the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files; without amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1900. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatrault; without amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1958. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;; without amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1960. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long; without amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1968. An act for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1993. An act for the relief of the estates of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 2006. An act for the relief of J. A. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 2064. An act for the relief of Richard H. Beall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 2168. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 5561. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents for business accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 5562. A bill relating to burley tobacco of the 1944 and 1945 crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5563. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration to exchange certain land of the United States within the Angostura Irrigation project, Hot Springs, S. Dak., for certain land owned by the city of Hot Springs, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 5564. A bill to fix the rate of tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act on employer and employees for the calendar year 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5565. A bill to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive certain checks and money orders in payment of taxes and for revenue stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORD:

H. R. 5566. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 5567. A bill to repeal the income limitation as to payment of death compensation to dependents of deceased service-connected disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 664. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2194, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. Res. 665. Resolution requesting the Smaller War Plants Corporation to investigate the possibilities for establishing small, independent enterprises in Alaska by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 666. Resolution to provide for an investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary of the circumstances surrounding the dismissal of Assistant Attorney General Norman M. Littell; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. McGEHEE introduced a bill (H. R. 5568) for the relief of the S. G. Leeffler Operating Co., of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

# SENATE

## FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1944

*(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 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:

Our Father God, this sacred altar at which our spirits bow in the midst of another day's demands is the witness of our weakness and the confession that in Thee alone is the answer to our need. The life of our spirits faints in the dust of our foolish pride. The cries of the crowd about us but bring us to confusion without and perplexity within. Weary of fruitless quests and futile arguments, we turn to Thee in the humility of prayer.

If Thy purposes have run counter to our own, if Thy will has bent ours, enable us to trust the wisdom of Thy perfect love and find Thy will to be our peace. Touch every privilege we enjoy with the halo of sharing, we beseech Thee. Melt it into unselfishness. Translate it into service. Let it not be clouded by pride. Make every blessing a transparent window in the temple of service, so that Thy spirit can shine through it in glory for human good. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 30, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 86. A bill to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; and

H. R. 5383. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4993) to amend Public, No. 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to further expedite the prosecution of the war, approved March 27, 1942, known as the Second War Powers Act, 1942, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gerry | O'Mahoney |
| Austin | Gillette | Overton |
| Bailey | Green | Radcliffe |
| Ball | Gurney | Reed |
| Bankhead | Hall | Revercomb |
| Bilbo | Hatch | Reynolds |
| Brooks | Hawkes | Robertson |
| Buck | Hayden | Russell |
| Burton | Hill | Shipstead |
| Bushfield | Holman | Stewart |
| Butler | Jenner | Taft |
| Byrd | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capper | La Follette | Tunnell |
| Caraway | Langer | Vandenberg |
| Chandler | Lucas | Wagner |
| Clark, Mo. | McClellan | Wallgren |
| Connally | McFarland | Walsh, Mass. |
| Cordon | McKellar | Walsh, N. J. |
| Danaher | Maloney | Wheeler |
| Davis | Maybank | Wherry |
| Downey | Mead | White |
| Eastland | Millikin | Wiley |
| Ellender | Murray | Willis |
| Ferguson | Nye | |
| George | O'Daniel | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Utah

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

[Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of BRIEN MCMAHON, chosen a Senator from the State of Connecticut for the term beginning January 3, 1945, which were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944 BRIEN MCMAHON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1945.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Raymond E. Baldwin, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 29th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1944.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
*Governor.*

[SEAL] FRANCES BURKE REDICK,
*Secretary.*

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the credentials of CLAUDE PEPPER, chosen a Senator from the State of Florida for the term beginning January 3, 1945, which were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944 CLAUDE PEPPER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Florida, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1945.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Spessard L. Holland, and our seal hereto affixed at Tallahassee, this 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1944.

By the Governor:

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
*Governor.*

[SEAL] R. A. GRAY,
*Secretary of State.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF CERTAIN AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in accordance with the requirement contained in the act of June 30, 1938, 52 Stat. 1253, as amended by the act approved June 17, 1944, Public Law No. 343, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, a report of all agreements entered into under the authority of that act since the last report to Congress on November 18, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HAWAII

A letter from the Acting Governor and the Secretary of Hawaii (through the Interior Department), transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1943 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—TELEGRAM FROM NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram I have received from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, endorsing both the St. Lawrence seaway and the Missouri Valley Authority principles embodied in Senator Murray's bill.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *November 23, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Re our letter National Farmers Union unqualifiedly endorses both St. Lawrence seaway and Missouri Valley Authority principles embodied in Senator MURRAY's bill. In convention assembled here this week we are giving wholehearted support to extension of the T. V. A. principle of autonomous river authorities reporting to President and Congress and we trust you will lend your support. The National Union position corresponds to that of President Dean and the Kansas Farmers Union as expressed in convention 3 weeks ago.

JAMES G. PATTON,
*President, National Farmers Union.*

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2185. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1296).

ACCEPTANCE OF BUST OF HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Library, I report favorably Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, authorizing and directing the Joint Committee on the Library to accept the bust of Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State. I ask that the concurrent resolution be presently considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The being on objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) was considered and agreed to as follows:

*Resolved, etc.* That the Joint Committee on the Library is hereby authorized and directed to accept, on behalf of the Congress of the United States, a bust of Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives and of the United States Senate from the State of Tennessee, presented by the Cumberland (Md.) Evening and Sunday Times, and to cause such bust, executed by George Conlon, sculptor, to be placed in a suitable location in the United States Capitol.

PROTECTION OF WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF DECEASED WORLD WAR NO. 1 VETERANS—REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I report back favorably from the Committee on Finance with amendments the bill (H. R. 1744) to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans, and I submit a report (No. 1297) thereon.

The committee today approved this bill with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting a substitute. The bill is known as the widows and orphans veterans' bill of World War No. 1. I should like to bring it up at the earliest possible time next week in order that it may go to the House for final action.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Georgia that in view of the interest in the proposed legislation it might be well to ask that the text of House bill 1744 as it passed the House and the amendment unanimously reported by the Finance Committee be printed in the RECORD for the information of those who may be interested.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make that request. I think both texts are printed in the report, but I ask also that House bill 1744 as it passed the House and the substitute unanimously ordered reported by the Finance Committee this morning be printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered; and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The text of House bill 1744 as passed by the House of Representatives is as follows:

H. R. 1744

An act to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War veterans

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the surviving widow, child, or children of any honorably discharged person who entered the service prior to November 12, 1918, or if the persons were serving with the United States military forces in Russia before April 2, 1920, and served 90 days or more during World War No. 1, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for disability in the service in line of duty, dies, or has died from a disease or disability not service connected, shall, upon filing application and such proofs in the Veterans' Administration as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe, be entitled to receive compensation: *Provided,* That payment of compensation under the provisions of this act shall not be made to any widow without child, or a child, whose annual income exceeds $1,000, or to a widow with a child or children whose annual income exceeds $2,500. In determining annual income, payments of war-risk term insurance, United States Government life (converted) insurance, and payments under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, ch. 11), and the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, as amended, shall not be considered.

SEC. 2. (a) The monthly rates of compensation shall be as follows: Widow but no child, $30; widow with one child, $38 (with $4 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $15; no widow but two children, $22 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $30 (equally divided) (with $3 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided).

(b) The total compensation payable under this section shall not exceed $64. Where such benefits would otherwise exceed $64, the amount of $64 may be apportioned as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe.

