

Frank Barnett, Jr.
 Carl Blanchett
 Robert Coward Boardman
 William Henry Boswell
 Peter Seelye Branson
 Alfred William Brass
 William Henry Brinkmeyer
 Bernard Stanley Brown
 James Wood Carroll
 Parker Olin Chapman
 Garth Dalmayne Clizbe
 Clyde Clavius Coffindaffer
 Henry Paine Crawford, Jr.
 Donald Brian Crews
 Charles Mitchell Daniel
 Harold Leroy Davison
 John Mac Neil Dempsey, Jr.
 John Augustine Devlin, Jr.
 Harley Earl Dilcher
 Sumner Raymond Dolber
 Robert John Donovan
 John Michael Dorsey
 James Harold Durfee
 Clarence Raymond Easter
 Albert Bradbury Ellerman
 Joseph Knowles Everton
 John Joseph Fehrenbacher
 Arthur Andre Fontaine
 Louis Randolph Ford, Jr.
 John Bradley Freeman
 William Elliott Fuller, Jr.
 Carroll Hitchcock George
 Harold Kirksey Goodbread
 Richard William Goode
 Herbert Richard Harris
 James Leonard Harrison
 Gordon Fairland Hempton
 Robert Fisher Henderson
 Frederick William Hermes, Jr.
 James Arthur Hodgman
 Julian Elliott Johansen
 Robert Durrell Johnson
 Harry New Jones 2d
 Kenneth Howard Langenbeck
 John Burton Lape, Jr.
 Elmer Maurice Lipsey
 Richard Suppes Lodge
 Paul Alan Lutz
 Worley Berry Lynn
 James Thomas Maher
 William Lothridge Martin
 Andrew Mazzotta
 John David McCann
 Albert Joseph McCullough
 Milton Lee McGregor
 Edward Duncan Middleton, Jr.
 Joseph Anthony Montagna
 James Edward Murphy
 William Emmet Murphy
 Earl Asa Parker, Jr.
 Raymond Grant Parks, Jr.
 Paul Reed Peak, Jr.
 Paul Powers Perez
 Lilbourn Amos Pharris, Jr.
 Robert Carlton Phillips
 Vance King Randle, Jr.
 Theodore Charles Rapalus
 David Harold Rasmussen
 Ricardo Allen Ratti
 Don Richard Rodgers
 Donald Henry Rollert
 Paul Thomas Ryan
 Marion Gardiner Shrode, Jr.
 Harrison Ballard Smith
 Neilus Andrew Spears, Jr.
 Raymond Benner Starbuck
 Jeremiah Milton Stark
 Richard Stoner Strickler
 George Francis Thometz, Jr.
 Wesley Matthew Thorsson
 John Bollyard Wade
 George Warren Wagner
 William Hamilton Wallace
 George Alfred Warren
 David Anderson Webb
 William Leroy Weiss, Jr.
 George Herbert Weller
 George Earnest Williams
 Ellsworth Albin Winnette

Andrew Wakefield Wofford
 Virgil Nourse Woolfolk, Jr.

POSTMASTERS
 ARIZONA

Jeanette Mae Collins, Dateland.
 CALIFORNIA

Roy A. Smith, Eldridge.
 Kenneth Baird Haslam, Firebaugh.
 Robert E. Meacham, Hermosa Beach.
 Eva L. Fowler, Kelseyville.
 Lawrence P. Comerford, Lincoln Acres.
 Sadie L. Diaz, San Marcos.
 Llewellyn B. Peck, Saratoga.
 Wanda L. Stark, Tulelake.

DELAWARE

Mary S. Bell, Smyrna.

GEORGIA

J. Heard Summerour, Duluth.
 Ruth G. Dixon, Girard.
 Wilma G. Cook, Parrott.

ILLINOIS

Nigel B. Herrin, Cave in Rock.
 Roll E. Gibbs, Clayton.
 Earl D. Husted, Cornell.
 Margaret W. Irish, Farina.
 Myrtle Wilkison, Glen Carbon.
 Mary Ruth Shine, Glenwood.
 John L. Zimmerman, Hinsdale.
 Wendell A. Stotler, Hudson.
 Mary H. Cofey, Maple Park.
 Hugh James, Montrose.
 James D. Cook, Mulkeytown.
 Lewis R. Wall, New Douglas.
 Albert W. Schurg, Pesotum.
 Charles E. Lowry, Philo.
 Samuel W. Brown, Ringwood.
 Jacob H. Michel, West Brooklyn.

INDIANA

Mary E. Wade, Wilkinson.

IOWA

George O. Friedrichsen, Alford.
 Anton C. Rank, Buffalo Center.
 Emma M. Jochimsen, Callender.
 William H. Meshak, Dedham.
 Eva M. Anderson, Fremont.
 Ida E. Heffernen, Peosta.
 John R. Shebek, Riverside.
 Alice B. Dougherty, Sheldon.

MINNESOTA

Ralph B. Dingmann, Clear Lake.
 Cora E. Albright, Lengby.
 Leonard J. Hintzen, Miltona.

MISSISSIPPI

Lewis F. Henry, Carthage.
 Mary S. Herron, Courtland.
 J. Wood Sartin, Jayess.
 Virgil L. Harrington, Merigold.

MONTANA

E. Warren Toole, Great Falls.

NEBRASKA

Tim N. Cannon, Juniata.
 Austin E. Scott, Mitchell.

NEW MEXICO

Mary J. Kemp, Reserve.

NEW YORK

Gertrude L. Rigaud, Oriskany Falls.
 D. L. Palmer, Otego.
 George Buechel, Patterson.
 Margaret T. Kennedy, Salisbury Mills.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ernie A. Neese, Cottageville.

VIRGINIA

William M. Upshur, Jr., Cheriton.
 Minnie J. Davis, Church Road.
 Oscar M. Buchanan, Kenbridge.
 Berkeley B. Baker, Lovettsville.
 Charles C. Kenny, Upperville.

WASHINGTON

Helen G. Anderson, Union.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera
 Montgomery, D. D., offered the follow-
 ing prayer:

O Thou whose all-enfolding love and
 mercy hold and guide through every
 eclipse of life, give us minds intent on
 pleasing Thee. As our station marks us
 with distinct obligation, we pray for help
 to weigh all questions by the rule of love
 and righteousness. Let the windows of
 our minds be "broad inward"—judging
 and watching ourselves lest our courage
 be presumption and our honesty expedi-
 ency. Wait, O Father, at the doors
 of our hearts that the vision of our Mas-
 ter may direct us to the uttermost.

O Divine One, build in us an ideal like
 unto Thine, so generous, free of evil
 tendencies which would render us care-
 less of the responsibilities of our voca-
 tion. We pray that the Congress may
 vindicate the sanctity and justice of
 humanity and make democratic form of
 government honorable, and strengthen
 the hands of all true patriots throughout
 this appealing world. If the sword and
 fire must come, let them cut the bonds of
 oppression and iniquity; allow not a pas-
 sion of unrestrained enthusiasm to rise
 in the soul of the public. O keep in our
 memory the age-old truth that all men
 are brothers, the sinners and the sinned
 against; binding up the wounds, rather
 than kindling the fires of war; let our
 administration of the peace not be in
 wrath and revenge but allied with broad
 and wise understanding. In the name
 of Him who hath dealt bountifully with
 us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yes-
 terday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr.
 Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced
 that the Senate had passed, with amend-
 ments in which the concurrence of the
 House is requested, bills of the House of
 the following titles:

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appoint-
 ment of postmasters; and

H. R. 4254. An act to extend for 1 year the
 provisions of an act to promote the defense
 of the United States, approved March 11,
 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the
 Senate had passed a bill of the following
 title, in which the concurrence of the
 House is requested:

S. 1758. An act to amend section 451 of the
 Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the
 Vice President has appointed Mr. BARK-
 LEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the
 joint select committee on the part of
 the Senate, as provided for in the act
 of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to
 provide for the disposition of certain
 records of the United States Govern-

ment," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.

MORE FOOD WASTE

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

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1565) relating to the appointment of postmasters, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 11, after "relegated", insert "; and any postmaster or acting postmaster of the fourth or third class who has passed a civil-service examination at any time and has given service satisfactory to the Department may be reappointed without further civil-service examination."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform us as to the nature of this amendment?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It is a clarifying amendment to H. R. 1565.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How does it clarify it?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. We passed a bill here by which a postmaster of the third class, if his office is relegated to the fourth class, might be appointed by the Postmaster General without taking a reexamination; also, if the office is advanced from the fourth to the third class, he would be exempt from a civil-service examination. The Senate decided it was necessary that this matter be clarified.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This simply means that in a shift from one class to another a new examination is not required?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It is not required if they have passed a civil-service examination.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Rhode Island General Assembly a few days ago adopted a model soldiers' vote bill. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a digest of the legislation prepared by the chairman of the board of elections.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a review of the book entitled "T. V. A.—Democracy on the March."

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

There was no objection.

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

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. OUTLAND. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago in this House we voted to discontinue Federal assistance to the school-lunch program throughout this Nation. I believed at that time, and I still believe, that this action was most unfortunate. Throughout America there are thousands upon thousands of school children who are underfed, and to whom the school-lunch program, inadequate as it was in many instances, was truly the bright spot in the day. Despite the general rise in our national income, thousands of families have relatively less than ever before, and the need for Federal aid to States and communities to continue the school-lunch program is as great, if not greater, than it has ever been. Because many mothers are employed in war industries, an increasing number of children are coming to school with an inadequate breakfast and without any provision whatsoever for lunch or with one that has been poorly selected. Transportation, rationing, and other wartime difficulties have complicated the problem still further. Without financial aid from the Federal Government, comparatively few schools can provide noon lunches for all children needing them.

Not only from my own congressional district but from all over the country have been coming earnest requests that legislation be enacted to provide for an adequate school-lunch program as an integral part of the services of our school

system. Parent-teacher associations, community councils, and many other organizations vitally interested in the health of our future citizens are urging such action. To this end I am introducing today into this House a bill designed to meet this need, one which I hope will not only provide for a continued lunch program, but one which will be administratively sound from an educational standpoint. I earnestly request that my colleagues study this proposed bill, and sincerely hope that it will meet with speedy, favorable action on the part of this body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me before the American Federation of Physically Handicapped last January in Buffalo.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I made last Friday night over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

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

There was no objection.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers have carried the story in the recent issues that General Hershey, the head of the Selective Service System, has again changed the rule regarding the induction of our men and boys into the Army. These rules and regulations have been changed so often, and without any regard to the welfare of the boys, that no one can keep pace with what those rules and regulations are. Our boys, subject to the draft, are unable to know what their status is. They cannot plan for the future. They are kept in constant confusion regarding their plans.

I am confident these men and boys, who are subject to the draft, would be unable to keep up with the sudden changes if they would purchase and read a morning, noon, and night edition of the daily papers. This constant changing of the regulations regarding the drafting of our boys should be stopped. A reasonable rule should be established and it should be retained. Our boys are entitled to know in advance what is in

store for them in the future. Under this plan of constantly changing the rules, they are kept in a state of uncertainty and in utter confusion. They should not be continued. Our boys are entitled to know what their fate is without confusion and uncertainty entering into their problem. It is high time to inject some good sound policies into the rules of the Selective Service System.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief survey of a recent election poll.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials on the Montgomery Ward case.

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

There was no objection.

THE ARABIAN PIPE LINE—A PROPOSED VENTURE INTO IMPERIALISM

Mr. GAVIN. 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. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the service activities of the Disabled American Veterans.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the president of the National Fire Protection Association in Philadelphia on May 8.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Constantine Brown entitled "This Changing World," that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 6, 1944.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE THOMAS H. BALL

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

*Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House the passing on yesterday of a distinguished Texan, a former Member of this House, Col. Thomas H. Ball, of Houston. Colonel Ball was 85 years old when he passed away. He lived a long and useful life. Not only has the State of Texas lost one of its outstanding citizens but the Nation has suffered a loss. Colonel Ball served in the House from 1897 to 1903. This short sketch of his life indicates his outstanding and various talents:

Thomas Henry Ball, a Representative from Texas; born in Huntsville, Walker County, Tex., January 14, 1859; attended private schools and was graduated from Austin College, Sherman, Tex., in 1876; studied law at the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, Va.; was admitted to the bar in 1886, and commenced practice in Huntsville, Tex.; mayor of Huntsville, 1887-93; chairman of the Democratic executive committee of Walker County, 1884-96; delegate to all State conventions from 1886 to 1924 with three exceptions; delegate to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in 1892, and at New York City in 1924; elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, and Fifty-eighth Congresses and served from March 4, 1897, to November 16, 1903, when he resigned; resumed the practice of his profession; general counsel for the State council of defense during the World War; was employed as general counsel for the port commission of the Houston harbor and ship channel, and was a resident of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I intend to make today excerpts from two editorials.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RESERVOIRS, LEVEES, AND FLOOD WALLS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill H. R. 4485, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this act, except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the War Department of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required cooperation will be furnished.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, there is a growing conviction among a large part of our population, as well as a good many Members of Congress, that the administration is playing politics with food. Either this is true or a top-heavy bureaucracy is responsible for the delays that have taken place in removing canned vegetables and meats from rationing.

During last December and January it is reported that both the Office of Price Administration and a large trade association made a careful survey of the quantities of home-canned goods on pantry shelves and the quantities on the retailers' shelves throughout the country. It was known at that time that cannery warehouses were filled to overflowing with last year's packs, particularly of canned vegetables. There is no known reason why rationing of these canned goods should not have been discontinued at that time.

Similarly, governmental authorities knew many months ago just what the supply situation of livestock was. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there has been no marked change in the supply situation of livestock between January 1 and the present time. On the contrary, information I have been able to obtain indicates that January slaughtering was at its peak. The question naturally arises, Why was meat rationing not

lifted at that time? It should have been done.

An article appearing in Collier's magazine of May 6, 1944, written by Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, raises a very peculiar situation. This article was published a week after the order was issued removing most meats and canned vegetables from rationing. In this article Mr. Bowles stated that there would be some relief of meat rationing "in 1945—with luck—and possibly end when the war in Europe is over," and that rationing of processed foods would not cease until "the war in the Pacific ends." Yet 1 week before his statement appeared he issued an order removing most meats and canned vegetables from all rationing restrictions. The Office of Price Administration should completely remove all ration restrictions on steaks and roasts of beef now. It should have been done last January.

Let me ask what can be the reason for these inconsistent statements and these inconsistent orders. Is it possible that Mr. Bowles is only a figurehead and that there is a hidden power to which he must respond? If so, who is it and what is it? This is convincing proof that someone is responsible for playing politics with our food supply.

Several months ago the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee advocated openly and publicly that the administration of all food activities should be centered in one administrative agency.

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

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. I am glad to yield to my colleague and neighbor.

Mr. BREHM. I feel confident that if the gentleman's suggestion had been followed and the food authority had been put under one head that there would not now be spoiling so many thousand pounds of butter, cheese, and other food. I trust that those responsible for the food administration may yet follow the suggestions of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman's observation is very timely and quite in point.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives agreed with the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee and reported favorably a bill which had been introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina, Representative FULMER, who is the chairman of that committee. The sentiment of the country was then, and is now, overwhelmingly favorable to the enactment of this legislation. The legislation would have been enacted except for administration opposition.

I am informed that the War Food Administration release of May 4 indicates that it did not even know that these items were to be eliminated from the ration list on May 1. Where is the hidden power in Government that is responsible for playing politics with our food supply?

In other words, on May there came out a release from the War Food Administration which indicated that the Administration knew nothing about an order that had been issued on the 1st of

May. So I repeat there can be no question but that this whole food program is being administered by some organization or individual or power which is anonymous and which issues orders to Mr. Bowles and Mr. Jones.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman called the attention of the House to the situation with reference to Mr. Jones of the War Food Administration. The President has been away for 4 weeks and I am just wondering who directed Mr. Bowles to remove 85 percent of meat from the ration list and to take these other things off the list?

Mr. JENKINS. In answer to the gentleman's question, I say I wish I knew. I hope these remarks of mine will bring an answer from somebody connected actively with the Food Administration. I see that Cecil B. Dickson, a prominent news reporter, in an article appearing in the Hartford (Conn.) Times of a day or two ago says the action of President Roosevelt in ordering Chester Bowles, the Director of Price Administration, to remove all meat except beefsteaks and beef roasts from rationing was considered a master stroke by inside New Dealers.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. In order to fully utilize dam and reservoir areas under the control of the War Department, the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate recreation, conservation, and other facilities thereat advantageous to the interests of the United States, or to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of War is authorized to grant leases of lands, structures, or facilities in said areas for such periods and upon such terms as he may deem reasonable. All moneys received for such leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On pages 2 and 3, strike out all of section 3, and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"SEC. 3. The Chief of Engineers under the supervision of the Secretary of War, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under control of the War Department, and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of War is authorized to grant leases of lands, structures, or facilities in reservoir areas for such periods and upon such terms as he may deem reasonable: *Provided*, That licenses to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies for the use of areas suitable for public park and recreational purposes may be granted without monetary consideration when the Secretary of War determines such action to be in the public interest. All moneys received for leases or

privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, during the course of general debate, a number of questions were asked with respect to the meaning of section 3, and particularly with respect to the meaning of the word "facilities" in line 25 of section 3. In response to the questions asked, as well as in response to some apprehensions manifested, it was stated by the committee that the purpose of section 3 was to authorize the Chief of Engineers in and around the pools, the permanent pools that are provided in reservoirs authorized for flood control, to make leases for recreational purposes only. It is in order to remove any apprehensions with respect to reclamation or power in connection with the word "facilities" and in order to make more certain that it is the purpose of section 3 only to authorize the Chief of Engineers to provide for recreational facilities that this amendment is offered as a substitute for section 3. I may say in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that under existing law the Secretary of War is authorized to make leases for 5 years, but that in many cases citizens who came to these lakes or these permanent pools would like to have longer leases for any residences or any places of abode they established along the lakes. This substitute is intended more definitely to limit the purpose for which the original section 3 of this bill was intended.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does the amendment as offered by the committee drop the word "conservation" altogether? My reason for asking that is I understood the word "conservation" is in there to make possible the establishment of wildlife refuges and things of that character for the conservation of property and wildlife.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is fair to say this substitute does eliminate the word "conservation." I personally can see no objection to its inclusion after "recreation," because that might be applicable in some cases. But the primary meaning of the section was for recreation, as stated.

Mr. CASE. I wonder if the chairman would feel free to modify the amendment to that extent to put in the words "wildlife conservation" after "recreation"?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to keep faith with the committee. I submitted this amendment to the committee and I was authorized by the committee to submit this as a substitute. Frankly I would say with respect to the wildlife feature that my thought is, with all deference, that these particular pools, from my observation and from my inspection, are really lakes, and those lakes provide for recreation and fishing facilities. It might be, it is possible, the gentleman may know more about the wildlife problem than I do, but it might be that the restrictions with

respect to wildlife propagation might impair the recreational facilities. Personally I trust that the gentleman will think about that matter and I trust he will appreciate my position.* I am not in a position to accept that amendment. My thought is this, further, that if after a further consideration of any and all the projects here it appears that you would like to provide for wildlife conservation and it could be done properly, that it might be embraced in another body. I have gone as far as I am authorized to go.

Mr. CASE. If I may comment just a bit further, the Izaak Walton League, with national headquarters in Chicago, did adopt a resolution which was rather critical of this bill on the ground that it feared some of these reservoirs would destroy wildlife.

The answer that some of us individually have made, and the answer of the chapters of the organization in my State which they have made in their endorsement of the bill has been that section 3, so far from destroying wildlife, is a means of protecting it.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. In that case it was suggested that the Fish and Wildlife Service could cooperate with the War Department through the language in section 3, to propagate fish, establish pools or bayous where feed might be planted for migratory waterfowl, and things of that sort. I would be a little disappointed if I felt that the amendment destroyed that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. While I am not as much of a sportsman as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and others who live in that State, I would say that the language "recreational" ought to embrace the aims and purposes of the Izaak Walton League. It may be that this language would be susceptible to the interpretation that the gentleman has in mind. I would not say that it would not be correct, in proper cases. But, I would say that for the present it is intended for recreation and park facilities, but I think the language is broad enough to embrace what the gentleman had in mind if the Secretary of War so agreed.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say we would get the money for the reservoirs authorized in this bill from the same source that we got the money when we authorized the building of some 13 of the finest reservoirs for flood-control purposes that I know of in the United States, in the great Commonwealth of Ohio. I know of no finer recreational facilities than some of those that have been constructed in those reservoirs that were constructed along the Muskingum River in Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Where did you get that money?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We got it from the taxpayers of the United States, money that the taxpayers wanted expended to protect their lives and their property.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Did you get it from the taxpayers or is it still to come from the taxpayers?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It might be both, if that will satisfy the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of War is authorized to sell to States, municipalities, private concerns, or individuals, at such prices and on such terms as he may deem reasonable, for domestic and industrial uses surplus water that may be available at any reservoir under the control of the War Department. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein certain documents.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill providing for the deportation of Japanese aliens immediately upon the conclusion of hostilities between the United States and Japan. The bill is short, and I am going to read it to you:

A bill providing for the deportation of Japanese aliens

Be it enacted etc.—

SECTION 1. All persons in the United States who on the 7th day of December 1941 were subjects of the Government of Japan and who became enemy aliens by reason of the declaration of war between the United States and Japan, are hereby defined and declared to be undesirable aliens and subject to deportation under the statutes of the United States providing for the deportation of undesirable aliens.

SEC. 2. Within 30 days after the approval of this act the Attorney General of the United States shall proceed to prepare warrants for the deportation of all undesirable aliens as defined in section 1 of this act. Such warrants shall be executed and such aliens deported immediately upon the cessation of hostilities between the United States and Japan.

SEC. 3. No undesirable alien as defined in this act, who has been interned as an enemy alien in the United States, shall be released from internment except for the purpose of deportation under warrant as herein provided.

SEC. 4. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

I venture to say that if a poll should be taken today of all the people in the United States to determine whether they desired to permit alien Japanese to remain in the United States after the conclusion of hostilities, the verdict would be at least 90 percent against allowing them to remain. On the Pacific coast, I would say that the verdict would be al-

most 100 percent for their deportation after the war.

The blood of our sons who were murdered at Pearl Harbor, and tortured and starved on Bataan and Corregidor, the thousands who have met death in the Solomons, the Marshalls, the Gilberts, on Attu, and other theaters of operation in the Pacific, cry out against this barbarous nation and the barbarous nationals who comprise it. I believe the people of this Nation do not want the aliens of that nation to remain in the United States when the war is over.

That being the case, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me obvious that appropriate legislation on the subject should be enacted now, because unless legislation of this kind is enacted during the war it will very likely never be enacted at all. That is the reason I have introduced this bill now, while the people are still free from the propaganda which will beset them after the war.

You all recall what happened after the First World War. There was an avalanche of propaganda, of manufactured sentimentalism throughout the United States which was deliberately calculated to make the people believe that those who had so recently been our enemies had become our brothers immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, and that they could never be persuaded by their leader to wage war on us again.

To such an extent did this propaganda go, and such effect did it have, that it even persuaded the people of the United States almost immediately after the close of World War No. 1 to scrap their Navy and to neglect the defenses of their own country. The same propaganda will be launched again after this war.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that this bill has to do only with Japanese aliens in this country. It does not have to do with Japanese born in the United States, who by virtue of their birth are citizens of this country. That is an entirely different phase of the Japanese problem, and one which must be handled separately and in a different way.

That phase of the question, I may say, is now being studied, and in due course an equitable and constitutional solution of the problem will be reached and presented to the Congress. That phase involves the loyalty of certain individual American citizens born of Japanese parentage, and presents a most important and vital constitutional question. No American desires to harm another American, simply because he was born of Japanese parentage, provided he is in fact, a loyal American, and no American will harm him. But the disloyalty of a vast number of Japanese-Americans has been so completely demonstrated during this war that the question as to them must be faced and must be solved—and it will be solved by just and proper legislation within the four corners of our Constitution.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, the question of the Japanese alien remaining in this country after the war is here now for solution. There is no constitutional question involved here. There is no question of injustice. The people af-

ected by this bill are highly undesirable enemy aliens. They came here solely by our sufferance. That sufferance is exhausted. We want them here no longer. We propose to send them back where they came from at the earliest practicable moment.

I trust very much that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will proceed to the immediate consideration of this bill so that it may be reported to the House and voted upon at this session of the Congress.

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

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Amend section 4 at line 15, page 3 by adding the following: "Provided, however, That, in the case of any reservoir located west of the 97th meridian, the right to the use of waters for such purposes shall be established, and the repayment of costs allocated thereto shall be provided for, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Reclamation laws."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, section 4 of this bill authorizes the Secretary of War to sell for domestic and industrial uses surplus water available at any reservoir under his control. There is no requirement in the section that the right to use such water for domestic and industrial purposes shall be established in conformity with local law, nor does there seem to be any such requirement elsewhere in Federal statutes relating to projects under the control of the Secretary of War. Uses for domestic and industrial purposes are ones that under the system of water law prevailing in the Western States have validity only to the extent that they are established or recognized under the provisions of the law of the place of use. They are in this regard like the right to make beneficial consumptive use of water for irrigation.

Section 6, as amended here today, in dealing with irrigation rights is intended to provide for the establishment of those rights in conformity with the requirements of the Federal Reclamation law. That law provides for proceeding in conformity with State laws for the establishment of the right to use water for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto.

As a matter of principle, I believe that similar conformity should have been required in connection with the sale of rights to use water for domestic and industrial purposes under section 4 of this bill. As the section now stands, the exercise of authority under it, if unchallenged, will amount to an assertion by the Federal Government of a claim of ownership to water for domestic and industrial purposes, without regard to local law. Even though the reservoir by which such surplus waters are developed are constructed and operated under the constitutional power of the Federal Government, the assertion of ownership of such surplus waters for domestic and industrial purposes would be an assertion that

Western States would and should regard as prejudicial to their claims of jurisdiction with respect to waters arising in their States. The possibility of such assertions could have been avoided by a relatively short amendment requiring the establishment of rights for such purposes in conformity with local law, in the manner provided in the Federal reclamation law. I have not pressed harder for such an amendment because so far as the Western States are concerned, I am not aware of any instance where surplus waters will be available for disposition under section 4. If I am wrong in this, this section, as a matter of principle, requires amendment.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept the amendment offered by the Congressman from Utah, and also the ones the committee will offer to section 6. These amendments do not interfere with flood control in the slightest. Their purpose is to tie the reclamation part of the bill to the reclamation laws as we now have them.

In the Colorado Legislature, where I served for many terms spanning a period of 25 years, we had a custom by which, when a bill had multiple purposes, it was referred in turn to each of the committees specializing on each purpose. In other words, had this bill been before our legislature the flood-control committee would have prepared the part having to do with flood control as they have done. Then it would have been referred to the irrigation and reclamation committee for preparation of the purposes having to do with the disposal of the so-called surpluses of water stored in these dams and reservoirs. This latter committee, of which I am a member, would have considered only the part of the bill having to do with the disposal of water for irrigation and domestic and industrial uses. The result would have been generally what we are trying to accomplish by these amendments, namely, to make no innovations or changes in our fundamental reclamation laws, but to tie this new program to these present laws that have been developed over the past 50 years.

In the States west of the ninety-seventh meridian, water is necessary for the growing of crops as well as for domestic and industrial uses. Men fought over it in the early days and only after years of litigation and trouble have the States in cooperation with the Department of the Interior worked out a satisfactory program. Let us not start a new program that will make trouble, misunderstanding, and serious legal difficulties. These amendments do not affect flood control and will generally satisfy our western water users.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday, the purpose of section 4 in no way involves reclamation. With all deference to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBIN-

SON], the amendment is utterly inapplicable and out of place at this point.

Under existing law if a reservoir is authorized and if there is a lack of water for human consumption or for the necessary enterprises in the area the local people are authorized to supplement the cost of that reservoir where the water table, for instance, is low and share by putting up money in the first instance in the case of the construction of the reservoir. It happens in many cases that there is a need, as the War Department has reported to the committee, for water for human consumption because of the drying up of wells. If that need occurs in Ohio, or if that need occurs in Massachusetts, or in any other State, instead of requiring the local people in the first instance where there is inability in many cases to issue bonds and to incur large indebtedness to share in the construction of that reservoir, the purpose of section 4 is to enable the Government, the Secretary of War, and the Chief of Engineers to make a disposition of water there for human consumption or for any proper industrial use. It strikes me, with all deference and in all kindness, that the amendment offered by my friend is utterly inapplicable and would defeat the very purpose for which section 4 is intended. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if it be proper to provide for the storing of waters for reclamation to grow crops in the arid West, with which I am in sympathy, it ought to be all the more in order to provide for the storing of waters for human consumption.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. Hereafter, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to interrogate the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the committee, on the intent and purpose of this provision.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman from Mississippi will be glad to answer his colleague in any way he can.

Mr. RANKIN. We are somewhat disturbed as to whether or not this provision will interfere with the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority under existing law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I answer my colleague by saying most emphatically it will not and should not interfere with the proper operation of T. V. A., and with the gentleman's permission I will proceed to make this statement: The purpose of section 5 is to coordinate reservoirs that should properly

be coordinated, to provide for flood control and for navigation.

I call the attention of my colleague to the fact that that language has nothing on earth to do with the development of power. It has to do only with and I quote: "flood control and navigation." In the Ohio Valley, along the Ohio River, the United States in addition to financing the Tennessee Valley Authority for the construction of dams and reservoirs for flood control for navigation, but in all fairness and in all candor primarily for power, has constructed other reservoirs along other tributaries of the Ohio River for flood control. If those reservoirs on the tributaries of the Ohio, including the Kentucky Dam, the greatest and biggest of all the T. V. A. dams, is to function for flood control that dam and those supplemental dams must be coordinated with the dams along the Allegheny River, along the Monongahela River, along the Kanawah River, along the Muskingum River, and other tributaries. It is essential for the proper coordination of all dams whether along the Tennessee, whether along the Cumberland, or whether along the Ohio or any of the tributaries to be under one central authority that shall have the final say as to how those reservoirs and those dams shall function for flood control. There is nothing whatever in this bill that interferes with the proper power development of the T. V. A.

I supported the T. V. A. and I know the attacks that were made upon it in the Congress. The T. V. A., as the gentleman from Mississippi, if I may presume to say so, must agree—the T. V. A. has been approved by the Supreme Court because of the development of navigation and flood control under the commerce clause of the Constitution. If it be the real purpose of the T. V. A. to provide for flood control then the T. V. A. ought to be coordinated with the other reservoir projects and other flood-control projects; and that is solely the purpose of this provision.

Mr. RANKIN. I was coauthor of the bill creating the T. V. A. We went into all those questions before the bill was ever introduced. The three main purposes were to improve navigation, to control floods, and to produce power. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the Gilbertsville Dam was constructed largely for flood control. That dam was constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority. The dams on the Tennessee are coordinated, they are all linked together, they are operated, may I say, through the powerhouse of the T. V. A.; and I do not want you to take away from the T. V. A. any of the jurisdiction over the operation of those dams and reservoirs.

Is it the gentleman's interpretation of this bill that its provisions would interfere with the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority to operate those locks and dams and control the reservoirs on the Tennessee River?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is one of the purposes for which the authorization exists, to provide for their operation as authorized by Congress.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. It is a great pity that when those dams were built on the Ohio River they did not set up an authority to harness that great wealth of hydroelectric power that is roaring down the Ohio, all the way down from the Allegheny Mountains to Cairo and now going to waste. We took time by the forelock and did save the power on the Tennessee. In doing so for the first time we provided a 9-foot channel from the mouth of the Tennessee to Knoxville and at the same time controlled floods on the Tennessee, and for the first time provided a system whereby we could check or hold back sufficient water to have a tremendous influence on floods south of Cairo on the Mississippi River. What I want to avoid is having any law passed today that interferes with the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority to control that river, as the jurisdiction now stands. What I want to know is whether or not it is the opinion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] that this bill will change existing law in that respect.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This will not change existing law in any respect except to make effective existing law to provide for flood control. As the gentleman asserts, one of the main arguments, as he now reminds us, for the T. V. A. was that it would afford flood control on the Ohio and Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is what the bill is likely to do: When two distinct authorities are given the right to interfere it is likely to cause conflict that would be to the detriment both of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the flood sufferers on the lower Ohio, the lower Mississippi, and the Tennessee. For that reason I wish the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] would leave that provision out or else accept an amendment to clarify the matter and show that it is not intended to interfere with the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am wondering if section 5 means that the Secretary of War can prescribe regulations for all reservoirs built throughout the country either wholly or in part with Federal funds? Does that cover the reservoirs which have been created and put under the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I may be permitted to answer, most emphatically no, because it says that it is for flood control or navigation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It says "all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, I answered the gentleman's question. It would be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use or storage of water available for flood control or navigation. It limits the au-

thority to flood control and navigation and has nothing to do with reclamation or power—

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. In the gentleman's opinion these authorities as they are established, and particularly that of the Tennessee Valley, should remain unimpaired in any region where applicable?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I think they should remain unimpaired. The T. V. A. is doing the greatest job in connection with the production of power, flood control, the improvement of navigation, soil conservation, and so forth of any agency of this Government. I am afraid if the pending bill is passed in its present form it is going to impair that efficiency and greatly injure the Tennessee Valley Authority. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] will accept.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 3, line 21, after the word "regulations", strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "except as otherwise provided by existing law."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, that is all we ask, that it will simply protect the Tennessee Valley Authority from interference and will leave the T. V. A. in control of the Tennessee River as the present law provides, and I hope my colleague from Mississippi will accept this amendment, because it is absolutely necessary to clarify the situation and to avoid a conflict that might prove disastrous.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept this amendment, because if it is not included in the bill it may very seriously interfere with the war effort and, of course, none of us want to do that. I call the attention of the Members to the fact that some of the dams on the Tennessee River which are operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority have recently been built for the expressed purpose of producing power for the manufacture of munitions, especially aluminum. The Cherokee, Douglas, and several of the other dams were built primarily for power, and they are charged 100 percent to power operation.

