the legislative intent that the State aeronautics commission should exercise the greatest measure of control over the development of aeronautical facilities in the State that would be consistent with Federal legislation on the subject, and from this it is a fair inference that if, as, and when the State of Wisconsin participates financially in any airport development program, it will desire that the funds for carrying out such a program shall pass through the State treasury and be administered by the State aeronautics commission. In this way, and in this way only, it would seem, can be avoided that confusion which seems inevitable if each local municipal unit is to proceed on its own, without regard to other parts of the State.

It is my considered opinion that unless provision is made for the channelization of Federal aid from the Federal administrative agency to the local subdivisions of the State through the State aeronautics agency, our State legislature will be very reluctant about giving airport development the financial support of the State, which will be so important for the success of the program. As regards legislation now before Congress, it is my understanding that there is a possibility of a compromise whereby the larger cities will be exempted from dealing through the State aeronautics agency, and I personally would not be opposed to such in the case of our State. But it is my opinion that even the larger cities would find it to their advantage to deal through a well-organized and experienced State department.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am,  
Very truly yours,

M. W. TORKELSON,  
Director, State Planning Board.

S. 458

An act to amend 14.71 (1) and to create 20.053 and 114.30 to 114.33 of the statutes, relating to aeronautics, and making an appropriation

*The people of the State of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:*

SECTION 1. 14.71 (1) of the statutes is amended to read:

"14.71 General Departmental Powers—(1) Appointment of Subordinates: Except as expressly provided by law, the governor, secretary of state, State treasurer, attorney general, State superintendent, commissioner of insurance, State fire marshal, director of purchases, public service commission, industrial commission, adjutant general, grain and warehouse commission, director of personnel, department of taxation, board of tax appeals, commissioners of public lands, State conservation commission, State supervisor of inspectors, banking commission, banking review board, free library commission, State chief engineer, director of agriculture, director of the budget, geological and natural history survey, State board of health, State highway commission, State planning board, State board of medical examiners, State board of dental examiners, State board of pharmacy, Wisconsin real estate brokers board, State board of vocational and adult education, Wisconsin employment relations board, commissioner of the motor vehicle department, director of public welfare, State aeronautics commission, and State athletic



commission are each authorized to appoint such deputies, assistants, experts, clerks, stenographers, or other employees as shall be necessary for the execution of their functions, and to designate the titles, prescribe the duties, and fix the compensation of such subordinates, but these powers shall be exercised subject to the State civil-service law, unless the position filled by any such subordinate has been expressly exempted from the operation of chapter 16 and subject, also, to the approval of such other officer or body as may be prescribed by law."

Sec. 2. 20.053 of the statutes is created to read:

"20.053 Aeronautics Commission: (1) There is appropriated from the general fund to the State aeronautics commission on July 1, 1945, and on July 1, 1946, \$20,000 for the purpose of carrying out its functions under chapter 114.

"(2) All moneys received by the State from the United States for the promotion of aeronautics or for airports or other aeronautical facilities, or from any unit of local government for such purposes, shall be paid within 1 week after receipt into the general fund to be held in trust, and are hereby appropriated therefrom to the State aeronautics commission for expenditures as provided by section 114.32."

Sec. 3. 114.30 to 114.33 of the statutes are created to read:

"114.30 Aeronautics Commission—(1) Membership: There is hereby created a State aeronautics commission consisting of five members to be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. The members of the said commission shall be men qualified by their knowledge of, experience in, or interest in aeronautics. Of the members first appointed, two shall serve for terms ending April 30, 1947; two for terms ending on April 30, 1949; and one for a term ending on April 30, 1951. Successive members shall be appointed for terms of 6 years each. Members shall continue to serve until their successor is appointed and qualified. Members of the commission shall receive no pay for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

"(2) Organization, meeting, report: The commission shall, within 30 days after its appointment, meet, organize, adopt a seal, and make such rules and regulations for its administration, not inconsistent herewith, as it may deem expedient and may from time to time amend such rules and regulations. At such organization meeting it shall elect from among its members a chairman, a vice chairman, and a secretary, to serve for 1 year, and annually thereafter shall elect such officers; all to serve until their successors are appointed and qualified. Meetings may be called by the chairman and shall be called on the request of two members, and may be held as often as necessary, and may be at places other than the State capitol. Three members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. All regular and special commission meetings shall be open to the public. It shall report in writing to the governor on or about December 1 of each year. Said report shall contain a summary of its proceedings during the preceding fiscal year, a detailed and itemized statement of all revenue and of all expenditures made by or in behalf of the commission, such other information as it may deem necessary or useful and any additional information which may be requested by the governor.

"(3) Director; Salary, Qualifications, Duties: The commission shall employ a director of aeronautics who shall continue in office at the pleasure of the commission and whose salary shall be fixed by the commission, but not to exceed \$5,000 per year, and shall be reimbursed for all traveling and other expenses

incurred by him in the discharge of his official duties. Said director shall be a person having executive ability and experience in aeronautics, and shall not be subject to the provisions of chapter 16 governing the competitive division of the classified service. He shall be administrative head of the commission, shall be responsible to the commission for the execution of its policies; and shall exercise the powers of the commission in the interim of its meetings but subordinate thereto. He shall not have any pecuniary interest in or any stock in or any bonds of any civil aeronautics enterprise.