SEC. 3. That as used in this act—

(a) The term "person who entered the service" shall mean a person, whether male or female, and whether commissioned, enlisted, or drafted, who was finally accepted for active service in the military or naval forces of the United States, members of training camps authorized by law, and such other persons heretofore recognized by statute or veterans' regulations as being eligible for World War service connection for disability;

(b) The term "widow" shall mean a person who was married prior to the date of enactment of this act to the person who served: *Provided*, That all marriages shall be proved as valid marriages according to the law of the place where the parties resided at the time of the marriage or the law of the place where the parties resided when the right to compensation accrued; and

(c) The term "child" shall mean a person unmarried and under the age of 18 years, unless prior to reaching the age of 18 the child becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, who is a legitimate child, a child legally adopted, a stepchild if a member of the man's household, an illegitimate child, but as to the father only, if acknowledged in writing signed by him or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support or has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such a child: *Provided*, That the payment of compensation shall be continued after the age of 18 years and until completion of education or training to any child who is or may hereafter be pursuing a course of instruction, entered into before said child reached his or her twenty-first birthday, at a school, college, academy, seminary, technical institute, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Administrator, which shall have agreed to report to the Administrator the termination of attendance of such child, and if any such institution of learning fails to make such report promptly the approval shall be withdrawn.

SEC. 4. That payment shall be effective from the date of enactment of this act in all cases where application under Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, is on file in the Veterans' Administration prior to the date of enactment of this act, and in all other cases payment shall be made from the date the application of the widow, child, or children, in the form prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is filed in the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "World War Widows' and Dependent Children's Act, 1943."

The text of the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance today to House bill 1744 is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That section 1 of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, is hereby amended by repealing subsections (a) and (b) thereof and substituting the following:

"'SECTION 1. (a) The surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased person who served in World War No. 1 before November 12, 1918, or if the person was serving with the United States military forces in Russia before April 2, 1920, and who was discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable after having served 90 days or more or for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, or who at time of death was receiving or entitled to receive compensation, pension, or retirement pay for service-connected disability, shall, upon filing application and such proofs in the Veterans' Administration as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe, be entitled to receive pension as provided by this act.

"'SEC. 2. That section 2 of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) That the monthly rates of pension shall be as follows: Widow but no child, $35; widow and one child, $45 (with $5 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $18; no widow but two children, $27 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $36 (equally divided) with $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

"'(b) The total pension payable under this section shall not exceed $74. Where such benefits would otherwise exceed $74, the amount of $74 may be apportioned as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe.'

"'SEC. 3. That section 3 of Public Law No. 514, Seventy-fifth Congress, May 13, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. On and after the date of enactment of this act for the purpose of payment of compensation or pension under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the term 'widow of a World War No. 1 veteran' shall mean a woman who was married prior to the effective date of enactment of this amendment, or 10 or more years, to the person who served: *Provided*, That all marriages shall be proven as valid marriages according to the law of the place where the parties resided at the time of marriage or the law of the place where the parties resided when the right to compensation or pension accrued: *And provided further*, That where the original date of marriage meets the statutory requirement and the parties were legally married at date of death of the veteran, the requirement of the statute as to date of marriage will be regarded as having been met. Compensation or pension shall not be allowed a widow who has remarried either once or more than once, and where compensation or pension is properly discontinued by reason of remarriage it shall not thereafter be recommenced. No compensation or pension shall be paid to a widow unless there was continuous cohabitation with the person who served from the date of marriage to date of death, except where there was a separation which was due to the misconduct of or procured by the person who served, without the fault of the widow.'

"SEC. 4. This act shall be effective from the date of its approval: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the repeal of subsections (a) and (b) of section 1 of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, contained in section 1 of this act, claims otherwise payable for a period prior to the effective date of this act may be adjudicated and placed on the roll and the benefits of this act shall be applicable to such claims and those claims now on the rolls.

"SEC. 5. Except to the extent they may conflict with the provisions of this act, the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, the Veterans Regulations promulgated thereunder, and of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, as now or hereafter amended, shall be applicable to this act: *Provided*, That no compensation or pension shall be reduced or discontinued by the enactment of this act.

'SEC. 6. The widow, child, or children of a veteran who served in World War No. 2 whose death is not due to service therein, but who at the time of death was receiving or entitled to receive pension, compensation, or retirement pay for disability incurred in such service, or who, having served at least 90 days during such war period or having been discharged for disability incurred in line of duty during such service, dies or has died from a disease or disability not service connected and at the time of death had a disability due to such service for which pension would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree, shall be entitled to pension in the amounts and otherwise subject to the conditions of Public Law No. 484, as amended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section the definition of the terms 'veteran,' 'widow,' 'child or children' shall be those applicable to World War No. 2 as provided in Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as now or hereafter amended: *And provided further*, That section 4, Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended accordingly."

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 30, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1373. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department;

S. 1714. An act to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Helen Halverson;

S. 1741. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V-3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942;

S. 1838. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions;

S. 1839. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944;

S. 1840. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943;

S. 1841. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1842. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943;

S. 1881. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; and

S. 1964. An act to reimburse certain aviation cadets and former aviation cadets for

property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at Carroll College, Helena, Mont., on January 8, 1944.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT ON CROP INSURANCE BILL DURING RECESS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has completed the hearings on the so-called crop insurance bill (H. R. 4911) and has marked up the bill. But I am afraid the report will not be ready to be submitted during today's session of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the committee may file the report during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MEAD introduced a bill (S. 2207) for the relief of Marlin-Rockwell Corporation with respect to the jurisdiction of the Tax Court of the United States to redetermine its excessive profits for its fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4993) to amend Public, No. 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to further expedite the prosecution of the war, approved March 27, 1942, known as the Second War Powers Act, 1942, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I send forward the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD. If the same report is to be printed in the House proceedings, I will not ask for its publication in the proceedings of the Senate, as I do not wish to duplicate it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

KINGS POINT, N. Y., *September 30, 1944.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to Public Law 301, chapter 194, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session approved May 11, 1944, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1944 Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

SENATORS

By the Committee on Commerce:

JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina (ex officio).

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, of Maryland.

HAROLD HITZ BURTON, of Ohio.

By the Vice President:

JAMES M. TUNNELL, of Delaware.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

By the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

SCHUYLER O. BLAND, First Congressional District of Virginia (ex officio).

EDWARD J. HART, Fourteenth Congressional District of New Jersey.

ROBERT RAMSPECK, Fifth Congressional District of Georgia.

RICHARD J. WELCH, Fifth Congressional District of California.

By the Speaker of the House:

EUGENE J. KEOGH, Ninth Congressional District of New York.

GORDON CANFIELD, Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey.

Representative DANIEL ELLISON, Fourth Congressional District of Maryland, was later appointed in place of Mr. RICHARD J. WELCH of California who was unable to attend.

The Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy assembled at Wiley Hall at 10:00 a. m. Friday, September 29, 1944, where the members were received by the Superintendent of the Merchant Marine Academy, Capt. Giles C. Stedman, United States Naval Reserve, and his staff.

The following members of the Board were present at the first and later meetings: Senator GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, Representative SCHUYLER O. BLAND, Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK, Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Representative GORDON CANFIELD, Representative DANIEL ELLISON.

*First meeting of the Board of Visitors*

After being conducted to the conference room, Representative SCHUYLER O. BLAND took the chair as temporary chairman for the purpose of organization.

The Board elected Representative SCHUYLER O. BLAND as chairman, and designated Lt. Comdr. William L. Bull, United States Maritime Service, as assistant secretary.

When, at the request of the chairman, the superintendent and his staff joined the Board in conference, the Superintendent was invited to make such reports on the state of the academy as he deemed pertinent and proper to bring to the Board's attention. In response to this invitation, the Superintendent, Capt. Giles C. Stedman, United States Naval Reserve, presented the following report:

"Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to welcome the first Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The entire academy personnel is sincerely gratified by this visit, and appreciates the important function of your board in better enabling us to accomplish the mission of this national institution.

"We are well aware that the performance of this additional duty during these arduous days calls for considerable sacrifice for each of you. But we firmly believe that this generous donation of your time and effort will be compensated for by the realization that you will have rendered a valuable service to the academy and to the Nation's growing maritime strength.