It is quite apparent that if the Corps of Engineers is going to be able to say, "You let all of the water out of this dam," and the Tennessee Valley Authority in the meantime has entered into contracts with the Aluminum Co. of America, with the Reynolds Metal Works, and with other war plants up and down the valley to furnish a certain amount of electricity, for which these dams were built, T. V. A. cannot carry out those contracts. T. V. A. cannot meet its obligations in order to produce aluminum if there is going to be any likelihood of the water being released at those dams so the generators cannot be operated. I want to say as a Member from one city in the Tennessee Valley which did have a serious threat of flood and still has a threat, that the Tennessee Valley Authority, by

operating its dams for a multiple purpose, navigation, flood control, and the generation of electricity, has been able to take care of the entire flood-control problem on the Tennessee River with the exception of Chattanooga where it is agreed that in order to be fully protected we are going to have to build certain protective works. It has been proven as a scientific fact that they can successfully operate their dams for the purpose of navigation, flood control, and the generation of electricity. We are satisfied that they are doing the best they can for the protection of Chattanooga where the only flood menace now exists.

Mr. Chairman, if the Corps of Engineers is going to be given authority to operate these dams you might as well turn the whole Tennessee Valley Authority over to them. You cannot have the T. V. A. making contracts to supply electricity and at the same time have somebody else say how much water you can hold in the dams for that purpose. You cannot work under that kind of divided authority.

I hope that the gentleman from Mississippi will say that it is not intended to change existing law insofar as the operation of these dams by the T. V. A. is concerned because it would be ruinous to our war effort to have a diffusion of responsibility.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman in his approval of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and with the gentleman's statement concerning it. The very fact that dams are built for a multiple purpose shows there are other reasons for such dams besides flood control. I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will cover the situation and safeguard those other uses.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. I maintain that the big problem at this time is the operation of these dams that were built for the purpose of supplying electricity in order to keep the aluminum production going at full pace. We have some dams down there in connection with which there was no flood control or navigation considered. The appropriations were to build the dams to produce power or electricity and those dams cannot be turned over to the operation of the Corps of Engineers unless we are going to hamper the war effort.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In the last great flood even though we did not have the Gilbertsville Dam finished, the Tennessee Valley saved Cairo, Ill. By using those dams and coordinating them according to the system they worked out there were held back the floodwaters of the Tennessee River.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is right and in this last flood the Tennessee Valley Authority prevented substantial damage to Chattanooga by a decision

there to let a certain cofferdam be washed out at the Kentucky dam project. They are doing the very best they can to control floods by the way they are operating those dams and at the same time supply the great amount of power and electricity that is needed and unless they can continue to do that the war effort in the valley is going to suffer greatly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The danger to which the gentleman refers is not so much in that to which he refers as it is in the fact that under this bill discretion is granted and delegated to the Army engineers, and if I remember my law correctly, unless you can show fraud in the man to whom the power to use discretion has been granted he cannot be challenged for what he undertakes to do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. The point I make is that you cannot have a divided authority as to how much water you are going to let out of the dams to produce electricity. We have to have that electricity for the Aluminum Co. and for the Reynolds Metal Works which are making more aluminum for bombers than all the rest of the Nation combined. The dams must continue to be operated under the T. V. A. regulations.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will clarify this particular section so that the law as it exists at the present time and as applicable to the T. V. A., the Columbia River, the Grand River, and others, will not be disturbed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know about the others. It is my opinion that this amendment is necessary. This matter was settled in the T. V. A. Act and all we want to do is to keep the program as it was provided in the T. V. A. Act.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a very comprehensive bill, embodying the data, experience, and research of more than 100 years. The purpose of the bill is the solution of one of the most pressing problems confronting the Nation today. It has been admirably handled and I hope that everyone interested in the legislation and the purpose it seeks to serve has read or will read carefully the speech which the

chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], delivered on yesterday.

It is a literary classic. It is a contribution to the history of our times. It marks a step forward in flood-control engineering. Naturally, I am particularly interested in the application of the proposed legislation to the Missouri River Basin.

The Missouri is the longest river on the North American Continent. It is approximately 2,500 miles in length and carries a flow of water unpredictable in volume and velocity. It drains an area of half a million square miles. In that area is included almost every mineral resource, timber resource, and agricultural resource which the Nation produces or the world could desire.

But Sir Walter Scott's couplet applies here with particular aptitude:

O, it is excellent to have a giant's strength;
But it is tyrannous to use it like a giant.

This great river and benefactor of mankind possesses a potential strength which untowardly exerted at flood renders it a ravaging giant of destruction and devastation. For the last 3 years it has been more destructive in my immediate section of the country than ever before in the memory of this generation, and has reached a higher crest and inundated wider areas than in any recorded rise since 1844, a hundred years ago. It follows that there is great interest in this bill in my immediate section, and throughout the Central West. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee one or two questions. It is my understanding that the bill in no way affects the proposition to establish a 9-foot channel in the Missouri River?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not. No navigation project is embraced in this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And it in no way affects any proposal for the development of power?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There are no facilities and no power projects authorized in this bill. The general law will obtain. If a reservoir is authorized and if the Federal Power Commission thinks that a penstock should be installed, and the Secretary of War agrees with it, there will be a penstock installed in the reservoir. But no power project is authorized in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. That is according to the law passed in 1938?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I say that is under existing law.

In further answer to the gentleman's question, we have repeatedly stated during the debate that no project, reservoir, or dam, or other improvement is embraced in this bill unless it is primarily for flood control. If power can be developed as an incident, or if reclamation can be provided, they are cared for in the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And third, while our primary interest is in flood control, our immediate concern in the next few weeks is relief from the disastrous consequences of the present flood now devastating the Missouri Valley.

It is my understanding that at the request of the chairman, a survey is now

being made by the Board of Engineers of the flood situation, and as soon as that report is available a bill will be brought in to provide for emergency relief in the repair, replacement, relocation, and raising of levees in the stricken areas. Pending control of floodwaters, provision must be made for their restraint in this rich agricultural section. May I inquire when the gentleman expects a report?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We hope to get it in in the next few days. The initial statement that I made in opening the debate on this bill was that we requested the Board to give us the facts on which to base the emergency bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And it is the intention of the gentleman and the committee to act immediately upon receipt of that information?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is. We have so stated.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Are there any other gentlemen besides the gentleman from North Dakota who would like to be heard? If there are no others, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I just rise to ask this question of both gentlemen from Mississippi. My first question is directed to the chairman of the committee and to the gentleman who was the author of the T. V. A. Section 5 reads:

Hereafter, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds—

My question is this: If this bill goes through, then, so far as flood control and navigation are concerned, the reservoirs of the T. V. A. will be under the jurisdiction of the Army engineers; is that not correct?

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I fear.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman addressed that question to me I will answer unhesitatingly, "No; it is not under the supervision or jurisdiction of the engineers." This language of the section does not change the control nor does it change the operation of the T. V. A. authority. I shall undertake to go into the matter more in detail when I have the privilege. It merely has to do with seeing regulations are made for any storage that is provided in the reservoirs, and nothing more or less, for flood control and control.

Mr. RANKIN. That function is already vested in the Tennessee Valley Authority, just as it is vested in the Department of the Interior at Grand Coulee and at Fort Peck in the Army engineers.

Mr. BURDICK. When this language says that all reservoirs shall be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War that includes all reservoirs, the T. V. A. as well as everything else.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Where is the language that it shall be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War? It is not in section 5.

Mr. BURDICK. Here is the language. I do not have much education, but I think I can read English:

Hereafter, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs—

Are you not walking right into a situation where you take that control away from the T. V. A.—

constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations.

If that does not mean what it says, I do not understand English.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It means that the T. V. A. shall operate in accordance with those regulations for flood control.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it mean that the Army engineers or that someone else has jurisdiction to tell the T. V. A. what to do?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield back the balance of my time. I just wanted to ask this question and no one seems to be able to answer it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota as to his definition of this particular section. The way it is now worded, it gives the Secretary of War the authority to prescribe regulations covering all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds.

Mr. BURDICK. I am glad the gentleman can read English also.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask whether a reservoir built for an irrigation project must be regulated solely for flood control?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield, that is not involved in this provision of the bill at all. If they are erected wholly for reclamation, there is no flood control and no navigation.

Mr. MURDOCK. The point I wish to make is that dams for irrigation may have a flood-control use and a navigation implication.

Mr. BURDICK. I started this row, and you can all get in.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the gentleman is correct in saying that it does not affect the T. V. A., then does the gentleman see any harm in saying "otherwise as

provided by law"? It seems to me that would clarify it.

Mr. BURDICK. Unless you put some restriction in there and leave the T. V. A. alone in the work it is doing in flood control and navigation and power, I will vote "no," and I know other Members will do the same thing.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is an amendment pending which will clarify the matter entirely.

Mr. BURDICK. I think so.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have read section 5 carefully and I think I know the purpose at which it is aimed. I take this time merely to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to the legislative intent with respect to the language used. It seems to me that as it is worded it would cover all flood-control and navigation projects which have been constructed in whole or in part with Federal funds. What I want to ask the chairman of the committee is this: Is it the intention of this section, and is it so worded, in the gentleman's opinion, as to apply to reservoirs that have already been constructed with public funds, and put them under the control of the Army engineers? As I read the section, it covers all flood control and navigation projects. It is limited to that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; it does not cover all projects, but go ahead with the question you would like to propound.

Mr. CRAVENS. It is limited to projects in the construction of which Federal funds have been used. What I am asking the gentleman, and I think this language covers it and I merely want to be sure about it, is this: Is it broad enough to include the reservoirs and dams heretofore constructed for those purposes, so as to give the Army engineers control over their operation as well as those that may be constructed in the future under the authorization of this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would answer in the affirmative. I suppose that is the reason for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. The T. V. A. operates reservoirs that have heretofore been constructed.

Mr. CRAVENS. This will cover, for instance, the Pensacola, Grand River Dam in Oklahoma?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It will, and that is one of the purposes of the section.

Mr. CRAVENS. I thought this was broad enough to do it, but as a result of the disastrous experience we have had there I wanted to know that the operating authority contained in section 5 would be applicable to that project.

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

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The acceptance of my amendment would clarify the entire situation. If this bill is passed in its present form, it is likely to disturb every one of these projects that have been constructed throughout the country.

Mr. CRAVENS. I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. I am

talking about a different proposition entirely.

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

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The language in section 5, as I read it, very clearly states that the Secretary of War shall prescribe regulations for the use of "storage available for flood control or navigation" and "all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds," and that the "project shall be operated in accordance with such regulations." If that does not include all reservoirs constructed with Federal funds for the purpose of flood control and navigation, then the language of the section means something with which the legislative intent does not comply.

Mr. CRAVENS. The purpose of my inquiry was to be assured that the language in section 5 was intended to and does provide that the Army engineers may regulate the operation of reservoirs even though they are already built. That it does not apply to the future projects only.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It would not if the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] were adopted.

Mr. GORE. Then does the gentleman accept the amendment?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all.

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

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I note that the gentleman has asked the chairman what this language means. Member after Member has asked what the intention is. May I ask the gentleman whether we are going to be governed by the language of the bill or whether, when the bill is passed, we shall have to look into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find out what the gentleman from Mississippi meant or intended to do?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield, I want it understood that I answered the question of the gentleman from Arkansas by saying this section embraced the Grand River Authority, and the gentleman knows why it should be embraced. I answered him further by saying that if the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] were adopted, it would embrace the Grand River Authority, and the Grand River Authority should be regulated as provided in this section.

Mr. CRAVENS. What I am particularly interested in and the reason I asked the question is that we have had some very disastrous experiences with the operation of certain flood-control projects. What we thought were flood-control projects turned out to be something else as a result of the activities of agencies of the Government other than the Army engineers. All I want to find out is this: I think the language is broad enough—and I wanted the chairman's corroboration of my construction of it—that the Army engineers by this language will have the right to regulate

projects already constructed, and will not be limited by this language to those that may be constructed in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman explain the effect of the words "Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes"?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will undertake to do so.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee I have been asked to accept the amendment whose purpose is to accept the T. V. A. from the operations of section 5. I have responded frankly that I am unable to accede to that request. The amendment and the substance of the amendment have been carefully considered by the Committee on Flood Control, and the committee decided not to accept the amendment. A number of my friends from Tennessee and one from Alabama have asked me if I would be agreeable to accepting a similar amendment. I have answered them frankly that in my judgment their fears or apprehensions were without substantial foundation.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS] who has just taken his seat referred to the project that gave to our committee the inspiration for this section. A project was authorized known as the Grand River Authority in Oklahoma. It involved the construction and operation of the Pensacola Dam. Reports were made on that project and in those reports it was understood that a certain amount of space in the Grand River Dam should be reserved for flood control. In the flood of 1943, last year, they had the most disastrous flood in the Arkansas Valley in the vicinity of the Grand River Authority. It developed in the hearings conducted by the Committee on Flood Control that that authority in its ambition and desire to develop power had not reserved the storage required by the report of the Army engineers for flood control.

It appears to the committee that the country should know the facts. That authorization was made because in that reservoir there was to be reserved space for flood control. It was not reserved. It was not under the supervision of the Secretary of War. He could not make the regulation. All he could do was ask for the space.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing on earth in this provision that interferes with the war effort. It will not affect a single dam that has been referred to by my friend from Tennessee where provision is made for flood control. The dams that are constructed primarily for power will not be involved. Why? Some of the dams are constructed for power and for flood control. This amendment simply provides that the T. V. A., the Grand River Authority, or any other au-

thority shall so operate those dams and those authorities that the regulations of the Secretary of War asking for the use of the space paid for by the people of the United States in those dams for flood control shall in the event of flood be available for flood control. Can there be any objection to that?

I am aware that unfortunately governmental agencies make claims from time to time that cannot be substantiated. I remember that in 1937 they had the greatest flood in the history of the Ohio Valley at Cincinnati and Louisville. From one end of the river to the other, they had the greatest flood, the highest flood, in the history of that valley. The spokesman for the Tennessee Valley Authority rushed in to the public print and said, substantially, "The Tennessee Valley Authority has saved the Tennessee Valley. While the Ohio Valley is being overflowed, the Tennessee Valley is suffering from no flood."

The fact of the matter was, and I so stated repeatedly, that in the Tennessee Valley that year along the Tennessee River and its tributaries there were no maximum floods. If there were floods along the tributaries of any major river in the United States at the same time, no reservoirs, no flood-control works, no levees would protect the people. There would be another Noah's flood.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for the additional 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, to be more to the point, in 1937 when overnight, almost, the Ohio River rose some 50 feet at Cincinnati, Paducah, the gage at Johnsonville in the Tennessee Valley, the gage at Chattanooga, the gage at Knoxville, showed conclusively that there was no major flood in the Tennessee Valley. The great Ohio flood came from the Miami and other valleys than the Tennessee Valley. There were rains and there was high water in the Tennessee Valley, but there was no major or maximum flood comparable to the floods in the Miami and other tributaries of the Ohio River.

In my judgment, with all due respect, and while I have supported the Tennessee Valley Authority, the claim that the Tennessee Valley Authority saved Cairo, the claim that the Tennessee Valley Authority materially reduced the floods of the Ohio River in 1937, is utterly without merit. The thing that saved Cairo was the flood walls built there to an elevation of 60 feet and the New Madrid Floodway under the Flood Control Act of 1928. I have no personal interest in this proposition. I submitted the amendment to the committee. The Chief of Engineers will not supervise or operate anybody's T. V. A. dam. The Chief of Engineers will not supervise or operate anybody's authority. The language is that it shall be the duty of the

Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation. There is not a word about power. The authorities will continue to operate the dams, but there will be one person charged with the responsibility of operating the dams for flood control. There will be no divided authority.

If there is nothing in the reservoir that was built anywhere, at Pickwick or elsewhere, for flood control, that section would not be applicable. At all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part from Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes, reserving to power every foot of water that was intended for power, the operation of such projects shall be in accordance with the regulations. It does not say "operation by the Secretary of War." It does not say "operation by the Chief of Engineers." It says "operation" by whom? By the authority that is charged with law, and by law with the operation. This section provides that there shall be coordination in the operation of all reservoirs on all of the tributaries when there is a flood in the Ohio Valley. It also requires the coordination under one person with the final say on all of the tributaries of the Arkansas when there is a flood in that valley. This section applies only if there is space reserved in those dams made for the storage of flood waters. And the Secretary of War, to protect the people and the property in those valleys, shall make regulations, and those regulations should be enforced for the utilization of those waters for flood control so that there may not be a repetition of the deaths and destruction in the Grand River Authority of 1943.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman has made a very good point, it seems to me, that this section 5 should apply to certain projects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, what is the question of the gentleman, please?

Mr. GORE. It is my intention to offer an amendment only to except the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In my judgment, may I say to the Members of the House, as a friend and supporter of the Tennessee Valley Authority, giving them due credit for the magnificent war production, there is not a thing in this section 5 which will interfere in anywise with the proper operation or with the authority of those charged with the responsibility for power development. It will merely guarantee that the Authority do what the Grand River Authority did not do in Oklahoma in 1937, and that they will reserve what is to be required by the regulations of the Army engineers and that the T. V. A. reservoirs will coordinate with the reservoirs along the Muskingum, and the reservoirs along the Miami and other tributaries of the Ohio, and while there are no authorities, there are reservoirs, along the tributaries of the Ohio where power is being de-

veloped, especially in projects begun under the National Industrial Recovery Act.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to ask this question: Is it not true that the authority of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations is limited to regulations for the storage for flood control only?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely, and for navigation. He is just asking that the storage which the people of the United States provided in those dams shall be reserved for flood control if it is needed to protect the lives and property of the people.

Under leave to extend, as I stated, none of the dams authorized in the pending bill provide primarily for the generation and distribution of power. The dominant interest in all of the dams is flood control. Such has been the case in previous flood-control bills. There are some dams authorized where power is incidental. In such cases where the report so states, provision is made for power, but there is no provision generally for power in the reservoirs authorized. I recall that in some of the flood-control dams provision is made for power to provide for utilization in reclamation. This is true with respect to dams in the Kings and Kern Rivers, but I repeat that there is no provision in the bill generally for the establishment of power facilities and for the distribution of power. In all cases it will be necessary for Congress in the future to make distribution and to provide facilities for the sale and distribution of any power that may be generated at any of the dams. There is provision for power in a few of the large dams along the tributaries of the Ohio, but the authorizations in the pending bill will not provide for the completion of these reservoirs, in my judgment, where power may be generated, and it will be necessary for Congress to make provision in the future for power facilities and distributions. I repeat that where power is incidental, flood control being the dominant interest, there are in some reservoirs provisions for generating power, but there is no provision for the distribution and sale of power. In responding to questions, I made the statement that there was no provision in any of the reservoirs for the generation of power. I made that statement having in mind that there were no reservoirs authorized in the bill primarily for power. In a few of the reservoirs, as in the case in reclamation reservoirs, there is a provision for the generation of power, but in no reservoir is there any provision for the distribution and sale of power, and I repeat that before such sale and distribution can be made, it will be necessary to obtain further congressional authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—yeas 18, nays 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 3, line 21, after the word "regulation", strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "except as otherwise provided in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to be technical, but it strikes me, in all fairness, that is exactly the amendment, not exactly, but substantially word for word, the amendment we just voted on.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, let us thresh out the point of order now if there is going to be a point of order raised.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky reserved the point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has been recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry, if the gentleman from Tennessee will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COCHRAN. Did not the reservation of the point of order come too late? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] withdrew the point of order, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that another Member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], reserved the point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; but not until after the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, the able and distinguished chairman of the committee, it seems to me, made a good case that some projects not constructed under the supervision of the Army engineers should be brought under their supervision by the operation of section 5, but in no way did it appear to me that he made a case, or that a case had been made or can be made, that the Tennessee Valley Authority should be brought under the supervision of the Army engineers. The gentleman from Mississippi says "wherever the water is to be used for navigation or flood control." Mr. Chairman, you cannot use the same water for

flood control and navigation and then take it in a bucket and bring it back above the dam and use it for power. These dams and this whole system is an integrated multiple-purpose system. The reservoirs are used for flood control; yes. To provide navigation; yes. And also for generation of power. It is not comparable to a dam that is constructed strictly and solely for one of the three purposes. In those dams this water and these reservoirs are used for all three purposes and to give supervision over flood control and navigation to one authority and then give to another authority control over generation of power is a futile proposition, because one agency will have control over the water for two purposes, while another agency would have control over the same water for a third purpose. It just does not work out that way. Water over the dam for whatever purpose is water over the dam.

This House, a great many times, has seen the trouble we encounter whenever we give divided authority. Here is a great river valley that is being utilized to the satisfaction of Congress. Here is an agency that is providing flood control and navigation in an admirable way, and at the same time using the same water for the generation of power. The T. V. A. is an agency created by Congress. Now, without due consideration of its effect upon this great agency, we are about to adopt a bill which does very vitally affect it.

I hope that, even though the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is not empowered by his committee to accept this amendment, the committee will not resist to the last degree the adoption of the amendment, which would exclude from the act that which has not been given due and proper consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MAY. No, Mr. Chairman; I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kentucky. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. MAY. The point of order is that the same subject has been dealt with in a previous amendment which was voted upon by the Committee just a few moments ago.

Section 5 of the act, to which the amendment is offered, provides:

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the use of storage available for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds provided on the basis of such purposes, and the operation of any such projects shall be in accordance with such regulations.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would preclude the Secretary of War from providing regulations as to those reservoirs or areas devoted to flood control on the Tennessee River.

In addition to the fact that it has already been passed upon, it is legislation which would amend by indirection an act of Congress and the general law on the subject.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Upon the point that the amendment is identical with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi provided that section 5 should apply "except as otherwise provided by law." The amendment which I have offered provides "except as provided in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act." I would point out to the Chair one instance where the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] would be applicable and where the amendment which I have offered would not be applicable. For instance, the Columbia River. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi would except that, whereas the amendment which I have offered would only except the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. One is general in its application while the other is specific.

As to the further point of order suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] that this is legislation which would repeal existing law, I would suggest that that is the very purpose of the bill and of section 5, to which the amendment is offered. Therefore, this does not constitute a sustainable point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] provided "except as otherwise provided by existing law." The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is general in its character and applies to all projects. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] referred specifically to that which was provided in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, many Members probably voted against my amendment because it was too broad. I hope they will support this amendment, and I hope my colleague, the chairman of the committee, will accept it.

Whenever you turn over the operation of the dams on the Tennessee River to any other agency, to that extent you cripple the greatest project of its kind ever developed on this earth. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] spoke about the floods on the Ohio River in 1937, and contend that holding back the water in the Tennessee did not affect them. If you go back, you will find that the water came within a very few inches of going over the levee at Cairo, Ill., and it was discussed in the press and over the radio at the time, and I thought was generally understood. If it had not been for the coordination of those dams and the holding back of that water on the Tennessee River, the Ohio River would have gone over the dam and flooded the city of Cairo, Ill.

The gentleman spoke about the great floods on the Ohio. Of course, we regret

those floods and we regret floods anywhere, but if they had taken time by the forelock on the Ohio River, as they did on the Tennessee, and had built the same kind of dams, we would not only have been able to promote navigation, we would have been able to produce ten or twelve billion kilowatt-hours of electricity every year that is now going to waste on the Ohio River, and we also would have been able to more adequately control floods on that stream for local purposes, and hold back the floodwater from the Mississippi River.

Now, suppose you get someone in control of this system who is at loggerheads with the Tennessee Valley Authority, and they decide to open up the dams on the Tennessee in advance and let all that water out; then suppose the rains fall in the Tennessee Valley area. That is not at all beyond the realm of possibility. Such procedure would vastly injure the entire Tennessee Valley area.

The dams on the Tennessee are all controlled now from a central station. They keep in touch with the water on every tributary. They know when the floods are coming and by the pressing of a button or speaking over one microphone they can instruct them how to regulate the flow of the stream and how to control it to the best advantage. If you take that authority away from T. V. A. and place it under somebody else, you will do the Tennessee Valley Authority irreparable injury, in my opinion, and you will not have improved the flood control on the Mississippi River and the Ohio River, or any other river, and will have injured it as far as the Tennessee is concerned.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment in all fairness, if I may be permitted to say that, is a reflection on the T. V. A. It provides that this shall not apply to the T. V. A. In other words, it authorizes the T. V. A. to commit a fraud on those dams where there is space reserved for flood control. It says to them, "If that space is necessary it shall be applicable everywhere else in the United States except on the T. V. A." I do not have that opinion of the T. V. A. I do not want to authorize them to violate a mandate of Congress.

I do not want to authorize them to perpetrate a fraud by saying to them that the space in the reservoir provided in the construction for flood control should not be utilized.

In all fairness and in all deference this amendment is worse than the other. I am the friend of the Tennessee Valley Authority; I have supported it; I would not want to do anything to interfere with its operation. All on earth this section does is to direct that when there is a flood and the Secretary of War, speaking for the Chief of Army Engineers, states

that they need space up there and they make a regulation, the T. V. A. in its operation will provide for it only when there is a flood; and that is the only time they need the space.

Finally, the authors of the amendment are right. A divided authority over a responsibility often means no authority. A divided authority meant the misuse last year of flood space in the reservoir at Pensacola on the Arkansas River. A divided authority now between the Secretary of War, who could only ask for the space reserved for flood control, and the T. V. A., might mean the loss of life and the destruction of property.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me ask the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee if it is not a fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority has so operated these dams as to make all necessary contributions to flood control in the past?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer the gentleman by saying that I know of no guide for the future except the experience of the past. I am not going to discriminate and say that one authority is a saint and another is a sinner.

Mr. JENNINGS. But I am asking the gentleman a practical question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The only flood we have had since the Tennessee Valley Authority was established was in 1937 and there were no great floods on the gentleman's river or in the Tennessee Valley, that year.

Mr. JENNINGS. I have asked the gentleman—

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered the gentleman's question by saying there has been no great, or maximum flood on the Tennessee River since the T. V. A. was authorized.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority has these dams for three purposes: The improvement of navigation, the control of floodwaters, and the production of power and that as a result of power operations it is now under contract—

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And nothing on earth—

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me finish my question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. JENNINGS. With 1,200 municipalities and over 200 war plants depending on the Tennessee production of power—

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman's question is fair; I know what he is referring to. There is nothing on earth—

Mr. JENNINGS. Should we under these circumstances run the risk of a power shortage or failure by the injection of some other agency into the control of waters of this area?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Dealing with the development of power, in the section; but there was a provision as I recall in the 1941 act for a levee at Chattanooga on the Tennessee River in the vicinity of Union Station. That levee was made some 15 or 18 feet for a mile or so on the theory that the res-

ervoirs would operate above it for flood control. That flood control was provided by the act establishing the T. V. A.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 26, noes 65.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 4, line 6, strike out the words "stored water" and insert in lieu thereof the word "storage."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a perfecting amendment. Its purpose is to do just what the committee has asserted and just what the committee has reported in the bill. The section under consideration provides that where there is water for reclamation of arid lands in any reservoir and provision therefor that the distribution of the water shall be by the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of Reclamation will handle the distribution; there was a criticism that this language, which is substantially the reclamation law, undertook to change existing law and required the beneficiaries of reclamation to pay for water. This language in here is the language of the Reclamation Act and they pay only for storage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 4, line 2, after the word "regulation", insert the following: "Under existing reclamation law."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, some of the friends and spokesmen for reclamation were critical of the language in the bill. It was asserted that where provision was made in a reservoir where there was water for reclamation that the Commissioner of Reclamation should have the power to prescribe regulations ad libitum without regard to existing law. This is merely a perfecting amendment. This amendment provides that these regulations shall be under existing reclamation law. It is a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. Hereafter, whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe regulations for the use of the storage available for such purpose, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations. Such rates, as the Secre-

tary of the Interior may deem reasonable, shall be charged for the use of said stored water; the moneys received to be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 4, line 8, after the word "receipts", strike out the period, insert a colon and add: "Provided, That this section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation district."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment and the committee authorized submission of the amendment after this set of facts was brought to its attention: At one or two reservoirs at least provision is made for the water for lands that are not presently under the Director of Reclamation in districts where the local interests have constructed their own canals and their own distribution system. The purpose of this amendment is to limit the provisions of this act so that they shall not apply to districts with canals and distribution facilities that have already been paid for and constructed by local interests.

It is a perfecting amendment in the interest of reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive flood waters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of the national security and with a view toward providing an adequate reservoir of useful and worthy public works for the post-war construction program, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, that the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted during the war, with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a post-war program of construction: *Provided further*, That when the existing critical situation with respect to materials, equipment, and manpower no longer exists, and in any event not later than immediately following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, the projects herein authorized shall be initiated as expeditiously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements and shall be prosecuted vigorously during the period of post-war reconversion: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$30,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1933, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Con-

necticut River Basin: *Provided*, That neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Williamsville site.

THAMES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for the Thames River Basin at an estimated cost of \$7,200,000.

HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

The project for the Thomaston Reservoir on the Naugatuck River, for flood control in the Housatonic River Basin, Conn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 338, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$5,151,000.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local protection works on the Susquehanna River at Harrisburg, Pa., is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 702, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$2,227,000.

The project for flood protection at Tyrone, Pa., on the Little Juniata River, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 702, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$1,392,000.

The plan for flood control in southern New York and eastern Pennsylvania authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, as modified by the act of August 18, 1941, is hereby further modified to include the South Plymouth and Genegantslet Reservoirs on tributaries of the Chenango River substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 702, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated additional cost of \$4,755,000.

The plan for the Raystown Reservoir on the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River, Pa., for flood control and other purposes, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 702, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment thereof.

MOBILE RIVER BASIN—ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the Allatoona Reservoir on the Etowah River, Ga., approved in the act of August 18, 1941, at an estimated cost of \$14,400,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts of Congress, is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 509, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and, as modified, is hereby adopted and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums previously authorized, \$200,000,000 for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in said document.

The project for flood control on the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 151, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$5,013,000.

The project for flood control on the Big Sunflower, Little Sunflower, Hushpuckena, and Quiver Rivers and their tributaries, and

on Hull Brake-Mill Creek Canal, Bogue Phalia, Ditchlow Bayou, Deer Creek, and Steele Bayou, Miss., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 516, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$3,752,000.

The project for flood protection in the backwater area of the Yazoo River authorized in the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, is hereby amended to authorize the Chief of Engineers, in his discretion, to include improvements for the protection of the Satartia area at an estimated additional cost of \$1,061,000 or, in his discretion, to include improvements for the protection of the Satartia area plus its extension at an estimated additional cost of \$1,952,000.

RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for the Little Missouri River in Arkansas, at an estimated cost of \$3,800,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$35,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Arkansas River Basin.

The projects for local flood protection on the Arkansas River are hereby modified and authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 447, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated additional cost of \$10,299,400.

The project on tributaries of the Fountaine Que Bouille River for flood protection at Colorado Springs, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 186, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$500,000.

The project on Purgatoire River for local flood protection at Trinidad, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 387, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$909,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$45,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the White River Basin.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Upper Mississippi River Basin.

The project authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, for local flood protection on the Mississippi River at the Ste. Genevieve Levee District No. 1, Missouri, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 727, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$141,000.

The project on the Mississippi River for local flood protection at Sabula, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 328, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$25,000.

The project on the Galena River, for local flood protection at Galena, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with

the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 336, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$300,000.

The project for flood control on the Illinois River is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 692, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$111,500.

The project on Elk Creek and Turkey River for local flood protection at Elkport, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 700, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$13,000.