"114.31. Powers and duties of commission—

(1) General: The commission shall have general supervision of aeronautics in the State and promote and foster a sound development of aviation in this State, promote aviation education and training programs, assist in the development of aviation and aviation facilities, safeguard the interests of those engaged in all phases of aviation, formulate and recommend and promote reasonable regulations in the interests of safety, and coordinate State aviation activities with those of other States and the Federal Government and in general prepare for the generally expected extensive expansion of aviation following the termination of World War II. The commission shall have all powers that are necessary to carry out its policies. The commission is especially charged with the duty of informing itself regarding all Federal laws that affect aeronautics in this State, all regulations pursuant to such laws, and all pending legislation providing for a national airport system, in order that it may recommend to the Governor and the legislature such measures as will best enable this State to derive the maximum benefits from such legislation if and when it shall become effective. It shall be the duty of all other State boards, commissions, departments, and institutions, especially the appropriate educational institutions to cooperate with the aeronautics commission.

"(2) Studies and investigations: It shall conduct studies and investigations with reference to the most effective development and operation of airports and all other aeronautical facilities, and issue reports of its findings from time to time.

"(3) Aviation education and training: In cooperation with the appropriate educational institutions of the State, and jointly with them it shall formulate programs of aviation education and training, and disseminate information regarding such programs.

"(4) Cooperation with Federal aeronautical agency: It shall cooperate with and assist the Federal Government, the political subdivisions of this State, and others engaged in aeronautics or the promotion of aeronautics, and shall seek to coordinate the aeronautical activities of these bodies. To this end, the commission is empowered to confer with or to hold joint hearings with any Federal aeronautical agency in connection with any matter arising under chapter 114, relating to the sound development of aeronautics, and to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of such Federal agencies, as fully as may be practicable, in the administration of said sections. It shall turn: h to the Federal agencies its cooperation, services, records, and facilities, insofar as may be practicable.

"(5) Air marking system: It shall cooperate with the Federal Government in any air marking system and weather information.

"(6) Technical services to municipalities: It may, insofar as is reasonably possible, offer the engineering or other technical service of the commission, without charge, to any municipality desiring them in connection with the construction, maintenance, or operation, or proposed construction, maintenance, or operation of an airport. Municipalities are authorized to cooperate with the commission in the development of aeronautics and aeronautical facilities in this State. The State

planning board and all other agencies are authorized and directed to make available such facilities and services, and to cooperate as far as possible to promote the best interests of aeronautics of the State.

"114.32 Federal aid for airports—(1) Commission may accept: The commission is authorized to cooperate with the Government of the United States, and any agency or department thereof, in the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of airports and other air navigation facilities in this State, and to comply with the laws of the United States and any regulations made thereunder for the expenditure of Federal moneys upon such airports and other air navigation facilities, and may enter into any contracts necessary to accomplish such purpose. It is authorized to accept, receive, and receipt for Federal moneys and other moneys, either public or private, for and in behalf of this State, or any municipality thereof, for training and education programs, for the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of airports and other aeronautical facilities, whether such work is to be done by the State or by such municipalities, or jointly, aided by grants of aid from the United States, upon such terms and conditions as are or may be prescribed by the laws of the United States and any rules or regulations made thereunder, and it is authorized to act as agent of any municipality of this State upon the request of such municipality, in accepting, receiving, and receipting for such moneys in its behalf for airports, and in contracting for the acquisition, improvement, maintenance, or operation of airports financed either in whole or in part by Federal moneys, and the governing body of any such municipality is authorized to designate the commission as its agent for such purposes and to enter into an agreement with it prescribing the terms and conditions of such agency in accordance with Federal laws, rules, and regulations and with chapter 114. Such moneys as are paid over by the United States Government shall be retained by the State or paid over to said municipalities under such terms and conditions as may be imposed by the United States Government in making such grants. Nothing in this section shall prohibit any local unit of government from dealing directly with the Federal Government in any transaction involving Federal aid for any airport or aeronautical facility owned by it or hereafter acquired or constructed.

"(3) Contracts: All contracts for the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of airports and other aeronautical facilities, made by the commission either as the agent of this State or as the agent of any municipality, shall be made pursuant to the laws of this State governing the making of like contracts: *Provided, however*, That where the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of any airport or landing strip and other aeronautical facilities is financed or partially financed with Federal moneys, the commission, as agent of the State or of any municipality thereof, may let contracts in the manner prescribed by the Federal authorities, acting under the laws of the United States, and any rules or regulations made thereunder, notwithstanding any other State law to the contrary.

"(4) Disposition of Federal funds: All moneys accepted for disbursement by the commission pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the State treasury, and, unless otherwise prescribed by the authority from which the money is received, kept in separate funds, designated according to the purpose for which the moneys were made available, and held by the State in trust for such purposes. All such moneys are appropriated for the purposes for which the same were made available to be expended in accordance with Federal laws and regulations

and with chapter 114. The commission is authorized, whether acting for this State or as the agent of any of its municipalities, or when requested by the United States Government or any agency or department thereof, to disburse such moneys for the designated purposes, but this shall not preclude any other authorized method of disbursement.

"114.325. Review: Orders of the commission shall be subject to review in the manner provided in chapter 227.