Part I. Introduction to Background and Establishment of Cadet Corps

"The passage by the Congress of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, gave distinct impetus to the Federal training of officers for the United States merchant marine by providing for the establishment of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

"The United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was officially organized by the United States Maritime Commission, in the spring of 1938. In order to prepare a comprehensive training program an exhaustive study was first made of all foreign systems of merchant marine officer training. For many years England, Italy, Germany, Japan, Holland, Norway, Sweden, France, and Denmark had well-established training programs. Accordingly, a comprehensive analysis was made of the best points of each system of training. With this background, and with the assistance of the keenest minds among American shipping officials and merchant marine officers, the Maritime Commission inaugurated and developed the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, the Nation's first Federal system for training officers for the merchant marine.

"The cadet corps had its inception when the 99 cadets who were aboard Government-owned or subsidized vessels were placed under the direct supervision of the Maritime Commission on March 15, 1938. Early in 1939, national competitive examinations for the appointment to cadetships were inaugurated, and for the first time in the history of this Nation an opportunity was presented to qualified young Americans of every State in the Union to receive training for a career in the United States merchant marine.

"Lacking its own facilities ashore, the newly established cadet corps necessarily had to share the quarters of certain other training institutions, such as the Admiral Billard Academy at New London, the New York State Maritime Academy at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., the United States navy yard at Algiers, La., and a United States Navy base in San Francisco. Although at that early date the total complement of the cadet corps was low, the course of study was comprehensive, based on a 4-year curriculum.

"The growing international tension and subsequent declaration of war suspended the 4-year course, and compelled the adoption of a shortened period of training. Concurrent with the increasing strength of the cadet corps, two basic schools were established, one at San Mateo, Calif., the other at Pass Christian, Miss. By the end of 1941, the rapidly increasing strength of the cadet corps made clear the urgent need for the establishment of an adequate academy on the Atlantic coast to furnish both basic and advanced training. Accordingly, thorough investigation was made to locate a suitable site for the new academy. Final selection indicated that the Walter P. Chrysler estate of 11 acres, at Kings Point, N. Y., was the most appropriate location, and in December 1941, its purchase for $100,000 was consummated by the United States Maritime Commission. Plans were at once developed to adopt this estate for use in building the first Federal Merchant Marine Academy which would furnsih officer training to the young men of all States.

Part II. Planning, Establishment, and Construction of United States Merchant Marine Academy

"The newly acquired Chrysler property and residence were occupied early in 1942, and instructional activity was commenced. At the same time, broad plans were developed at the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps headquarters in Washington for the final design of the academy. Architects, cadet corps officials, prominent merchant marine officers, and educators jointly contributed to the preparation of the over-all plans. The design was based on a peacetime complement of 1,200 cadet-midshipmen, although it was then fully realized that during the war it would be necessary to operate with at least double that figure. Final design having

been established, a unique problem presented itself owing to the need of continuing all training activity at the same time that the builders proceeded with construction of the new buildings. Further, the enrollment was constantly increasing, and to accommodate the cadet-midshipmen it was necessary not only to occupy fully all existing buildings on the grounds, but temporary C. C. C. barracks as well, erected for the purpose. Owing to the critical shortage of steel, reinforced concrete was used for the basic construction of the new buildings. Record progress was made in the entire constructional program.

"At the termination of the construction period of approximately 15 months, the academy was substantially complete and accordingly was officially dedicated on September 30, 1943. At this date the academy had entered upon its full-scale instructional program. The cadet corps at that time had a total strength of 7,514 cadet-midshipmen, of whom 1,094 were undergoing basic training at the academy and the two basic schools on the Pacific and Gulf coasts; 2,200 were undergoing advanced training at the academy, and the remainder, some 4,220, were in an intermediate period of training at sea aboard numerous merchant vessels voyaging to all parts of the world.

Part III. Broad Review of Cadet Corps Academic Curriculum

"The course of training prescribed for the past 2½ years has been one of 18 months' duration, consisting of 3 months at basic school, followed by at least 6 months aboard ships, and 9 months advanced courses at the academy. Effective October 1, 1944, the course will be extended to 2 years.

"The method of instructing cadet-midshipmen is unusual, because of the provision whereby each cadet-midshipman must serve at sea aboard merchant vessels as a part of his training. Consequently, during existing war conditions, all cadet-midshipmen assigned to the academy for advanced courses are veterans with service in combat zones.

"At the very beginning of the cadet corps system of training it was found necessary, because of the movements of merchant vessels, to have new sections of 25 cadet-midshipmen commence their basic and advanced academic schedules at weekly intervals. Graduations take place at semi-monthly intervals, thus keeping a constant supply of graduates available for sea duty.

"It is, of course, recognized that before newly appointed cadet-midshipmen are ready for assignment to training at sea, a basic course ashore is essential. Hence, the present basic training, of 4 months' duration, has a twofold purpose. First, to prepare cadet-midshipmen to be useful when they join a vessel for sea training, and take care of themselves and others in event of enemy action or accident, and second, to present a rudimentary outline of the chief subjects upon which to build future training. With cadet-midshipmen undergoing sea training aboard so many varied merchant vessels, centralized control is difficult. Accordingly, a novel method of supervising their study is in force. District cadet-midshipmen supervisors and instructors are stationed in New York, Baltimore, New Orleans, the Canal Zone, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle. These officers visit vessels which are in port, and not only check progress made by cadet-midshipmen, but also assist them with studies. In addition, the cadet corps has developed a guided plan of self-study for the cadet-midshipman at sea, called a sea project. This sea project outlines for the cadet-midshipman the essential points of importance on board his ship, to which attention must be directed during his study. This comprehensive manual has been so designed that for all cadet-midshipmen undergoing deck training, only two individual types of projects are necessary; one for cargo ships, and one for tankers. For cadet-midshipmen in engineering training, two projects suffice—one for steam, and one for Diesel vessels. Cadet-midshipmen are at sea for an over-all period of 6 to 9 months, depending on duration of voyages. During this time they make sketches, prepare drawings, and write answers to hundreds of questions. These questions pertain to the construction, equipment, operation of their vessels, and other professional subjects. Upon termination of their sea training, cadet-midshipmen must have their projects completed. They then report to district supervisors for assignment to the academy.

"To summarize academic training at Kings Point, the course now consists of 36 weeks' advanced work, and will be expanded to 52 weeks on October 1, 1944. Deck and engine cadet-midshipmen take separate courses of study, although both study naval science and shipping economics. The chief subjects studied by deck cadet-midshipmen include navigation, seamanship and cargo, ship construction, mechanical drawing, and meteorology. Engineer cadet-midshipmen have as major courses the study of steam engineering, Diesel engineering, refrigeration, electrical engineering, ship construction, and engineering drawing.

"Teaching is chiefly done by the lecture-demonstration method. Lectures are supplemented by pertinent laboratory and practical work. Extensive use is made of educational motion pictures, slide films, charts, models, specimens of equipment, and other visual aids.

"Instructors are guided uniformly throughout their respective courses by lesson plans developed by officers of the cadet corps. These lesson plans show detailed content of each lesson, and when used in conjunction with an instructor's guidebook, insure that all courses are taught in accordance with a standard plan.

"Academic control is exercised chiefly by an academic board, which maintains high scholastic standards, and an effective method of detecting cadet-midshipmen who are unable to measure up to the high standard required by the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

"While cadet-midshipmen pursue a rigorous course of study, there are extensive provisions made for extracurricular and recreational activities. An extensive athletic program is under way, using all available facilities for the physical conditioning and recreation of cadet-midshipmen. The academy also possesses an auditorium, recreation rooms, and a library which contains a collection of books on appropriate technical and general subjects.

"At the completion of courses, graduates are examined for their original merchant-marine licenses as third mates, or third assistant engineers, for service in any ship in the United States merchant marine. Graduates also receive diplomas and commissions as ensigns in the United States Naval Reserve and United States maritime service. About 5,000 have graduated from the cadet corps and its academy since 1938. Of this number, 30 percent, or about 1,500, are on active duty as officers in the Navy; the remaining 3,500 are serving as officers in merchant vessels.