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN

The projects for flood control for Red Lake River, Minn., including Clearwater River, Minn., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 345, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$902,940.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by subsequent acts, as hereby expanded to include the plan of improvement for flood control, irrigation, power development, navigation, and other purposes, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; and as expanded is approved; and, in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of the comprehensive plan as modified and expanded: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by existing law: *And provided further*, That portions of the storage authorized for the main stem of the river shall be placed on tributaries if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for silt control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost.

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas City, Kans. and Mo., is hereby modified and extended to provide for improvement substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 342, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated additional cost for the modified project of \$8,445,000.

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000.

The project on Knife River for local flood control at Beulah, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$26,100.

The project on Knife River for local flood control at Hazen, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$6,600.

The project on Milk River adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide local flood protection at Harlem, Mont., is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers

in Senate Document No. 103, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$21,100.

The project on Milk River for local flood protection at Havre, Mont., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 103, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$313,100.

The project on Boyer River for local flood control on East Fork of Boyer River at Denison, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 254, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$17,830.

The project on Nishnabotna River for local flood control at Hamburg, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$236,000.

The project on Bear Creek for local flood protection at Morrison, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 356, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$220,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$70,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Ohio River Basin, including the following projects in tributary basins, namely:

The local flood protection works in the Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River area, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 685, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$135,500;

The local flood protection works at Dillonvale and Adena on Short Creek, Ohio, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 889, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$158,200;

The local flood protection works at Taylorsville on Salt River, Ky., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$129,350;

The local flood-protection works at Latrobe on Loyalhanna Creek, Pa., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 444, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$112,500;

The Burr Oak Reservoir on the Hocking River, Ohio, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 762, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$400,000;

The Rowlesburg Reservoir on the Cheat River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in the report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War on November 26, 1942, at an estimated cost of \$29,230,000; and

The improvement in the Youghiogheny River Basin, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in a report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War on March 29, 1943, at an estimated cost of \$37,970,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for the Panther Mountain Reservoir on Moose River, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 405, Seventy-seventh

Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$600,000.

The project for flood control on Chittenango Creek and tributaries, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 625, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$111,000.

The projects for flood control on Owasco Inlet and Outlet, Montville and Dry Creeks, State Ditch, and Crane Brook, N. Y., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 815, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$64,200.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TEX.

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for the North Concho River, Tex., at an estimated cost of \$4,800,000.

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for Pecan Bayou, Tex., at an estimated cost of \$1,560,000.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of Whitney Reservoir in accordance with the plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for the Brazos River Basin, at an estimated cost of \$15,000,000.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project on Willow Creek for local flood protection at Creede, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 104, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$68,500.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The project on the San Diego River for local flood protection at San Diego, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 635, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$370,000.

VENTURA RIVER BASIN

The projects on the Ventura River and tributaries for local flood protection at Ventura and Ojal, Calif., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 323, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$1,600,000.

SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the prosecution of the projects approved in the act of June 22, 1936, as modified by the act of June 28, 1938, for the Santa Ana River Basin and for the protection of Orange County, Calif., including the projects on Lytle and Cajon Creeks for local flood protection at San Bernardino and Colton, Calif., in accordance with the recommendations contained in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 11, 1944.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL BASIN AND BALLONA CREEK

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$25,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of August 18, 1941, for Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and Ballona Creek, Calif.

SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

Sacramento River

The projects for the control of floods and other purposes on the Sacramento River,

Calif., adopted by the acts approved March 1, 1917, May 15, 1928, August 26, 1937, and August 18, 1941, are hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated February 7, 1944, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost of \$46,056,000; and, in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$15,000,000 for the prosecution of the modified projects: *Provided*, That this modification of the project shall not be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Table Mountain site.

San Joaquin River

The project for the Isabella Reservoir on the Kern River for flood control and other purposes in the San Joaquin Valley, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated January 26, 1944, contained in House Document No. —, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$6,800,000.

The plan for the Terminus and Success Reservoirs on the Kaweah and Tule Rivers for flood control and other purposes in the San Joaquin Valley, Calif., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized \$4,600,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the plan.

The project for flood control and other purposes for the Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans contained in House Document No. 630, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable at an estimated cost of \$19,700,000: *Provided*, That the conditions of local cooperation specified in said document shall not apply: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall make arrangements for payment to the United States by the State or other responsible agency, either in lump sum or annual installments, for conservation storage when used: *Provided further*, That the division of costs between flood control and irrigation and other water uses shall be determined by the Secretary of War on the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the War Department, and the local organizations.

The plan of improvement for local flood protection on various streams in the Merced County stream group in the San Joaquin Valley is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 473, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$1,300,000.

The plan of improvement for flood control and other purposes on the Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries, including Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Flood Control Committee Document No. 2, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized \$8,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the plan.

COQUILLE RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Coquille River, Oreg., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 620, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$143,000.

NEHALEM RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Nehalem River, Oreg., is hereby authorized

substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 621, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$23,000.

WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$20,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Willamette River Basin, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The projects on the Snake River for local flood protection at Helse, Roberts, and Weiser, Idaho, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 452, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$743,000.

The projects on the Palouse River and tributaries for local flood protection at Pullman and Colfax, Wash., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 888, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$478,000.

The project on Alkali Canyon for local flood protection at Arlington, Oreg., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 631, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$118,000.

WILLAPA RIVER BASIN

The project on the Willapa River for local flood protection at Raymond, Wash., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 701, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$127,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 5, strike out all of line 2 after the word "herein" and all of lines 3 and 4 and all of line 5, including the word "reconversion" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the Committee permit me to say that the language stricken out on page 5 of the bill is as follows:

Shall be initiated as expeditiously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements and shall be prosecuted vigorously during the period of post-war reconversion.

The Director of the Budget suggested in lieu of that language the language of the amendment that I have sent to the Clerk's desk. I think it means the same thing and the committee is agreeable to the language suggested by the Director of the Budget rather than the language of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment in exactly the same language on page 27 of the bill where this language I have directed attention to occurs again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 27, strike out all of line 9 after the word "herein" and all of lines 10, 11, and 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the identical language is stricken and the same language substituted as in the previous amendment, applicable to page 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have one further committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 20, line 11, strike out the period after the word "site" and add the following words: "But shall authorize only the low level project to approximately the elevation of 400 feet above mean sea level, said low level dam to be built on a foundation sufficient for such dam and not on a foundation for future construction of a higher dam."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this proviso has reference to a project along the Sacramento River. The present proviso in the bill is in the following language:

Provided, That this modification of the project shall not be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Table Mountain site.

The language that I have submitted in the amendment proposed is the language that the Member from that district involved, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has suggested, which the Corps of Engineers has approved. It means exactly the same as the language in the bill and the committee has no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Page 5, at the end of line 10, insert:

"In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the Nation through the construction of works of improvement, for navigation or flood control, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control; to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with the appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users.

"In conformity with this policy, any works of improvement for navigation or flood control herein or hereafter authorized

for construction by the Chief of Engineers under the supervision of the Secretary of War affecting the use of waters in the rivers of the Nation shall be governed by the following provisions and conditions:

"(a) Works herein authorized shall not be undertaken until an investigation and a report thereon have been made and approved by the Congress, as provided in (b), in any case where the Governor of any State in which the works or any part thereof are located or in which arise any of the waters which are required therefor, files a written objection thereto with the Secretary of War within 3 months after the date of this act.

"(b) Such works hereafter authorized for construction shall not be undertaken until after the making of an investigation, and the submission to and approval by the Congress of a report as provided in this paragraph. The investigation and report shall be made to the end, among other things, of providing for the coordination of plans for the construction and operation of the proposed works with other plans for the use of waters that would be affected thereby. In conformity with this requirement, the Secretary of War is hereby directed to investigate such proposed works for navigation or flood control in cooperation with the State or States in which the works or any part thereof are to be located and in which arise any of the waters that would be required therefor, and, in the case of works that might require the use of waters arising west of the ninety-seventh meridian, in cooperation also with the Secretary of the Interior. Reports based on such cooperative investigations, to be submitted to the Congress, shall set out therein, among other things, the relationship between the construction and operation of the proposed works and the plans of the various States respecting the affected waters, the views and recommendations of the affected States with respect to the proposed works; and in the case of investigations made in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, the relationship between the construction and the operation of the proposed works and existing and potential beneficial consumptive uses of waters west of the ninety-seventh meridian, and between plans developed or being developed by the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of the arid lands and purposes incidental thereto, and the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with particular reference to these matters. Such reports shall be effective only when approved by the Congress."

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment as read. This amendment admittedly is somewhat long. My remarks on it are going to be appreciably more brief. Under the circumstances the amendment, in order to cover the ground, has to be long, but in reality there is nothing complex or involved about it. Its purpose, clearly stated in the first paragraph, is to protect the States against developments within their borders, which would be detrimental to them. The amendment does not provide—and I want to emphasize this—that any State can permanently block a necessary project. Neither does it create unnecessary delay in the case of future authorizations as provided in section (b). The procedure would be essentially no different from that which is now followed. The time involved would be no greater. Even in the case of section (a), works included in the present authorization, there is no question of construction beginning until after the close of the war, and there is no reason

for any objection to the delay that might be involved.

The amendment simply makes mandatory that proposed projects shall be examined by the Secretary of War in cooperation with the State or States affected, and in the case of waters west of the ninety-seventh meridian in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior. It thus makes certain that in all cases the position of the State or States with reference to construction and operation of a project shall come officially before Congress in the Army engineers' reports. Whereas the facts are sometimes brought before the Army engineers, they recognize the States' right to be heard in these matters, and so long as we continue to be a Federal Government, composed of 48 States, it preserves to the individual State the rights to which its self-respect and dignity entitle it.

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

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is this not the same language that was stricken out of the river and harbor bill, or similar to an amendment that was rejected in the House when the river and harbor bill was under consideration?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I do not have the text of that amendment before me.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have very high regard for the gentleman who offered this amendment, but I do not believe the proposed language should be written into the flood control law of the land. I do not think that it could be charged that I am one who disregards local and State rights in reference to water. As a matter of fact, when the rivers and harbors bill was before the House I spoke in favor of the amendment and voted for all of the amendments to give priority to the rights of the local irrigators and users of water.

However, in the amendment that is before us now we have a different proposition. As I understand this amendment, it would mean that every project we have authorized today by this act would have to be resurveyed, another report brought back to the Congress, and then Congress would have to authorize it again; more surveys, more reports, more waiting, more expense.

There are rivers in the country that have had very serious flood-control problems, where the damages run into the millions of dollars and cost hundreds of lives. For year after year they have had surveys and resurveys and meetings and pep meetings and surveys and more surveys, and the people are tired of it. There is not a project here which does not have the approval of the district engineer, the division engineer, the Board of Review of Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers. To enact a provision in this bill that says we propose to authorize some work and that this authorization does not count until you have another survey, another report back to Congress and another act of Congress, is rather confusing. It is un-

fair to the people who will be benefited by this bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the course of those surveys by the district engineers and the United States Army engineers Corps, public hearings are held, not only locally, but here in Washington, and an opportunity is afforded to anyone who desires to present his views; is that not correct?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

I am very much in accord with the objective of the amendment to grant every possible consideration to local interests. I am very much in accord with the idea that State authorities should be consulted in these matters, but I do not believe that we can win the respect of the country by making our procedure more cumbersome and say that we are going to have two acts of Congress to authorize what we say we are authorizing today.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

There are a number of projects in this authorization bill which are located in the State of Oregon, and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Flood Control and his colleagues on their wisdom and foresight in including these projects in the bill. Several of those Oregon projects are in my own congressional district, and I confess to a certain degree of personal satisfaction in the generous treatment they have received from the committee because all of those projects were initiated by myself, as the Representative in Congress from that district, and all of them had their origin in the resolution which I introduced providing for the initial surveys.

The Willamette River Basin flood-control project when completed will be one of the most comprehensive flood control projects in the entire world. It will not only stop the disastrous floods in the valley but it will also irrigate the entire area through which that great river flows.

This is the third authorization made by the Congress for this great project, which has been declared by the Army engineers to be one of the most perfect multi-purpose projects of its kind in the United States, and one of the most beneficial.

Since I introduced the resolution authorizing the first survey several years ago the project has expanded in scope beyond the original expectations of either the engineers or the people in the Willamette Valley who will benefit most directly by it. Already there has been authorized for the project \$22,300,000, most of which has been appropriated and spent in construction. This bill authorizes \$20,000,000 more, and I am glad to note that the committee recommends the expenditure of that additional amount immediately following the close of the war. This project has been given a very high post-war priority and it distinctly merits it.

Both for the information of my colleagues and of the people of the Willamette Valley, who are so vitally interested in this project, I should like to read here a portion of the committee's report, showing the scope of the project and the progress which has been made to date.

The Willamette River is formed by the Coast and Middle Forks, which join a few miles above Eugene, Oreg. The river then flows north 189 miles to enter the Columbia River 99 miles above its mouth. The Willamette Basin lies between the Cascade Range on the east and the coast range on the west. The mountainous areas, which comprise a large part of the basin, are characteristically rugged and generally covered by forests. The valley floor proper is a broad alluvial plain through which the main stream and the lower sections of its tributaries flow in winding courses. The basin has a drainage area of 11,200 square miles. The population is approximately 650,000, engaged in farming and forestry and the processing of those products. The farm lands in the valley are very fertile and are intensely cultivated.

Floods in the basin may be expected from November through April and major floods occur in the period from late November to early February. Flood damages to farm lands and communities are very heavy. The most recent flood in this area occurred in the period between December 31, 1942, and January 4, 1943, when the stage at Albany exceeded bank-full stage by 13.6 feet and an area of 342,300 acres was inundated, causing damage estimated at \$5,708,000.

Congress authorized bank-protection works at several localities in the basin in the Flood Control Act of 1936 and in the act of June 28, 1938, approved the general comprehensive plan for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin as set forth in House Document No. 544, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, and authorized \$11,300,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of that plan. The Flood Control Act of 1941 authorized an additional appropriation of \$11,000,000 for the prosecution of this comprehensive plan. With authorization of funds thus far provided by Congress the War Department has completed most of the bank-protection works along the Willamette, Clackamas, Molalla, and Santiam Rivers, and the Fern Ridge and Cottage Grove Reservoirs. The preparation of detailed plans for four other reservoirs in the approved plan is well under way.

The committee recognizes the importance of carrying forward the flood-protection works in the Willamette River Basin to an early completion and it believes that the sum of \$20,000,000 should be authorized at this time in order that this important work may continue immediately following the cessation of hostilities.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein data contained in the committee's report on this project, a part of which I have just read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did the gentleman say that there were certain projects the surveys of which had not been completed, and which were not included because the surveys were not completed?

Mr. MOTT. No; I did not say that. I said there were a number of authorized Oregon projects in the bill, and I was calling particular attention to one of the major ones in western Oregon, in the first district of that State, which I have the honor to represent. The survey for this particular project was completed more than 5 years ago and the construction has been under way for 4 years. Surveys for the other Oregon project were completed more recently, but they have all been completed, and approved.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS], the author of the pending amendment, and I want to be kindly disposed when he asked him if his amendment did not embrace matters that were defeated on the floor of the House during the consideration of the river and harbor bill a few weeks ago. The gentleman very frankly responded that he was not aware. If the question had been asked him just what his amendment embraced and who was responsible for it, I think he might have answered in a similar way and said that he did not know, because whether he knows it or not, this amendment is contradictory, and would destroy flood control.

There would not be any flood control or reclamation or other projects under the proposed amendment. Somebody has imposed on the gentleman, I say with all due deference, and there have been cooked up into one amendment offered by him a lot of the unfounded fears that have been conjured up by some of the people in the far West with respect to reclamation.

For instance, there is a provision here that one law shall apply east of the ninety-seventh meridian and another west of the ninety-seventh meridian. Whether the gentleman knows it or not, under the Constitution of the United States the same law must apply everywhere where the facts are identical, because the Constitution is applicable both east and west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

Again, the gentleman says that all of the projects that are approved in this bill shall be referred to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the other services,

when in truth and in fact, whether the gentleman knows it or not, under the regulations of the President of the United States, the Director of the Budget now directs that before any recommendations can be submitted by the Chief of Engineers or by the Secretary of War they must be referred to the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, and other agencies of the Government that may be interested. So there would be a case of going up the hill again after we have already made the trip down. All of those precautions are provided for in the existing Budget requirements.

Moreover, with respect to the doctrine of the appropriation of waters west of the ninety-seventh meridian, permit me to say that there are flood-control projects in this bill for the protection of the city of Los Angeles, with 1,500,000 people. There are projects in this bill west of the ninety-seventh meridian for the protection of the people of the Sacramento Valley, where the Congress of the United States has been making flood-control appropriations since 1917.

There are items in this bill for the protection of the magnificent valleys of the Kings and Kern Rivers, where the people for more than 75 years have constructed their own local protective works, where millions of dollars have been invested in local protection works. Yet under the gentleman's amendment, all of these matters would be thrown into the ashcan and hereafter they shall be under the supervision of the Commissioner of Reclamation, if those responsible and fostering the gentleman's amendment have their way.

Again, this bill provides for magnificent flood-control projects in the State of Oregon in the Willamette Valley, one of the most magnificent valleys and one of the best flood-control projects in the United States. All projects are now referred, and properly so, for comment to the Director of Reclamation and the Federal Power Commission, under the direction of the President of the United States, before they are transmitted to the Congress. The Director of the Budget requires that all comments and all criticism of every project be embraced in the reports.

Mr. Chairman, whether the gentleman knows it or not, one of the best projects in this bill is for the protection of New England. I give it to you as my deliberate judgment, and I know something of every river in the United States—mark my words, I measure my statement when I say there is more nearly complete protection for the Connecticut Valley in New England in this bill than for any other part of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLUMLEY: On page 5, line 18, after the article "a", strike out the word "high."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, since I arrived on the floor I have received a telegram concerning which I wish to make a comment or two, and it will take me more than 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I used up a lot of time yesterday undertaking to define my position with respect to this bill. I shall not take much time now.

I stated the reasons why I proposed to offer this amendment.

Personally and officially I am opposed to any dam at the proposed Williamsville site such as is contemplated. There is no exigency, no emergency, no hurry, which necessitates action at this time in the Connecticut River Valley area.

It may be that the so-called program now calls for a dam at the Williamsville site. This is not conclusive of the need therefor.

Competent engineers advise me that there are other ways to accomplish the necessary flood control without disrupting the program or destroying so much property, or interfering with so many lives as does the proposed establishment of the Williamsville Dam. Even a low dam, whatever that is or may be, for its height and its definition is left to the discretion of the Army engineers.

You see, Mr. Chairman, this low dam destroys 4 cemeteries, one of 50 graves, one of 300 graves, another of 300 graves, and the fourth of 200 graves, a total of 850 graves. Some of them are of men who were at Westminster, Vt., where the first blood of the Revolution was shed.

It is to be 460 feet above mean sea level, and 180 feet high from the foundation. It will flood 2,700 acres destroying two villages, namely, West Dummerston and Harmonyville, where incidentally, there is everything but harmony with respect to the prospect of its destruction.

Some 144 buildings will be inundated including schools and churches.

So I am opposed to the plan as proposed. You would be, did it involve the people of your district.

It is true the compacts are out of the window, but even the Federal Government should show some respect for States which evidenced their desire to contract to establish flood control and did compact so to do.

Since it is a matter of record that there are other plans which do not involve destruction and devastation but afford ample protection for flood control, I insist that neither the authorization in this bill, nor previous authorizations should be construed to authorize the construction of any dam at the Williamsville site, and therefore, to accomplish this purpose the bill should be amended as I suggest: On page 5, line 18, by striking out the word "high." The proviso will then read:

Provided, That neither this authorization, nor previous authorizations, shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam at the Williamsville site.

This should be done in order that more complete and full and ample consideration and further hearings may be had, and that the rights and interests of the several States involved and affected may be taken into consideration more completely and fully protected.

The excuse and justification offered for Federal interference is based on the argument that States will not enter into compacts. The States involved in this controversy did enter into a compact; therefore, that argument falls flat. They agreed; they legislated; they made a compact "out of the window." They are nevertheless entitled to be heard before sentence is pronounced and they are dictatorially executed on a Federal altar.

I desire to read a telegram I have just received:

SPRINGFIELD, VT., May 8, 1944.

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am informed it is reported I stated before Flood Control Committee in House of Representatives that Vermont would be satisfied with a dam on West River if power potentialities were eliminated. Such report entirely erroneous, if alleged to be a quotation, it is incorrect. We urge such flood-control construction as will safeguard persons and property along lower Connecticut River and at same time preserve and not destroy West River Valley. I request you carry this message to the House. What is a high dam?

ALBAN J. PARKER,
State of Vermont Attorney General.

The attorney general opposed the construction of any dam at the Williamsville site. He favored, instead, a number of small dams in that basin, which would give equal or a greater amount of flood-control storage for the benefit of the lower Connecticut River Valley area, and would give the West River Valley area flood protection also, while not destroying its essential character.

The attorney general spoke officially for the State.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to participate in any civil war in New England and I regret the necessity of rising in opposition to the amendment of my colleague from Vermont. As a matter of fact, the striking out of the word "high" in the proviso inserted in this bill, as suggested by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], would leave the proviso reading, "neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam at the Williamsville site."

I want to call attention to the fact that the proposed dam at the Williamsville site is one of 20 approved by the Army engineers and approved by Congress. Three of these reservoirs have been built and money is authorized in this bill for the other 17 reservoirs. There is no more reason why Congress should say there shall not be a flood-control reservoir at Williamsville than we should say there shall not be a flood-control reservoir at any other town in Vermont. Congress cannot pick the site for these flood-control reservoirs. We have got to leave that to the Army engineers. I think when the committee added this

proviso eliminating the high dam at Williamsville, they assured the people of Vermont that there would be no more land flooded than was absolutely necessary to carry out their plan of flood control, and for flood control alone. I concurred in the statements made before the Committee on Flood Control by the distinguished attorney general from Vermont and I am so quoted in the record. If this bill provided funds as had been contemplated for erecting a \$29,000,000 dam and reservoir at Williamsville, I would be fighting side by side with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] to strike that item from the bill. But so long as the Williamsville Dam and Reservoir is nothing more than a flood-control dam and reservoir like the other 19 reservoirs, I do not believe the amendment should be adopted. We continue to leave the decisions as to the location of these flood-control reservoirs with the Army engineers.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it perhaps will be interesting to the members of the committee to know that there have been 3 major floods on the Connecticut River in the last 17 years; in 1927, 1936, and 1938. Those 3 floods took 28 lives and caused property loss to the extent of \$144,000,000. These floods come too frequently. Each year we suffer damages amounting on the average, according to the Army engineers, to more than \$3,800,000 in the Connecticut Valley. Even in those years when we have only spring freshets, our losses run into hundreds of thousands of dollars, due to damage done in smaller agricultural and industrial towns. In order to offset these great losses which have occurred, as I say, in the past 17 years, the Army engineers have come forward with a program of local protective works at 7 cities and towns and for the construction of 20 reservoirs. These are small reservoirs. Of these 20 reservoirs, the largest is the reservoir to which this amendment is directed. The total number of square miles drained by the tributaries whose waters would be impounded in the 20 reservoirs is about 2,500. This reservoir alone represents 400 square miles or about one-sixth of the entire program. It is all important to the people of Hartford, Springfield, and Holyoke, and of all the cities and towns in Massachusetts and Connecticut, as well as in New Hampshire and in Vermont, which lie on the Connecticut River, that this dam remain in the program. The Army engineers have told us time and time again it is the most important dam that we have. If we go through with this program, for which the Government has already appropriated or authorized the expenditure of \$40,000,000, to leave out this dam would be like the boy in Holland with the dike. You would have a complete, beautiful dike, but you would have a hole in it, and no one would be plugging the hole. The result would be we would suffer huge losses along this river, regardless of how much we had expended on the other 19 dams.

For that reason I feel that this committee, knowing these facts and of these losses of over \$144,000,000 in the 17 years

in 3 separate floods, plus the loss of 28 lives, will not want to stand in the way of the recommendations of the Army engineers. Only yesterday the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] stated he wanted it distinctly understood that he is all for flood control, and his constituents are incontrovertibly for flood control. This is a chance for him to prove it, because this is the most important flood-control reservoir that there would be in the entire Connecticut Valley. Yesterday a former Governor of Massachusetts, our colleague, who knows about what has been going on in our New England States, said that the compacts to which the gentleman from Vermont referred in his speech, cannot possibly be carried out between the several States. In other words, about \$5,000,000,000 may have to be used in order to have complete flood control in this country. In those basins which lie in more than one State, as the Governor stated yesterday, you cannot expect the States to take on any such burden. The compacts in New England which were referred to and which were voted down and rejected by this body back in 1938, provided for only eight small dams, and they included power. Power has been taken out of this dam in order to meet the objections of the people of Vermont. All we ask for is a low dam for flood-control purposes only. The reservoir will be in a valley where 76 percent of the land is wooded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to enter into this very pleasant and interesting Republican dispute from New England, but coming from New England myself, I enter as one who represents a district in that section of the country. It is also pleasing to me, as the author, in 1938, of the 100-percent Federal contribution for flood-control dams, to note my Republican brethren from New England, every one of whom were here at that time, opposed it, that they have seen the light and now support the position that I took then. I see the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] in a nice, pleasant way chastising me by indicating that he was the other way. Well, I cannot challenge him because I have too much affection for him to take issue with him even if my recollection was to the contrary.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to get into this New England pleasantry? I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Would not the gentleman still favor the compact method of the States rather than the method provided in this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman introduced the law under which these authorizations are being made. The gentleman from Massachusetts comes from an area that has no flood problems. But the gentleman from the Boston section of New England, who is now speaking, always thought that the problems of the people of other sections of the coun-

try were the problems of the people of my section, and I am glad to see my New England brethren on the Republican side getting away from their economic provincialism in considering the problems of the people of other sections of the country.

So my purpose in rising was not so much to enter into a Republican dispute of a pleasant nature but, perhaps with a little pride, to refresh the recollection of my Republican brethren from New England when they condemned me as a violator of States' rights in 1938, when the only thing I stood for was that where a river flowed between two or more States—I do not care where they are located, north, east, south, or west—and the people of the area in which the river flowed were affected by floods, loss of life, and loss of property, that was a challenge to the Federal Government and not to the State governments. That was the broad viewpoint I always took, and I am somewhat proud of the fact that the existing law was introduced by myself. I am particularly pleased to note my Republican friends from New England, who were here in 1938—mark you, I say 1938—honestly opposing then after the experience of the past several years has shown that my humble leadership at that time was for the best interests of the country and for the best interests of New England following me now.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Perhaps it is possible that some of the Republican friends from New England know when they are licked, but we do not want to be drowned after that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct. Open confession is always good for the soul, according to the old saying. In any event, as I recollect, my friend is excluded from my remarks, as he was not here in 1938.

As far as the amendment is concerned, with this little pleasant exchange refreshing history for the benefit of New England only, I hope the amendment of my friend from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] will be defeated.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a citizen of the State of Jefferson Davis, standing for State rights from my youth up, I rather hesitate to enter into this controversy with Vermont, because it might serve to remind of the days of '63, when my relatives and some citizens from Vermont had some differences that were adjusted at Vicksburg against Mississippi's better judgment. But I should like to say there is not a Member of the House for whom I entertain a higher personal regard than my good friend the gentleman from Vermont [Mr.

PLUMLEY]. For many years, as a voice crying in the wilderness, there were those of us who defended reservoirs to detain the floodwaters in the hills where they originate, as a contribution to the solution of flood control. Among the first reservoirs for flood control that I ever saw, among the first constructed in the United States, were some reservoirs in the magnificent State of Vermont. I shall never forget a trip I made across the beautiful Green Mountains one afternoon, in driving out from Montpelier. Interested in mountains and streams as I am, I visited among the first flood-control reservoirs constructed east of the Mississippi River for flood control in the State of Vermont. They protected the lands below. As a member of the Committee on Flood Control, I received an inspiration, and we provided for reservoirs in every flood-control act, beginning with the act of 1936.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] if adopted, would be—pardon me for saying it—worse than ridiculous. Under the adopted project for the Connecticut River Basin for the protection of Holyoke, Springfield, Hartford, and the valley up the river, there are some 14 to 19 reservoirs authorized, as I recall, 5 being in the State of New Hampshire—the river dividing those 2 beautiful, magnificent, and fine States—9 of them being in the State of Vermont. The closest of these reservoirs to Massachusetts, as I recall, is the reservoir that the gentleman would strike out of this bill. So they would leave in the act the reservoirs that really occupy other narrow valleys of Vermont farther up the State. It is really most unsound to contemplate the elimination of one reservoir near the boundary of Massachusetts, and there are several in Massachusetts, one or two of which have already been constructed, as I recall, just to strike out one reservoir that is farthest away from most of the people in Vermont. In my judgment, the \$30,000,000 authorized in this bill for the further protection of the valley would be jeopardized, because the millions of money spent for the construction of levees and flood walls at Springfield, Hartford, Holyoke, and other cities was all expended and the heights of flood walls and levees were fixed in consideration of the benefits of the reservoirs that were to be constructed above.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that there is no more generous flood-control project in the United States, none any more nearly completely provided for, than that along the Connecticut River, in the flood-control acts, beginning with the act of 1936, and perfected in the pending bill.

With all deference, I trust that the amendment of my friend the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] in the interest of flood control in New England, will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 6, line 16, after the amount strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "And is further modified to include flood-control work and structures in the greater Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City area on the Susquehanna River at cost not exceeding \$500,000."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, the distinguished chairman of the committee and several of his colleagues made a trip into up-State New York and examined flood damage done by the Chenango and Susquehanna Rivers. They found and they recommended that a great deal of trouble could be saved the people up there by the building of the Whitney Point Dam project.

Unfortunately, as I said in my remarks on the floor yesterday, this only accomplished half what it should have accomplished. It saved the city of Binghamton, which is at the confluence of the Chenango and Susquehanna Rivers. The steps taken in flood-control work at that junction and in the Whitney Point Dam project did save the city of Binghamton itself from serious future flood ravages. Unfortunately, it did little or nothing for the municipalities of Johnson City, Endicott, and the village of Vestal, a few miles below, on the Susquehanna River. In fact, the construction of flood walls on the southern bank of the Susquehanna, in the city of Binghamton, may even have aggravated the situation further down, because as time passed, more and more sediment collected along the banks of the Susquehanna down near greater Endicott, and throughout the Vestal area.

Every year thousands of people are flooded out of the lowlands on each side of the Susquehanna as it courses down through Johnson City, Willow Point, Broad Acres, Vestal, and through the Greater Endicott area. For this reason I submit to the House that this job has been only partly done. Nearly as many people are affected in these areas—and the distinguished Chairman is familiar with that section—as there are in the city of Binghamton. I hope the House will give serious consideration to further and additional flood-control work being done in the very near future by the Army engineers on those few miles beyond the confluence of the Chenango and the Susquehanna Rivers. Those people living in areas below the junction are just as much entitled to have their properties protected against floods as the good people in my own home city of Binghamton are. I am very happy about and satisfied with the work which the committee and the Army engineers have done in my home section. Nevertheless, I believe that the Army engineers owe it to the people of the municipalities farther down the river to see to it either that the river is dredged at Vestal and vicinity or that constructive and substantial flood walls are erected at these points so that floods will not in the future ravage and damage the properties of the people down there.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the gentleman appear before the committee on this project?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have appeared before the committee and I will say in all deference to the good chairman that he gave me a very sympathetic hearing. I have also talked with General Reber who at that time was in charge of the Army Engineer Corps. They have all been sympathetic with my proposal.

If this amendment is adopted it will provide that those sections and those municipalities be added to the sections that have already been mentioned in this bill and that no steps can be taken until the provisions of this legislation have applied to them, they to be subject also to such other legislation as should apply. Let me point out that no objections have been voiced by the Army engineers to this project so far as I know. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted and I ask the favorable consideration of the Committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall not take the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in opposing this amendment permit me to say that we are most sympathetic with the situation at Binghamton. The project was adopted for the vicinity of Binghamton. If the project is to be extended to other areas will not the gentleman permit me to suggest that he will have to ask the committee to pass a resolution, ask that the project be reviewed, and ask for a report so the project could be submitted by the committee?