"114.33. Severability: If any section, subsection, paragraph, or other provisions contained in chapter 114, or its application to any person or circumstance shall be held unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the constitutionality of any other section, subsection, or paragraph or its application to other persons or circumstances."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 1945, if passed and published by that time otherwise upon passage and publication.

Senate: Ayes 23; noes 3.

Assembly: Ayes 60; noes 22.

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

Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. LEA rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEA: On page 1, line 5, strike out "the" and insert "this."

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, this is merely the correction of a clerical error.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. LEA. I hope the gentleman will permit this amendment to be acted on.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the point of order to permit the gentleman from California to conclude his remarks.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment simply clarifies a clerical mistake. It was recommended by the legislative counsel of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter from the director of the State planning board of the State of Wisconsin and a copy of chapter 513 of the laws of 1945, passed by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made by Mr. L. E. Kopitzke, president, and George L. Mooney, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### THE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I ran for Congress on a platform of "win the war abroad and win prosperity and security at home." So did most of you. We asked our districts to support us on that basis, and they did.

The war has been won, and now we are faced with our obligation to carry out the second part of that platform, to establish security and prosperity at home. I may be a little bit naive, Mr. Speaker, but I still consider that platform a solemn pledge to my people, and to like-minded people everywhere, to do all in my power to see that reconversion proceeds in a rapid, orderly, and thorough way.

Our goal is full production and full employment. We must let nothing turn us from this aim until it has been accomplished. I do not intend to hedge or stall myself, and I do not want to see this house hedge or stall, in facing this most

pressing problem of today. We must pass the full employment bill.

We are passing through a difficult and dangerous period. Unemployment grows daily, as more men and women are released from the armed services and millions are jobless through cancellation of war contracts. True, there are some housewives who will return to their kitchens, youths who will go back to school, and older people who will return to well-deserved retirement. But the most optimistic estimates place these voluntary withdrawals from the active labor force at six to ten million, while the number of job seekers runs into many more than that—just how many we do not yet know.

Throughout the land, there are alarming signs of domestic strife. Labor and employers are growling at each other like two strange bulldogs. Tempers are mounting; old feuds are breaking out. Our social and economic machinery may not be able to halt the progress of this creeping conflict. Sometime within the next few months there will be a turning point at which we as a nation—and we as responsible representatives of the people in the Congress—will have to choose which way we will go and how to steer in that direction. We will have to choose between sinking back into the stagnation of the early thirties on the one hand, and moving on and up into a busy and prosperous economy of full employment on the other.

What is the reason for this domestic strife that is mounting by the minute and threatening the success of return to peace? Why are workers and management alike, holding back or actually striking for more wages and more profits? Why are there such alarming signs, such mutterings of racial discord? Why are the pressure groups making life miserable for more than one man within the sound of my voice?

It is fear that brings these things about. It is our old enemy, fear and the fear of fear—lack of confidence in the future. Reconversion measures will bog down and may fail, Mr. Speaker, if we do not find the way to lay the necessary firm foundation of confidence in the future.

I have this on the authority of the man responsible for demobilization and reconversion. He is a sober and thoughtful man, a middle-western banker, close to the temper and the thinking of our people from the grass roots on up. Here is how John Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, describes his job:

My task is one of the redirecting from war to peace of the four main resources from which the health of our economy springs: our manpower, our raw materials, our plant and equipment, and our managerial know-how (p. 1064, Senate hearings).

That reflects a clear understanding of this job on the part of the man who has been designated to do the reconversion job, and who is struggling manfully with it in the face of terrific obstacles—and one particular obstacle—the specter of fear, the widespread lack of confidence in the future. Facing his task against



these terrible odds, John Snyder goes on to say in sober earnest:

It would be a useless task if it did not have as its goal full production and employment—a high standard of living and long-range stability (p. 1064).

And then he goes on to plead for action by the Congress that will make it possible for him to discharge his tremendous responsibilities. He says:

The mechanism by which we will attain our long-range goal should be established now.

Notice that John Snyder said "should be established now." He did not say anything about long-drawn-out debates in search of a perfection which we can never expect to reach. He did not suggest that we should wait until next year and thrash this problem out in the primaries and in the fall elections. He asked for prompt and practical action now to make possible prompt and practical transition from war to peace—prompt action that will head off this creeping paralysis of fear which we see reflected in the headlines telling us of labor strife.

John Snyder asks for action, and he says:

If this is done—

Note that he says, "If this is done"—present policies can readily be integrated with long-term measures and the new machinery can be functioning effectively by the time we have finished our immediate task of reconversion.

And, again, still quoting this responsible official, this sober, clear-sighted man from the grass roots of the Middle West:

Our peacetime goal must be and will be full employment. To do its part in the achievement of this goal, the Federal Government must set up now the machinery through which it will act. The legislation which you are now considering sets up that machinery (p. 1061).

Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the United States has acted in response to Mr. Snyder's plea and in response to the urgent desire of the overwhelming majority of our people, and in line with the good sense and good judgment of the overwhelming majority of the Senate itself. I do not like the bill as passed. I do not think it is strong enough. I do not think it is definite enough. In their attempt at clarification I think that our distinguished colleagues in the Senate have gone too far in the direction of weakening the original bill. I urge that we in the House shall do a better job.