"Part IV. Grounds, Buildings, and Equipment

"The academy, now totaling 60 acres, is situated at Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y. New construction completed since acquisition of the Chrysler estate includes buildings suitable for their respective purposes which are all named in honor of persons who were prominent in the history of the merchant marine. Major buildings include seven dormitories for cadet-midshipmen, a large mess hall, a drill hall, a hospital, and academic buildings for deck and engine training. These are supplemented by necessary service buildings.

"The success of a training program depends to a certain degree, on available instructional equipment. The academy is fortunate in having secured a great deal of marine equipment from the Navy and from the United States Maritime Commission. For deck training, navigational instruments and aids are available, including a most up-to-date Sperry gyrocompass laboratory. A full-sized set of ship's cargo masts, winches, and booms is installed near the waterfront for practical instruction in cargo handling. Instruction in seamanship is supplemented by numerous small boats and latest designs of lifeboat davits and life rafts. There are also based at the academy, sail-, steam-, and Diesel-propelled training vessels, in which cadet midshipmen make short cruises as part of their practical training. Engineering laboratory equipment includes a marine steam power plant which generates steam from two marine boilers. This steam is used for heating the entire academy, as well as for operating instructional equipment. A varied selection of steam engines, pumps, and auxiliaries, as well as Diesel engines, electrical equipment, and shop tools is available for actual operation and practical training. The department of naval science has not only a wide variety of representative guns, loading machines, specimen mines, and paravanes, but also has numerous instructional models and aids for classroom use.

"Part V. Operation of Academy

"The United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps is a division of the training organization of the War Shipping Administration. This organization has jurisdiction over the training of officers and seamen for the duration of the war. The cadet corps operates under the direction of a supervisor whose office and staff are located in Washington, D. C. The academy, the largest unit of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, is headed by a superintendent. Next in the chain of command is the commandant of cadet midshipmen, assisted by the executive and administrative officers, and the secretary of the academic board, who supervise all academic and service departments necessary to the operation of the academy.

"The academy at Kings Point and the cadet basic schools at San Mateo and Pass Christian are operated on a military basis, with discipline on the same plane as that at other service academies. Cadet-midshipmen of the cadet corps are appointed midshipmen in the United States Naval Reserve, in an inactive status. Officers and instructors are assigned to cadet corps units jointly by the United States maritime service and the United States Navy. The Navy has been most cooperative in every respect in assisting in the operation of the academy and other cadet corps units.

"More than 90 percent of our instructors are merchant marine officers, approximately one-half of whom are on active duty as members of the United States Naval Reserve. They have been assigned to the academy by the Navy Department. The remainder are commissioned officers of the United States Maritime Service. Our subordinate administrative complement consists of enlisted personnel of the United States Maritime Service and civil-service employees.

"Part VI. Accomplishments and Aims

"Thus the establishment and growth of the United States Merchant Marine Academy has been outlined. Built at a cost of $7,300,000, less than the cost of a single modern destroyer, there now exists the first Federal academy for training merchant marine officers, operating on a parallel with the Naval

Academy, Military Academy, and Coast Guard Academy for the equally important American merchant marine.

"The cadet corps as of this date has already graduated 5,000 officers, many of whom have since risen to positions of master and chief engineer aboard vessels of the United States merchant marine. Of growing importance, however, is the post-war function of the cadet corps and its academy. It is expected that graduates, having been trained under the highest possible standards, will take the initiative in safeguarding the interests and well-being of the United States merchant marine in years to come, and thus play a key role in the national welfare.

"Highly desirable is the prompt return to a 4-year course, consisting of 9 months' basic training, 12 to 15 months aboard ships, and 2 years advanced study at the academy. Also highly desirable is the return to national competitive examinations for appointment as cadet-midshipmen in the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

"It may be of interest to note here that the 5½-year merchant marine officer training course of Russia was reduced to only 4½ years during the existing war. In the opinion of not a few interested in the future of the American merchant marine, the reduction of the cadet corps' 4-year course to 1½ years was indeed drastic, and action to return to 4 years should be taken at the earliest practicable date.

"Conclusion

"In conclusion, may I again assure you that you are most welcome. I thank you for your kind interest and attention. The entire staff of the United States Merchant Marine Academy offers you its full cooperation, and stands ready to assist you in every way possible during your visit."

Upon the conclusion of this report the chairman threw the meeting open to questions by members of the Board, some of whom were not familiar with the organization of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and Academy. Their questions were answered by the Superintendent and his staff.

At this time Capt. James Harvey Tomb, United States Navy, retired, the first Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, was presented to the Board.

In order to thoroughly acquaint the members of the Board with the academic program of the academy, each member was given a folio containing the following enclosures, the purpose of each being briefly outlined by Commander Harold V. Nerney, United States Naval Reserve, executive officer of the academy:

1. Information booklet of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

2. Information booklet for ship's officers and shore officials of steamship companies.

3. Regulations and instructions of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

4. (a) Registration as of September 1, 1944, showing distribution and quota by States.

(b) Home States of cadet-midshipmen in training as of September 1, 1944.

(c) Typical daily strength report of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

5. (a) United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps roster of officers, September 1, 1944.

(b) Organization chart of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(c) Directory of officers of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, September 1, 1944.

6. (a) Academic curriculum of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(b) Outline of courses for preliminary cadet-midshipmen (deck) and a typical class schedule.

(c) Outline of courses for preliminary cadet-midshipmen (engine) and a typical class schedule.

(d) Outline of courses for advanced cadet-midshipmen (deck) and a typical class schedule.

(e) Outline of courses for advanced cadet-midshipmen (engine) and a typical class schedule.

7. Typical academic schedule for the week.

8. Typical plan of the week.

9. Album of pictures of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and cadet-midshipmen activities.

10. Guide book for instructors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

11. Typical instructors' manuals:

(a) Instructor's Manual in Navigation for Preliminary Cadet-Midshipmen (deck).

(b) Instructor's Manual in Steam Engineering for Preliminary Cadet-Midshipmen (Engine).

12. Tanker supplement to the sea project for cadet-midshipmen (deck).

The superintendent invited the chairman to designate a member of the Board to deliver a brief address to the regiment of cadet-midshipmen immediately before the review at 4:05 p. m. Senator GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE was selected to make this address.

The regimental commander, Cadet-Midshipman William C. Gibson, United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, was then presented to the chairman and members of the Board. After being presented, he invited the members of the Board to luncheon with the regiment at Delano Hall.

Just before the meeting adjourned at 11:30 a. m., the chairman informed the Board of the regrets expressed by the following members of the Board for their inability to be present due to unforeseen circumstances: Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY, Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL, Representative EDWARD J. HART.

Meeting with the regiment of cadet-midshipmen

At 12:30 p. m. the Board was conducted to Delano Hall by the cadet-midshipmen regimental commander and his staff for luncheon with the regiment. There were no commissioned officers present. After luncheon each member of the Board was introduced to eight cadet-midshipmen from his home State and held a 20-minute conference with them.

Tour of the academy

Their officer escorts having been presented to them, the members of the Board proceeded on a conducted tour of the academy. Among the various buildings and activities inspected were—

Barry Hall: Typical cadet-midshipmen's quarters.

O'Hara Hall: Naval science classrooms, drill hall, pistol range, gun room, and ordnance equipment.

Bowditch Hall: Academy library, classrooms, radio code room, chart room, mechanical drawing room, radio laboratory, gyro laboratory, meteorology equipment, bridges, and the auditorium.

Fulton Hall: Classrooms, electrical laboratory, machine shop, Diesel laboratory, welding school, forge shop, and steam laboratory.

Samuels Hall: Sail loft, practical seamanship room, lifeboat and fire fighting classrooms, and signaling rooms (where a brief class in Mersigs was held).

Proceeding then along the water front the Board viewed the Cargo Mast Unit, Lyle Gun and Breeches Buoy Unit, and observed the harbor facilities and training vessels.