Under the gentleman's amendment there is nothing said about the local people being required to furnish the rights-of-way or to maintain the project when constructed; and with all the deference to the gentleman, if he wants the protection that has been given to Binghamton extended the committee will be delighted to do it, but under the rule that obtains any projects in this bill must first be considered by the engineers, reported on, and the report submitted to the committee. Members of Congress have the privilege of following this course; but there is no way in which we can include a project on which there is no report.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will yield, certainly, but I do not want to take up too much of the time of the Committee.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I know the gentleman is sympathetic to the situation. Will he yield for a question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield for a question; go ahead and propound your question.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman's committee has already brought about flood-control work in the city of Binghamton, and I know the gentleman is just as interested in sections a

few miles farther down. I want to ask him if he does not feel that it is just as fair to protect those people down there, 15 miles farther down the Susquehanna, as it is to protect the people in the city of Binghamton?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be pleased to answer the gentleman's question, but I ask the indulgence of the House for intruding on the committee's time. The projects submitted to the committee and approved are contained in the report submitted with this bill, and all the hearings before the committee are available. I repeat again that we have not embraced in the report made by our committee any project unless it has been favorably reported by the Chief of Engineers. In the absence of a report to extend the adopted project in the usual way I know of no reason why an exception should be made.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman recalls, does he not, when I came before his committee 3 or 4 years ago and pointed out this very situation it was as pressing then as it is now. Scarcely a year passes but what this section is inundated, and I say that the construction of flood walls would relieve the condition.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Again I suggest to the gentleman that he come before the committee and ask for a survey; but I trust the gentleman will not hold the committee responsible for statements made to the committee by Members of Congress, including himself, the gentleman from New York, because they are interested in their districts. We are always glad to have their views; but there is a hard and fast procedure that must be followed by everybody in Congress to get a project included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: On page 12, line 20, strike out the last word "Provided" and then strike out all of lines 21, 22, and 23 and strike out the first 5 words in line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That the use for navigation and related purposes, in connection with this expanded general comprehensive plan, of those waters of the Missouri River which arise west of the ninety-seventh meridian shall be subordinate to and shall not adversely affect at any time the beneficial consumptive use, west of the ninety-seventh meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that the States in the upper Missouri River Basin shall have preference to their own waters for domestic use and for irrigation. The amendment applies only to the arid lands of the Missouri River Basin west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

I am aware that the chairman of this committee has erroneously stated that unless the amendment applies to the whole of the United States it is unconstitutional. I challenge the correctness of that conclusion and I say to him that it is not unconstitutional, that under the Constitution the Federal Government has power to start in any part of the United States of America in connection with flood control and with navigable streams. I say to him that the only place in the Constitution of the United States where he will find a provision to the effect that the operation of laws must be uniform throughout the Nation is in the bankruptcy clause, naturalization and taxation provisions.

The chairman therefore is mistaken on the constitutional question, absolutely mistaken. The Government of the United States is not limited by any provision of the Constitution from operating in any part of the United States of America. It can make any classification it sees fit to of the subject matter or the location in which it operates.

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

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman believe that proviso a good one which reads: "Nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand on the water resources of the river above Sioux City"? Does not that meet with his approval?

Mr. LEMKE. That does not meet with my approval.

Mr. STEFAN. Would that take care of the gentleman's objection?

Mr. LEMKE. No; it does not because we have to go further in providing water for irrigation in the upper Missouri River Basin. This provision limits us to existing law which is insufficient.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the words "now authorized by existing law"? Would that not satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. LEMKE. That will not satisfy us. Under that provision they can take for navigation every drop of water that we need in dry years for irrigation purposes. We would then be left high and dry without enough water even to give a cow a good drink.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sympathetic with what the gentleman is trying to avoid, but I am wondering if the purpose of his amendment is not disposed of by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]?

Mr. LEMKE. No, it is not, because that is a State-right matter. We are here dealing with a particular question in a particular project, the Missouri River Basin.

Let me show you why we are not satisfied with the provisions of this bill. I know that the chairman has said that he is interested in irrigation, that he is willing that we should keep all the water for irrigation purposes so as to prevent it from flooding the lower Mississippi Valley. That is exactly what we want to do. We want his cooperation in this effort. We want him to help us to keep the waters needed for irrigation in the upper Missouri Basin. This so that we can have it for domestic use and in order to build up our ground-water level again, that has fallen 52 feet in the last 50 or 75 years.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Section 4 says that the Secretary of War is authorized to sell for domestic and industrial use the surplus water. That must mean there is some water to be kept back and we are going to get the surplus water, if any.

Mr. LEMKE. That is correct, but there will be no surplus water and I wish to give you the facts right now in connection with that. For instance, under existing law they could take 16,800,000 acre-feet a year, whereas we have only 11,600,000 acre-feet in dry years in the Missouri River Basin. That is the difference in our conclusions and that of the committee. It is for this reason we are objecting to the present existing law, which is a camouflage and a hypocritical pretense to steal all the water in the Missouri River in dry seasons in order to permit a few boats to float down the Mississippi River.

Mr. BURDICK. In a year like that there would be no surplus water?

Mr. LEMKE. There will not be a drop. As a matter of fact, there will be a deficiency in the water supply.

I have no quarrel with the able chairman of the Committee on Flood Control; in fact, I admire his willingness to listen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to cooperate with the chairman on flood control; I am opposed to floods, I am opposed to the devastation caused by floods, but I want him to understand that for every dollar lost through floods we lost a hundred by drought. I want him to know that if he works with us to keep this water which we intend to use for irrigation and other purposes, it will be the best way to prevent floods in the lower Mississippi Valley. That should be his aim and purpose as well as ours.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been rushed in here before we have had an opportunity to get the report of the Bureau of Reclamation and I want to quote now from H. W. Bashore, Com-

missioner of the Bureau of Reclamation in his report on the Missouri River Basin, which report has just been released. This bill should have waited until that report was released and studied by the members of the committee.

Mr. Bashore in his report states as follows:

The reclamation plan proposes a total of 90 reservoirs with a combined capacity of 45,700,000 acre-feet, most of the reservoirs on tributaries of the Missouri for use in irrigation, flood control, and power development, but two-thirds of the reservoir capacity on the main stream for use in flood control, aid to navigation, power development, and irrigation.

When fully developed, the plan would provide water for the irrigation of 4,760,400 acres of dry land, and supplemental water for 538,000 acres of land now irrigated but not assured adequate water in years of low run-off. Seventeen power plants, in the completed power system, would supply seasonal power for pumping water for irrigation, and nearly four billion kilowatt-hours of firm power, annually, for domestic, commercial, and industrial uses.

The irrigation of numerous areas scattered widely over the northern Great Plains and over other semiarid sections of the Missouri River Basin would add to an unavoidably precarious dry farm and grazing economy the stabilizing influence of lands with insured crops and high yields.

The droughts of the last decade cost governmental agencies, principally Federal, a total of \$1,246,557,087, and these expenditures were inadequate to the needs, since tens of thousands of families nevertheless were forced to migrate from their abandoned homes. These expenditures are roughly equal to the cost of full utilization of the waters of the Missouri River system. While it is not contended that full use of these waters will eliminate drought losses, it will reduce the catastrophic effects and prevent much of the human suffering.

Let us get this project and save the flood waters for the upper Missouri River Basin States in dry years. I realize we are 48 States, but 1 Nation. If that 1 Nation is to be preserved the rights of these 48 States must be respected, even by the Committee on Flood Control and by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I may say that this battle has just begun. This is just a skirmish. We are going to win because justice will prevail in the end. We are not going to take the water from the people in the States where it originated so that some fellow may float a yacht down the lower Mississippi Valley, while the people and their cattle in the upper regions go hungry on account of the lack of food and water.

The chairman of the Committee on Flood Control says that irrigation has nothing to do with this bill. That the bill will not interfere with irrigation. Then why did he put that provision in the bill that we are limited to existing law? If it has nothing to do with it, why have you not the courtesy, as you are so unusually courteous on all occasions, to put in this amendment that can do no harm to the bill?

If it is true that this bill does not interfere with our irrigation projects, why not put this simple little amendment in to allay our apprehensions? I have in my office hundreds of requests from Governors, county commissioners, and from

various local communities in which the fear is expressed that this bill will deprive them of the local use of their own waters. Why not allay their apprehensions?

I again beg the chairman of this committee to be courteous enough to that great area to accept this amendment.

I submit the following basic facts to show that with a 6-foot channel there is only enough water left to irrigate approximately 2,778,000 acres, and that with a 9-foot channel there would be no water at all left for irrigation.

Out of 15,768,000 acre-feet mean annual yield at Yankton:

Requirement with 6-foot channel and reservoirs to regulate 20,000 ¹ by 2 by 240 (navigation period)	9,600,000
Evaporation from reservoirs.....	1,000,000
Waste to coordinate flood control with navigation.....	500,000
Release during nonnavigation period for various uses.....	500,000
Total	11,600,000

15,768,000—11,600,000=4,168,000 acre-feet for upstream domestic, industrial, and irrigation use (for 2,778,000 acres).

Requirements with 9-foot channel and reservoirs to regulate 30,000 by 2 by 240 (navigation period)	14,800,000
Evaporation	1,000,000
Waste.....	500,000
Winter release.....	500,000
Total	16,800,000

¹20,000 cubic second-feet converted to acre-feet for the navigation period of 240 days per year.

This permits no irrigation development at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is unable, due to illness, to be here this afternoon. You all know his interest in irrigation, and I am sure, will well understand his disappointment at not being here.

Mr. Chairman, this House has been hearing a good deal in the past few months about irrigation and what it means to those of us who live in the arid and semiarid parts of the West. It was with a great deal of pleasure that I listened today to our distinguished majority leader speak about the converts to flood control in the New England delegations during the past 7 or 8 years. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I recall during our recent debate on the river and harbor bill the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] getting up and telling us that he had been out in our part of the country, and because of

first-hand information on our needs he thereby became a convert to irrigation and its possibilities.

Mr. Chairman, to those of us who live in the West, water is of the greatest importance. It is our basic natural resource, and everything we do is predicated on its use. We are not unselfish in looking after our own interests in this respect because we know that the wise use of the water which originates in our area will not only benefit us but, in the final analysis, the rest of the country as well. Water is our lifeblood and without it we would wither away and die. This is the fundamental factor to consider when debating bills of the nature now before us.

If we are given the right to develop and use our water resources we can and will contribute not only to our own welfare and future but to that of the Nation as well.

We know that the Congress is becoming better acquainted with the problems which confront us in the arid and semi-arid States, and we sincerely hope that careful consideration will be given to our needs. We, of the Rocky Mountain West, come from the largest undeveloped area in our country, but potentially we can become one of the richest areas. We can and we will work hand in hand with the other regions in developing our country, because we want to see the Nation develop on a national scale. If our needs are not considered or, if considered, given only scant attention, not only will we suffer but the rest of the Nation will as well. There is no reason why a sound, well integrated economy cannot be equitably worked out between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation so that the waters of the Missouri and the Yellowstone can be utilized to their fullest extent, first, for domestic purposes, such as irrigation, mining, industrial and municipal uses, and then for flood control and navigation.

We are interested in flood control, especially in the lower reaches of the Missouri Valley Basin, and we believe that through letting us retain control of our waters, building adequate storage facilities, and creating multiple purpose dams where needed, we can facilitate the development of our area and others; we can assist in flood control; and we can thereby bring about a safe and sound development in all sections. We of the West have to fight all the time to retain control of our natural resources. At times it is discouraging because we are so few in number. However, we do have faith in the people's body, the Congress, and we look to you for a square deal and the retention of our rights, especially in the development of this particular commodity, our greatest natural resource, water.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Gladly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I want to say that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has been alert in looking after the interests of his State

and all that section of the country known as the intermountain region, together with the great Northwest. Especially do I wish to commend the gentleman for his very effective work in connection with the Hungry Horse Dam in sponsoring that legislation.

I would like to add to what he has already said this, that there is a difference between that part of our country lying west of the ninety-seventh meridian and other sections of the country, not considering the three Pacific States. We have in the intermountain region a different water law.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has properly emphasized that difference with all of its meaning, and I congratulate him and commend him on his remarks and upon his legislative work.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona. We both have the same problems to contend with, because we represent areas somewhat alike. I should also like to call to the attention of the House the fact that my colleague from Arizona has always been of great help to me not only with his sound advice but with his unerring ability to guide legislation along the right path. He is a true son of the West, a real legislator, a sound worker for his State, and a distinct credit to his country. We are fortunate that we have him with us here.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, again the controversy prevails between those representing States on the upper Missouri River and those who represent States on the lower Missouri. We in Missouri are interested in flood control while those of you on the upper river are interested in irrigation.

It seems to me as long as there is to be a controversy between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers, there will undoubtedly be a great delay in advancing the flood-control projects and likewise the benefits sought by the States in the Northwest for the irrigation of their land and for other purposes will be delayed. Some way should be worked out to meet this situation. I am not in favor of the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior to dump any disputes that might arise in the lap of the President for final decision. The Congress should be big enough to meet this situation. We have placed enough responsibility on the President as it is and, further, he would be the one that would be subject to criticism no matter what his decision might be.

Mr. Chairman, it was nearly 20 years ago that I cast a vote on a flood-control bill where there was a controversial issue involved. The gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Sears, offered an amendment authorizing the construction of reservoirs in connection with flood-control projects. That was a very bitter issue at the time.

I supported the amendment, which was defeated by 10 votes. I had a reason for supporting that amendment. It so happened that in 1913 I came across the country on the first Pennsylvania train that was operated after the terrific floods that caused so much damage in the State of Ohio, especially in Dayton, Columbus, and other cities. The train entered Columbus on a temporary track. Homes, bridges, farmhouses, and barns were upside down. The railroad tracks were a twisted mass of steel. Bridges were destroyed. From Columbus it was necessary to leave the main road and go north about 95 miles, the tracks being under water half of the way. We finally connected up with the northern branch of the road and were able to proceed to Washington, arriving many hours late. Some years thereafter I drove from St. Louis to Washington, and I passed over 2 tremendous flood-control dams. These 2 dams were constructed to prevent a recurrence of that disaster. Three additional dams were also constructed, making 5 in all, and as I recall it the engineer was a Dr. Morgan, who later had something to do with the construction of dams in the Tennessee Valley. It is my understanding that since those dams were constructed and floodwaters are stored, there has never been a disastrous flood in that area in Ohio. If that be true, I felt if it could be done in Ohio it could be done in other parts of the country. We have spent hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to control floods. Year by year they continue; in fact, in the flood in the Missouri and Mississippi Valley the past few weeks it was more disastrous than any flood that ever occurred in that area. As I say, we want flood control for the Missouri Valley and those of you in the Northwest want irrigation. There must be a way we can get together, and the sooner the better for all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I have just read two editorials on this subject, one in the St. Louis Star-Times of May 3 and the other in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 7. Under the permission granted me, I include these editorials:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of May 3, 1944]

IT CAN BE DONE IN THE MISSOURI VALLEY

Visited at one and the same time by the worst flood in a century and by David Lillenthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, St. Louis today dreams of an M. V. A.—a vast Missouri River authority to control floods, irrigate the plains, promote water-borne commerce, and develop electric power for a rich inland empire.

It is a brave dream. But the danger is that it may ebb with the flood. The T. V. A. did not spring full-blown from some wishful thinker's brow. It is the result of 25 years of hard work and hard fighting—fighting that goes on even now in Washington.

Just as the Missouri is four times as long as the Tennessee, so are the difficulties to be overcome in the realization of an M. V. A. enormously greater than those that stood in the way of T. V. A. There were at least some links of common interest that held people in the Tennessee Valley together. But what do we people in St. Louis have in common with the people who live in the foothills of the Rockies where Red Rock Creek, the Beaver Head, and the Jefferson come together to

form the second longest river of the continent? Or, for that matter, how much do we have in common with the wheat farmers of the Dakotas and the corn growers of Nebraska and Iowa?

Unfortunately, there are no romantic stern-wheelers playing a song on their whistles that is known up and down this great valley. Along this slash of water across the prairies there is very little of the familiarity which existed, in Mark Twain's day, between St. Louis and Memphis, Natchez, and New Orleans. But what potentialities there are in the cultivation of such an acquaintance.

Today Montana is not concerned about floods, and Missouri does not give a whoop about irrigation. But what gold could be mined from this valley of ours if it were realized up and down the whole length of the river that a single Government-sponsored agency could not only control floods and provide water for irrigation ditches, but could also bring electric power plants and the industries that go with them, a really navigable channel and the trade that goes with it.

So long as sectional interests work only for what they want, the river will continue to flow through a long tunnel of "pork barrels," but if ever all of us in this valley learn to pool our desires and to make one organization responsible for the satisfaction of all of them, then Montana's sorry drift toward depopulation will be reversed and Missouri's rich black earth will no longer be flushed into the Gulf.

As David Lillenthal said, the technical problems of this transformation are not beyond the resourcefulness of the engineers. But first there must be a common determination to set the engineers to work for a common purpose. This calls for men of vision up and down the valley. The Tennessee had its Senator Norris—paradoxically a man from the valley of the Missouri—who worked and preached until the dream of T. V. A. was an actuality. We need hundreds of Norrises—businessmen and farmers and ranchers and public officials fired with the dream of an M. V. A., men determined to explain and to plead, to organize and to fight until their dream, too, is a reality.

The Army engineers have a plan on which the technical structure of an M. V. A. can be built just as soon as the war's demands abate and men and material are available for work. But nothing will come of the plan until people up and down the valley join in the common cause. When they do, it will become apparent that the great wealth which this valley has already yielded is as nothing to what it offers its people.

With the floodwaters lapping at the terminal tracks and covering thousands and thousands of acres of farm land, St. Louis and Missouri are challenged to light a torch, to take the lead in a great movement not only for the control but also for the full exploitation of the Missouri. The only question is the old one:

Will the desire go up and go down with the flood?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 7, 1944]

ONE RIVER PLAN IS THE NEED

The United States Army engineers' Pick plan for development of the Missouri River is scheduled to come up in the House tomorrow, and with it will come an opportunity for the upper and lower valley States to put an end to their bickering and to demonstrate that they can at last begin to work together.

The plan, in its present form at least, is not acceptable to the upper valley, which believes, with good reason, that in the context of other legislation it is prejudicial to irrigation. The basis of the controversy is the Army engineers' attempt to have Congress allot to navigation a fixed amount of water

equal to the greater part of the river's annual flow in the last 10 years.

The irrigation States very sensibly are determined not to stand peaceably by and see navigation priorities put on water of which they are entitled to some part for irrigation.

They have proposed various protective measures, the latest of which is a suggestion by Secretary Ickes that Congress lay down the law that irrigation shall be paramount to every other interest in the use of Missouri River water.

The objection to this is that it would work the same unfairness on flood control and navigation that it is intended to prevent from being worked on irrigation. To be specific, what would happen if, in the face of a flood descending the river, the Army engineers wanted to release water from storage in order to make reservoir space available for containing the flood, while the Reclamation Bureau wanted to keep the reservoirs full because to do so would keep irrigation interests paramount?

Secretary Ickes would have the President resolve any such dispute. The fault in this suggestion, of course, is that a moment when disaster impends is no moment for arguing what to do about it. If argument continues long enough, nothing can be done about it.

As a general rule, it would be proper for Congress to declare flood control, irrigation, and navigation to rank in importance in that order; but legislation should leave enough latitude for engineers to operate the system flexibly and in the best interests as they appear at the moment of decision.

Is it not becoming obvious that two or more antagonistic agencies—the Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau—cannot develop this valley without sacrifice of its total resources, even though they declared an armed truce? Is it not plain that only harm will be produced if either the upper or the lower valley attempts to force some plan upon the other? We shall get somewhere only when we agree on one plan for all of us and one organization to which all will be willing to entrust their interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in this bill the Committee on Flood Control reports a project with reference to the Missouri River that is to cost \$200,000,000. That is a very substantial outlay and it ought to be examined with some caution. It will apply to a river that starts about 17 miles above St. Louis and runs a course across the country to the southwestern section of Montana for a distance of nearly 2,500 miles. It is really a monumental water course. It drains something more than half a million square miles of this country, and it is proposed in this bill to make provision for an over-all comprehensive project which will include channel straightening and improvements and reservoirs and other works to provide, first for navigation; second, for irrigation; third, for power; and fourth, for flood control. They do not run particularly in that order, but that is the over-all plan for which \$200,000,000 are to be expended.

Now come the folks from this area, where water is a priceless commodity, and say that before we take away all their water for navigation purposes to sustain a barge or a vessel that may haul commodities, we believe that preference should be given to beneficial consumptive uses.

What are those uses? First, domestic. That is fundamental; that involves drinking water; that involves water for livestock; that appeals to an instinct of self-preservation, and navigation must necessarily be subordinated to that.

Second, they want to have preference for municipal purposes. There is not a soul in this body who would deny a village or a town the necessary water in preference to navigation. That is all they ask for in this amendment. They want preference to be given to irrigation because that is vital to the sustenance of life out there. Without water there can be no vegetables, no produce of the soil, nothing with which to sustain life. It is just a matter of common sense, and you cannot argue with that kind of fundamental need.

They want preference for water for mining. Look at the first section of this bill, and what does it say? It sets up a reservoir of projects for the post-war period. For what purpose? Manifestly to make jobs. That is what it does. If a mine cannot get water preference for continued operation, you destroy jobs. Does that not make sense? They want preference also for industrial uses—meaning for their factories and their mining plants and similar purposes. That means jobs. This bill is dedicated, among other things, to making jobs in the post-war period. Would you destroy them now by not giving them a preference for this water? What difference does it make if you have a sufficient channel to float a battleship, if the produce of the soil and the contents of factories and the livelihood and self-preservation that are involved here are not first given preference?

There is ample precedent for it. Back in 1902, we began placing a very comprehensive reclamation act on the books. We have added to it every year. Read the language of those acts. What does the language say? The water users shall have preference. That is the essence of the reclamation law, and it has been regarded as good gospel for more than two generations. The law was drafted by experts who had some knowledge of the West and of its essential needs.

Before us is an amendment. What does it say? It says in effect that west of the ninety-seventh meridian, preference shall be given to water for drinking purposes, for livestock, for irrigation, to keep factories going, as well as all those other things that generate commerce, and that navigation and commerce shall come last. Certainly that ought to appeal to every good instinct and to the common sense of Members of this House, and that is why I am for it. Recently I had first-hand opportunity to appreciate what water really means in that country. That is why I am for that amendment.

The Members of the House from those western spaces have expressed a sustained concern about this matter. You will remember the effort which was made some weeks ago to have similar language incorporated in the rivers and harbors bill. Their efforts are not dictated by selfishness or provincial interests. They know as no other person

can know, from a lifetime of experience what water means and they seek assurance that the basic daily needs of their people will not be neglected and that navigation shall be subordinated to their essential needs. Is that asking too much?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not listed among those requesting recognition at the time debate was limited.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I did not know there was a limitation.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. I was one of those who rose to be assigned some time. Is it possible for me to assign my time to the gentleman from Nevada?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment to this bill (H. R. 4485) offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE]. As a Member at large from Nevada, a typical arid-land State west of the ninety-seventh meridian, I feel that this Congress, by express inhibition incorporated into this bill, should terminate the executive and judicial legislation which is aimed at the destruction of the rights of the people to the use of flowing waters for irrigation and reclamation.

The only title the Federal Government has to control flowing waters springs from clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, giving to Congress the power—

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

That power has been exercised in the improvement of navigable streams in the interest of interstate commerce and the public safety. It has never been expressly extended in any statute to the control of any innavigable stream. An innavigable stream, by the force of the term itself, cannot serve commerce whether interstate or local.

Under the riparian doctrine or the appropriation doctrine and under both doctrines combined, from the time of the Louisiana cession in 1803 and the Guadalupe-Hidalgo cession in 1848 and the admission of Nevada in 1864, governments never claimed the corpus of the water at all or the right to the use of water, except as subordinate to the right of the people, to use it for agricultural, domestic, and power purposes. When Congress passed the Reclamation Act it provided that the Interior Department should conform to State laws in acquiring water rights to be held in trust for the use of settlers.

The abuse sought to be checked here is of modern origin. In the beginning navigability was defined as navigability in fact. But now it has been stretched to cover streams potentially navigable or formerly navigable, or to cover all the

miscellaneous tributaries, headwaters, and creeks that might conceivably augment the firm or seasonal flow of a river capable of carrying commerce. Under recent decisions the definition of navigability has been so whittled away as to constitute a menace to all the rest of the public who make use of flowing waters for agricultural purposes. If this goes on farms may be dried up and farmers wiped out in aid of a mythical river-steamboat trade so remote that its smoke will never come within a hundred miles of the farmers' homes.

Mr. Chairman, we in the arid-land States do not oppose commerce, although, outside of the railways, the highways, and the air transport, we see very little of it west of the ninety-seventh meridian. What we ask is protection of irrigation and reclamation which has built up the West under rights and customs, enjoyed and followed under the riparian and appropriation doctrines. We want protection through a positive statutory inhibition, against a definition of navigable waters that has no basis in any statute thus far enacted. It seems to me that when it comes to definitions, Congress should be the fountainhead—not the victim.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, time has been limited on this amendment and I shall have no opportunity to speak on it, but I agree with the gentleman from Nevada in his support of the Lemke amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota is the amendment that was offered by him to the river and harbor bill, applicable to that bill with respect to navigation, and it was defeated by the House. The substance of the amendment was embraced, as I have already pointed out, in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]. With all due deference, the amendment has no place in the pending bill.

The language of the amendment is:

Provided, That the use for navigation and related purposes in connection with this expanded general comprehensive plan.

The amendment was offered to the river and harbor bill and was considered by the House, and that very amendment is now offered to this flood control bill.

I am in sympathy with reclamation. This amendment gives my friends from the West an opportunity to proclaim anew their devotion to reclamation on all occasions. They have the privilege of doing that. But in all kindness, this amendment has no place in this bill.

Something has been said about the report of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Chief of Engineers submitted this report. There was a major flood not once, not twice, but three times last year in the Missouri River. My good friend the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] just returned from out West, made the same address and the same speech, and you know many good speeches can be made just as applicable to one point in a bill as to another. He spoke on this amendment with respect to navigation. The House did not agree with him. But with all due kindness, the people along the Missouri River from Sioux City to its mouth suffered last year not one flood but three floods, and today they are suffering one of the greatest floods in their history.

This project has been considered carefully. We began hearings on the Pick plan in May 1943, and we did not report this bill until March 29, 1944. Moreover, I say this bill provides for the expenditure of some \$200,000,000, and the entire Pick plan will cost something like \$475,000,000 or \$500,000,000.

Under this plan the pressing projects are the ones that are essential for flood control. They will have no reference to any reservoir where there is a drought. I sympathize with the drought sufferers. We want the waters to stay up there to eliminate droughts. The purpose is to provide for flood control and for the storage of those waters in the main stem of the river above Sioux City, when they come, to prevent them from overflowing the valley from Sioux City to the south.

Under the authorization of \$200,000,000 every possible safeguard is thrown around the reservoirs. There can be no argument about the right to use the waters on the tributaries of the Missouri because the dams cannot hold water on the main stem unless they empty from the tributaries into the main stem.

The committee embraced in the bill every possible precaution. I read from the bill:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by existing law.

Moreover, as I pointed out in presenting this bill on yesterday, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the commerce clause of the Constitution controls with respect to the waters, and wherever there is a conflict with State laws the Constitution must control.

The bill further provides in an effort to be more than doubly fair, in an effort to lean over to cooperate with Reclamation:

That portions of the storage authorized for the main stem of the river shall be placed on tributaries if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for silt control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost.

The undisputed testimony before the Committee on Flood Control in May 1943, and since then, during the hearings, was to the effect that if it had not been for the Fort Peck Reservoir the floods at Omaha, the floods at Sioux City, the floods at Kansas City and below would have been much higher. I respectfully submit that if the doctrine that reservoirs can detain and hold back flood

waters is to obtain in the United States along the Ohio and its tributaries and along the Connecticut River and its tributaries, that doctrine ought to obtain along the Missouri River to protect the people of that great basin, including the States of North Dakota and South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, and other States, to get the protection accruing from reservoirs for flood control that is accorded under other flood-control projects adopted by the Congress of the United States.

Let me say in conclusion, I did not make the point of order and did not insist on it because, while the substance of this bill has been defeated by the House during the consideration of the river and harbor bill and defeated by the House today, and I read from the amendment offered by the gentleman from New England, which I referred to in my remarks, "And in the case of works that might require the use of waters rising west of the ninety-seventh meridian in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior," there are flood-control projects in the Sacramento Valley, in the Willamette Valley, and there are flood-control projects along the Columbia River and along other rivers in the West, west of the ninety-seventh meridian, and in my judgment, the amendment is not applicable. This plan is fundamentally flood control and not navigation, and every possible use of the water is safeguarded under the provisions of this bill because the bill declares in no uncertain language that the right to the water along all the tributaries of the Missouri River shall be recognized.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman certainly knows this amendment would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I told you I had withdrawn the point of order, but I say this amendment was defeated. How many times does an amendment have to be defeated before it will be no longer offered? That was the only point I had in making reference to it.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], the author of the amendment.

Mr. LEMKE. Why do you not accept our amendment? Why do you wish to limit us to the excess waters under the existing law, which I have pointed out to you and which your committee knows, under the committee bill would be no water at all in dry years?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Your colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], spoke yesterday about there being a drought out there. We can do a lot, but Congress cannot make it rain. It cannot make the snows come down. The only way North Dakota is going to be relieved of drought—and other Western States—is for the snows to fall and for the rains to descend. What we want you to do is to keep those waters, whether they be from the snow or the rain, along

the tributaries to relieve that area and prevent the flooding of the valleys below.

Mr. LEMKE. Why do you not adopt our amendment? That is exactly what we want to do.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have great respect for the gentleman.

Mr. LEMKE. If you agree with us, why do you not adopt the amendment?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have carefully considered the gentleman's amendment with all its ramifications, but it is not applicable to every bill that comes along. It has been defeated once in the consideration of the river and harbor bill a few weeks ago and has been defeated substantially by the House today in defeating the Stearns amendment, and I think it should be withdrawn.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It is true that Congress cannot make the rain or snow, but Congress can build reservoirs up there, not only to help irrigation, but to reclaim land and to help control floods down in the valley.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is nothing on earth in this bill that will prevent the Bureau of Reclamation building reservoirs in addition to those authorized in this bill, if approved and appropriated for by Congress. But it will take \$175,000,000 of the \$200,000,000 herein authorized to provide levees to be constructed to protect the Missouri River Valley from Sioux City down to its mouth.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. It has no place in a flood-control bill. Rather, let us look at some facts pertaining to the Missouri River.

The Missouri River Basin embraces approximately one-sixth of the total area of the United States. Between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth of the Missouri River there are about 1,800,000 acres of land subject to flooding at extreme stages. Most of this area is under cultivation at the present time and includes some of the most fertile and productive land in the world. The principal crops grown are corn, wheat, barley, rye, oats, alfalfa, and garden produce. Although the land is highly productive floods on the Missouri River have always constituted a serious hazard to farming. Previous to the construction of river improvement works the land was not only subject to floods but to damage by bank erosion and cut-offs. The threat from bank erosion and cut-offs has now been removed by the river stabilization works but the flood hazard still remains. The principal cities subject to flooding are Kansas City, Mo., Kansas City, Kans., Council Bluffs, Iowa, Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa. In addition to these cities there are over 50 smaller municipalities which are already or partially vulnerable to floods along the main stem of the Missouri River. At Sioux City, Iowa, a city of over 80,000 population, a portion of the business district is subject to flooding and also a large part of the

stockyards, railroad facilities, and some manufacturing and industrial establishments.

In the upper part of the river the highest flood of record was caused by the March rise in 1881. Practically the entire area from bluff to bluff was inundated from Sioux City, Iowa, to St. Joseph, Mo., and the river was above flood stage all the way to the mouth. In addition to the damage caused by the water itself, there was a great deal of damage done by the cutting and crushing action of huge cakes of ice as they were swept down stream. This flood caused millions of dollars of damage.

In the lower part of the river the highest flood of record was caused by the June rise in 1844. This flood also produced stages in the upper part of the river approaching those of the 1881 flood. Reliable records of the damage caused by this flood are not available. The next highest flood of record in the lower part of the river was caused by the June rise in 1903. This flood paralyzed commerce, industry, and communications for weeks and caused millions of dollars of damage at the Kansas City alone. The total direct damage during this flood between Sioux City and the mouth was over \$10,000,000.

In addition to the floods of 1844, 1881, and 1903 there have been many other severe floods between Sioux City and the mouth, such as those which occurred during 1908, 1909, 1915, 1927, 1935, 1942, and 1943. In fact, there is flooding of some consequence practically every year on the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth.

The floods of 1943 inundated about 1,000,000 acres of land, of which about 200,000 acres were flooded for the second time. On about 600,000 acres the flooding prevented the production of the normal crop, and on about 300,000 acres it may require from 1 to 3 years before the land can be placed into full normal crop production. Highways and railroads in the river valley suffered heavily. Practically every agricultural levee between Sioux City and the mouth was either overtopped, breached, or otherwise seriously damaged. These floods of 1943 caused damage of about \$35,000,000 along the main stem of the river between Sioux City and the mouth.