But above all, Mr. Speaker, I do urge that we act promptly. We have so little time. I am frankly fearful of the way things will go throughout the country if we do not act. I am fearful that the counsels of reaction, of inaction, of delay—the counsels of too little and too late—will have their way among us.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fail. We must act. We must pass the full-employment bill.

Let me be specific about why we need this long-range legislation now. Let us consider the immediate reconversion problems and see just how it can be made less difficult if we act now on long-range policies and procedures that will create an atmosphere of confidence—procedures that will help us here in Congress,

that will make it possible for us to discharge our own heavy responsibilities in the trying months that lie ahead.

I hold in my hand the fourth report to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. It was published only last week. Here in the front of the report is a tabulation that breaks down the reconversion problem into its components. The title of this chart is, "Where We Stand on Reconversion October 1, 1945." It is a summary of what the agencies have done, what the major policies are, and what problems lie ahead. It includes recommendations for congressional action needed.

As I look down this analysis it appears to me that neither the executive branch nor the Congress can possibly handle the job without adoption of the full employment bill. That alone can enable us to lead the country out of the critical period next spring, out of the domestic discord that we face today and into a period of domestic tranquillity with the full production and employment which we must reach, and reach promptly, if we are to preserve our cherished American institutions.

First on the list of reconversion problems set forth by the Director of Reconversion are two items on which he does not ask for further legislation at this time. These items are contract termination and plant clearance.

These important problems, which could have been such terrific headaches, which could have stymied the whole task of switching back to peace production—these jobs, the Director says, are under control. He says contracts totaling \$23,000,000,000 have been canceled since August 14—less than 2 months. He says further—and in the light of our experience with governmental delays this is a matter for applause and admiration—that Federal procedures have been set, personnel has been trained and made available in the agencies; that personnel has been trained in contractors' organizations to handle the details of these settlements; that the interim financing system is in operation. His goal is to settle all canceled contracts within a year, and he does not ask for more legislation in this field.

In respect to plant clearance, where the problem was to remove Government-owned supplies and equipment speedily so as to permit rapid change-over, the Director reports that the necessary warehouse space has been acquired and that practically all requests for plant clearance have been met within 60 days.

This is a remarkable record of accomplishment. Why was it possible for this relatively new organization to begin this job so promptly and so well? The answer is that in these particular cases we had acted. We had looked ahead. We had developed and passed legislation to anticipate these far-flung problems and to make it possible for them to be solved adequately and promptly. Here, Mr. Speaker, we were not too little and too late, and I think we may well take pride in this record.

But let us take this lesson to heart. Let us act promptly and wisely on the

enormously larger job for which contract termination and plant clearance only open the door. Let us adopt the full-employment bill.

Following down the analysis by the Director of Reconversion, he next grapples with the problem of surplus disposal.

#### SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Machinery has been set up to handle the disposal of materials and plants, but the work has hardly begun. How can prospective buyers make intelligent bids on this property which we want to get rid of unless they can see ahead, and unless they think they can find markets for it, or markets for the output of the plants? How can the administrative officials tell what bids they should accept? How can we tell what policies to adopt when in important cases a decision is referred to us, as is required by law?

These are not isolated decisions that can be made in a vacuum. Each case affects the others. They all depend fundamentally on whether we are going to get full production and full employment promptly. They depend on whether we can look forward confidently to stability in our economic system. They depend on whether action is taken to build the necessary confidence on the part of business and of labor and to coordinate the work of government, which, whether we like it or not, will govern the economic climate of the country.

Mr. Snyder asks for legislative action covering the disposal of merchant ships and certain phases of foreign surplus. We have retained to ourselves in Congress the final authority in respect to many large plants which may be surplus. How are we going to provide this additional legislation—obviously needed—unless we can be reasonably sure what world-trade conditions will be? How can we tell that, unless we can be confident of full employment in the United States; for it is quite clear that there can be no healthy world trade and probably no peace in the world if the largest industrial Nation cannot even keep its own economy on an even keel?

Let us tell the world, let us assure our own people, that we are going to have full employment and full production. Let us not be too little and too late.

#### PRODUCTION CONTROL

The controls of production that were necessary for war must be removed for peace. This is perfectly clear to all of us, and I am glad to see the promptness with which the War Production Board and the Director of Reconversion have acted.

But everybody knows that we cannot let go all at once. Everybody knows that it is absolutely necessary to prevent inventory hoardings and scrambles for scarce items. Everybody knows that we cannot get rid of all controls until production catches up with demand. The only real protection against inflation is to get production up to match demand. How do we do this? Why should manufacturers increase production unless they think that they can find a market?

Here again, the answer is simply confidence that there will be markets, and this means production, and this means full employment. The Director of Re-

conversion asks us to continue the emergency powers under the Second War Powers Act. How long shall we extend this necessary authority? How can we tell unless we take action to assure continued markets and production and employment after the controls are lifted?

#### MANPOWER ASSISTANCE

This matter-of-fact analysis by the Director of Reconversion now comes quietly to the human phase of reconversion. Here all controls have been dropped.

Have we acted promptly enough and well enough in this respect? As I read the headlines day by day, I wonder. I wonder whether our action here has been too little or too late. I wonder if inaction with respect to other fields of governmental policy will compel us to adopt emergency rescue measures during the coming months. I wonder if we will see a recurrence of work relief and made work—or whether we will recover after the critical time next spring.