Upon completion of this tour, the Board proceeded to Kendrick Field and witnessed the review of the regiment of cadet-midshipmen.

The Board reassembled at the senior officers' mess at 4:45 p. m. for an informal discussion which terminated at 5:30 p. m.

Superintendent's reception and dinner

At 6:30 p. m. the superintendent held a reception and dinner for all members of the Board. In addition to the members of the Board there were present Capt. J. H. Tomb, United States Navy (retired), 5 officers from the headquarters of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, and 20 officers of the academy staff.

After the dinner a film depicting the activities of the entire United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was shown, accompanied by a running commentary given by Commander H. V. Nerney, United States Naval Reserve.

The Board adjourned for the day at 10:40 p. m.

Saturday, September 30, 1944

The members of the Board reassembled at 8:30 a. m. and were conducted by their officer escorts on a tour of Patton Hospital, visiting the dispensary, dental rooms and laboratories, wards, operating rooms, and diet kitchen.

Second meeting of the Board of Visitors

The members of the Board were taken aboard the training vessel *William Webb* for an inspection of the water front.

At 9:30 a. m. the Board assembled in the wardroom of the training vessel *William Webb* for its final meeting, adjourning at 10:30 a. m.

Upon adjournment, the members of the Board proceeded to Kendrick Field to witness a formal review of the regiment of cadet-midshipmen.

Following the review, the members of the Board attended a buffet luncheon in O'Hara Hall with the superintendent and senior officers of the academy and prominent invited guests from the maritime industry in celebration of the first anniversary of the dedication of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The members of the Board departed from the academy at their pleasure upon the conclusion of the luncheon.

Comments and recommendations

As a result of the inspections made and the interviews held with members of the Merchant Marine Academy staff and cadet-midshipmen of the regiment, the Board of Visitors respectfully submits the following comments and recommendations:

1. The Board recognizes the necessity of maintaining a permanent United States Merchant Marine Academy. This academy will be an important factor in the development of a sound merchant-marine policy for the country. The maintenance of an adequate merchant marine of high standards depends upon the availability of qualified officers as well as upon the existence of the best ships and favorable economic conditions. It is imperative that the indispensable service to the Nation which the United States Merchant Marine Academy has been rendering in maintaining a steady supply of well-trained officers for the merchant marine and the Navy shall be continued in the immediate post-war days and for all years to come.

2. Although the present plant and facilities of the academy are of a permanent nature and have been developed in accordance with well-conceived plans, the Board feels that early and careful consideration should be given to the expansion of both grounds and buildings to the end that a complete and fully integrated educational institution may be established at the earliest moment. Study should be made of the evident need for officers' quarters in a permanent academy. Enlargements of both grounds and facilities should be based on the requirements of the future permanent cadet-midshipmen complement of 1,200.

3. The Board is of the unanimous opinion that a full 4-year course is needed for this profession and recommends the return to the 4-year course as soon as practicable. Op-

portunity should be given to the graduates of the present shortened course to pursue post-graduate work upon resumption of the full course in order that they may have competence and knowledge in their profession equal to the graduates of the 4-year course.

4. The Board recognizes the need, during the national emergency, of keeping the cadet corps at a maximum strength without regard to national competitive examinations, provided the applicants meet the educational qualifications required. However, as a permanent national institution, it is necessary that equal opportunities for entrance be offered to the population of all parts of the country. Such equality may be attained by the assignment of quotas to each State and the requirement of passing a competitive examination by all applicants, subject to the additional qualifications of high moral character, perfect physical condition, and aptitude for the profession.

5. The Board recommends that means be provided for the academy to keep fully abreast of all modern marine inventions and equipment. As an example, one member of the Board learned, while overseas this summer, that the British were planning to place radar equipment on the vessels of their merchant fleet. It is hoped that it will be possible for the United States Navy to cooperate with our merchant marine in a free exchange of contemporary developments in maritime, naval, and scientific fields.

6. The Board believes that there is a lack of proper publicity for the academy. The members have been surprised and pleased, even as members of a congressional committee having to do with merchant marine legislation, at the outstanding establishment found at Kings Point. Ways and means should be found by which the true story of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and Academy can be brought to public attention. The Board will aid in every way to accomplish this.

7. It is the recommendation of this Board that the next Board of Visitors to the academy visit and study conditions at the academy at an early date in the year, so that they can have ample opportunity to give due consideration to questions of permanent policy and thus make a more substantial contribution to the welfare of the Merchant Marine Academy.

8. The Board recognizes that a great majority of the cadet-midshipmen who are now in training have seen service with the merchant marine in combat zones; they feel that this is a strenuous education for these men in itself, and produces the best kind of officer material for the future. The Board recommends that consideration be given to the general status of merchant marine officers as veterans of this war. A distinction must be made between their status and the status of members of the military and naval services during the war, yet certainly these men deserve regard as veterans of war service and should be given a fair opportunity to establish themselves in their profession. Any study of the situation must consider their special qualifications and their special needs.

Conclusion

In conclusion the members of the Board wish to congratulate the superintendent, the officers, and the cadet-midshipmen of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and Academy for the splendid work being done. The Board was deeply impressed by the spirit and morale of officers and cadet-midshipmen, as well as by the institution, the latter so splendidly arranged and most effectively operated with an administrative and educational personnel of the highest character and efficiency.

The Board wishes to thank the superintendent, their escorts, and every officer for the courtesy and hospitality extended to the members during their visit.

To Lieutenant Commander William W. MacKenzie, United States Naval Reserve, Secretary to the Board of Visitors, the Board expresses its sincere appreciation for his ceaseless efforts in its behalf, and for his invaluable assistance and cooperation.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES M. TUNNELL.
J. W. BAILEY.
HAROLD H. BURTON.
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.
SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.
GORDON CANFIELD.
EUGENE J. KEOGH.
EDWARD J. HART.
ROBERT RAMSPECK.
DANIEL ELLISON.

## CONVENTION AND PROTOCOL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FRANCE RELATIVE TO INCOME AND OTHER TAXES—REMOVAL OF BAN OF SECRECY

As in executive session,

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate for ratification the convention and protocol between the United States and France, signed at Paris on July 25, 1939, for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes. The same convention was submitted to the Senate under date of February 1, 1940. At that time the convention and protocol were referred to a subcommittee consisting of the late Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the senior Senator from Georgia. A favorable report was made to the full committee, and the full committee reported favorably upon the convention under date of May 8, 1940.

However, due to the political and military developments in Europe, and particularly in France, the convention went back to the State Department and into the hands of the Executive without formal action.

This is the same convention and protocol, now resubmitted to the Senate. I ask that the ban of secrecy be removed in order that the matter may be properly handled by the officers of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the form of the convention and protocol which is now resubmitted identical to that in which it was previously submitted?

Mr. GEORGE. It is identical; there has been no subsequent change.

Mr. AIKEN. It is in regular treaty form, is it?

Mr. GEORGE. It is in the regular treaty form.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in understanding that it is in the same treaty form in which it was when previously submitted?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, the same as when it was previously submitted.

The improved political situation in France, and particularly the relationship between the United States and France, now makes it appropriate for the matter to be considered. I am now merely asking for the removal of the ban of secrecy on this convention and protocol.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the request of the Senator from Georgia is granted and the treaty and protocol are made public and will be published in the RECORD.

The treaty and protocol, Executive I, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, are as follows:

[Executive I, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session]

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention and protocol between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on July 25, 1939, for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, which convention and protocol were reported favorably to the Senate without amendment by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on May 8, 1940, as explained more fully in the report on the convention and protocol made to me by the Acting Secretary of State.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Acting Secretary of State. The attention of the Senate is invited particularly to the statements in the report which have relation to the possibility of bringing the convention and protocol into force on January 1, 1945, in accordance with a provision in article 27 of the convention.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 30, 1944.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Convention and protocol of July 25, 1939, between the United States and France for the avoidance of double taxation.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, November 24, 1944.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House.*

THE PRESIDENT: The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, the convention and protocol between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on July 25, 1939, for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes.