The amount expended under provisions of section 5 of the 1941 Flood Control Act amounted to approximately \$300,000. All this effort and expense was nullified by the 1943 floods. In addition, the engineer department expended over \$800,000 for rescue and emergency work during the 1943 floods. The estimated cost of restoring the levees damaged during these floods to their original degree of protection is approximately \$1,800,000.

In an attempt to provide flood protection for their lands local interests have constructed levees and drainage works throughout the reach from Sioux City to the mouth at an estimated expenditure in excess of \$20,000,000. However, the levees are generally inadequate to protect against any except the minor floods and have not been constructed in accordance with any unified correlated plan. These local interests are anxious

to secure a much greater degree of protection than they now have but are convinced that the problem is of such magnitude that the burden must be assumed by the Federal Government. Although a considerable increase in the amount of protection now afforded can be provided by levees it is impracticable to provide complete protection against all past floods by levees alone.

There is no question but that additional flood protection for the Missouri Valley Basin is needed and justified and the general comprehensive plan for flood control as proposed by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army would seem to be the solution. The plan proposed would provide for a series of levees and appurtenant works along both sides of the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth, supplemented by the presently authorized reservoirs in Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri and additional multiple-purpose reservoirs. By these proposed improvements not only would large flood damages be prevented along the Missouri River and its tributaries and the Mississippi River but also floodwater would be retained for their best uses for all purposes, including irrigation, navigation, power, domestic and sanitary purposes, wildlife, and recreation. Considering the large benefits of tangible nature and special intangibles as the saving of human lives, the alleviation of suffering, stabilization of economic life of the valley, and encouragement of industrial and civic developments, the Army engineers have concluded that the plan herein proposed is entirely justified. In this connection it may be stated that the proposal is for a progressive improvement to be undertaken by steps as conditions warrant and the availability of funds permits.

Recurrence of floods as above enumerated and the occurrence of still larger floods are to be anticipated unless preventative measures are undertaken. The flood problem is a serious one and the large expenditures to remedy it are justified.

We are asking you to protect the bread basket of the world from the ravages of floods. In these days when we are stressing food production, the protection of food-production centers must be given serious consideration. The total value of the area subject to floods between Sioux City and the mouth of the river, including all fixed and movable property, has been estimated to be about \$1,000,000,000. One large flood or a series of floods might well wipe out this entire investment. More important than the consideration of monetary values is the fact that adequate flood protection would mean the saving of lives and the alleviation of human suffering. We should all be interested in securing this sound development program which is based upon the safeguarding of the interests of all of the people of the Missouri River Basin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEMKE) there were—yeas 47, nays 50.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. WHITTINGTON and Mr. LEMKE to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—yeas 52, nays 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be heard at this point and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONTROL AND DRAINAGE IN LOUISIANA

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I had occasion to take this floor and urge adoption of the rule to bring H. R. 4485 before this House for consideration. Today I want to speak for the bill the passage of which has become one of the most urgent and important pieces of legislation in the interest of the safety, welfare, and development of the lower Mississippi Valley yet proposed.

Many people think of flood control only in the terms of levees or dikes built along the banks of streams in the hope of controlling the floodwaters that come in the spring. For more than a century now the people of the lowlands have resorted to levees in their attempt to control the waters that inundate their lands at floodtime. The first levees were constructed by the individual landowner and calculated to protect the most important fields of his plantation or farm from the encroachment of backwater or the flooding of local streams in times of excessive rainfall. These levees were makeshift and patchwork and, while partially effective, did not protect the lands from inundation in the years when the floodwaters from the upper reaches of the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Valleys came in such volume that they could not be contained in the river channel.

Gradually the farmers and landowners began to band together and help one another build community levees that were calculated to relieve several tracts of land. From this was evolved the local levee districts that built levees along the low banks of streams in an effort to hold the water back from their particular section. The fellow up above dumped his water on the man below, or the man below might in times of great danger resort to the extreme of cutting the levee above, below or across the river at whatever point seemed to him to offer the best prospect of keeping the water off of his particular section. Naturally chaos and animosities were rampant. Finally the States and their political subdivisions took an interest and brought some semblance of order and cooperation. However, the problem was not yet solved. The floods still came and they still do. However, with the better order that came with the recognition of the problem as being one that affected the economy and welfare of entire States better engineering was applied, studies of vast comprehension were undertaken until finally it was recognized that the matter was not one for just local communities or even

the States, but that it affected the welfare, health and the economy of the entire Nation. Floods bring with them not merely the inundation of a vast area in the lowlands; they bring death by drowning to the populace, to the livestock, the poultry, to the wild life of the areas affected, but they also bring the destruction of homes, barns and buildings that are either washed away or covered with water that does untold damage. Floodwaters when in torrent from crevasses cause, in some cases, erosion and the complete destruction of once-fertile fields, in others a deposit of silt and muck may render those fields sour and impossible of cultivation for several years depending on how long the water stood on the fields and the type of silt or muck deposited.

To speed the flow of the waters and make it possible for the streams to handle the vast volume, it became apparent that drainage was also an integral part of flood control. River and bayou channels had to be widened, deepened, straightened, and cleared of debris and obstructions giving the floodwaters a right-of-way, so to speak, in order that they would not spread out over the banks of the streams and either inundate or so saturate the land that it would be impossible of cultivation and use.

This bill, H. R. 4485, is calculated to make provisions for these things. The Army engineers, the Mississippi River Commission, and the Flood Control Committee of this House have done an extensive and magnificent job of study and preparation. They have prepared a bill that is nonsectional and nonpolitical. They have made a comprehensive study of the major needs of the Nation as a whole and have tried to incorporate those needs into one omnibus bill and now ask this House to approve of their labors. We should do so, even if some of the details are not just as much as we would like. We should bear in mind that these proposals are a bit of vitally needed post-war planning laying a pattern of drainage, reclamation, and flood control that will give homes and employment to thousands upon thousands of our men and women now in the armed forces and in war industries, and at the same time adding millions upon millions of dollars to the value and productiveness of our lands.

Why, in my own district, the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana, there is a drainage provision that will reclaim and restore to productiveness several million acres of the finest, richest soil on earth—land that has a topsoil, not of 6 or 8 inches but of 6 to 10 feet, in a climate that is incomparable for year-round cultivation of fruits, vegetables, and produce. The provision for the clearing, straightening, deepening, and widening of the Boeuf, the Tensas, the Black, and Ouachita Rivers, and of Colwar Creek, Big Creek, and Bayou Lafourche and Bayou Macon, a project that is estimated to cost the Government but \$5,013,000, should bring many times that sum to the people in the productiveness of the reclaimed lands each year. The fact that the water from local rains and backwater can run off quickly will

permit the soil to be rid of its water saturation and permit the farmer to get into his fields many weeks earlier, all of which is an untold benefit. However, not only are these benefits accruing to the farmer and landowner but also, by draining off the local waters and permitting the streams to return to normal levels, the land will be much drier and both the land and the streams will be able to take care of far greater volumes of flood waters when they come.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that flood control and drainage are one and inseparable. To have adequate flood control we must also have adequate and efficient drainage. This bill makes the first provision for steps in that direction, and I urge the passage of this bill, which provides \$5,013,000 for the above-named streams and further provides a sum of \$3,800,000 for the Red-Ouachita River Basin, a total of \$8,813,000 for north Louisiana to help prevent the further preventable loss of life and the loss of property due to floods.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I addressed myself to this bill and someone enthusiastically acclaimed the benefits which were being received by the upper Ohio Valley as the result of this flood-control program. Now there is one aspect of it that disturbs me. However, if the chairman of the committee would be good enough to listen to my question, he might be able to explain it. Yesterday my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. TROUTMAN] addressed himself to the power aspect of these dams that are going to be constructed along the Youghiogheny River.

Also, my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] took up the matter with me, and he also expressed his concern. I see before me the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] who is in the coal business himself and who has a great many coal miners working in his district.

I am not taking the position that I am opposed to waterpower, because I am not in all instances, but I feel where coal is available in great quantities and handy, it is quite possible that power can be obtained just as cheaply, if not more so, from coal in our neighborhood than from waterpower.

I am told by the chairman of the committee that this is not a power project and that, although penstocks are constructed in these dams, in order for any power to be used or any machinery or equipment installed to obtain power from these dams, further legislation must be obtained from the Congress. It is on that understanding, which I would like the gentleman from Mississippi to confirm now, that I intend to support this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In response to the gentleman's question I will state that is the policy that was announced in the presentation of this bill. The dams are primarily for flood control. In some cases power is authorized incidentally; there is no provision for the sale and distribution. The policy ob-

tains, not only in the gentleman's area along the Ohio River and its tributaries, but elsewhere in the country. It is the conviction of this committee that these projects, if they are to be used for the sale and distribution of power, are to be passed on by the Congress later. There is provision for the generation of power in a few of the projects, but it is incidental and there is no provision for distribution facilities in any of the projects.

Mr. WRIGHT. And I would like to ask the gentleman this question, Is it not correct, then, that if these projects are to be used for any power or if any generation equipment is installed, further legislation by the Congress will be necessary?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have so stated. Where power is provided to any extent in or along the tributaries of the Ohio, I believe further authorizations will have to be made before any power is generated, or in my opinion all the authorization will be used for projects in which there is no power.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask to proceed out of order for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, stated that the simplification bill, passed by the House on last Thursday, will raise an additional \$2,000,000,000 of revenue, and at the same time he released a copy of his statement to the press. I felt it my duty to prepare for the press a complete answer to the charges made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN]. In view of the fact that the House passed the simplification bill without a single dissenting vote, including the vote of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN], I feel it my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

Both the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department agree that the estimate in our committee report is correct. The bill will result in a loss of revenue amounting to approximately \$60,000,000 instead of a gain of \$2,000,000,000.

The changes made by the bill on exemptions, rates, deductions, definitions of dependents all affect the revenue. Some changes result in increases of revenue and some result in revenue decreases. The net result is estimated to be a loss of \$60,000,000.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] has confused and misused the figures upon which his estimates are based. The change in the definition of dependents would alone result in a revenue loss of \$290,000,000, but he neglects to figure the loss which would result from increasing the dependent credit from \$350 to \$500. This is an increase of \$150 for each dependent, and there are 20,000,000 dependents. His calculation that the tax base will be increased by \$4,000,000,000 neglects this important in-

crease in the amount of dependent allowances.

For estimates we must rely upon the information supplied by our actuaries. Neither the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] nor I know all the details. All of our actuaries agree on the revenue effects of the bill as given in the committee's report.

I do know, however, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] is wrong when he implies that many of the 9,000,000 Victory taxpayers will be subject to surtax under the simplification bill. Actually about the same number, or even fewer, taxpayers will be subject to the surtax. I also know that he is wrong again when he talks about "velvet" when speaking of the tax receipts for 1944. According to the estimates of our actuaries, the taxes for 1944 will be \$60,000,000 less, not \$2,000,000,000 more, than under present law.

I trust that nobody will believe that a responsible committee of the House would attempt to deceive the membership of the House or the American people. We would be deceiving the Members of the House and the public if the gentleman from New Jersey were right. Mr. McLEAN's premises being wrong, his conclusions must necessarily be wrong.

The statement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] is such an unwarranted attack upon the intelligence of our committee and upon the capabilities of our actuaries that I feel that I cannot let it go unchallenged.

Mr. GAVIN. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 16, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following: "That the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes, approved in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, for the Ohio River Basin, is hereby modified to include the construction of flood-control works for the protection of Ridgway, Johnsonburg, St. Marys, and Brockway and vicinity in the State of Pennsylvania."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand the amendment is an extension of an existing adopted project, and that amendment has been prepared by the Office of the Chief of Engineers, and he submitted a statement that it is authorized as an extension of an existing project on which we have conducted hearings.

Mr. GAVIN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have not had an opportunity to present it to the committee, but I will say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned I see no objection to the amendment, under those circumstances, because it is merely an extension of an adopted project, heretofore approved by the committee and Congress.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I rest my case and offer no statement on my amendment as I do not wish to take up

the time of the membership of the House, and ask that action be taken on the amendment immediately.

I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for the excellence of his work on this flood-control legislation. He has earned and deserves the hearty commendation of the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Page 11, line 12, after the word "in", insert "Plan B"; and in line 13, page 11, strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$2,623,500."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, one cannot long sit in the House of Representatives without an appreciation that we are truly the greatest deliberative body in the democracy of the world. Here we meet on common ground to give expression to the needs and will of our people. To adequately fulfill our duties we at times individually come into conflict one with the other, because the problems of the people we represent so greatly differ. We have heard the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] state today that the greatest problem confronting his people was lack of water. I come before you emphasizing the fact that the most vital problem immediately confronting the people of Galena, Ill., which is my residence, is too much water at not infrequent times.

Galena, Ill., has been the scene of devastating floods for over a century. During the past hundred years rushing and uncontrolled waters have rushed down upon its citizens over 15 times, bringing consternation, destruction, and death. Citizens have witnessed the business district in complete shambles. Business houses which were built for the generations have been compelled to close their doors forever. Manufacturing establishments which have given work to many, have had their stocks and machinery ruined, depriving employees of gainful employment for long periods of time. Galena, one of Illinois' oldest cities possessing many historic shrines including General Grant's home, mecca of hundreds of thousands of tourists from throughout the world was until today uncertain of its future. I say today, because the flood bill now before us carries an authorization of \$300,000 to remedy disastrous flood conditions in Galena. It is needless for me to say that I am gratified with this degree of consideration because it at least recognizes a situation upon which I have worked untiringly for over 10 years. Those of you who have flood problems in your district know the work involved in order to obtain the necessary legislation.

Sincerely I express appreciation of the aid and assistance given me by the various members of the Flood Committee and the Corps of Engineers. Only this morning the chairman of the committee permitted me to appear before his committee and the Chief of Engineers, re-

garding the amendment which I have just offered. During my many years in Congress I have refrained from offering many amendments. I have held in most instances that the various committees after extensive hearings are in a better position to judge the facts. However, in this particular case I sincerely believe that I am the better judge. I have lived in that locality practically my entire life. During all those years I have studied this problem which is so vital to the entire community. I know, as no one else here knows, the compelling needs. That is the reason for this amendment.

In keeping with an act of Congress, the Army engineers made a final survey of the Galena River for the purpose of submitting plans to remedy the situation. In 1940 the engineers reported several plans. They recommended plan A, which provides for the construction of a system of levees and flood walls with sewer drains and pumping plant, the removal of certain obstructive bridges, and the enlargement and improvement of the channel, the estimated cost to be \$418,000, of which the city of Galena should assume \$118,000. That is the plan embraced in this bill. To me it is definitely insufficient, and that is the reason that I have offered this amendment.

In addition to plan A the Army engineers also submitted plan B. This B plan is without question the more efficacious. It provides for retention reservoirs at a cost of \$2,623,500, of which the United States will pay \$2,502,300 and local interests \$121,200. I emphasize that this is the most satisfactory plan because, according to the engineers' report under plan A, and I quote from the report:

It will be noted that plan A does not protect the privately owned Westwick foundry on the point of land at the junction of Galena River and Hughlett Branch, or the plant of the Galena Manufacturing Co., on the east bank of the main stream, just below Madison Street; nor will it prevent the inundation during major floods of certain small residential areas along the east bank of the river and on the west bank below Spring Street.

To me a job half done is not done at all. It requires a great deal of time and expense for the engineers to become located. When they are located is it not sensible they complete the job? To provide protection for part of the community and leave the rest unguarded seems impractical to me, and, I am sure, to you. The two factories which are given no protection under plan A are of paramount importance to the workers and to the community. They are the two largest factories in Joe Daviess County. The livelihood of many depends upon the noninterruption of work in these plants. For years these factories have borne the brunt of many floods. Now that we have recognized the need for protection in the locality why not give to all the needed protection? Why leave with some the everlasting fear of destruction? I ask you to vote for my amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if there are any other bona fide amendments to this section?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to this section.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized on the amendment at this time and had hoped I might continue for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee, and the gentleman from Illinois to be recognized for 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me implement the observations made by my good friend and fellow colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] in support of this amendment. He seeks additional funds to carry on an alternative plan which has been prepared by the Board of Engineers. I think the whole thing can be described as a small river that begins in Wisconsin and comes down through northern Illinois and has a confluence with another stream about 4 miles above the city of Galena. It has some historic value, because it was once the home of General Grant. In the flood of 1927, and I think in a subsequent flood, the hardware store which was operated by General Grant long ago was probably under 6 or 7 feet of water.

The War Department engineers recognize the necessity for a flood-control plan; so they submit two, one called A and the other called B. Plan A can be carried out for about \$423,000; plan B would cost \$2,500,000 or \$2,600,000; so we have our choice. The district engineer, the division engineer, and the board have finally reached a general accord on the proposal that was set forth in plan A to provide for the expenditure of \$300,000, a portion of which shall be raised locally.

The difficulty with this plan is that according to their own statement it will afford only partial relief, that there will no doubt be some measure of flood control benefit to that area. But listen to this, very interesting statement from the report of the Board of Engineers itself:

The proposed improvements would afford protection against floods considerably larger than in past records but would not protect against rare floods that may occur; and the possibilities of inundation of the protected area must be contemplated.

To me that is a rather curious statement. It in essence says that we propose to spend \$300,000 but you folks out at Galena must remember that there may come floods and the inundation of your town must be contemplated. Why spend any money if there is the possibility of a rare flood—and we have had several "rare" floods out there in the last 20 years, but there will be an inundation of that town all over again.

It would appear of doubtful wisdom to spend sufficient funds in order to give only partial protection to the industrial area of that town, to take care of the

two industries that are now outside of the proposed flood protection in plan A which has been recommended by the engineers. The reason they ascribe is this: They say the benefits to be derived from the larger plan will not be commensurate with the burdens and the expenditures that will be made; and yet there is a possibility that after we spend this money, the area may still be inundated, as contemplated by those sentences from the engineers' report itself. I have no quarrel whatsoever with the formula which the engineers use in setting up a project, namely that the benefits to be derived shall be commensurate with the expenditures to be made. Doubtless, there will be benefits in proportion to the amount recommended in this measure. But it will be a partial flood control job. That is conceded in the report on this project. It will not include two industries located there. It is therefore fair to ask whether it shall be a piecemeal job. It would seem like an unwise investment unless provision is made for complete protection.

Here is the Galena Manufacturing Co.; here is another industry; they are set out on a spit of land and we cannot include them in the protection. Yet of the entire estimated damages against which future protection is to be provided, 35 percent is industrial damage.

The proposal made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] calls for putting into effect a plan already explored by the War Department which is called plan B, instead of plan A. It will cost more money, but it will ultimately give complete protection to the Galena River Basin and to the city of Galena. It would appear to me that would be a rather wise expenditure even though it is substantially above the amount recommended in this authorization.

I sincerely hope and I commend to you the amendment that is now on the desk and trust it will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Chairman, it is a fundamental thing in flood control that the benefits must exceed the cost, otherwise the Federal Government would be justified, as it has in some cases, in buying the town and moving it up the hill. It has done that in Illinois.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and I know he is greatly interested, covers a report submitted in 1941. It has been before the Congress and the committee for nearly 2 years. The committee considered the report, adopting the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, and it provided for the plan that he recommended. He recommended that plan B embraced in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois be not adopted because, as he said, the cost of that plan would be twice the amount of the benefits, as I recall.

Mr. Chairman, if we propose to make an exception in one case, you let the bars down and you crucify the sound, fundamental principles of flood control, whether it be in Illinois or Mississippi.

In all fairness, I may say that I brought this amendment before the committee today and we point out to you now as we pointed out then to my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], that this amendment would adopt plan B, costing about \$2,600,000, according to the report, and the amendment only authorizes \$400,000, which is absolutely contradictory.

I sympathize with the situation. The committee leaned over backward to help. The language of the committee is as follows:

is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 336, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$300,000. Under this language while the local interests would not be relieved from making the contribution and giving the assurances required, if the cost of the project was actually \$400,000 or \$418,000, the project would be authorized inasmuch as the term "estimated cost" is sufficient to care for the actual cost.

The committee considered this amendment. We submitted it to the Chief of Engineers. He said that at the time he submitted his report in 1941 these two factories were not engaged in war work. He further said that in the event it now develops that it would be economically possible and economically justified to extend the works, under the discretion given to him, and if the cost would not exceed the benefits, he could do it under the language of the act which authorizes substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, which recommendations adopted by the committee require the local interests to contribute, maintain, and give the assurances contained in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in said document, as provided in the bill. I appeal to my very good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I may say I have been in sympathy with the program to conserve public expenditures and to reduce the high cost of government and to eliminate all waste and extravagance. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] have now asked us to include a project where the cost, according to our report and hearings, exceeds the benefits.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why, we do not quarrel with the benefits.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Your question, please.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not quarrel with the benefits theory at all. It is only that if these two plants are kept out, additional work will have to be done later on, and perhaps it will cost more than we are asking for at the present time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has covered that in his statement and I say in all fairness to the other Members of the House that the language of this authorization is broad enough so that if the gentleman and the Government through the Chief of Engineers, repre-

senting the people, find that he would be justified in substantially completing this project in order to protect those industries, those two manufacturing plants and a small residential area, he would be justified in making an extension without the amendment, or an additional authorization, provided the local interests made the contributions and furnished the assurances contained in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in said report, and as required in the bill.

In all fairness and equity I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas prevailed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Page 11, line 13, after the word "of", strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$418,000."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the need for the adoption of the amendment which I have now offered is most necessary and urgent. You have just rejected my other amendment which would have raised the authorization for flood relief for the Galena River from \$300,000 to \$2,623,500. This present amendment raises the authorization from \$300,000 to \$418,000. I say that the adoption of this amendment is of great importance because under plan A which now stands by reason of your rejection of plan B, the cost of construction is \$418,000, of which the United States is to pay \$300,000 and the local community \$118,000. According to the report of the engineers' investigation, it is disclosed that the city of Galena has a bonded indebtedness of \$93,700, which is only \$5,684.40 less than the legal maximum fixed by the Illinois Constitution of 1870. Therefore, it is obvious that even should plan A, which authorizes but a \$300,000 contribution by the Federal Government, become a law, no construction would result because the local community could not bond themselves for the additional \$118,000. The Army engineers report the great need of this flood construction; the Committee on Flood Control has reported favorably upon it. I assure you personally it is greatly needed. Without the adoption of this amendment it could not be possible. I ask you to vote for this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment substitutes \$418,000 for \$300,000. That is a distinction without a difference, because its estimated cost is \$300,000. If it costs \$200,000 under that estimate why the project will be constructed and if it costs \$350,000 it will be constructed. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection, and I have conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] on this amendment and he has no objection. The estimated cost of \$300,000 in the bill

is to cover the estimated cost of the project as recommended by the Chief of Engineers. It does not include protection for the two manufacturing industries or for a small residential area, as I recall. As stated, if the Chief of Engineers now finds that the cost of protecting these two factories and the other area will not exceed the cost of construction under the language of the bill without an additional authorization provided the local interests made the contributions and gave the assurances for maintenance and as otherwise required by the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers even though the estimated cost of the project as approved or as extended actually exceeded \$300,000, it could be constructed. So I repeat that under the discretion the matter of the estimated cost is not hard and fast. It will probably cost \$418,000 for the Federal works if the project is extended, provided the local contributions and assurances required in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers are furnished by the local interests. By substituting \$418,000 for \$300,000, no waiver is made of the local contributions required in the bill and in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON: On page 20, following the heading "San Joaquin River", in line 12, insert the following paragraph:

"The project for Farmington Reservoir on Littlejohn Creek, enlargement of Hogan Reservoir on Calaveras River, and related protection works is authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 545, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$3,868,200."

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the reason I am offering this amendment is that the project has been approved by all governmental agencies involved. There have been full and complete hearings on the matter, and the only reason it was not incorporated in the bill is because the report has not actually been printed. The hearings will be found in volume 1, pages 313 and 383, and in volume 2, pages 597, 599, and 603. The amendment was prepared by the Army engineers. Every single department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Reclamation Service, everyone concerned, has approved the report, which is House Document 545, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

I think I am justified in asking you to approve this amendment and include it in the bill. My people come here in good grace. We have spent over \$2,000,000 of our own money—that is, the little city of Stockton—in flood-control work along the Calaveras River. We have spent over a quarter of a million dollars in maintenance and operation, and the Government engineers have made a study of this project and determined that to have complete flood control for the city of

Stockton and the surrounding area, these two streams should be controlled as set out in the report. It seems to me that is a very reasonable request to make of the committee.

I want to thank the chairman and the committee most heartily for their very courteous attention to me and the opportunity they afforded me and my constituents to be heard before the committee. But we have complied with the spirit of the law. The only obstruction that I can see to this amendment is the fact that we have not technically had the document printed and lying on the Speaker's desk. The document is referred to in the amendment and, as I say, every single governmental step required and the acquiescence of every single governmental agency required has been obtained.

I respectfully suggest if you put it in this bill and there was anything wrong or anything should slip, that can be taken out over on the Senate side. As I say, I know that every requirement, every approval, every survey, every report to make it effective and to comply with the rules of the House has been complied with, and I most respectfully and urgently request the committee to adopt this amendment and place it in the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I feel most sympathetic with the project of my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. Under the general rule, the committee did not hear Members of Congress unless the project had been favorably reported. In all fairness, there had been a delay in reporting some projects in California, and while this project had not been submitted to the Congress, in an effort to help our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] we permitted him to testify.

If you will turn to the hearings you will find that I said to him that we had gone out of our way. We heard his testimony, and we were not following the usual course. We said to him at the time, in substance: "Until and unless the report is transmitted to the Congress, until and unless we have the engineers to analyze that report, to the satisfaction of the committee, the project cannot be included in the bill."

Now the report has been submitted to the Congress. It has not come to the committee. We have not conducted the same analytical hearing on that that we have conducted on other projects, inasmuch as the report has not been printed as yet.

In addition to that let me say to the gentleman from California that since this bill was reported, other projects have been reported to the Congress, and we have said to others of our friends: "The only way that your project can be included in the bill is for you to go before the Committee on Commerce in the Senate, where they will have the report, where the report can be analyzed and hearings can be conducted, and your project, if recommended by the Chief of Engineers, will be included, we are sure, in the Senate."

If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, there will be a dozen other projects discriminated against. With all kindness, let me suggest to the gentleman that he withdraw his amendment. If he goes before the Senate Committee on Commerce and the committee includes his amendment, I think the conference committee would be justified in insisting that the amendment be agreed to. Unless that is done, there is nothing for this committee and the House to do except insist upon the rule that the gentleman should take the same course as all other Members of Congress and as all other projects have taken.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the chairman say for the record that he is willing to support this amendment in the Senate if the document is printed?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have already stated, in all fairness—and I usually do what I say—that if this amendment is included in the Senate, and if the recommendation for the project is favorably reported by the Chief of Engineers and I am on the conference committee, I think it should be agreed to. As stated, I suggest that the amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fine spirit and I enjoy it a lot.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

PROVISOS IN MISSOURI RIVER PROJECT

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, during the debate several references have been made to the provisos that appear in the paragraph on pages 12 and 13 that deal with the Missouri River Basin project. Several have referred to the proviso at line 20, which reads:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of that now authorized by existing law.

And I desire to direct attention to the additional proviso that follows in line 24, which reads:

And provided further, That portions of the storage authorized for the main stem of the river shall be placed on tributaries if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for silt control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost.

In view of the importance which those provisos will have in the prosecution of this project, it may be well to give the history of their incorporation in the bill. They were proposed by me in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, during the executive sessions of that committee when they were working

on the draft of the bill following the public hearings, in February.

The amendments were proposed in the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1944.
The Honorable WILL W. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman, Committee on Flood Control,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WHITTINGTON: Reflection upon the various points of view and suggestions made with reference to the report of the Army engineers proposing a system of flood control on the Missouri River leads me to submit a couple of amendments which might be useful in the nature of provisos.

The first is designed to place in the legislation, where it will be plainly apparent to all who read the law, the flexibility of the Army engineers' proposals, stressed in the letter of the Chief of Engineers. It would read:

"Provided, That whenever it shall appear that flood and silt control above Sioux City can be increased thereby or more water be made more readily available for agricultural and industrial use without impairment of flood control below Sioux City and without increasing the authorized limit of cost, the Chief of Engineers shall place on tributaries, at sites to be selected after consultation with other Federal agencies concerned, portions of the storage proposed in the division engineer's plan for the main stem."

Such an amendment, or addition to the customary reference to the appropriate House document, would simply emphasize the flexibility and express the thought of Congress that where the benefits from the project could be increased by a certain modification, it should be done.

The other amendment is designed to allay any fears that any part of the engineers' proposals would injure water rights above Sioux City. It is the language accepted by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for placing their bill in connection with the Missouri River channel project. It reads:

"Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed as creating below Sioux City any demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin above Sioux City in excess of those now authorized by existing law."

This does not go as far as the amendment sought by many western Members in setting forth a priority of use, but it does effectively guard against any loss of rights now existing.

Your usual thoughtful and valued consideration will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress,
Second South Dakota District.

I discussed the proposals briefly with the chairman of the committee, as he will recall, and left the letter with him. Subsequently I discussed them with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], a member of the committee. A day or two later I was informally advised by both of them that the suggestions had been favorably received by the committee and probably would be incorporated in the bill. Naturally, then, I was pleased when the bill was introduced on the 27th of March, 1944, to see them incorporated in the language of the provisos previously cited. This word on their origin is given for whatever value it may have in the operation of the statute when the bill becomes law.

My concern on these points, particularly on the desirability of recognizing storage on the tributaries as valuable in any plan of flood control for the Missouri River Basin had been previously expressed to the Chief of Engineers by letter, November 22, 1944, and in a series of conferences with members of his staff.

In the letter and in the conferences I pointed out storage possibilities on several of the tributaries in North Dakota and South Dakota particularly on such rivers as the Little Missouri, Knife, Cannonball, Heart, Grand, Moreau, Cheyenne, White, and others. I also called attention to problems that would be created by the flooding of Indian lands at several points along the main stem of the river.

I was particularly concerned that provision be made for later coordination with whatever recommendations might come from the Bureau of Reclamation. Accordingly, I ventured to suggest that the letter of recommendations by the Chief of Engineers carry appropriate language to make clear that the suggested main-stem reservoirs might be modified as to site and size to permit coordination with recommendations by other agencies and to meet conditions that might develop as the work progressed, that it authorize placing storage on tributaries, and that it also establish authority to make complete reimbursement by payment to individual Indians and Indian tribes for any lands flooded and property injured or by the location and construction or relocation and reconstruction of works and facilities.

The following reply was received:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, November 26, 1943.
HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: Reference is made to your letter of November 22, 1943, in which you present several suggestions for possible development of the proposed projects on the main stem of the Missouri River and its tributaries with a view to obtaining the maximum benefits from the expenditure of Federal funds in the development of the Missouri River Basin for flood control and allied water uses. Your letter also contains a suggestion that the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Missouri River investigation include a recommendation for appropriate authority pertaining to the acquisition of Indian lands needed for the proposed reservoirs and the reimbursement for or the relocation of the interests of the Indians.

May I thank you for these helpful suggestions, and also for the constructive comments which you have made in your several recent conferences with the Department's representatives. I may assure you that your views as expressed in your letter of November 22 will be fully considered in the preparation of the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

The Chief of Engineers did give consideration to the suggestions as is evidenced by the language in paragraphs 10 to 14, inclusive, in his letter of recommendations that appears in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, which by reference in the bill be-

fore us, becomes the law when the bill is approved.

For convenient reference, the paragraphs mentioned are inserted at this point:

10. The amount of storage in the main-stem reservoirs and the location and size of these reservoirs is of vital importance to the ultimate development of the entire basin. I am convinced in the light of all information now available that the plan of the division engineer and the Board provides a flexible basis for securing that storage and obtaining the full multiple-purpose use of the waters of the Missouri Valley. The plan contemplates further expansion with a view to solving the flood and other problems in the upper tributary basins. Many of these solutions will doubtless be accomplished through the construction, by appropriate agencies, of additional multiple-purpose reservoirs on those tributaries and headwater streams.

11. The Department recognizes water-flow retardation, soil-erosion prevention, and production of hydroelectric power as important parts of the Missouri Basin program. The generation of power, in multiple-purpose projects now authorized for flood control and in those proposed in the expanded plan of development, is a definite part of the recommended program. Plans for the production, transmission, and sale of hydroelectric power should be worked out with the cooperation of the Federal Power Commission. Installation of power facilities so as to meet the economic needs of the Missouri Basin should be approved from time to time by the Secretary of War upon recommendations by the Federal Power Commission and the Chief of Engineers.