It depends on confidence and cooperation and coordination. For these things we need and must have the full-employment bill.

#### DEMOBILIZATION AND VETERANS' READJUSTMENT

Work for veterans is not a separate problem. Veterans' organizations have emphasized again and again their clear understanding of this. They know and we know and General Bradley knows that there can be no real continuing answer to jobs for veterans at decent wages—except full production and full employment. We need, says the Director of Reconversion, legislation for the clarification of veterans' reemployment rights and liberalization of veterans' benefits. But this will be only a temporary stop-gap—unless we move from demobilization promptly into full employment. Veterans, like all the rest of us, have a stake in the general prosperity which is of much more importance to them than their special privileges as veterans.

#### PRICE CONTROLS—WAGE CONTROLS

The situation in respect to prices and wages is loaded with two kinds of dynamite. There is the urgent danger of inflation on the one hand if wages and prices spiral upward and production lags behind. There is, on the other hand, the urgent danger of deflation, of lost purchasing power, of business volume sagging, of production and employment spiralling downward into stagnation.

The answer—the only real answer to both dangers—is full production and full employment. Full employment means adequate purchasing power, adequate purchasing power means full production, and full production means full employment. The only answer to inflation is to bring the production up to match the demand. In the presence of full production we never have had inflation in time of peace.

Wage disputes and price demands alike can be solved in an atmosphere of understanding and good will—provided that the workers and the business interests both have confidence in the future. This means confidence in full employment—and again I ask for prompt, decisive action by the Congress.

#### RATIONING AND AGRICULTURE

The unwelcome necessity for rationing was accepted by the people of this country as a necessary evil. All of us would like to see it stopped entirely as soon as possible. We can stop it very soon—provided we can keep production up. The farmers of this country have proved their capacity to expand production. They will continue to provide the food we need—if they can have confidence in their markets.

But the farmer knows that his market is the pay check of the city worker. We have made commitments to our farmers—commitments for protection which I think they well deserve. We have undertaken to protect them against the price collapse that would otherwise overtake them when factory pay rolls collapse.

How can we afford to make good on this recommendation unless we can find the way to see that factory pay rolls do not collapse?

All this again spells full employment. Let us act before it is too late.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND PUBLIC WORKS

The basis for the boom which many people see ahead, and which I see ahead if we act wisely, is the backlog of private construction and especially of housing. Will this materialize? Yes, if there is confidence in the future.

New houses, new stores, new factories are built when people think they can be used and paid for. This country needs new houses by the million. It needs new factories, new stores. They will be built if people believe in full employment, and at the same time this healthy volume of private construction can provide a major basis for the full employment and full production that are needed to justify this new construction.

So we come again to the underlying need for confidence in full employment—and this means action here and now.

Few of us have delusions any more that public works construction can sustain our whole economy. The job is just too big. There is an urgent need for useful public works but for this very reason we must not handle public works solely for emergency relief. They must be planned ahead.

Private construction and public works alike can make their proper contribution to the country's welfare only with a consistent national policy for full employment and stability. Furthermore, only on the basis of such a policy can we rationalize and stabilize the construction industry itself. On both counts, we need assurance of full employment, full markets, full production.

#### FOREIGN TRADE

Many people have expressed the view that foreign trade has great possibilities for prosperity at home. Others contrariwise fear the loss of markets through importation of low-cost goods produced abroad by low-wage labor.

My own view is that when we say foreign trade we mean trade—in other words exchanging goods and services for mutual benefit. We mean a fair and honest swap. Our requirements for things we do not have or things we can produce only at high cost are so large that they are a controlling influence in

world trade. If we can maintain full employment and therefore full production in this country, it means that economic health can be maintained throughout a large part of the world; and this means economic peace. On the basis of economic peace alone can we build military peace.

On the other hand, a peaceful healthy world will need the very things that we can best produce. It will need our machinery, our automobiles, our locomotives. It will need them and can pay for them—provided that we let them pay; and this means imports and we will need the imports—provided we maintain full employment.

Those who look forward to a peaceful world must act promptly to assure full employment in the United States.

#### FEDERAL TAX AND BORROWING PROGRAM

Day by day we hear grave warnings of the terrific burden of the Federal debt. Day by day we hear cries about the crushing burden of taxation on the one hand and pleas for financial assistance at home and abroad on the other. The Director of Reconversion, in his report, asks for continued public support for the direct sale of bonds to individuals in order to minimize the inflationary pressure of the sale of bonds to banks. He asks for prompt enactment of a transition tax program which balances the desire for tax relief with the necessity for inflationary controls.

We have acted on transitional tax policies, perhaps not completely, but I think not unwisely. Have we acted to sustain the incomes out of which these taxes must be paid? Have we acted to sustain the employment, the production, which alone can create these incomes?

Have we acted to assure full production and employment? Not yet.

What are we waiting for, Mr. Speaker? Is it that we do not see the need? Listen again to the Director of Reconversion:

The mechanism by which we will attain our long-range goal should be established now. If this is done, present policies can readily be integrated with long-term measures and the new machinery can be functioning effectively by the time we have finished our immediate task of reconversion.