This is the same convention, with accompanying protocol, which was transmitted to the Senate with the President's message dated February 1, 1940, and which the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on May 8, 1940, reported favorably to the Senate without amendment and recommended that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification thereof, after a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in a report of May 8, 1940, had expressed the view "that the terms of the convention are advantageous to the United States, and that the convention should be ratified." The texts of the convention and protocol of July 25, 1939, together with the texts of the President's message of February 1, 1940, and the report of the Secretary of State to the President, dated January 30, 1940, were printed in Senate Executive A, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session. The text of the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is printed in Senate

Executive Report No. 7, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, together with the texts of the report of the subcommittee of that committee, a report of May 3, 1940, by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Congress of the United States, and a technical memorandum of the Treasury Department relating to the convention and protocol.

Pursuant to an order of the Senate, in executive session, dated September 26 (legislative day of September 18), 1940, the Secretary of the Senate returned the aforementioned convention and protocol to the President without the advice and consent of the Senate to their ratification. This action was explained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 26, 1940 (vol. 86, pt. 11, p. 12670), as being proposed "in view of the political changes effected through military operations in Europe" since the convention and protocol were signed.

In view of the improvement of the political situation in Europe as affecting the relations between the United States of America and France, consideration has been given to the possibility of further improving trade relations between the two countries by removing certain of the barriers to trade which result from the double taxation of income. After consultation between interested authorities of this Government, it has been concluded by the Department of State that it would be worth while to propose that the convention and protocol signed on July 25, 1939, as the best available means of eliminating double taxation on income and of facilitating reciprocal administrative assistance between the taxing authorities of the two countries, be resubmitted to the President with a view to its transmission to the Senate.

Considering that article 27 of the convention provides that it "shall become effective on the 1st day of January following the exchange of the instruments of ratification," and that it appears to be desirable, for the purpose of placing the fiscal relations of the two countries upon a mutually advantageous basis, to have the convention and protocol brought into force, if circumstances should make it possible, on January 1, 1945, it is hoped that action will be taken at an early date with a view to determining whether the convention and protocol may be ratified on the part of the United States of America.

It will be recalled that the concluding sentence in the President's message of February 1, 1940, read as follows:

"As the President of France signed the decree of ratification on July 29, 1939, the convention may be brought into force on January 1, 1941, if the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification at the present session."

By a decree of July 29, 1939, published in Journal Oficiel de la République Française of August 10, 1939 (p. 10103), the President of France ratified the convention and protocol of July 25, 1939. The decree of July 29, 1939, was placed before the French Chamber of Deputies on December 22, 1939, in conformity to the provisions of the French law of March 19, 1939.

According to a report received by the Department of State from the American Ambassador in Paris, in a communication dated November 9, 1944, in response to a request by the Department of State that the Ambassador ascertain what the present situation in France may be with respect to the action necessary to bring the convention and protocol into force under the French constitutional procedure, it appears that the deposit of the French President's decree with the Chamber of Deputies fulfilled the substantial requirements of French law in order to give the convention and protocol validity in France.

The Department of State is of the view that the convention and protocol, under which important concessions in respect of taxation would be accorded to American institutions and firms, represent the best available guaranty of favorable treatment for American interests in relation to matters of taxation.

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
*Acting Secretary of State.*

[Enclosure: Convention and protocol of July 25, 1939, between the United States and France for the avoidance of double taxation.]

---

CONVENTION FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RULES OF RECIPROCAL ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE IN THE CASE OF INCOME AND OTHER TAXES

The President of the United States of America and the President of the French Republic, being desirous of avoiding double taxation and of establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, have decided to conclude a Convention and for that purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. William Christian Bullitt, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France;

The President of the French Republic:

M. Georges Bonnet, Member of the Chamber of Deputies, Minister for Foreign Affairs,

who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

TITLE I. DOUBLE TAXATION

*Article 1*

The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The federal income taxes, including surtaxes and excess-profits taxes;

(b) In the case of France:

(1) The real estate tax;

(2) The industrial and commercial profits tax;

(3) The annual tax on undistributed profits;

(4) The agricultural profits tax;

(5) The tax on salaries, allowances and emoluments, wages, pensions and annuities;

(6) The professional profits tax;

(7) The tax on income from securities and movable capital;

(8) The general income tax.

*Article 2*

Income from real property, including income from agricultural undertakings, shall be taxable only in the State in which such real property is situated.

*Article 3*

An enterprise of one of the contracting States is not subject to taxation by the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits except in respect of such profits allocable to its permanent establishment in the latter State.

No account shall be taken, in determining the tax in one of the contracting States, of the purchase of merchandise effected therein by an enterprise of the other State for the purpose of supplying establishments maintained by such enterprise in the latter State.

The competent authorities of the two contracting States may lay down rules by agreement for the apportionment of industrial and commercial profits.

The terms "industrial and commercial profits" shall not include the following:

(a) Income from real property;

(b) Income from mortgages, from public funds, securities (including mortgage bonds), loans, deposits and current accounts;

(c) Dividends and other income from shares in a corporation;

(d) Rentals or royalties arising from leasing personal property or from any interest in such property, including rentals or royalties for the use of, or for the privilege of using, patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulae, goodwill, trade marks, trade brands, franchises and other like property;

(e) Profit or loss from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

Subject to the provisions of this Convention the income referred to in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) shall be taxed separately or together with industrial and commercial profits in accordance with the laws of the contracting States.

*Article 4*

American enterprises having permanent establishments in France are required to submit to the French fiscal administration the same declarations and the same justifications, with respect to such establishments, as French enterprises.

The French fiscal administration has the right, within the provisions of its national legislation and subject to the measures of appeal provided in such legislation, to make such corrections in the declaration of profits realized in France as may be necessary to show the exact amount of such profits.

The same principle applies mutatis mutandis to French enterprises having permanent establishments in the United States.

*Article 5*

When an American enterprise, by reason of its participation in the management or capital of a French enterprise, makes or imposes on the latter, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with a third enterprise, any profits which should normally have appeared in the balance sheet of the French enterprise, but which have been in this manner diverted to the American enterprise, are, subject to the measures of appeal applicable in the case of the tax on industrial and commercial profits, incorporated in the taxable profits of the French enterprise.

The same principle applies mutatis mutandis, in the event that profits are diverted from an American enterprise to a French enterprise.

*Article 6*

Income derived by navigation enterprises of one of the contracting States from the operation of ships documented under the laws of that State shall continue to benefit in the other State by the reciprocal tax exemptions accorded by the exchange of notes of June 11 and July 8, 1927, between the United States of America and France.

Income which an enterprise of one of the contracting States derives from the operation of aircraft registered in that State shall be exempt from taxation in the other State.

*Article 7*

Royalties from real property or in respect of the operation of mines, quarries or other natural resources shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which such property, mines, quarries or other natural resources are situated.

Royalties derived from within one of the contracting States by a resident or by a corporation or other entity of the other contracting State as consideration for the right to use copyrights, patents, secret processes and formulae, trademarks and other analogous rights shall be exempt from taxation in the former State, provided such resident, corporation or other entity does not have a permanent establishment there.

*Article 8*

Wages, salaries and similar compensation and pensions paid by one of the contracting States or by a political subdivision thereof to individuals residing in the other State shall be exempt from taxation in the latter State.

Private pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the contracting States and paid to individuals residing in the other

contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

*Article 9*

Income from labor or personal services shall be taxable only in the State in which the taxpayer carries on his personal activity.

This provision does not apply to the income referred to in Article 8.

*Article 10*

Income from the exercise of a liberal profession shall be taxable only in the State in which the professional activity is exercised.

There is the exercise of a liberal profession in one of the two contracting Sta es only when the professional activity has a fixed center in that country.