12. The proposed reservoirs will inundate Indian lands at several points. The estimates submitted on the over-all cost of the projects include funds to cover the cost of taking such lands and buildings, including relocation of burial grounds. It is to be understood, therefore, that approval of this plan includes authority for the Indians through their tribal councils, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey and relinquish such property to the United States, and authority for the Secretary of War to enter into appropriate agreements with the Secretary of the Interior and the Indian tribes concerned for the payment of the fair value of the property taken or for the contribution of a sum approximating such value toward locating or constructing or toward relocating or reconstructing buildings, works, facilities, or water projects in the vicinity of the Missouri River or its tributaries.

13. In summary, I believe that the expanded plan of development for the Missouri River Basin as recommended by the division engineer and the Board, establishes a broad framework for comprehensive basin-wide improvements that will derive the maximum benefits from the full multiple-purpose use of the water resources of that basin. That plan is flexible in that it proposes sufficient latitude to permit such modifications thereof and changes therein as may be found advisable, and it should be augmented by appropriate work of other agencies duly constituted by law to perform such work. Thus there are no problems of water use that cannot be satisfactorily solved with the full cooperation of all water-use agencies as the over-all plan of improvement is placed under construction.

14. This comprehensive plan should be approved now and at least the first phase of development authorized to be prosecuted in the same manner as that prescribed by existing law for similar comprehensive plans for large river basins. Approval at this time will permit details to be worked out through coordination and cooperation with all other

agencies concerned and will enable working plans to be prepared so that construction can be initiated expeditiously and prosecuted with efficiency and dispatch throughout the post-war period.

This account of the origin of the provisions that appear in the paragraph in the bill is given, Mr. Chairman, in order to establish the legislative intent of them and to buttress and give force to the possibilities for progressive coordination with the programs of other Federal agencies in the Missouri River Basin, including the construction of reservoirs on tributaries as well as the main stem of the river.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the proposal under consideration for the Missouri River watershed I want to pay my respects to the committee and its distinguished chairman. This I can do with propriety and actual knowledge as it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Flood Control Committee in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. First, I wish to state that the Congress and the Nation are extremely fortunate in having the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] as chairman. My personal opinion is that no individual in or out of Congress is so familiar with and sympathetic to the disastrous and overwhelming problems caused by water run-off. This great committee, under his leadership, has formulated a plan for a comprehensive control of the water run-off in every section of the Nation. Benefits will continue to accrue from this program for generations to come.

It is not my intention to enter into a discussion of the very excellent report submitted as a comprehensive plan for development of the Missouri River Basin. I do wish to state that it is with great satisfaction that I have read the report and the letters from the Chief of Engineers, the Commissioners of Irrigation, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Agriculture.

The Missouri River Basin is the only large watershed in the Nation on which Congress has not authorized a comprehensive plan for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and an expanded domestic use of the water run-off. The future prosperity of this large section of the Nation will be largely determined by the use of this great natural resource.

The report submitted by the Chief of Engineers recommends a program of impounding the water run-off in vast sections of this area through multiple-type reservoirs. These reservoirs would have the beneficial effect of protecting areas downstream from floods, store water for local irrigation, furnish electric power in some areas, be of great benefit to the wildlife of the section, and furnish recreational areas that are badly needed. The multiple-purpose reservoir developments would accrue benefits to the rural

communities in this section which is in the arid and semiarid region.

During the testimony before the committee on the entire watershed by Col. Miles A. Reber it was brought out that the entire program was flexible and the final construction of it would be through a coordinated policy approved by the Federal, State, and local areas. Personally, I am interested in the program as proposed for the Kansas River and its tributaries. The report mentions that the Kanopolis Reservoir will be completed as soon as material and labor can be released from war production. The Harlan Reservoir has congressional authorization. Plans for its construction have been completed and further authorization for funds are included in this proposal. This means that this project would be given a green light at the earliest opportunity. Smaller reservoirs are being recommended on the tributary streams in Kansas and Nebraska. A project at Kirwin, Kans., has been under study for several years and the plans are now receiving final consideration in the Bureau of Reclamation office at Denver, and also before the Director of the War Food Administration. Every effort is being made for the economic justification of it as a project which fits into the Department's program for increased food production. Studies are being made and reports will soon be available on the project at Cedar Bluffs on the Smoky Hill.

All of these projects, plus others that are being studied on the Kansas River, will furnish great protection from floods, furnish water for irrigation, improve the rural conditions in the areas affected, and be of general economic benefit to the Nation.

During the hearings before the Flood Control Committee the State was fortunate to have as its representatives Hon. Joe R. Beeler, of Jewell County, who was the personal representative of Andrew J. Schoepel, Governor of the State; George S. Knapp, State water-resources engineer; and Dr. E. Porter Ahrens, State director of the National Reclamation Association, who represented the Republican River at the hearings. These gentlemen expressed approval of the plan submitted by the Army engineers and ably presented the views of Kansas.

At the conclusion of the war, thousands of young men will be returning to Kansas. These young men have served with honor and distinction as representatives of our State on foreign battlefields and in defense industries. They will want to return to their home State and home locality. It will be the duty of the State and Nation to work out a program that will furnish employment for them. The construction program submitted to this committee by the Chief of Engineers would, when completed, furnish great and lasting projects to our State and our Nation. Projects of this type must be given consideration if we are to avoid another leaf-raking program. This program is one of vision and promise. To me it is the beginning of a program that I have personally visualized for years. During my service in Congress I have

consistently worked and voted for a comprehensive reservoir-control program for the water run-off in our section of the Nation. Those of us who are familiar with the ravages of floods and droughts could do no less than use our every means for early approval of the proposed plan.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point, and that amendments to any section of this part of the bill be in order.

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

There was no objection.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following-named localities, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage areas; the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of War may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to the Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Chipola River, Ala. and Fla.; Wacassas River and its tributaries, Fla., and of adjacent areas in Gilchrist and Levy Counties, Fla.; Oklawaha River and its tributaries, Fla., and of adjacent areas in Alachua and Marion Counties, Fla.; Scajaquada Creek and its tributaries, N. Y.; Buffalo River, Minn.; Wild Rice River, Minn.; Marsh River, Minn.; Sand Hill River, Minn.; Red Lake River, Minn.; Roseau River, Minn.; Snake River, Minn.; Middle River, Minn.; Tamarac River, Minn.; Two Rivers, Minn.; Warroad River and Bull Dog Creek, Minn.; Mississippi River and its tributaries, in the County of Aitkin, Minn.; Apple River, Joe Davless County, Ill.; Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio; Indian Creek, Ind. Osage River, Mo. and Kans.

San Rafael Creek and its tributaries, California.

Bayamon and Hondo Rivers and their tributaries, municipality of Bayamon, P. R.

SEC. 9. That the sum of \$810,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the improvements herein, the sum of \$10,000,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended in equal amounts by the Departments of War and Agriculture for carrying out any examination or survey provided for in this act and any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by said Departments. The sum of \$1,500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended by the Federal Power Commission for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act or any other acts of

Congress, to be prosecuted by the said Federal Power Commission.

Sec. 10. That the following works of improvement for run-off and water flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention, are hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of the national security and with a view toward an adequate reservoir of useful and worthy public works for the post-war construction program to be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the plans of the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans and preliminary work may be prosecuted during the war with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such works so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of post-war construction: *Provided further*, That when the existing critical situation with respect to materials, equipment, and manpower, no longer exists and in any event not later than immediately following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, the projects herein authorized shall be initiated as expeditiously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements and shall be prosecuted vigorously during the period of post-war reconversion.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

The program on the Los Angeles River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Under Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 426, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$8,380,000.

TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TEX.

The program on the Trinity River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 708, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$32,000,000.

LITTLE TALLAHATCHIE RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Little Tallahatchie River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 892, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$4,221,000.

COOSA RIVER WATERSHED (ABOVE ROME, GA.)

The program on the Coosa River watershed above Rome, Ga., is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 236, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$1,233,000.

LITTLE SIOUX RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Little Sioux River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 268, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$4,280,000.

POTOMAC RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Potomac River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 269, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$859,000.

COLORADO RIVER WATERSHED (TEXAS)

The program on those portions of the Colorado River watershed included in the watersheds of Pecan Bayou, San Saba River, Brady Creek, and the area tributary to the main stream of the Colorado River below its confluence with the Concho River and above the

mouth of Pecan Bayou, is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 270, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$2,693,000.

OUACHITA RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Ouachita River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Under Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 275, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$11,243,000.

Sec. 11. That the balance remaining from the authorization of \$10,000,000 provided in section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, for the 5-year period ending June 30, 1944, to correlate the program for the improvement of watersheds by the Department of Agriculture for measures of run-off and water flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds with the program for the improvement of rivers and other waterways by the Department of War is hereby reauthorized to be expended during the post-war period by the Department of Agriculture for the prosecution of the work authorized in section 10 of this act: *Provided*, That not more than 20 percent of the authorization made available herein shall be expended on any one project.

Sec. 12. That section 7 of the act of June 28, 1938, (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), is hereby amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized in his discretion to undertake such emergency measures for run-off retardation and soil-erosion prevention as may be needed to safeguard lives and property from floods and the products of erosion on any watershed whenever fire or any other natural element or force has caused a sudden impairment of that watershed: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement or measures for run-off and water flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds may be expended during any one fiscal year for such emergency measures."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 20, line 18, after the word "numbered" insert "513."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 25, line 7, after the period, insert "Choctawhatchee River, Fla."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 26, following line 1, insert "Deep Red Run in Tillman County, Okla.; Little Elk Creek, Salt Fork, Elm Creek, Saddle Mountain, Turkey Creek, Okla."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]. While I have not had an opportunity to confer with the Corps of Engineers, my information is that some of those streams have not been surveyed, and if the others have been,

it will not be objectionable, so I see no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, all of us here, I am sure, are interested in this measure because of the ultimate benefits to the Nation as a whole. The people of northwestern Minnesota are particularly interested in this bill, H. R. 4485, because its passage will authorize a much-needed and meritorious project in the congressional district I represent. I refer to the flood-control project known as Red Lake River, including Clearwater River of Minnesota.

We also are particularly interested in this bill because it includes authorizations for preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes of 12 other rivers and creeks in northwestern Minnesota. They are Buffalo River, Wild Rice River, Marsh River, Red Lake River, Roseau River, Sand Hill River, Snake River, Middle River, Tamarac River, Two Rivers, Warroad River, and Bull Dog Creek.

The Red Lake-Clearwater project will cost the Federal Government \$902,940. It has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers of the War Department as a worthy undertaking. An additional cost of \$86,000 will be borne by local agencies.

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

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to take this opportunity to inform the House that not only is the gentleman speaking for himself and the district he has the honor to represent, but all of us from the Minnesota districts. We have examined this thing carefully and are thoroughly in favor of it. The Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers drain one of the richest basins in the world for raising grains and seed crops and a great variety of products which are greatly needed now. This is a very important project which can be finished in a relatively short time so that this land can be brought into production. Its benefits can be made available even before the war is over. So I compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. HAGEN. I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his comments and cordial remarks.

The Secretary of War recommends that this project be started after the war. However, substantial facts have been presented by the Minnesota Department of Conservation, as well as other groups and individuals and myself, showing that this particular project should be undertaken now as an aid in increasing food production for the war effort.

On the occasion of one of my appearances before the House Committee on Flood Control, I discussed the immediate need for the completion of this flood-control project. Just prior to that time Col. George R. Goethals, Chief, Civil

Works Division, office of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, also testified that the results of the project would be highly beneficial.

The Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers periodically overflow their banks and flood some of the most productive farm land in America. The adjacent territory is a well settled farming area of hard-working farmers operating medium-sized farms. Various grains, hay, and other forage crops are grown. Dairying, livestock, and poultry raising are also carried on to an extensive degree.

These floods not only destroy crops but create such personal hardships for the farmers and families in that area that during recent wet years some of them have had to move elsewhere.

According to the report of the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, farmers and taxpayers in the flood area have suffered a loss of more than \$3,384,000 during the years 1919 to 1939. Some of the more recent years have been the worst flood periods.

Record crops have been raised during average years, and some of the drought-stricken sections have had to depend upon their forage and grain crops for livestock feed from the Red Lake-Clearwater area.

Completion of this project now will greatly increase food production for the war effort with a minimum of cost to the Government.

My predecessor in Congress, Representative R. T. Buckler, and I, as his secretary for 8 years, have been actively interested in this project for a long time, and we have received wonderful cooperation from many individuals, committees, and officials in an effort to bring efforts of more than 30 years to a successful culmination.

The passage of this omnibus flood-control bill by the House of Representatives, with the inclusion of the Red Lake-Clearwater River project, marks the furthest step forward in the long history of this excellent proposal.

In order that my colleagues in the House may be more familiar with this particular project I desire to make a few pertinent remarks concerning it.

Red Lake River, the principal tributary of the Red River of the North, has its source at the outlet of lower Red Lake in the northwestern part of Minnesota, flows generally westward through a meandering course for 196 miles, and empties into the Red River of the North at East Grand Forks, Minn. The drainage area contains 5,711 square miles, of which about 500 square miles are water surface. The principal tributary is Clearwater River, which enters from the south about 90 miles above the mouth of Red Lake River.

The Chief of Engineers has investigated the flood problem on the Red Lake River and its tributaries pursuant to the authority contained in the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and has submitted a report to Congress in which he recommends adoption of a Federal project for the regulation of Red Lake for flood control by the installation of

three hand-operated Tainter gates and other appurtenant works and for the rectification, clearing, and enlarging of the channels of Red Lake River and Clearwater River, Minn., at an estimated cost to the United States of \$902,940.

The Flood Control Committee believes that the improvements outlined in the report of the Chief of Engineers would provide a reasonably satisfactory solution of the water supply problems in the Red Lake River Basin and the control of floods resulting from direct overflow from streams within the Red Lake River Basin and it has recommended the authorization of the work proposed by the Chief of Engineers.

It now appears that the project will at last be approved by Congress. I sincerely hope that this body will see fit at a later date to appropriate the necessary funds to start work on the project during 1944-45.

Over a long period of time, many public officials, civic-minded citizens, township officials, and farmers have cooperated and expended unselfish efforts to advance this most worthy plan. This authorization and approval by the House today, and the expected passage by the Senate, gives renewed hope to hundreds of farmers and their families in the large area which will be most benefited. I am happy to have had a part in the work of advancing this plan to its present stage of development.

As the Representative in Congress from the Ninth District of Minnesota, I urge and ask the continued cooperation of my constituents and my colleagues here in the House in the next steps forward to ultimate completion of the project.

Now our special efforts must be directed toward the approval of the plan by the Department of Agriculture and the War Department as an emergency wartime effort to increase the food supply.

If the farmers of this area definitely know that their crops will not be destroyed by floods, they will plant and produce a large amount of food and crop products. If we are not able to get the project started as an emergency wartime job, we will ask for funds at the appropriate time to get the project under way immediately after the close of the war.

The fine public spirit of citizens, townsmen, and farmers alike assures me of their continued interest and cooperation in the advancement of this long-pending Red Lake-Clearwater River project.

The victory and the undertaking of this great flood-relief job is in sight. I believe my long experience with it will be helpful. I will continue to do everything within the power and influence of my office as a Member of Congress and to the best of my ability to see it through to completion.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note from an examination of the report accompanying the bill H. R. 4485, page 3, that—

In approving the Flood Control Act of 1941 the President directed that no new flood-control projects should be undertaken unless

they were of direct importance to the defense of the Nation.

I understand further that the projects now being authorized are for post-war construction. On page 10 of the report, in a discussion of the Susquehanna River Basin, I note the following:

The Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, modified the previous authorization for the Sunbury, Pa., project and the general plan for southern New York and eastern Pennsylvania to include the Lackawanna River.

I also note on page 6 of the bill that further modifications are made to the basic act of June 22, 1936.

When my distinguished predecessor, an able and distinguished Congressman, the late Patrick J. Boland, was a Member of the House, plans were laid for the Stillwater project and for alleviating the flood dangers on the Lackawanna. Recently I took the matter up with the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Flood Control and he contacted the Army engineers, who in turn reported that they were making a current study, the results of which would be made known in July. I should like to state for the record that when those studies are completed I shall take the matter up with the chairman of the committee and ask for a hearing if a hearing is required at that time.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The chairman of the committee and the committee will continue to cooperate with the gentleman, who has been most diligent in behalf of control of the floods along the streams to which he has referred.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 25, between lines 8 and 9 insert the following: "Susquehanna River, in the vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to the amendment. The gentleman has adopted the recommendation we made to him earlier in the afternoon.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 26, after line 2, insert "Grand River, S. Dak., Moreau River, S. Dak."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to state whether or not an examination and survey of those two streams has been ordered. I am agreeable to this amendment being included if it is agreeable to the other members of the committee. If we find an examination and survey has been ordered, it

can be eliminated in the Senate or in conference.

Mr. CASE. That is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee with regard to the Marais des Cygnes River in Kansas? On page 26, line 1 of the bill, reference is made to the Osage River, Missouri and Kansas. As a matter of fact and a matter of history, the Osage River starts in Missouri, but the upper part of the Osage was known throughout all our geographies until the last 3 or 4 years as the Marais des Cygnes. May I ask the chairman whether this reference to the "Osage River, Missouri and Kansas," includes the Marais des Cygnes River in Kansas?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I may answer the question of the gentleman, and I think the House is justified in relying upon his statement that that river is also known by another name, I am sure that the river, no matter what it is known as locally, will be reported on as the Osage River, sometimes called, as the gentleman has pointed out, the Marais des Cygnes. I have in mind that the Arkansas is called Ar-Kansas out in Kansas, but we get a report on the same stream whether it is called Arkansasaw or Ar-Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, during the last week the flood waters have just receded from several towns along the Marais des Cygnes, and it has resulted in the second highest flood in the history of the State. So we feel it is quite an important problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

T. V. A. IS NOT A YARDSTICK

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

A few weeks ago this House passed the annual independent offices appropriation bill and sent it to the other end of the Capitol for approval. Amendments that will have a far-reaching effect on the future operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been adopted by the Senate, and the bill is now in conference.

In anticipation of the day that I will be called upon to vote for or against these T. V. A. amendments, I have recently read two very interesting books: one, *The Power Industry and the Public Interest*, which is a summary of the results of a survey of the relations between the Government and the electric-power industry made under the direction of the trustees of the Twentieth Century Fund. The other book was *T. V. A.—Democracy on the March*, by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The adoption of the T. V. A. amendments to which I have referred brings the whole subject of the T. V. A. and its future before Congress. Regardless of how we may individually feel as to the

wisdom of setting up the T. V. A., we must now accept the fact that the people we represent have an investment of more than \$800,000,000 in the Tennessee Valley Authority. As I see it, our problem today is to determine just how we can make the best possible use of the T. V. A. property, and just what we should do to bring about the greatest possible return on this huge investment.

I have my own personal views regarding the wisdom of permitting the Federal Government to embark on the T. V. A. program. Frankly, I cannot help but wonder if we might not have been better off, as a nation, if, instead of spending \$800,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority, we had permitted private capital to finance these projects. There are millions of dollars of private capital lying idle in banks scattered all over the country. Money that could have been invested in expanding the private power industry, not only in the Tennessee Valley area but throughout the Nation. However, as far as T. V. A. is concerned, that question has been settled.

Before the House passes on the T. V. A. amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill, there is one ghost that I would like to see laid once and for all. I would like to scotch the yardstick idea that has confused so many people whenever T. V. A. was discussed. If the taxpayers of this Nation are going to endorse and support the program of T. V. A., they have a right to know just what the supporters of T. V. A. have in mind. Was T. V. A. set up to provide a yardstick for the electric-power industry or was it created as part of a great social experiment of developing the national resources of the Tennessee Valley?

Unfortunately, the Federal Power Commission with the sanction of Congress has spent thousands of dollars printing volumes, comparing T. V. A. electrical rates with the rates charged by private utility companies in every city, town, village, and hamlet throughout the United States. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has filled page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with similar comparisons.

The complaint of many supporters of private industry is not with the great social experiment of developing all the national resources of the valley and raising the standard of living. Nor is its resentment directed at the notable practical demonstration which the T. V. A. and the Canadian Hydro have made in proving the large per capita use which the public will make of electricity in the home, provided rates are sufficiently low. It is directed principally against the use of the T. V. A. rate schedules and average per kilowatt-hour prices paid in the territory as a yardstick by which the public may judge the extent of the robbery perpetrated upon them by private industry.

May I, at this time, quote from statements made by men who have supported T. V. A. from its very beginning?

The views of Prof. Martin G. Glaeser, who helped determine the T. V. A. rate schedules in 1933, with respect to the validity of the yardstick have been stated as follows:

Long ago I had concluded that the yardstick idea is a will-o'-the-wisp which lends itself admirably to propagandistic purposes, but the pursuit of which could end only in a bog of discussion, of claim and counter-claim.

Also, on the question of yardstick, I quote from the Twentieth Century Fund report on *The Power Industry and the Public Interest*:

The national significance of the T. V. A. experiment in relation to the regulation of power rates by State commissions has been dramatized by the invidious term, "yardstick."

Although, in its early years, the T. V. A. wholesale rate was featured as a yardstick by the T. V. A. and its supporters, that claim has now been abandoned. Conditions of generation differ so widely between a multiple-purpose project and a private plant that equality, or even comparability, of costs cannot be expected. The cost of generation by the T. V. A., no matter what method of allocation is used, cannot be a measure of reasonable costs for any other plant, whether steam or hydroelectric.

Nor has the retail yardstick any more scientific validity. If the wholesaler does not operate on a strictly commercial basis, development costs cannot be readily allocated to the retail distributor. Furthermore, the over-all wholesale-retail costs are no more comparable to those of other utilities than is the wholesale rate itself. Insofar as costs have been shifted or absorbed in expenditures for other purposes, the ability of T. V. A. distributors to show a profit is no proof that their resale rates are reasonable.

Still on the subject of yardsticks, I turn to the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. David E. Lilienthal, who, in his recent book, states:

The particular rates embodied in the T. V. A. schedule were not to be an absolute standard of precisely what should be charged for electricity anywhere and everywhere in the country, with the implication that any company charging more than the T. V. A. rate was therefore proved an extortionist. The country is far too diverse, conditions are far too varied, for any such oversimplification.

I am sure that my distinguished colleague [Mr. RANKIN] will accept the testimony of the three outstanding authorities I have quoted, and that we will hear no more about the T. V. A. yardstick.

David E. Lilienthal is one of the greatest living authorities on T. V. A. For one I accept his statement that T. V. A. rates should not be used as a yardstick. I have heard the T. V. A. yardstick called a 20-inch yardstick or a rubber yardstick. It is gratifying to learn from such eminent authority that there is no yardstick as far as the T. V. A. is concerned.

I intend to oppose any T. V. A. amendments that might "hamstring" those who are charged with protecting the taxpayers' investment. That statement does not mean that I think the T. V. A. act, in its present form, is perfect. It is my belief that inasmuch as the T. V. A. must continue to operate in competition with private utilities, it should pay all taxes

at the same rate paid by competing private companies. If the consumer of electricity bought from a privately financed power and electric-light company is to pay a sales tax on the amount of his light bill, then certainly those who buy electricity from a T. V. A. Government-financed company should pay a tax at the same rate. In the near future I hope to prepare some figures comparing the taxes paid by T. V. A. and its consumers, with the taxes paid by private electric-light companies and their consumers.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BREHM: On page 25, line 7, after the period in line 7, strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "Hocking River in Hocking County, Ohio."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would say in deference to the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure a report on the Hocking River was authorized. For that reason I suggest the gentleman withdraw his amendment, and if you find or I find it is not authorized, we can ask the Senate to insert it.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, some 3 or 4 weeks ago I talked with the Army engineers' office here in Washington regarding this section of the Hocking River at Rockbridge, Ohio, and its destructive effects upon the farms adjacent thereto, and was informed that they would be pleased to have their engineer make a survey of this area. My amendment authorizes that this action be taken.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of that statement, I have no objection to this stream being included.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I spoke of a project that might be listed on page 25 of this bill and the Chair said if I would name the stream it might be included. I am not quite sure whether it has already been included in a survey. I refer to the Hassayampa River in Arizona. It may have been included in a general survey of the Gila River and its tributaries which is one of those extensive surveys begun some years ago and still in progress. Acting on the suggestion the Chairman has made to several other Members, I would like to take that question up further and see whether a survey has been made on the Hassayampa.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if that be the stream which the gentleman mentioned to me yesterday, I took it up with the Office of the Chief of Engineers and I was advised the report was in process of being submitted. If you find that statement is not absolutely correct with respect to this stream you just mentioned, I suggest you ask for an examination of it to be included in the Senate bill. But I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion. He made a similar suggestion to the gentleman from California a moment ago, which I would like also to act upon. As I said yesterday, there is a flood-control situation badly needing action at Holbrook, Ariz., on the Little Colorado which has been looked into and carefully studied by the Army engineers. They have made their complete report some time ago and the only thing left in finishing this report is that it has not cleared the Bureau of the Budget, nor the Bureau of Reclamation. However, I happen to know that the Bureau of Reclamation is favorable to it and would interpose no objection. In the same way, then, I should like to have this referred to the Senate after clearance is had and later possibly to the conferees in regard to this same bill, because the flood hazard at Holbrook is very, very bad. The Army engineers' report is complete up to the point indicated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the remainder of my time on a matter of general policy covered in this measure. We have had a good deal said here today in regard to the implications of this bill, that it does not affect reclamations or power production, because it applies solely to flood control or navigation. The words of the chairman to that effect are reassuring and I am glad to have them. However, I want to point out that years ago in order to inject the Federal Government into the regulation of some of these rivers and justify the expenditure of Federal funds, the constitutional phrase "control of navigation" by Congress has been greatly extended by wide interpretation. I am not so sure but that the Government has erected some flood-control and even some irrigation dams under the guise of affording navigation. If the Chairman is referring specifically to actual navigation as covered by the terms of this bill, its effects may be well and good. If, however, a dam on the river that flows by my door, the Roosevelt Dam, begun in 1906 and finished in 1911, which is also a flood-control dam, but primarily for irrigation, if that dam is to be controlled by an agency other than the Bureau of Reclamation because it has some flood-control possibilities or because it has something to do with navigation actually or impliedly, then, of course, that is something else yet. I want to point out to the chairman of the Flood Control Committee that here is a danger of centralizing too much power in the hands of the War Department in the control of our western rivers.

At the same time, however, I want to say that I have great confidence in the Army engineers. They have done a magnificent job. I want them to continue, but I do not want to centralize control of all of our rivers even in the hands of the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, several days ago, under the influence of mis-

leading statements and a barrage of false propaganda, the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway was eliminated from the rivers and harbors bill in the House by a small majority. Owing to the fact that that project is now pending before the Senate—and it is our hope to have it restored—and owing to the fact that reports and recommendations on flood control on this stream have not been completed by the Army engineers, we find that such an item would not be in order on the pending measure. However, I hope to get it inserted in the Senate.

I wish every Member of the House could see these pictures of the devastating floods on the Tombigbee River, where people have been drowned within the last 2 months, their stock drowned, and their property swept away. If we are going to control floods and legislate generally for the rivers of this country, I should like for it to be done on a more equitable basis. This Tombigbee River cannot be ignored.

Recently the statement was made in the debate here in the House to the effect that the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway had not been approved by the Chief of Army Engineers. The House was led to believe that the Chief of Army Engineers was not in favor of it, when as a matter of fact what the Chief of Army Engineers did was to submit a report of his own Board with the comment that there were certain phases that should be left to the Congress itself. But so far as the engineering feasibility of the project, or the accuracy of the report of the Board of Army Engineers was concerned, he never expressed the slightest doubt.

A few days ago, Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Army Engineers, who was on the Board that made this report, appeared before a Senate committee, and this is what he said:

If we came up here and submitted a report recommending a project for slack water on the Mississippi between Cairo and New Orleans, by building locks and dams on the Mississippi River itself, at an estimated cost of \$66,000,000, I think you would all take off your hats and cheer.

Why did he say they would take off their hats and cheer? Because it would cut the cost of up-bound traffic on an average of 50 percent or more, and would benefit everybody on the upper Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Illinois, the Cumberland, and the Tennessee, as well as the entire Great Lakes area.

He says further:

This alternate route on the Tombigbee we are recommending amounts to the same thing, only the locks and dams are to be built on the Tombigbee instead of the Mississippi. There is no greater tangible saving than that which will accrue from use of the Tennessee-Tombigbee route instead of the Mississippi for the upstream traffic. This saving as estimated in House Document 269 is \$1,000,000. It is very conservative and should be doubled on account of the increase that has taken place in upstream traffic on the Mississippi River.

This would really be better than a slack-water route up the Mississippi for the reason that it would leave the benefits of the current on the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

General Robins says that even if he were to make an additional report, which some of them have clamored for, he would make the same report that he is making now, that this project is not only feasible, but that it is the only way you can overcome the swift current of the Mississippi for upstream traffic.

It means more to the people of the Mississippi Valley from Pittsburgh, Pa., to New Orleans, La.; from Sioux City, Iowa, to Mobile, Ala.; from St. Paul and Minneapolis, and from Chicago to the Gulf coast than any other development of its kind that has ever been proposed. Yet it was voted down in the House under the influence of false propaganda; and today we find that these floods are destroying the people on that stream, without compensation or without relief. General Robins went on to say:

Taking into account all the changed conditions since the report before the committee was prepared, there is a total tangible saving in sight today of \$4,000,000 a year for this project, and the carrying charges on this project are \$3,500,000. From the information that is officially available to this committee, there is no question in my mind but that the Tennessee-Tombigbee project is economically sound without considering recreation or national defense or enhanced land values, or any other intangible benefits.

We can go back to the field, make another report, and do all the work over again, and hold hearings, and when the new report comes up before the committee you will have the same old arguments in opposition to the project that you have today. If the committee, if the Congress wants us to make another report, we will be glad to make it. That is the situation as I see it.

Senator OVERTON. You are satisfied that the report that would be submitted would be along the lines you just stated?

General ROBINS. Absolutely, and if this report can be attacked on account of some of the changed conditions since the report was written I do not see why it cannot be defended on account of other changed conditions.

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

Mr. RANKIN. In a minute. General Robins is one of the ablest men who ever served with the Army engineers; he knows more about this proposition than any other man alive. He is now Assistant Chief of Engineers, on whom the Chief relies for information on this particular proposition.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman in his opening remarks said there were misleading statements made on this floor referring to that project.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman refer to the argument that was presented by me at the time it came up?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman led the House to believe that the Army engineers were not in favor of this project.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman did no such thing at all. The gentleman presented to the House the arguments

and statements made by the engineers themselves in their report. May I ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman know of another single river and harbor project ever presented to this House containing the same reasons for its justification as were contained in the Tombigbee River proposition?

Mr. RANKIN. Those justifications were ample at the time the report was made and have increased by leaps and bounds from that day to this. It is now imperative that this great project be constructed.

General Robins himself, who, as I said, was on the Board which made the report, said before the Senate Commerce Committee the other day that if he were to go back and resurvey this traffic, that would not change the physical facts; and that he would make just about the same report he made then and that he is making now, in which he recommended then, and recommends now the construction of this project.

Mr. DONDERO. And on that report this House on four votes rejected that proposition.

Mr. RANKIN. This House was misled to believe that the Chief of Army Engineers was not for it. That was the inference that the gentleman from Michigan left, that the Chief of Army Engineers was not for it. Here is the Assistant Chief of Army Engineers, who was on the Board that made the report, and he not only recommended it but he recommends it now. Why did not the gentleman from Michigan consult General Robins before he launched his attacks and misled so many of his colleagues to vote against this great project that would mean so much to the people they represent, including the people of Michigan?

Mr. DONDERO. But the Chief of Army Engineers said in his letter—

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the gentleman was swept off his feet by misleading propaganda. Certain paid lobbyists have been coming before the committee ever since I have been on it, trying to mislead the committee on this proposition. Now they are trying to mislead the Senate. The gentleman from Michigan could not do the shippers of his own State of Michigan greater harm than to kill this great project. Every time a towboat with the average barge load carried a load of Michigan goods to the Gulf States it would save from \$2,405 to \$5,448 on every return trip by using this Tombigbee route.

Mr. DONDERO. Then if the Chief of Army Engineers felt as he did when he made that report, that it moved in the direction of speculation in order to justify the proposition—

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, he did not say anything of the kind. He said there were certain questions with reference to the amount of traffic, or the routing of traffic, or questions of policy, that would fall more within the realm of statesmanship. As far as the engineering of the project itself was concerned, it was approved by every man who investigated it; approved

by the Board and a member of that Board—Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins—is now Assistant Chief of Engineers. He approved it then, he approves it today, and recommends its construction.

This project has been approved by the President. General Robins further stated that:

There have been a great many extracts read from House Document 269 particularly having to do with the letters of the Tennessee Valley Authority and of the National Resources Committee. I would like to call attention to the fact that after the President got those letters he said—and it is printed in House Document 269—that he is in favor of this project.