I hope that the Congress will adopt an efficient mechanism for mobilizing the resources of the country—both private and governmental—for the attainment of full employment and production. I believe that a mechanism such as this bill proposes is a tremendous step toward the attainment of this goal.

Summing up briefly, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize as strongly as I can two things. We are heading into a period of dislocation and reconversion that is going to try our wisdom and our tolerance and our resourcefulness. To cope with this situation, we need the full-employment bill, and we need it now. We need its clear, inspiring statement of the great national objective of full-employment opportunity in a free, competitive economy—a ringing statement, a call to action for human needs as compelling as a declaration of war.

We need the sober, firm commitment that we will direct the resources of the Federal Government to the winning of



this war against the menace of stagnation and depression which is a threat to our institutions hardly less dangerous than the powerful military enemies we have successfully defeated. Nothing less than this open, honest, firm commitment will do; nothing less can build that confidence which must provide a firm foundation for our economic system of private enterprise.

Finally, we need the procedure set up in this bill under which the executive branch and the Congress can discharge their new and heavy tasks. We need the annual National Budget so that we can see within our human limitations where we are headed and what must be done to keep us on the broad highway. We need that annual Budget as an administrative mechanism that will compel a higher order of coordination in the executive branch. And, Mr. Speaker, we need the joint committee of the House and the Senate to receive the President's annual Budget and his economic program, to work it over thoroughly and critically, and then to provide us with a joint resolution which we can in turn debate thoroughly and openly in each House, and which will finally provide a sound, thoughtful, mature statement of our immediate economic objectives and our intentions for well-timed and prudent legislative action.

**LIFTING OF L-41 WILL BRING \$50,000 ADDITIONAL PROFIT TO ONE WASHINGTON BUILDER—OTHER SELFISH SPECULATORS DOUBLE PRICES ON HOMES—RENTAL PRIORITIES NEEDED FOR VETERANS—UNCONTROLLED BUILDING BOOM UNDER WAY**

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our uncontrolled building boom is under way. Yesterday, War Production Board Order L-41, the only direct governmental control on selling prices of homes, was swept away as a result of the lobbying efforts of a group of big speculative real-estate operators.

This morning, a speculative builder in Washington put 50 new homes on the market, all of them constructed under the \$8,000 price-limitation order. Today, those homes are priced at \$9,000. The lifting of L-41 will mean an additional profit of \$50,000 to that one builder. He was one of the group which protested Government control of housing prices so vigorously.

In Miami, Fla., last week, a family was negotiating for a similar home, priced at \$8,000. Yesterday they were informed the price now would be \$16,000.

The headlines in this morning's edition of a substantial New York newspaper tell the same story of inflation. They read as follows:

Real-estate boom—New York City enjoys biggest buying spree since the late 1920's—explanations: Too little living space, inflation fear, high-replacement costs—rise expected to continue.

So we are now embarked on our stormy voyage across the uncharted seas of post-war inflation, without protection against the financial storm against which responsible leaders have sought to warn us for months.

Our ally England has been faced with this same problem, the same danger of inflation, as a result of increased income and war scarcities. On the same day we discarded our major control of a \$15,000,000,000 industry, the British Parliament, by an overwhelming majority, voted to continue that country's wartime controls for another 5 years.

A month ago one of the leaders of the speculative building group, in his efforts to persuade the administration to relinquish all control of housing prices, made the promise that builders would refrain from get-rich-quick policies, and that lending institutions would avoid excessive appraisals to help curb inflation.

Let us look a little further into the case of the Washington builder, who stands to make such an excellent profit from the lifting of L-41, and see how well that promise has been kept.

His houses are made of unfaced brick and are two-story, two-bedroom homes. They are small—20 by 22 feet. Each lot is 50 by 100 feet. They are located several miles from Washington. Construction material cannot be said to be of the finest quality. The wooden floor joists and subflooring, for instance—the joists are third-grade green pine. A carpenter said he feared the floors would sag. In most of the houses hardware is still of wartime finish.

Nearby is a similar home, except that it contains one more bedroom, is larger, and is built on a larger lot than the houses in question. This house sold in July 1942 for \$6,250, on a \$650 down payment. The new homes are appraised by a private lender at \$8,990, and require a down payment of \$1,700.

Those are the facts. I shall let them speak for themselves.

There has never, in the history of our country, been a building boom comparable in volume to the one we are now facing. Literally millions of our people want homes, millions want them badly enough to pay more than they normally would be willing to pay.

Prospects of supplying sufficient construction material to meet that demand in time to stave off more inflation are discouraging.

The Western Pine Association, in a statement issued October 6, says this:

To summarize the first 9 months performance of the Western pine industry in 1945; lumber production was down 11 percent more than during the same 1944 period, shipments were 10 percent lower, and stocks at the end of September are lower at this date than for many years.

On October 8, the War Production Board said this:

No appreciable replenishment of lumber stocks, which are now at an all-time low, can be expected during the fourth quarter of 1945 because of sharp cuts in production.

Summed up, we have the greatest housing demand in our history, coupled with an insufficient supply of building materials—two of the facts needed to

bring the worst inflation of our generation, unless drastic action is taken on prices.

My most urgent concern in the national housing shortage that threatens us is the plight of the returning veteran.