*Article 11*

Gains derived in one of the contracting States from the sale or exchange of stocks, securities or commodities by a resident or a corporation or other entity of the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State, provided such resident or corporation or other entity has no permanent establishment in the former State.

*Article 12*

Students from one of the contracting States residing in the other contracting State exclusively for the purpose of study shall not be taxable by the latter State in respect of remittances received from within the former State for the purpose of their maintenance or studies.

*Article 13*

In the calculation of taxes established in one of the contracting States on the use of property or increment of property of an enterprise of the other State, account shall be taken only of that portion of the capital situated or employed and allocable to a permanent establishment within the former State.

The foregoing provision shall apply to the French "patente" tax and the United States capital stock tax even though these two taxes have not been referred to in Article 1 of the present Convention.

In the application of the present Article navigation enterprises of one of the contracting States, enjoying in the other State the benefits of Article 6 of the present Convention, shall not be considered as having a permanent establishment in the latter State insofar as shipping activities are concerned.

*Article 14*

It is agreed that double taxation shall be avoided in the following manner:

A. As regards the United States of America:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this convention, the United States of America in determining the income and excess-profits taxes, including all surtaxes, of its citizens, or residents, or corporations, may include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed, all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of the United States of America, as though this convention had not come into effect. The United States of America shall, however, deduct from the taxes thus computed the amount of French income tax paid. This deduction shall be made in accordance with the benefits and limitations of section 131 of the United States Internal Revenue Code relating to credit for foreign taxes.

B. As regards France:

(a) Schedular taxes: Income from securities, debts and trusts having its source in the United States of America shall be subject in France to the tax on income from securities; but this tax shall be reduced by the amount of the tax already paid in the United States of America on the same income. In consideration of the fiscal regime to which the legislation of the United States of America subjects the income of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations or other entities, the deduction of the tax paid in the United States of America shall be effected in a lump sum through a reduction of 12 in the rate of the tax established by the French law.

The income other than that indicated in the preceding paragraph shall not be subject to any schedular tax in France when, according to this convention, it is taxable in the United States of America.

(b) General tax on revenue: Notwithstanding any other provision of the present convention, the general income tax can be determined according to all the elements of taxable income as imposed by French fiscal legislation.

However, the provisions of the first paragraph of article 114 of the French Code on direct taxation relative to the taxation of aliens domiciled or resident in France shall continue to be applied.

*Article 15*

In derogation of Article 3 of the Decree of December 6, 1872, American corporations which maintain in France permanent establishments shall be liable to the tax on income from securities on three-fourths of the profits actually derived from such establishments, the industrial and commercial profits being determined in accordance with Articles 3 and 4 of this Convention.

The remaining one-fourth shall, in all cases, be taken as the basis of the annual tax on undistributed profits applicable to the same corporations.

*Article 16*

An American corporation shall not be subject to the obligations prescribed by Article 3 of the Decree of December 6, 1872, by reason of any participation in the management or in the capital of, or any other relations with, a French corporation. In such case, the tax on income from securities continues to be levied, in conformity with French legislation, on the dividends, interest and all other distributions made by the French enterprise; but it is moreover collectible, if the occasion arises, and subject to the measures of appeal applicable in the case of the tax on income from securities, with respect to the profits which the American corporation derives from the French corporation under the conditions prescribed in Article 5.

*Article 17*

The American corporations subject to the provisions of Article 3 of the Decree of December 6, 1872 who were not placed under the special regime established by Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention for the avoidance of double income taxation between the United States of America and France, signed April 27, 1932, may, during a new period of six months from the date of the entry into force of the present Convention, exercise with reference to past years, the option provided in those two articles under the conditions which they prescribe.

Moreover, the American corporations contemplated in the third paragraph of Article 10 of the Convention of April 27, 1932, may be admitted to benefit from the provisions of that paragraph, when the tax has not yet been paid, if the latter was not found to be payable, prior to May 1, 1930, by a definitive judicial decision or if such decision has been the subject of an appeal in cassation.

*Article 18*

Any United States income tax liability remaining unpaid as at the effective date of this Convention for years beginning prior to January 1, 1936 of any individual resident of France (other than a citizen of the United States of America) or of a French corporation may be adjusted by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, on the basis of the provisions of the United States Revenue Act of 1936. However, no adjustment will be made more than two years subsequent to the effective date of this Convention unless the taxpayer files a request with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue prior to such date.

*Article 19*

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Convention, in order to avoid double taxation on public servants, employees of one of the contracting States being citizens of that State and remunerated by it, who have been received by the other State to perform services in such State shall be exempt in their principal place of residence from direct and personal taxes whether national, state or local.

Such employees who own real property in the State in which they perform services shall not benefit from the above exemptions with respect to the taxes levied on such real property. Employees who engage in any private gainful occupation in such State shall not be entitled to any exemption under this Article.

TITLE II. FISCAL ASSISTANCE

*Article 20*

With a view to the more effective imposition of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, the contracting States undertake, on condition of reciprocity, to furnish information of a fiscal nature which the authorities of each State concerned have at their disposal, or are in a position to obtain under their own laws, that may be of use to the authorities of the other State in the assessment of the said taxes.

Such information shall be exchanged between the competent authorities of the contracting States in the ordinary course or on request.

*Article 21*

In accordance with the preceding Article, the competent authorities of the United States of America will transmit to the competent authorities of France, as regards any person, corporation or other entity (other than a citizen, corporation or other entity of the United States of America) having an address in France and deriving from sources within the United States of America rents, dividends, interest, royalties, income from trusts, wages, salaries, pensions, annuities, or other fixed or determinable periodical income, the name and address of such person, corporation or other entity as well as the amount of such income.

The competent authorities of France will transmit to the competent authorities of the United States of America, as regards any person, corporation or other entity (other than a citizen, corporation or other entity of France) having an address in the United States of America and deriving from sources within France rents, dividends, interest, royalties, income from trusts, wages, salaries, pensions, annuities, or other fixed or determinable periodical income, the name and address of such person, corporation or other entity as well as the amount of such income.

The information relating to each year will be transmitted as soon as possible after December 31.

*Article 22*

The competent authorities of each of the contracting States shall be entitled to obtain, through diplomatic channels, from the competent authorities of the other contracting State, except with respect to citizens, corporations or other entities of the State to which application is made, particulars in concrete cases necessary for the establishment of the taxes to which the present Convention relates.

However, the competent authorities of each State shall not be prevented from transmitting to the competent authorities of the other State information relating to their own nationals (citizens, corporations or other entities) if they deem it opportune for the prevention of fiscal evasion.

*Article 23*

Each contracting State undertakes to lend assistance and support in the collection of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, together with interest, costs, and additions to the taxes and fines not being of a penal character according to the laws of the State requested, in the cases where the taxes are definitively due according to the laws of the State making the application.

In the case of an application for enforcement of taxes, revenue claims of each of the contracting States which have been finally determined shall be accepted for enforcement by the State to which application is made and collected in that State in accordance with the laws applicable to the enforcement and collection of its own taxes.

The application shall be accompanied by such documents as are required by the laws of the State making the application, to establish that the taxes have been finally determined.

If the revenue claim has not been finally determined, the State to which application is made may, at the request of the State making the application, take such measures of conservancy as are authorized by the laws of the former State for the enforcement of its own taxes.

The assistance provided for in this Article shall not be accorded with respect to the citizens, corporations or other entities of the State to which application is made.

*Article 24*

In no case shall the provisions of Article 22 relating to particulars in concrete cases, or of Article 23 relating to mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, be construed so as to impose upon either of the contracting States the obligation to carry out administrative measures at variance with the regulations and practice of either contracting State, or to supply particulars which are not procurable under the law of the State to which application is made, or that of the State making application.

The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it. Nevertheless, such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a business, industrial or trade secret. In such case it shall inform, as soon as possible, the State making the application.