Senator BAILEY. The President?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

One railroad lobbyist undertook to show that the proposed locks would be inadequate, and General Robins made him look ridiculous. Here is the general's reply:

General ROBINS. I happened to be a member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors when this project was under consideration, and this same discussion about the locks took place at the Board meeting for several hours, and the question as to whether these locks would have to be made wide enough to correspond with the locks on the lower Tennessee to take care of the traffic that came down the Mississippi River was gone into at length. The Board agreed that the question of the width of the locks should be left open, and in its report recommended locks approximately 75 by 450 feet clear, and put the word "approximately" in so that the adjustment could be made if the locks had to be widened out.

I would like to explain that after a project like this is authorized by the Congress, the first step that the Department takes is to have made what is called a definite project report. In preparing this report the district engineer goes into all engineering questions over again such as dimensions of the locks and all details and dimensions are perfected and the definite project report sent into the Chief's office for approval before the contract drawings and specifications go out. I think the committee may have no concern about whether, if this waterway is authorized and built, the Corps of Engineers will build the locks of the proper size to take care of the potential commerce.

The other day Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, said to General Robins, with reference to this project, "If it is shown to be a profitable institution I am going to be very likely for it." To which General Robins replied, "Senator, I can show you that in 5 minutes."

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and to the other Members of the House that if this Tennessee-Tombigbee project is finally defeated, it will not only be a great punishment to the people along these streams but it will be a great punishment to the people in Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Kentucky, Mississippi, and in every other State that uses these streams for the transportation of goods, because every toll load of eight barges that goes down has to come back, and when it does, to get back to Cairo, it is

penalized \$2,400, the extra cost of fighting the swift current on the Mississippi. If it goes up the Ohio it costs \$2,800 extra. If it goes from Mobile, the extra cost is more than that. If it is from Birmingham to Cairo it is more than \$5,000.

Here is a statement by Col. P. A. Feringa, of the Army engineers, showing the saving this project would bring to the users of our inland waterways:

COMPARATIVE AVERAGE COSTS OF WATER TRANSPORTATION VIA EXISTING ROUTES AND VIA THE PROPOSED TOMBIGBEE-TENNESSEE WATERWAY

The following computations are based on the average performance of a representative tow of one 1,200-horsepower Diesel towboat and 8 barges of various standard types and dimensions loaded with a typical mixed cargo, at 55 percent load factor, of 3,500 revenue tons, to and from locations previously mentioned:

Over-all cost per hour.....	\$21.25
Average speed of tow in slack water (miles).....	5½
Cost per mile in slack water.....	\$3.86
Average current in Mississippi River below Cairo (miles per hour).....	2½
Cost per mile against 2½-miles-per-hour current.....	\$7.08
Cost per mile with 2½-miles-per-hour current.....	\$2.66
Average lockage time:	
Tennessee-Ohio River section, 30 minutes.....	\$11
Tombigbee section, 45 minutes.....	\$16
Warrior section, 1 hour.....	\$21

New Orleans to Cairo via Mississippi River, 860 miles in slack water (no lockages).....	\$6,273
New Orleans to Cairo via Tombigbee-Tennessee, 908 miles in slack water, \$3,504; 24 lockages, \$364.....	3,868

Saving in cost per trip in favor of Tombigbee route..... 2,405

New Orleans to Paducah via Mississippi River:	
886 miles against current.....	6,273
46 miles in slack water.....	177
2 lockages.....	22
Total.....	6,472

New Orleans to Paducah via Tombigbee-Tennessee:	
862 miles in slack water.....	3,327
22 lockages.....	342
Total.....	3,669

Saving in cost per trip in favor of Tombigbee route..... 2,803

New Orleans to junction of Tombigbee Canal with Tennessee River via Mississippi River:	
886 miles against current.....	6,273
261 miles in slack water.....	1,007
4 lockages.....	44
Total.....	7,324

New Orleans to junction of Tombigbee Canal with Tennessee River via Tombigbee River:	
647 miles in slack water.....	2,497
20 lockages.....	320
Total.....	2,817

Saving per trip in favor of Tombigbee route..... 4,507

Similarly the cost comparisons between other points on the inland waterways via the two routes are as follows:

From--	To--	Via Mississippi River			Via Tombigbee River			Saving per trip via Tombigbee River
		Running	Lockages	Total	Running	Lockages	Total	
Mobile.....	Cairo.....	\$6,875	0	\$6,875	\$3,221	\$364	\$3,585	\$3,290
	Paducah.....	7,052	\$22	7,074	3,044	342	3,386	3,688
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.....	7,882	44	7,926	2,214	320	2,534	5,392
Port Birmingham.....	Cairo.....	8,458	279	8,737	2,710	579	3,289	5,448
	Paducah.....	8,635	301	8,936	2,532	557	3,089	5,847
	Tombigbee junction.....	9,465	323	9,788	1,702	535	2,237	7,551
Demopolis.....	Cairo.....	7,763	32	7,795	2,015	332	2,347	5,448
	Paducah.....	7,940	54	7,994	1,837	310	2,147	5,847
	Tombigbee junction.....	8,770	76	8,846	1,007	288	1,295	7,551
Columbus.....	Cairo.....	8,257	96	8,353	1,521	268	1,789	6,564
	Paducah.....	8,434	118	8,552	1,343	246	1,589	6,963
	Tombigbee junction.....	9,264	140	9,404	513	224	787	8,617
Aberdeen.....	Cairo.....	8,403	128	8,531	1,375	236	1,611	6,920
	Paducah.....	8,580	150	8,730	1,197	214	1,411	7,319
	Tombigbee junction.....	9,410	192	9,602	367	192	559	9,043
Fulton.....	Cairo.....	8,546	224	8,770	1,229	140	1,369	7,401
	Paducah.....	8,726	246	8,972	1,051	118	1,169	7,803
	Tombigbee junction.....	9,556	268	9,824	221	96	317	9,507

It should be noted that the cost tables have been prepared using the best figures presently available. An average current of 2½ miles per hour against upstream traffic has been set up for the Mississippi, this rate of flow being assumed in the tables to compensate for the necessary double-tripping through the cut-offs and crossing from bank to bank to avoid breasting the full force of adverse currents. Arbitrary time factors for lockages of one-half hour for Ohio River type; three-fourths hour for the proposed Tombigbee type; and 1 hour for Warrior type locks have been used in the absence of any definite figures therefor and lack of time for having test runs. No time was available for field check hence the figures were prepared from composite office data.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter addressed to me under date of November 3, 1943, Colonel Feringa also submitted figures to show the

cost per ton-mile of transporting oil by rail, by tankers, by pipe lines, by barges, and by railroads. I quote from that letter as follows:

There is also herewith a table showing comparative costs per ton-mile of tankers, barges, pipe lines, and railroads. These figures were used by the Chief of Engineers in his address at Corpus Christi, Tex., on April 18, 1942, at the dedication of the extension of the Intracoastal Waterway:

	<i>Mills per ton-mile</i>
Rail tank car.....	8.3
Deep-draft tanker.....	1.25
Pipe line.....	3
Barge.....	2-2.5

And here is a table showing the saving in distances this Tennessee-Tombigbee project would provide:

Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway
WATERWAY DISTANCES TO GULF PORTS

From--	To Gulf at New Orleans via Mississippi River	To Gulf at Mobile via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings	
			Miles	Percent
Minneapolis-St. Paul.....	1,718	1,610	108	6
Chicago.....	1,398	1,290	108	7½
St. Louis.....	1,043	935	108	10
Cairo.....	660	752	108	12½
Hickman.....	824	788	36	4
Pittsburgh.....	1,841	1,641	200	11
Cincinnati.....	1,379	1,179	200	14½
Louisville.....	1,236	1,036	200	16
Paducah.....	606	706	200	22
Chattanooga.....	1,370	740	630	46
Wilson Dam.....	1,165	535	630	54
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal.....	1,121	491	630	56.2

DISTANCES VIA TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY VERSUS EXISTING WATER ROUTES

From--	To--	Distance via present waterways	Distance via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings in miles via Tennessee-Tombigbee	
				Miles	Percent
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal.....	Fulton, Miss.....	1,711	57	1,654	96.7
Do.....	Aberdeen, Miss.....	1,673	95	1,578	94.3
Do.....	Columbus, Miss.....	1,635	133	1,502	91.9
Do.....	Demopolis, Ala.....	1,507	261	1,246	82.7
Do.....	Birmingham, Ala.....	1,687	441	1,246	73.9

Can you imagine a project by which you could accomplish greater savings in time, distance, and transportation costs with so much ease and so little expense?

But the opposition has attempted to tell you that this project would not aid national defense; when as a matter of

fact the Tennessee Valley is producing more war materials than any similar area in America, and this new waterway is badly needed to get the raw materials in and the finished products out.

Here is what General Robins has to say on that subject:

Representative RANKIN. May I ask him a question, Mr. Chairman?

Senator OVERTON. Very well.

Representative RANKIN. On this question of national defense, they have eliminated any benefit for national defense. As a matter of fact, a great deal of our defense work is being done in the Tennessee Valley area, is it not, on the Tennessee River?

General ROBINS. That is right, quite true. Unquestionably if that waterway were in operation today it would be of tremendous value for national defense, but you cannot put a money value on it any more than you can put a value on winning the war.

Representative RANKIN. If we should get into a war in the future, in addition to furnishing a slack waterway for up-bound traffic, should the Mississippi River be closed, this would furnish us an outlet to the sea, would it not?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

Representative RANKIN. And moreover, one that is so protected that it could scarcely be attacked from the sea?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

They talk about there being no increases in defense activities in that area. Do you know that that very book to which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] referred a while ago says that the power used for industries in this war is as great if not greater in the Tennessee Valley area than it is in either Pittsburgh or Boston? Vast amounts of war material are being produced there, and yet they are bottled up for want of this outlet to the sea.

General Robins has shown that this project is not only feasible but that it is necessary to meet the demands of the traffic in that area.

No one has ever questioned its feasibility, but the opposition has criticized and misrepresented it on the grounds of its necessity and its economic justification. General Robins has completely answered those criticisms. He has also shown that it is necessary from a standpoint of national defense, not only now but throughout the generations that are to come. Even if conditions had not changed since this report was made, this project would be more than justified. But conditions have changed, they have greatly changed, and those changes have made the construction of this project more imperative.

Vast volumes of war materials are now being produced along the Tennessee River, and will be even after this war comes to an end. Every intelligent man knows that we must maintain an air force second to none when this war is over, and the materials from which those planes are built are manufactured in the Tennessee Valley. The aluminum from which the planes are manufactured is made there, and the bauxite, the raw material from which that aluminum is made, is shipped in. That bauxite comes from the south, largely from Haiti and South America. Large volumes of it would all pass through this inland waterway, and save this country untold millions of dollars in the years to come.

Besides, one of the greatest oil fields in the world has just been brought in on the lower Tombigbee—on both sides of the river. One well was brought in in southeast Mississippi, the other day, just a few miles from this stream, that pro-

duces 1,000 barrels of oil a day. It is said to be the largest oil well ever brought in east of the Mississippi River.

All these changed conditions have increased the necessity for this great project that would save the American people enough in transportation costs to pay for its construction in a few years.

It has been pointed out by the Army Engineers that no project of this kind that has ever been surveyed, investigated, and approved as this one has, but that it has finally been constructed. This one is just as sure to come as the night follows the day. It should be approved now in order that its benefits may be realized at the earliest possible moment.

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

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that this is a bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and other purposes. It had been my intention to introduce an amendment to provide relief from damage caused by floods from Lake Erie in the Howard Farms area. Three floods have left over 300 people homeless. I have talked to the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, however, for whom I have the most profound respect, and will not offer that amendment at this time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RAMEY. I shall be most happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to say that the gentleman has been most fair and most cooperative. This project was not reported by the Chief of Engineers under any authorization survey. The gentleman from Ohio on yesterday spoke with respect to the project. He called the committee's attention to the fact that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had introduced a bill and that a report had been made on that bill and that there were hearings in the Senate.

Mr. RAMEY. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I say to the gentleman now as I said to him then that in as much as we have had no recommendation from the Chief of Engineers and no report, yet, if there is a favorable report on the project and it is included in this bill in the other body I think the conferees would be authorized to agree to its being included in the bill. In fact, I think we might make that agreement based on the assumption that there is a favorable report from the Chief of Engineers.

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

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand it, what the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi says amounts to this, that if the gentleman does not press for his amendment now, if Senator TAFT's amendment is placed in this bill in the Senate, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi will not interpose any opposition to the matter in conference.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentle-

man from Mississippi meant exactly what he said and said exactly what he meant, that if there was a favorable report on that bill and if it was included by the other body in the bill that it would occur to me—and I said that to the gentleman previously—that the conferees would be authorized in agreeing to its remaining in the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman gives us that assurance I know he will do exactly that. The point I am trying to lead to is this: That if that is done there should be no reason for the conference committee to come back and say: "We kept something out that was exactly similar to that." There will be nothing like that to interfere.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; on the contrary I stated to the gentleman and to other Members similarly situated that if those projects were recommended the other body would have the right to include them in the bill and then they could be included by the conferees.

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the chairman of the committee for his consideration and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House is a very important one to many sections of the country, especially mine; but right now, Mr. Chairman, I am more interested in getting those dikes and levees on the Missouri River repaired. Every year for the past several years we have had floods on the Missouri River which have torn out the dikes and levees and have flooded many thousands of acres of rich soil and farm land. Right now much land cannot be put into crops because it is covered with water. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he is able to give us a statement as to just when we can expect this emergency flood-control-authorization bill to come before the Congress so we can get some action and get repaired those dikes that are now out along the rivers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Understanding that the gentleman directs his inquiry to me, I restate as I have repeatedly stated that we have requested the Chief of Engineers to submit recommendations as to the amounts required for emergency repairs of existing flood-control works damaged or destroyed by floods in the midcontinental area.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi indicate about when we may expect the bill to come before the House?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say this—and without meaning to be presumptuous—I am a member of several committees. I do not know of any committee that has been more prompt in dealing with these emergency matters, giving them prompt attention and reporting on them than the Committee on Flood Control. I trust that the policy that has obtained in the past will obtain in the future.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, up to date but little money has been spent on the Missouri River as compared with the large rivers

of the Nation and I am happy to support a bill which will give us some relief in that very large area of the Missouri River Basin. As I said before, the floods have been devastating and have kept many thousands of acres of the finest land that lies out of doors out of cultivation. The loss has been so great to many of those people along the river that it has been almost unbearable. So I know I voice the sentiment of the people of my district when I say now that some relief is in sight by the passage of this bill. The folks will be very pleased and happy to know that the Congress of the United States has finally gotten around to doing something of a permanent nature instead of just handing out little piecemeals to the people who live along the Missouri River.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I know of no further debate and no further amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, 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. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 517, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Flood Control.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole awhile ago and to include therein some excerpts from the record of testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee.

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

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 538), as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, the 31st day of May 1944, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials, under the provisions of clause 40-A of rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave for 60 legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the life, character, and public service of the deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned: And he shall further

Resolved, That the necessary expenses connected with the memorial services herein authorized shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Memorials and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Governor O'Connor at the opening of the Pulaski Highway in Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM and Mr. SHAFER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement on an expression on socialized medicine.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of State Control Versus Federal Control of Education of Veterans.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, May 17 will be the anniversary of the independence of the Norway that we knew before the war. I ask unanimous consent that on that day after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House on that subject for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the extension of the remarks I made in committee this afternoon I may include a letter from myself to the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper articles and other excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Honorable C. P. Newton, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Hugh D. Hart.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I do not desire to take this time, but I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order granted me for this afternoon. I covered the subject during debate on the bill just passed and therefore I yield back my special order.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNDER THE BANNER OF THE
CONSTITUTION

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the invasion on the western front and before the blood of our boys is spilled on foreign soil, I want to call the attention of the American people to the dastardly campaign that has proceeded for many years to gradually kill the faith of our people in their Constitution and to spell America with a little "a." I want to say here and now that this dastardly campaign will not succeed because the American people are awakening to the true danger that confronts them.

Behind all of this is the lowest brand of politics that has ever been inflicted upon the best people that have ever lived on this earth. The methods used are not American; they are European and Asiatic. Before it is too late, I am going to speak plainly and call a spade a spade. It would be criminal negligence to do less.

At the outset, I want to challenge the myth that has been built up around the personality of one man. This myth has been developed to such an extent that there are no longer two major political parties in the United States. Today we are approaching a great national election for President of the United States and we find the contest to be between one man, on the one side, and the Republican Party on the other side. The followers of the one man have long ceased to be the historic Democratic Party. Respect for the two-party system died in the United States when this one man accepted the nomination for a third term and broke off sharply and intentionally with our previous American tradition honored by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson. Millions of Americans were shocked by this brazen departure from the time-honored traditions of a free people. Now comes this same one man seeking a fourth term and this time forsaking our great American traditions and openly flouting the Constitution of the United States. Every manner of subjection and intimidation are being employed until there are few left in the United States who have the courage to stand up and be counted in the fight for American independence and the Constitution of the United States.

There must be some excuse for shedding the blood of our boys. Surely, there must be some object attainable for their sacrifice. They are dying to uphold the American Constitution. They are dying to keep America free as we Americans have learned to know freedom. They are dying in defense of the

great free system which has made this the most prosperous Nation in the world, where our people enjoy the highest standard of living that the world has ever seen. Why has some European or Asiatic foreign philosophy penetrated into our midst? Did the doctrine of one world spring from the soil of free America? Have Americans ever been a dependent people?

Mr. Speaker, when the Constitution of the United States was adopted in 1787, no one questioned the independence of the new Nation. Only a few years before, the Declaration of Independence of 1776 was flung as a challenge to the world from the American Colonies.

What has happened to our people to make it necessary to fight once again for that independence? Who are the betrayers of the men of 1776? What foreignisms have penetrated into the very fabric of our free people?

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

Mr. DAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. May I inquire of the gentleman just what foreignisms he is talking about?

Mr. DAY. I am talking about the foreign "isms" such as communism and such kindred types, including class consciousness that is growing here in America. I also call into question this alignment that is being built up in various parts of the country where we find that under the guise of being Democrats it is almost becoming a class conflict.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman object to the United States alignment with Russia for the crushing of a common foe?

Mr. DAY. Not at all, but I object to the injection of communism on this soil.

Mr. GORE. Who is interjecting communism here? Who in a responsible position is injecting communism in this soil?

Mr. DAY. The Communist Party and the fellow travelers.

Mr. GORE. Is that all the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. DAY. Yes; that is what I am talking about, and I am very familiar with it.

Mr. GORE. They are a very small minority party. If that is the bugaboo that the gentleman sees, I fear his alarm is unfounded.

Mr. DAY. No; it is growing in proportions. In the part of the country I come from it has become very serious. We have had a taste of it and it has gotten to the point now where we have to revise fundamental Americanism in order to check this growth.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. What constitutional rights have been taken away from the gentleman or any other American citizen?

Mr. DAY. From me?

Mr. McCORMACK. From any American. What constitutional rights have been taken away from any American?

Mr. DAY. A great many.

Mr. McCORMACK. Name them. Give us a bill of particulars.

Mr. DAY. Well, I could do that if I had time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has 30 minutes. I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 20 minutes longer if he wants to give a bill of particulars.

Mr. DAY. I will be glad to do that when I conclude my remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman ought to give his bill of particulars now.

Mr. DAY. I do not have to do that now.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is propagandizing, making a general statement.

Mr. DAY. I will answer the gentleman when I finish my remarks in detail.

Why should these men in high places apologize for our American birthright?

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. What men in high places have apologized for our American birthright? I would like to know that. I have not heard of them.

Mr. DAY. Why do men in high places apologize for our American birthright and embrace a foreign doctrine known as One World?

Mr. GORE. The gentleman is asking the question for its innuendo and effect. I would like to know from him what men in high authority have apologized for their American birthright.

Mr. DAY. I will answer that question later. Please do not interrupt me again at this point. I will be ready for the gentleman as long as he wants to go.

What has happened to our people that they are urged to adopt the two-flag system instead of honoring Old Glory? What has become of the Star-Spangled Banner?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, who is urging us to adopt a two-flag system?

Mr. DAY. I refuse to be interrupted at this point.

The extent to which the breeding of the foreign philosophy of One World has grown on American soil was graphically brought to my attention the other day, when the chairman of the symbol program subcommittee of the Four Freedoms Committee, United States of America division, came to my office and handed me a pamphlet depicting the United Nations flag of "four freedoms," consisting of four red bars on a field of white. In this pamphlet it is stated as follows:

Since this flag pays honor to, and represents the flags of your country's allies and friends, it is accorded all the respect due the individual nation's flags. Therefore a good rule to follow is to respect and treat this flag as you would your own.

We have only one flag in the United States, and this is the Stars and Stripes. I quote the following from the United States Code, 1940 edition, title 4, section 1:

The flag of the United States shall be 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; and the union of the flag shall be 48 stars, white in a blue field.

Section 3 of this same title protects our flag from any disrespect or mutilation and makes it a penal offense for anyone in the District of Columbia to publicly "mutilate, deface, defile or defy, trample upon, or cast contempt, either by word or act, upon any such flag."

I hereby emphatically denounce the two-flag system which calls for honoring of this so-called "four freedoms" flag on an equal basis with the Stars and Stripes. The display of this flag along with Old Glory casts contempt on our national emblem. We cannot have a divided allegiance. This Nation cannot endure half national and half international. As a young man sitting in the gallery of the United States Senate, I recall the stirring words of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, spoken on August 12, 1919, when he said:

I am anxious as any human being can be to have the United States render every possible service to the civilization and the peace of mankind, but I am certain we can do it best by not putting ourselves in leading strings or subjecting our policies and our sovereignty to other nations. The independence of the United States is not only more precious to ourselves but to the world than any single possession. Look at the United States today. We have made mistakes in the past. We have had shortcomings. We shall make mistakes in the future and fall short of our own best hopes. But nonetheless is there any country today on the face of the earth which can compare with this in ordered liberty, in peace, and in the largest freedom? I feel that I can say this without being accused of undue boastfulness, for it is the simple fact, and in making this treaty and taking on these obligations all that we do is in a spirit of unselfishness and in a desire for the good of mankind. But it is well to remember that we are dealing with nations every one of which has a direct individual interest to serve, and there is grave danger in an unshared idealism. Contrast the United States with any country on the face of the earth today and ask yourself whether the situation of the United States is not the best to be found. I will go as far as anyone in world service, but the first step to world service is the maintenance of the United States. You may call me selfish, if you will, conservative, or reactionary, or use any other harsh adjective you see fit to apply, but an American I was born, an American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but an American, and I must think of the United States first, and when I think of the United States first in an arrangement like this I am thinking of what is best for the world, for if the United States falls the best hopes of mankind will fall with it. I have never had but one allegiance—I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a league, internationalism, illustrated by the Bolshevik and by the men to whom all countries are alike provided they can make money out of them, is to me repulsive. National I must remain, and in that way I like all other Americans can render the amplest service to the world. The United States is the world's best hope, but if you fetter her in the interests and quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence. Leave her to march freely through the centuries to come as in the years that have gone—strong, generous, and confident—she has nobly served mankind. Beware how you trifle with your marvelous inheritance, this great land of ordered liberty, for if we stum-

ble and fall freedom and civilization everywhere will go down in ruin.

Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of O. W. I.'s Handbook of the United States of America, sent to me by Elmer Davis, Director. He states that—

The handbook gives a factual picture of the United States Government as it is, not as it was 10 years ago or may be 10 years from now.

Under the heading of "Historic American speeches and documents" we find the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter but only the preamble of the Constitution of the United States? What has become of the Constitution? Are we justified in the conclusion that in the last 10 years the Constitution has become so outmoded that it can no longer be included in a list of historic American documents? Right here we can place our finger on what has happened to the people of the United States. The New Deal ignores the Constitution. This handbook, while omitting the Constitution of the United States, includes the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Later on in this discussion I shall examine the last two mentioned historic speeches and documents to see if they are entitled to be included when the Constitution of the United States is left out.

What are the "four freedoms" and how have they stood the test of time? On January 6, 1941, the President in his message to the Congress outlined the "four freedoms" with the following statement:

This is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation.

Let us see. As outlined by the President, in his own words, he thus defines the "four freedoms":

The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

This has become entirely misleading. We must now add "except in Poland, Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and the Soviet Union."

The President thus outlines the second freedom:

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

Subsequent events revealing the truth have amended this, the second freedom, by adding the words, "except the Soviet Union and those nations which worship other gods than the God known to our Christian faith."

The President thus defines the third freedom:

The third freedom is from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understanding which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

If this be carried out literally, there would never be freedom from want in the United States, for we are already facing an indebtedness of over \$300,000,000,000, and have reached the limit of taxation. Under these conditions we dare not even consider a world W. P. A. to be financed by the taxpayer of the United States.

The President sketches the fourth freedom in these words:

The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

Judging by recent events and speaking in United States of America terms, this will be a difficult task, because there is more fear in this country at this hour than we have ever known before. If this means a world police force, possessing the only remaining armaments, count the United States out, because, under our Constitution there is no authority to place a world army or world navy in authority supreme over the Army and Navy which Congress must provide for the defense of our people under the plain provisions of the Constitution.

The O. W. I. handbook includes the Atlantic Charter as one of the historic American speeches and documents. It, too, must be amended from the original statement issued by President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill after their conference at sea. The first principle enunciated by them in their own words is as follows:

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

We now know that this must be further clarified by a change of position on the part of one Winston Churchill so that it would now read: "except Britain shall have Hong Kong, Singapore, north Africa and the Dutch East Indies."

The second principle of the Atlantic Charter was thus defined on that memorable day in August 1941:

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;

But these great Anglo-Saxon leaders had failed to reckon with a certain dictator by the name of Josef Stalin. This second principle must now be amended by adding these words: "But this does not mean that the Soviet Union shall not ravish Poland, choke the life out of Finland and enslave the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia."

And what a change was to come over the third principle of the Atlantic Charter which these great statesmen so fervently expressed in these words:

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Unkind fate has sadly altered this third principle. There must be appended to it the following: "Provided, however, That such states as shall be first occupied by the Soviet Union can bid farewell to free elections, especially, Hungary, the Balkan states and even Italy."

Weighing the future of the United States, how can any responsible Senator or Representative proclaim that this Nation will abide by the decision of any foreign council as to when the American people shall go to war? The American Constitution provides that Congress alone can declare war. How could any constitutional process require Congress

to declare war just because a foreign council says that it must? We cannot yield our sovereignty without overthrowing the Constitution. Is it to be done by ignoring the Constitution? Are we ready for anarchy?

Some Senators and Representatives have generously stated that they would be willing to surrender some part of our sovereignty so that the mandate of the foreign council would be obligatory. This may be awfully nice of them to do this. The hitch is that they have no such power to abdicate and if they did so, they could be impeached. Why not be honest with the American people? Who covets the doubtful reputation of big-hearted internationalism at the expense of their own American people whom they were elected to represent?

There is no constitutional method or constitutional process by which we can yield our American independence or surrender our national sovereignty. Neither can we constitutionally place any world army or world navy or world police force in supreme authority over the Army and Navy which under the Constitution it is the duty of Congress to provide for the defense of the American people. What is the use of twisting words and indulging in shallow phrases about international obligations when every honest and intelligent Senator and Representative knows that so long as the Constitution of the United States exists in its present form, this Nation cannot be lawfully involved or entangled in any manner which will hinder or cripple the express powers of the Congress set forth in the Constitution of the United States?

In the Connally resolution, adopted by the United States Senate, it is stated:

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The great danger to the Republic in this sort of involvement is that it keeps the American people from getting down to the practical business of looking after our own problems. The conception outlined is probably no more than the traditional cooperation of the United States to secure peace and advance the cause of humanity. Our history is replete with such instances. Under the American Constitution no real loss of sovereignty is possible. The inclusion of the words "constitutional processes" brings in the good old Constitution and the American people and takes out the Roosevelt-Willkie One World. I repeat, the danger lies in the fact that this sort of international preoccupation will keep us from doing our duty in solving the vital problems facing us on the home front after the war is over. We have a very serious class conflict well on the way and millions will soon be crying for good jobs. It would be foolish to spend too much time with One World talk.

The latest development has clarified the situation still more. We have wit-

nessed the Stalin invitation to Father Orlenskis, a Communist fellow traveler, and the righteous indignation of Americans of Polish descent. We dare not even contemplate further divisions of this sort among our people by the intrusion of issues that should never be thrust into our midst. We must keep our minds free to solve America's vital problems that threaten our existence as a Nation of free people.

We cannot tolerate a divided allegiance to keep us from this task. Our cooperation with other nations must be limited by this fact. At all costs, we must preserve American independence and the sovereignty of the United States. To make this doubly certain and to prevent temptation seizing those who ought to know better, I am offering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the following words:

SECTION 1. Neither the President nor the Congress shall have power to surrender the independence of the United States, nor any part of their sovereignty.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The United States has never failed to cooperate with other nations to obtain peace and to advance the cause of humanity anywhere in the world. I appreciate the apprehension and the anxiety of those who fear World War No. 3. To my mind the surest way to become involved in World War No. 3 is to weaken the devotion which is owed by every American citizen to the Constitution of the United States and our beloved Republic. This allegiance has already been weakened to a dangerous point. If our responsible leaders further weaken this devotion and allegiance by dubious internationalistic twistings of the Constitution, the future indignation of the people will be visited upon them and it will be most emphatic.

I have lived many years in this great Republic and came to Washington as a boy of 14, upon the Inaugural Special from Canton, Ohio, with the newly elected President McKinley. My father was his Secretary of State during the Spanish-American War and I have seen men and women appear upon the national scene in one administration and another for a period of over 40 years. My father was appointed Justice of the United States Supreme Court by President Theodore Roosevelt and I served as confidential secretary to Chief Justice Melville Weston Fuller, appointed by Grover Cleveland. I yield to no man in my devotion to and understanding of the Constitution of the United States. It has been a part of my fiber every day of my life and will so continue until the end.

With all due respect to those who favor international entanglements and the diluting of our American independence, I want to say to you, go slow, you are trifling with the only bond of allegiance that holds the diverse people of America together. We are already facing serious class conflict. And there are foreign philosophies extant among our people. Today, they are still all Americans.

What would it profit us to haul down the Stars and Stripes and run up the flag of the "four freedoms" if it kills hope in the breast of the Americans of today and tomorrow, who will come to visit the Capital? How can you ever explain to them what has become of the Stars and Stripes, when you take them to Mount Vernon, Monticello, or Arlington? Who would have the nerve to walk through Statuary Hall and look upon the faces of the great Americans who stand there in their silent presence? Who could ever again ascend the Washington Monument or visit the beautiful memorials to the immortal Lincoln and Jefferson?

Let it never be said that the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress did this to America. Let us be faithful to the words of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge when he said:

I have never had but one allegiance—I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a league.

Today the temple stands. Crowds are milling about, false and foreign sounding words are heard in the market place. Where is the faith? Men are waiting for leadership, for a rallying point. It is here—under the banner of the Constitution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, unless there are other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders but the Chair will submit the request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was rather interested to see if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] was going to comply with the statement he made that he would give a bill of particulars as to what constitutional rights have been taken away from any person and also answer the question which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is now in the chair, asked him. I am very sorry that the gentleman from Illinois has made some portions of the speech which he has just delivered. In connection with the future conduct of our country after this war is over, he is entitled to his opinion the same as anyone else, and even where he and I might disagree, I respect his views in disagreement the same as I respect any other person's views. But outside of that, the import of the gentleman's speech, or the result of it, is to tend to bring about misunderstanding and division among our people. Our country is at war and when a nation is at war, its obligation is to do all the things necessary to preserve it. We are faced with the law of self-preservation, politely speaking, and in the plain language of the day, we are faced with the law of the jungle, and nations, like individuals, when faced with the law of the jungle or the law of self-preservation, must respond to the exigencies and necessities of the dangers that confront them, and in the case of a nation, of the era that confronts them.

Mr. DAY. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him at this point?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, go ahead, yes.

Mr. DAY. When you say we are living under the law of the jungle, does that mean the law of the Constitution has been abandoned?

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I say that?

Mr. DAY. That is the way I interpreted it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That just shows how much the gentleman followed what I said. It just shows how irresponsible the gentleman's reasoning is. I said we are responding to the law of the jungle. I did not say we are living under the law of the jungle.

Mr. DAY. Well, perhaps that accounts for some of these departures.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thing about the gentleman from Illinois is that he was wrong before Pearl Harbor and never had the courage to admit he was wrong and never got on the right premise since. I have no argument with a man who honestly disagrees and then gets back on the right course, but the gentleman, since our country entered the war, has never changed his course of conduct. My remarks are confined to the gentleman from Illinois. I want no other Members of the House to think, even remotely, that my remarks have any application to them. The gentleman says, "As one man against the Republican Party." Why, gentlemen, that is the argument of a dictator. That is the argument of one who has a dictatorial state of mind. I am not going to call names—"Hitlerites"—and all of that. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the majority of the American people voted for President Roosevelt and whoever is the next President—

Mr. DAY. Are you in favor of a fourth term?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, is that not a brilliant contribution?