Every boat from Europe and the far Pacific brings thousands of our servicemen back to us. They are pouring home at every port. It is conservatively estimated that 700,000 of them, with wives and children, will be looking for homes. Seven hundred thousand places to live. That is not some problem to confront us in the hazy future. It is here, now, demanding action. And every ship that enters port increases its intensity.

This same question—what can be done to provide homes for these returning servicemen—recently was put to the same group of speculative builders, the group which promises that the building industry can solve the housing shortage without Government assistance. Their reply was:

Nothing should be done. Let the returning soldiers scramble with the rest of us. Once he is out of uniform, he shouldn't receive any better treatment than anyone else.

That callous selfishness is shocking to the average American, but it is indicative of the indifference to be found in some business quarters of the plight of the man who fought your fight and mine for 4 long years. An ordinary sense of fair play and justice demands that those men who have been unable to seek homes on an equal basis with the rest of us while they were battling our enemies, should be given priority for homes at fair and reasonable prices.

For a half million returning veterans to find themselves without shelter for their families should be a source of national shame, demanding instant action.

During the war we very successfully found means to provide priority shelter for hundreds of thousands of in-migrant war workers, coming into industrial centers to produce for war.

Construction material was set aside and channeled to builders to provide them with housing. Rents were held at levels the in-migrant workers could pay. The job was done with dispatch.

Are not our returning fighting men entitled to the same treatment we gave our civilian war workers?

I would suggest that the administration adopt some plan of material control that will channel a certain percentage of available construction supplies to building homes for these veterans—small, modest homes that they can buy at reasonable prices. A certain percentage of all materials allowed contractors might well be allocated for construction of small homes to be sold at fair prices to veterans with families.

In addition to the above, some housing should be allocated for rentals to veterans. Many returning youngsters, newly married, unsure of their futures, would be unwise to buy a home at the present time. In many instances, it will be impossible for them to do so until the veteran is established in his job and becomes settled.

This rental provision could be handled by the same machinery that provided similar rental housing for war workers.

These two objectives could be accomplished by acts nearly as simple as changing the words "in-migrant war worker" to "serviceman" in the housing regulations.

Some step such as this suggestion must be taken soon. Responsible leaders in the building industry already are worried about the explosive threat that is contained in the pressure of the Nation's housing demand.

Already veterans have been requesting city officials in New York to let them pitch their tents in Central Park, because they could not find shelter in the Nation's greatest city.

In this, too, we might learn from the experience of England. It has only been a few months since British Tommies being demobilized took drastic action themselves to find homes. Vigilante committees were formed in smaller cities. Empty houses were commandeered, and servicemen's families were installed in them. In some instances violent disorders occurred.

Our housing problem must be solved speedily if we are to avoid the seething unrest that might provoke housing riots here.

[From the Washington Daily News of October 16, 1945]

#### COAST TO COAST "NO VACANCY" SIGNS GREET HOMECOMING VETS

Two months after the end of the war America's cities still suffer from growing pains. A UP survey found today that the housing shortage from coast to coast is worse than it was 6 months ago. And the returning veteran suffers most.

Soldiers, sailors, and marines come back to find the "no vacancy" sign up all over town. A soldier in Chicago spread a newspaper on the sidewalk and lay down to sleep.

An ex-soldier pleaded in a Boston newspaper's want-ad columns: "Would some kind person have a heart? Veteran and wife urgently need apartment."

A couple with two children in Miami begged for space to park their trailer.

#### WAR WORKERS STAY

A housing official in Atlanta said "there's not a dog house for rent."

In New York, Detroit, Chicago, Denver, and San Francisco it's the same story—more people than there are living accommodations.

Housing officials estimate that it will be next spring before there will be enough new building to improve the situation.

The jam has grown worse since VJ-day because the veterans are moving into communities already filled with war workers—who like the big city so well they have decided to stay.

#### HOTELS JAMMED

In Philadelphia, for example, only 9 percent of the war workers plan to leave this year.

A survey by the Cleveland Press showed that 73 percent of the war workers who moved to Cleveland intend to stay there.

Many cities are trying to help veterans find a home, but only a few are having success.

In New York, the Navy Officers Housing Committee has a list of 5,000 waiting for apartments. Veterans get priorities on housing units listed with the city renting agency. Rear Adm. Monroe Kelly, commandant of the Third Naval District, asked the public to give the Navy a break and stay out of New York hotels during the last 2 weeks of October. He said that if the hotel situation is not relieved, thousands of bluejackets from

the Pacific front will be deprived of reunions with their loved ones.

The Philadelphia Housing Authority aiding veterans and war workers, has 1,157 families on the waiting list and no vacancies.

Seventy-five percent of the applicants were discharged servicemen.

#### VETERANS HARD HIT

Atlanta met part of the problem by housing veterans in 400 houses that had been used by workers in a war plant, now closed. Minneapolis set up a housing bureau to help veterans; but in September there were 1,364 new applicants and only 57 placements.

At Salt Lake Veterans' Administration officials said the need for housing was the foremost concern of most ex-servicemen appealing to the Administration for help.

Boston has a war rental housing agency, but the funds were appropriated for servicemen's housing. Officials ruled it would be illegal to use the money to aid discharged servicemen.