Mr. DAY. Will you answer the question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Whoever is the next President, and I will answer your question in a moment, the gentleman is not going to divert me—whoever is the next President has to receive a majority of the votes of the American people who vote next fall. Now in answer to the gentleman's question let me say this, and I say it with all due respect to those who disagree, and I say it impersonally, that in my opinion the man best qualified to lead our country during the trying days ahead, to more quickly bring about the winning of the war and the winning of the peace, is Franklin Delano Roosevelt. That answers your question. You brought it in. I never intended to bring it up. You brought it up.

Mr. DAY. That clarifies that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; it clarifies your mind, I hope.

Now the gentleman says, "I am an American." Does the gentleman mean to imply by that that nobody else in the United States is an American but the gentleman from Illinois? The gentleman from Illinois has made some rather rash statements, not only today but in the past. He talks about owing alle-

giance to one flag. Does the gentleman think anybody else does not owe allegiance to the same flag? He talks about his dear father, who was a great man. We have to stand on our own feet. I cannot stand on the reputation of my forebears. I have to stand on what I have made of myself.

Mr. DAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman brought his father's name in. I respect his father.

Mr. DAY. Will the gentleman yield? I stand here—

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no; I do not yield for a speech. Do you want to ask a question?

Mr. DAY. Well, you referred to my comments about my father. I want to say something—

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not yield for that.

Mr. DAY. I stand here—

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not yield for that.

Mr. DAY. I did not think you would.

Mr. McCORMACK. I respect the gentleman's father, but I do not rely upon my forebears to try to strengthen my position. I do not rely upon my forebears to try and strengthen a weak position that I have adopted.

Mr. DAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. There is no use yielding to the gentleman from Illinois, because he makes no contribution. Now, on the question of nationalism, he has a right to be a nationalist. I do not know what a nationalist is. And what is more, I do not know what internationalism is, whatever the gentleman has in mind. But one thing is certain, if I am to infer correctly from what the gentleman from Illinois says, he wants nothing done after this war is over to try and save the next generation of youth, most of whom are unborn today, from undergoing the horrors and rigors and destructiveness of modern warfare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion that if we had visionary and courageous leadership a little over 20 years ago, the young men who are wearing the uniform today would be living a normal, peaceful life. I served in the last war. Two brothers served in the last war. Four and a half million others did. Eleven million are in this war. Ninety-five percent of the youth wearing the uniform today were not born on Armistice Day 1918. Oh, yes; they talked about the loss of sovereignty and our markets being flooded by products of cheap labor, and they discussed everything, but they failed to discuss one thing. What about the next generation? I see the children of today. Twenty or twenty-five years pass and they are grown up. They are our own flesh and blood. Twenty-odd years ago we fought in a war to end wars. Then when Wood-

row Wilson said unless something was done there would be another war, the people did not believe in him and in what he said. Twenty years have passed and we are in another war. Ninety-five percent of these youngsters wearing the uniform were not born on Armistice Day 1918. Unless something is done, unless the United States takes its position as a leader among the nations of the world in a cooperative effort, based upon national interest and in response to the moral law to do something to try to avert a future war, 20 or 25 or 30 years from now the next generation will be engaged in another global war. Is it wrong for some of us to try to stop that? I respect the gentleman's views if he thinks that is wrong.

The gentleman has a right to entertain his views, but if some of us entertain different views, I do not think the gentleman has any right to characterize such persons by calling them names. I respect the gentleman's views in disagreement. But all I know is that in my time we have had two world wars, and that mankind is on a journey of war. Unless something is done by men and women of reason and good will to try to stop that journey of war, the next generation, yet unborn—only tomorrow as far as generations are concerned—will be wearing the uniform, engaged in another war, and they will be the children of girls and boys of today, grandchildren of mothers and fathers who have young men wearing the uniform in this war.

The gentleman speaks about internationalism. I do not call that internationalism. Nobody loves America better than I do. I do not think I have a monopoly on that love. I think a hundred and thirty-three million other Americans, a vast majority of them, love America. Just because some people do not agree with me, I do not believe in calling them names. They are good Americans, the same as I am. Nobody impugns the patriotism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY]. I will defend the gentleman against anyone who undertook to impugn his patriotism. But I certainly challenge his judgment, because I know this much, that if before Pearl Harbor his judgment had prevailed in this body and in the Congress of the United States, when Pearl Harbor happened we would have had to beg for peace, and the probabilities are there would have been no United States of America today.

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

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am the son of a very distinguished sire. I have referred to my father here today because of the affection that I bear for him, and because I am proud to be his son. But, when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] speaks about standing on your own feet, may I recall to him that I represent in this body, as Congressman at Large, the great

State of Illinois, with approximately 8,000,000 people; that I have been nominated by the Republican Party in 4 consecutive State-wide campaigns. I have been twice elected to this body, and only on last April, I won the nomination by my largest plurality, over 250,000 more than my opponent.

Maybe I do not stand on my own feet, but if you do not call that feet, what do you call it?

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE T. V. A. AND THE PUBLIC

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks, like other Members of the House from every section of the country, I have listened with the keenest interest to the speeches of those Members here who represent the great region served by T. V. A.

It is a stirring experience to hear the catalog of benefits the people have enjoyed because the resources of their river and their valley have been developed by the T. V. A. No believer in true democratic principles could stand unmoved before the demonstration of the way in which the management of T. V. A. has won the people's full support. All the people are fighting today to protect the T. V. A. from attack. It is proof enough for me that this great Government program is really meeting the people's needs. It proves that T. V. A. is doing the basic job with which it was entrusted by the Congress.

This is no time to forget the fundamental purpose T. V. A. was created by the Congress to accomplish. All its authorized activities had a single objective. They were to benefit the people. The building of the great multipurpose dams which now control the Tennessee was a spectacular engineering undertaking, but this demonstration of technical brilliance was not an end in itself. The large investment of public funds was authorized in order that the well-being of the people should be advanced. In the same way, the power system created as one function of this great program of unified development was not established just to show that great dams could be designed and operated to serve three purposes together, although that is an exceedingly important demonstration at this moment and the doubting Thomases have been proved in error.

They said that floods could never be controlled by multipurpose structures

which at the same time would create a channel for navigation and provide great quantities of power for the people. That is what they said a few years ago. But the valley of the Tennessee in a year of heavy rainfall is entirely safe today, while floods sweep down through other valleys. And at the same time transmission lines crisscross the countryside carrying power from the force of the water the dams hold back. In this river valley the people are safe today. As other river valleys are made safe for men to live in, this pioneering experience on the Tennessee will be immensely valuable. But the T. V. A. plan of river control was not established just to make that point.

The power system of T. V. A. was not established simply to prove that a great public operation could be successful; that men working for their Government could be just as efficient, just as resourceful, and as able as the best men employed by the most efficient private enterprises; or to prove that a public system could be both self-supporting and self-liquidating. I do not mean to underestimate the importance of the demonstration T. V. A. has given on that point either. It is immensely heartening to learn in detail how successful, in the ordinary business sense, this public enterprise has been. By all such standards T. V. A. is a success; but the final test is whether all these triumphs of managers and technicians have met the needs of the people. That they have, abundantly, is the greatest demonstration of all the works of T. V. A.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I want to say to the gentleman from Washington that it certainly is very heartening to us Representatives from the Tennessee Valley to see a gentleman whose district I believe is farthest from the Tennessee Valley of any in the United States rise on the floor of the House and speak on behalf of this great project in the Tennessee Valley. It certainly shows that Members from all parts of the United States appreciate the work the Tennessee Valley Authority has done in the war effort and the contribution it is making to our national economy.

I have had the privilege of knowing ever since the gentleman has been here of his great interest in public power programs of this kind because I have visited with the gentleman in his home State of Washington and have seen Grand Coulee and Bonneville. I know the interest of the gentleman and of the people who live in his district and in his State in this kind of project and of the interest they have in Washington in seeing T. V. A. successful because it has a direct bearing on the success and the future development of similar projects in the gentleman's own State.

I know I speak for the other Representatives from the valley in expressing appreciation for the great interest the gentleman has in the T. V. A. and in defeating these amendments which would hamstring and curtail its operations.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman for his kind statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the distinguished gentleman from Washington but I have been wondering just what if anything this had to do with his district.

I compliment the gentleman for looking at many of these questions not from a State's point of view, although he has had plenty of experience with public power in Washington, but looking at factors such as T. V. A. from the viewpoint of national need. I think we owe the gentleman a good deal of thanks for taking the trouble to make this contribution this afternoon on the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. I cannot refrain from likewise expressing my appreciation for the gentleman's effort and his broad-minded viewpoint. I should like to say to the gentleman from Montana that the residents of the State of Washington and of every State have a direct interest in the outcome of this question, because the people as a whole have invested approximately \$750,000,000 in the T. V. A. It is a great going business owned by the people of the Nation. The question involved now is the question of efficient operation, continued efficient operation. With continued efficient operation the T. V. A. will pay back to the people of the United States that which they have invested and in addition bring about great national benefit.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to concur with what the gentleman from Tennessee has already said, but the point I was trying to get over was that the gentleman from Washington was really doing a statesmanlike thing in discussing something which did not apply to his district.

Mr. GORE. As he has consistently done since he has been a Member of this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is true. I know as far as the T. V. A. is concerned the people of the entire country pay for it and the people of the entire country are going to get benefit out of it.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman from Montana. I believe that all of us are trying to be less provincial on economic matters. I realize that the future of T. V. A. is very vital to my country, because we have, as I say, two large hydroelectric power projects, one at Bonneville and one at Grand Coulee, and in my opinion anything that jeopardizes T. V. A. will eventually jeopardize the great power projects in the Pacific Northwest to which I shall refer a little later.

Everyone of us has a responsibility to know just how this has happened. It did not happen by magic. This outpouring of public protest against certain proposals which would change the T. V. A. would never have occurred unless the people knew the answer. The people of the Valley know what the McKellar amendments would do. They would deprive the T. V. A. of the essential tools which permit its power operations to be used as an instrument for their benefit. They would destroy T. V. A.'s managerial efficiency. Their adoption would make operating conditions impossible. They threaten repayment to the taxpayers of the public investment. Those results have never been disputed by any responsible person. But I prefer to put the issue in different terms. The adoption of the McKellar amendments would prevent the T. V. A. from meeting the needs of all the people in the operation of this public power system.

No wonder this struggle has attracted Nation-wide attention. This is not a question of the wisdom of public versus private power developments. For this area that issue was settled by the people years ago through their representatives in Congress, in State and local legislative bodies. This is not just a technical question of financing. You do not find businessmen and farmers and labor groups excited about the details of keeping books, accounting for funds, or the difficulties of preparing estimates of power expenditures in advance. You do not find editorials from coast to coast in financial papers and religious journals unless the issue is deeper than a method of financing. People do not go all out for a revolving fund unless that revolving fund is a symbol of something fundamental. The country is not fooled. They know that if the McKellar amendments were adopted, the ultimate purpose of the T. V. A. power system would be jeopardized. There would be an ever-present danger that it would no longer serve the needs of all the people, that some day it might be run to benefit a special group.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON of Texas). Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I cannot let this hour go by without joining my other colleagues from Tennessee in expressing my appreciation for the very fine logical argument being made by the distinguished gentleman from Washington. I think the summation he is just now giving and perhaps will continue to give to some degree of the evil effects of these amendments, if adopted, is one of the finest I have heard, and I certainly appreciate the manner in which the gentleman is bringing it to the attention of the House.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

I have a particular interest in this question beyond the interest of every citizen to see an honest and efficient governmental agency continued. I have an

interest beyond the interest of every Member of Congress to see that policies adopted by the Congress are executed faithfully, and that the money invested in this great enterprise by the taxpayers who are our constituents is ultimately paid back. I want to be counted with Members from the T. V. A. area because some day the welfare of the people of my district may be threatened just as the well-being of the people of the Southeast is in danger today.

I have the honor to represent a district in an area which will some day be served by power generated at great dams constructed by public funds like the dams in the Tennessee Valley. Today almost all the power from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams is going into war production. The problems of the Bonneville Power Administration, the marketing agency for power from both these structures, are not like the problems of T. V. A. The supply of power which they deliver is almost entirely hydro-generated. Our part of the country is rich in this respect. Over 30 percent of all the potential water power in the Nation is in the great Northwest. The technical problems of the Bonneville Power Administration are therefore not the same as the problems facing the T. V. A., where hydro and steam plants are operated together as one system. And, at the present time, our public power system is not a system in the same sense as T. V. A. Power from Bonneville and Coulee is not the sole source of supply for a given area. The people are not wholly dependent on decisions with respect to its disposal for this necessity of modern life as they are in T. V. A.

Some day the power created by the dams on our Northwest rivers will be available for peacetime uses. Today almost every kilowatt of energy from Grand Coulee and from Bonneville is waging war. Without that power our victory would be tragically postponed. The war record of those dams is adequate rebuke to the captious critics who once fought their building and attacked it as a visionary and useless waste of public moneys. Those dams are saving democracy for the people now. But I am looking forward to the day when the power they generate will enrich the people's lives in peace. Our problems will not be precisely the same as those of T. V. A. even then. The climate is different; agriculture and industry are not the same as in the Tennessee Valley. Power costs and rates and uses will not be identical. But the basic problem presented by the pending amendments will be the same, and in one respect the administration of these public power systems must be alike. Both must be operated for the benefit of all the people. They must earn their support. If after 11 years of peacetime operation our western system has done the job for the people living there that the T. V. A. has done for the people in the valley of the Tennessee, I shall be content.

I agree with the analysis my friend, the gentleman from the Third District of Tennessee (Mr. KEFAUVER), presented in his remarks the other day. He sug-

gested that the reason the people had benefited so greatly from the T. V. A. was because the line between political and managerial responsibility was so clearly marked and had been so scrupulously regarded by the Congress and by the management of T. V. A. Put in another way, it might be said because the relationship between the responsibilities of politicians and of experts had been so clearly defined in theory and observed in practice.

Today the fortunes of the world are in the hands of the experts. They are the ones who plan our houses, process our food, move us from place to place, and work toward the end that men can live in comfort and freedom from disease. Their decisions have changed and will change the lives of millions of people. Politicians, or statesmen, if that word has a better sound, can lay down national policies. But experts have got to carry them out. In this modern world there is no graver problem than the one of finding ways through which the politicians and the experts can work in harmony to serve the people. The decisions of the scientists, the engineers, all kinds of specialists, including specialists in management, will determine if the policies we set out really meet the people's needs.

Too many experts practice their expertness with the sole objective of increasing the profits of a single private enterprise. They are not concerned about the people. Too many experts in government whose talents are meant to be devoted to the people as a whole fail because they practice their expertness to accomplish what they think the people need, without much knowledge of what the actual needs may be. That is why some public programs fail to reach their ultimate objective after the politicians have decided policies in the public interest. Too many times the experts fail to make the benefits of such policy decisions really count for all the people. Then the people appeal to the politicians. And we try to decide technical questions on this floor, to settle here the differences between the people and the experts.

There are no differences between them in the Tennessee Valley. There the people and the experts stand united. And with one conspicuous exception, the politicians are standing with them. I want that formula preserved and extended. The men who established the T. V. A., who set up the statute, were Members of the Congress. We call them politicians. The men who build the dams and operate this power system are experts. The men who fix the rates, who determine costs and conditions of service—they are experts, too. The responsible management coordinating all these special skills is a board of experts in that field. Their expertness has met the people's needs and has been devoted to the people's benefit. They have carried out the public policies adopted by the Congress. They have the people's support. I am deeply impressed by it. It seems to be almost unanimous. I get a little weary of hearing pleas on behalf of groups—of being told the businessmen, the farmers, the workingmen are in favor of this or that, as though they were separate institutions, their problems and futures

entirely independent of each other. I am considerably refreshed to hear from the people as a whole, and to know from my mail that there is one area and one Federal program which has united support because all the people have had a share in the benefit.

I want that same record and that same support for the public power system which will someday be established in my own area. When the permanent statute creating our system is adopted I want the line between political and managerial decisions to be just as clearly defined and just as faithfully adhered to as it is in the T. V. A. Politics must keep out of management and management must keep out of politics. And both must work together for the people.

It is preposterous that such a policy adopted by Congress so long ago should be in danger today after 11 years of experience and such a record as T. V. A.'s. It is ridiculous to propose that responsibility for every detail of management in the operation of this power system should be shifted from the region concerned to Washington. It requires a point of view beyond my comprehension to propose that the competent technicians employed by T. V. A. should be relieved of full responsibility for power management, that the Congress should take over the details of operation, and that the experts should try to become politicians themselves in order to hold their jobs. T. V. A. could never meet the changing needs of the people under such a system.

So of course I am opposed to these vicious McKellar amendments, riders to the appropriation bill. The experts and technicians who administer T. V. A. should be chosen for their technical skill, not their loyalty to a political leader. The Members from the area concerned have made their position clear. They are against the amendments. They are for T. V. A. They stand with their people, and that is where I stand. They are opposed, as I am opposed, to the amendment which would deny to T. V. A. the use of its receipts for the expenses of its business operations as the basic act provides.

The people's representatives in Congress want the flexibility of the present system retained, not because of any abstract theory, but because they know how it works. They want an honest, efficient administration of a business enterprise, but I want to emphasize that the point at issue is bigger than that. A business-like administration of a public enterprise is not an end in itself any more than is the building of a dam or a transmission line. They have a common purpose. They are instruments to serve the people. Unless they meet that test, they are wasteful and extravagant, no matter what the books of account disclose.

It is because T. V. A. has served the people that the people support it. When the management of a Government agency, the experts, the Members of this House who represent the region of its operation, and the people who are immediately affected stand united together, that is an invincible combination. The McKellar amendments will be defeated. There is no doubt about it. This is a people's Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE OMNIBUS VETERANS' BILL

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation told the House that the omnibus veterans' bill would be taken up this week, probably Thursday. The people of San Francisco have always been vitally interested in providing for the veterans. Our community is particularly close to the war; San Francisco is the center of all activities in the Pacific theater. From our harbor go forth battleships, cruisers, and naval craft of every description, seeking the enemy in battle. Returning to our shores, these same ships are repaired, reconditioned, and refitted in San Francisco yards. The cruiser *San Francisco* itself, after her memorable battle in the South Pacific, proudly returned to our city for repairs, and this famous fighting ship is again in service. Admiral Callaghan, of San Francisco, who was in charge of this ship, paid the supreme sacrifice while standing on her bridge. His feat adds luster to the long list of American naval heroes.

California was admitted to the Union on September 9, 1850—less than a hundred years ago. Since that time the Golden State has played an impressive role in every war. During the War between the States it was gold, mined in California, which kept solvent the credit of the Federal Government. During the Spanish-American War in 1898, San Francisco was the port of embarkation for all men and supplies bound for Manila and the Philippines. San Francisco shipbuilders built the mighty cruiser *Olympia*, flagship of Admiral Dewey when he entered Manila Bay; they also built the *Oregon*, which rounded Cape Horn to join Admirals Sampson and Schley in destroying the Spanish Fleet off the coast of Cuba. Californians have covered themselves with distinction on every battlefield and in every engagement. No community is more war-conscious at the present time than my home city of San Francisco. Every man, woman, and child is doing his or her utmost to further the war effort, and is giving of himself or herself unstintingly and unhesitatingly, and all San Franciscans desire that the returning veterans receive fair treatment.

Recent figures from the War Department give the totals of the men and women of California in the Army as of December 1943 as follows:

	Male	Female
Total Army personnel as of the end of December 1943	407,000	5,530
Total number Army personnel acquired from November 1940 through Dec. 31, 1943	438,500	7,543
Total separation (discharged)	80,628	2,074

Let me repeat the total number who have been discharged: 80,628 men and 2,074 women. It is therefore essential that current legislation be enacted without delay.

Since entering Congress, it has been my privilege to support every measure introduced in behalf of veterans. I am supporting the present G. I. bill. This omnibus bill will give guaranteed loans, education, and other benefits to servicemen; servicewomen will share the same as the men. Special attention will be given to finding suitable jobs for men and women, and an endeavor will be made to see that they are located in positions for which they are best equipped. Those unable to find jobs will get a readjustment allowance. Unquestionably, many openings and many opportunities will develop, because when the Nation returns to a peacetime economy from the present wartime economy, there will be a tremendous need for men and women, and this demand will last for years after the war. Loans will be guaranteed up to a certain amount to buy a home, a farm, or to start a business. Under present proposal, the interest on guaranteed amounts will be paid the first year. These loans will be processed through local agencies. The loans will be secured by the property, and the Government will be subrogated for the amounts guaranteed. While it is proposed that other lenders will have a claim on the property prior to the Government, it is the intention of the Congress that the Government approve the loans so that the veterans will not be imposed upon. As an outcome of this legislation, demand for small farms will probably increase. The demand for small homes should be tremendous, because many single men, upon retiring from the service, will marry and will require not only homes but furnishings and equipment that go with a home. Unquestionably, many schools will be required, because it is expected that the birth rate will increase after the war when men and women settle down. Schooling propositions are also provided for in the bill. A telegram received by me this morning from Donald S. Tresidder, president of Stanford University, reads:

Respectfully urge that you do everything within your power to effect amendment of omnibus bill retraining of returning servicemen to make certain that selection of institutions and other matters logically relating to local administration is vested in State agencies existing or to be created.

In this connection I understand the Barden bill (H. R. 3846), which provides for State advisory committees, State selection of institutions, administration through State educational agencies, State counseling services for returning veterans, and the use of existing educational agencies and institutions, was considered but not approved by the distinguished Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The Barden bill provides that existing facilities will be used under the direction of the several States. The World War Veterans' Committee assert that the educational provisions of the omnibus bill include all of the good points of the Barden bill. Furthermore, in addition thereto, the G. I. bill eliminates any new or old Government bureau which might be called upon to control veterans by placing the

supervision of this program under the Veterans' Administration.

Schools and colleges throughout the country may expect a real educational boom. Expanded hospitalization should be provided for wounded or ailing veterans. The omnibus bill is quite comprehensive. The indications are that additional legislation may be necessary from year to year to give more complete hospital and health service to veterans and their families.

Sooner or later the Congress will be called upon to determine whether an adjusted-service pay act for those serving in World War No. 2 should be enacted. Several bills of this nature are already pending before the House and the Senate, calling for varying amounts and varying procedures as to payment.

It is time the House should set up a special committee which shall devote its time to the full consideration as to whether an adjusted-service pay act should be enacted and, if so, the amounts which should be paid and the manner in which the payments shall be made. Unless the House proceeds in an orderly fashion to make a study of this nature it is not unlikely that this or a subsequent Congress may be stamped into passing a bill which would not be equitable either to the servicemen or to the Nation.

There is considerable feeling among the servicemen, their families, and friends that the servicemen are the ones making the greatest sacrifice in the war effort; by reason of their military or naval service they are denied the opportunity of earning high rates of pay in war industry. The thought is being expressed that one way to equalize this matter would be for the Congress to enact an adjusted-service pay act granting a credit of a certain sum of money for each day of service which the serviceman has rendered in either the Army or Navy as an offset to what he might have earned had he remained in civilian life and been employed in war industry. The entire matter is deserving of special study and consideration by a committee of the House.

I am therefore introducing a resolution to provide that a special committee be set up to study adequate compensation for men and women when they are discharged from the service. In the meantime, let us pass the G. I. omnibus bill so as to be fair to G. I. Joe and G. I. Jane.

FREEDOM OF ENTERPRISE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during recent months we have all noted an increasing flow of speeches, articles, and resolutions, the principal tenor of which has been to imply that "freedom of enterprise" is being denied to the American businessman because of too much alleged interference by the Government in the private affairs of business.

It has been my personal observation that the majority of these speeches and

other expressions along this line have been couched in very general language, to say the least.

In my capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Small Business I have had occasion to talk or correspond with a number of persons who apparently hold the above view as to too much alleged governmental interference in the affairs of business. I am frank to state that, except in certain minor instances, I have encountered very few of these complainants who were in a position to support their general charge with concrete examples which would stand up under close examination.

Without exception these persons have been quick to admit that it is the duty of the Government to devise and administer measures designed to prevent inflation, to collect the taxes necessary to war and other types of financing, to exercise close supervision and direction over the flow of critical materials so that war and the most essential civilian needs shall be served first, to direct the flow of manpower to both the war industries and the armed services, and, at the same time, to do all of these things with an eye on the national needs of the future so that we may enter the post-war period in as healthy an economic state as it is possible to attain.

The House Committee on Small Business was established for the sole purpose of investigating the problems of small business during wartime and examining all charges from responsible parties which alleged that insufficient consideration of the rights of small business was being afforded to it by the Government. In addition, the committee was later instructed to investigate the need of a sound program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business.

FORUM FOR COMPLAINANTS

The committee has taken cognizance of this tendency on the part of certain individuals and organizations to give voice to their fear that there is too much interference by Government in the affairs of business and feels that the attention of both the public and the Congress should once again be called to the forum which is afforded to these complainants through the medium of the Small Business Committee.

A resolution has just been passed by the committee to which no member of the committee dissented. This resolution not only reaffirms the position of the committee and cites its instructions from the House but also solicits the appearance before the committee of any responsible persons who feel they have just cause for asserting that there now exists too much governmental interference with business during wartime.

CONTROLS SHOULD BE TAKEN OFF SOON AS POSSIBLE

I personally know of no Member of the Congress who desires to see a continuation during peacetime of the majority of the governmental controls which, of necessity, have been imposed upon us all during wartime. I feel that the great majority of our businessmen who have studied the problems of Government know why these controls were imposed

and feel that only through them could we attain quick victory and return to peace with the Nation and its individual citizens in a robust and healthy economic condition.

BANNER OF FREE ENTERPRISE

To my way of thinking, many of these persons who cloak their criticisms of this sort under the banner of free enterprise are doing so with their tongues in their cheeks and, if true to their own beliefs, would admit that a certain hypocritical cast governed most of their public expressions of this kind.

ALL OVER BUT THE SHOOTING

Honest criticism, based upon supportable evidence, should be given full consideration and a quick hearing at those points where remedial action can be best secured, but, in wartime, I cannot quietly and gracefully listen too long to unsupported and too general statements of this kind without wondering if they are not truly harmful to the cause of national unity and the fullest prosecution of the war. Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson has summed the present situation up only too well when he said, "It is all over but the shooting." During the months to come, more than ever before, we need to deal in truths and facts and not in innuendoes and criticism of our Government which cannot be substantiated.

INVITATION EXTENDED

I, therefore, wish to publicly extend this invitation to the small businessman constituents of all of our Members, and to do this through the Members, asking that all who feel they have just cause for complaint against the Government for lack of consideration or unfair treatment by the Government to come and lay their complaint before the House Committee on Small Business at any convenient time. In this invitation, I am unanimously supported by all members of this committee. I submit herewith a copy of the resolution just passed by our committee to this effect. The resolution is as follows:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Whereas under House Resolution 18 the Select Committee on Small Business of the House was created to consider the problems of small business and in respect thereto was instructed to investigate—

1. Whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and utilized, and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering such development and utilization;
2. Whether adequate consideration is being given to the needs of small business engaged in nonwar activities, or engaged in the transition from nonwar activities;
3. Whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and
4. The need of a sound program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business.

Whereas under the post-war program every consideration must be given to the advancement of small business enterprises in the interest of their continued growth and prosperity untrammelled by obstacles of any kind from government, big business, or any other

influences, and in order that those who have gone to war may have an opportunity upon their return to engage in business of their own choosing without interference from any source; and

Whereas small business is the essence of individual initiative and the free-enterprise system, and vital to the welfare of the country, employing approximately 98 percent of the number of workers representing small business concerns with less than 100 employees out of about 2,138,300 producers and distributors: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House Committee on Small Business in carrying out the injunction of the House of Representatives proposes to prosecute these instructions to the fullest extent and to that end invites information from, or appearance before this committee, anyone who has facts to present which tend to, or do, show that the free-enterprise system as reflected by small business which has built this country and is paramount to the success and well-being of business in general and small business in particular is being retarded or interfered with in any manner.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Austin American.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1758. An act to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3261. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2987, a bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 138, granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of New York and the

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations concerning the settlement of the boundary line between said States at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on S. 1272, to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations, at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, May 12, 1944, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Wednesday, May 10, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 4215, relating to custodial service employees of the Postal Service. Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Daylight Saving Time of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, May 11, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on daylight-saving time bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 18, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2809, to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. (Ship construction reserve fund.)

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 25, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4486, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the Clerk by letter.

Witnesses are requested to notify the Clerk by letter at least a day in advance of the hearings of their desire to testify in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared. Written statements for the record from persons other than witnesses should be submitted a day in advance. Amendments to be proposed during the hearing should be submitted to the reporter in duplicate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1523. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision affecting an existing appropriation for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1524. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$11,600,000,

and a draft of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 578); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. KEARNEY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2448. A bill to provide that nationals of the United States shall not lose their nationality by reason of voting under legal compulsion in a foreign state; with amendment (Rept. No. 1428). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4464. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Select committee of the Committee on Agriculture. Pursuant to House Resolution 119. Resolution investigating the activities of the Farm Security Administration (Rept. No. 1430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VOORHIS of California: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4404. A bill to transfer Government activities in connection with domestic rabbits to the Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4776. A bill to amend the Transportation Act of 1940 so as to extend for 4 years the life of the Board of Investigation and Research, established by section 301 of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 4777. A bill to assist the States to establish and maintain school-lunch programs; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 4778. A bill to apply title 11 of the act of September 16, 1942, as amended, to employees of the United States who are outside the United States, so as to further facilitate voting by the use of State ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4779. A bill to provide for the deportation of Japanese aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WARD:

H. R. 4780. A bill to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4781. A bill to provide for making available, until expended, sums appropriated pursuant to section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4782. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the Tulalip Tribe of Indians, State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4783. A bill to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. J. Res. 275. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to make a study of the question as to whether the Congress should enact an adjusted-service-pay act; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 4784. A bill for the relief of L. T. Gregory; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4785. A bill for the relief of Frederick D. Ballou; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 4786. A bill for the relief of Terrell E. Beckner, committee for Kimball Lee Beckner; 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:

5634. By Mr. GREGORY: Senate Resolution No. 44 of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, regular session, 1944, memorializing Congress to pass a law enabling the ceiling prices on flour spar to be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5635. By Mr. HALE: Petition of a number of residents of Sagadahoc County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082 in order that there may be greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants, and that men in training camps may be better protected from the effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5636. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 4, tenth ward, Binghamton, N. Y., and signed by 68 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5637. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Heart O' the Hills Post, No. 1480, Legion, Tex., opposing House bill 2820; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5638. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the continuation of the Territorial Papers of the United States to an early conclusion; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal and triumphant Creator, whose holy purposes are beyond defeat, we come in the mystery of inter-

cession seeking Thy righteous will and the enabling strength to do it. We confess that we have remembered and treasured the words of the Master's matchless prayer, "Thy kingdom come," but we have too often forgotten their flaming meaning. The great hope of the kingdom of love has grown dim as hatred and selfishness and man's inhumanity to man have desecrated the earth. Yet we are grateful that in darkest days prophetic souls have marched with Thee, keeping step to the distant music of Thy sure victory. Wherever hatred gives way to love, wherever prejudice is changed to understanding, wherever pain is soothed and ignorance banished, there Thy banners go and Thy truth is marching on.

In spite of mockers by our side, in spite of cunning foes without and fears within our own fickle hearts, by the shining light of Thy presence keep us steadfast on the march to that City of Light whose builder and maker is God. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, May 9, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1565) relating to the appointment of postmasters.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters;

H. R. 3261. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

RESOLUTION BY MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at its annual convention in St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the continuation of publication of the Territorial papers of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 869);

H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Paul Barrere; without amendment (Rept. No. 870);

H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 871); and

H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons; without amendment (Rept. No. 872).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 873).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search; without amendment (Rept. No. 874);

H. R. 2408. A bill for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 875);

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 876); and

H. R. 2689. A bill for the relief of Pete Paluck; without amendment (Rept. No. 877).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 272. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, Jesse M. Knowles, and the estate of Lee Stroud; with amendments (Rept. No. 878);

H. R. 1519. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 879); and

H. R. 2855. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Buby; without amendment (Rept. No. 880).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1602. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winnie Left Her Behind, a patent in fee to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 881).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution relating to the invitation to the Congress of the United States to send a delegation to visit the British Parliament; without amendment (Rept. No. 868).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Steve Barbre; and

S. 1904. A bill for the relief of J. Fletcher Lankton and John N. Zieglele; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1905. A bill for the relief of Captolla Colvin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1906. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nellie L. Fickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1907. A bill declaring a temporary policy with respect to immigration to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.