The UP survey showed this was the situation in brief:

#### "WORSE THAN CRITICAL"

BOSTON.—Almost no houses or apartments available. Hotels booked solid for weeks in advance.

NEW YORK.—Hotel, apartment, and house rental shortages worse than 6 months ago, when it was critical. Hotels booked solid through November 15.

PHILADELPHIA.—City officials estimate Philadelphia needs 100,000 new homes to provide space for the war-swollen population.

MIAMI.—Leading hotels booked solid for winter season. Some apartment buildings and hotels being sold as many as four times a year—each time at a profit.

DETROIT.—Hotels Book Cadillac and Statler refuse to take reservations Monday through Thursday when all rooms are filled with businessmen. Detroit Housing Commission reports fewer places to rent now than at peak of city's war production.

#### "NOBODY'S GOING HOME"

CHICAGO.—City housing center gets 100 applicants a day but has nothing to offer for immediate occupancy. Hotels jammed.

OMAHA.—One moving company reports that residents are moving out five times as fast as those moving in, but still no houses for rent.

INDIANAPOLIS.—John H. Hewitt, executive secretary of the Indiana Hotel Association, said no Indianapolis hotel has been able to supply a room without an advance reservation since VJ-day.

DALLAS.—Holmes Green, head of the War Housing Committee, said "People are not building houses for rent, and nobody's going home."

SAN FRANCISCO.—Hotel, apartment, house-rental situation "definitely worse" since VJ-day. Shortage increased by families of veterans moving to the Pacific coast and by persons arriving to meet returning servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a statement from the Washington Daily News of today, Tuesday, October 16, 1945, entitled "Coast-to-Coast No-Vacancy Signs Greet Homecoming Vets," disclosing a situation where the veterans who are returning from this war are unable to rent a home or to buy a home.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts in each.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BIEMILLER for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 17, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will meet Wednesday, October 17, 1945, at 10 a. m. in room 304, Old House Office Building, to consider the bill H. R. 2202.

##### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 17, at 10 o'clock a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

747. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

748. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for



other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

749. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the head of the post-graduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

750. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1124. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4355) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Shull, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 4384. A bill to amend the act of June 8, 1936, relating to vocational education, so as to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4385. A bill to constitute service in the Organized Defense Volunteers, Territory of Hawaii, for any period from and after December 7, 1941, to June 21, 1945, as service in the armed forces of the United States for such period; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 4386. A bill to facilitate and simplify the administration of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4387. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service," approved December 21, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 4388. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service," approved December 21, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOESER:

H. R. 4389. A bill to prevent the lapse of reemployment rights of veterans when the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, becomes inoperative; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 4390. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4391. A bill to authorize temporarily the allowance of leave to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard retired subsequent to September 8, 1939, and retained on active duty, to the same extent as if such officers had not been retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4392. A bill to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4393. A bill for the relief of the owners of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4394. A bill to relieve persons who have completed service in the merchant marine from liability for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4395. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the acquisition and development of systems of State parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 373. A resolution to provide for travel pay allowance to clerks of Representatives or Delegates in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4396. A bill for the relief of William S. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4397. A bill for the relief of Theresa Mondell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4398. A bill for the relief of Thelma McMullen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4399. A bill for the relief of William R. Weathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Nolan V. Curry individually and as guardian for his minor son, Hershel Dean Curry; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Joe F. Rada and Bessie Rada; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4402. A bill for the relief of Viola McHale; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 4403. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary M. Souders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 4404. A bill for the relief of Pietro Ghio; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHARP:

H. R. 4405. A bill for the relief of John Bakelaar; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 4406. A bill for the relief of Loyal F. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1248. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the Wyoming State Convention of

the American War Mothers, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to provide for the designation and construction of a national veterans' hospital at the Hot Springs State Park, Thermopolis, Wyo.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1249. Also, memorial of Thermopolis (Wyo.) Pioneer Association, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to provide for the designation and construction of a national veterans' hospital at Thermopolis, Wyo., for the relief of an emergency now existing in the care and treatment of veterans of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1250. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Frank W. Shaw Post, No. 137, American Legion, Fryeburg, Maine, that Congress extend to those of the armed services who were disabled while in service and are thus identified by the possession of the Purple Heart or by certification of disability, the privilege of free postage on their personal first-class mail; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1251. By the SPEAKER: Petition of August Wessig, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to greater motorist vehicle-pedestrian safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, whose providence flows to us in an unbroken stream, humbly we come to Thee, drawn by Thy boundless love and wondrous compassion. As we bring to Thee our weaknesses and perplexities, set Thy seal upon our hearts that they may be enriched with the living forms of character which are right and grandly right. Turn us toward Thy holy temple that from this sanctuary may come wisdom and grace commensurate with our needs.

So often our thoughts and desires are diverted by the pressing cares of duty; in our necessities, hide not Thy face far from us and take not Thy Holy Spirit from us. Draw near when we are cast down, when burdens are unjust and our thoughts wander as we question the tragedies of these times. As we greet each new day with its wealth of opportunities, keep us from the silken cradle of ease, remembering the multitudes who are loveless and homeless with no chart or compass and with no language but a cry. Make each of us a messenger of light and hope, cheerfully accepting the discipline of life in the joy of Thy companionship. In our Redeemer's name, Amen.

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

#### JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) and ask for its immediate consideration.