*Article 25*

Any taxpayer who shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the contracting States has resulted in double taxation in his case in respect of any of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of such State may come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

*Article 26*

The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of this Convention. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, rates of conversion of currencies, transfer of sums collected, minimum amounts subject to collection, payment of costs of collection, and related matters.

TITLE III. GENERAL PROVISIONS

*Article 27*

The present Convention shall be ratified in the case of the United States of America by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and in the case of France, by the President of the French Republic with the consent of the Parliament.

This Convention shall become effective on the first day of January following the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

The Convention shall remain in force for a period of five years and indefinitely thereafter but may be terminated by either contracting State at the end of the five-year period or at any time thereafter, provided six months' prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective on the first day of January following the expiration of the six-month period.

Upon the coming into effect of this Convention, the Convention for the avoidance of double income taxation between the United States of America and France, signed April 27, 1932 shall terminate.

Done at Paris, in duplicate, in the English and French languages, this 25th day of July, 1939.

[SEAL] WILLIAM C. BULLITT
[SEAL] GEORGES BONNET

PROTOCOL

At the moment of signing the present Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have agreed that the following provisions shall form an integral part of the Convention:

I

The present Convention is concluded with reference to American and French law in force on the day of its signature.

Accordingly, if these laws are appreciably modified the competent authorities of the two States will consult together.

II

The income from real property referred to in Article 2 of the present Convention shall include profits from the sale or exchange of the said property, but shall not include interest on mortgages or obligations secured by the said property.

III

As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "permanent establishment" includes branches, mines and oil wells, plantations, factories, workshops, stores, purchasing and selling and other offices, agencies, warehouses, and other fixed places of business but does not include a subsidiary corporation.

When an enterprise of one of the contracting States carries on business in the other State through an employee or agent, established there, who has general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders which he receives, this enterprise shall be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the latter State. But the fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States has business dealings in the other States through a bona fide commission agent or broker shall not be held to mean that such enterprise has a permanent establishment in the latter State.

Insurance enterprises shall be considered as having a permanent establishment in one of the States as soon as they receive premiums from or insure risks in the territory of that State.

(b) The term "enterprise" includes every form of undertaking whether carried on by an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other entity.

(c) The term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, as the case may be, "United States enterprise" or "French enterprise".

(d) The term "United States enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in the United States of America by a resident of the United States of America or by a United States corporation or other entity.

The term "United States corporation or other entity" means a partnership, corporation or other entity created or organized in the United States of America or under the law of the United States of America or of any State or Territory of the United States of America.

(e) The term "French enterprise" is defined in the same manner, mutatis mutandis, as the term "United States enterprise".

IV

The term "life annuities" referred to in Article 8 of this Convention means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years to the person who has paid the premiums or a gross sum for such an obligation.

V

Citizens and corporations or other entities of one of the contracting States within the other contracting State shall not be subjected as regards the taxes referred to in the present Convention, to the payment of higher taxes than are imposed upon the citizens or corporations or other entities of such latter State.

VI

The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit, allowance, or other advantage accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

VII

Documents and information contained therein, transmitted under the provisions of this Convention by one of the contracting States to the other contracting State shall not be published, revealed or disclosed to any person except to the extent permitted under the laws of the latter State with respect to similar documents or information.

VIII

As used in this Convention the term "competent authority" or "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Treasury and in the case of France, the Minister of Finance.

IX

The term "United States of America" as used in this Convention in a geographic sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

X

The term "France", when used in a geographic sense, indicates continental France, exclusive of Algeria and the Colonies.

XI

Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

Done in duplicate at Paris, this 25th day of July, 1939.

WILLIAM C. BULLITT
GEORGES BONNET

## THE DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS—ADDRESS BY JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD a portion of an address on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, delivered by Hon. John Foster Dulles at the biennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on November 28, 1944.

There being no objection, the portion of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I now turn to consider the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and particularly their most featured organ, the Security Council. That is designed to prevent the outbreak of war through the use of force if necessary. That arrangement disturbs many. To them it seems to camouflage a military alliance whereby a few powerful nations will dominate the many smaller nations without regard to justice. On the other hand, many feel that only material force is dependable and consider that our commission's approach reflects the so-called impractical idealism of Christianity.

These opposing viewpoints could seriously divide American public opinion, even to the point of paralyzing our national action. That would be a catastrophe and, I think, a quite unnecessary catastrophe, for the force proposals of Dumbarton Oaks have been played up out of all relation to what the facts justify. In reality they are little more than scenery. But some such scenery may be necessary, if only to secure the indispensable support of the many who, particularly in wartime, think that peace can be assured only in the same way that victory is won, that is military might.

Let us look more closely into the significance of what threatens to divide us.

Almost all of us can accept the premise of Dumbarton Oaks that, in a world of imperfect individuals, some force-in-being of the nature of a police force is important for security. However, it is also clear that if such a police force is to be effective, it must be under a commanding executive who can surely and quickly bring it into action. If the use of force becomes highly problematic and contingent on the outcome of debate and negotiation, actuated by conflicting considerations of expediency, then it ceases to be an effective instrument—either for good or evil.

That, I think, is what we have under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The national force quotas can be brought into action only by the vote of a council of representatives of 11 nations and, while the matter is not yet explicit, we can assume that the majority of six must always include the representatives of China, France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America. Further, these representatives are not bound to any principle of action or rule of conduct. Their vote is wholly discretionary and will be dictated primarily by national considerations. I do not know what authority may be given the United States member. But it can be taken as sure that he will not vote to use force unless he thinks that the President and Congress will approve. Certainly, the Soviet member will not act without the approval of Mr. Stalin. Indeed, experience to date indicates that Soviet representatives at international conferences are extremely reluctant to take independent responsibility. We can be sure that the British member will not act without the approval of the British Cabinet who, under their parliamentary system, will have to be sure of Parliament's support and who will also probably want to consult the other members of the British Commonwealth.

Such an arrangement falls very short of providing that unified executive command of force needed to make it an effective instrument. Proof of that is found in the fact that it is not relied upon to deal with either Germany or Japan. That weakness is not a deficiency of draftsmanship. It is a deficiency inherent in the present state of the world. There are only two ways to assure that force can be used effectively. One is the way of despotism. That puts force under an executive head who is free to use the force at his own discretion. That way provides uneasy security to those who are willing to buy it at the price of freedom. The other way is the way of free men. Through custom—common law—or through a legislative body they create a system of law adequate to regulate human behavior. Then they delegate to an executive the power and duty to enforce those laws. The executive has no discretion, but is bound to use force he controls without fear or favor, and against great and small. Those subject to law know in advance what conduct will attract a penalty and what conduct will assure protection.

That way was not, however, available to the authors of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. There is yet no world acceptance, and therefore no effective definition, of proper and improper national conduct. It would not be enough to define and prohibit national misconduct of the flagrant type. For that would, by inference, legitimatize evasions. To illustrate, the modern technique is to extend one's national domain by internal penetrations. We used that method to get control of the Panama Canal Zone, and since then others have perfected it. The difficulty of adequate definition is so great that the Chinese failed when they sought to incorporate in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals a definition of "aggression." It seemed that any definition which would give to some the freedom to which they felt entitled might also permit a license which might be abused by others. Therefore it was decided that each future international controversy, unless perhaps of the small "justiciable" class, would have to be dealt with as a mater of discretion.

It is difficult to quarrel with that conclusion, but it involves attaching to force so many strings that it cannot be an effective instrument of order. Thus, each of the nations so far participating in the plans for world organization has accepted the right of the Security Council to invoke force, but on the assumption that, through its representative, it will have a string on its use. In the case of the great powers, that veto power will be reinforced by national military establishments which will far surpass any peace quotas which will be made available to the world organization. Other prospective member states will also seek immunity from possible arbitrary action by the council and they may get it. If they do not get it directly, in the form of a veto power in the council, they may get it by side understandings with some major power acting as their protector. Also, even as now planned there must be at least one concurring vote in the council by a small state and five others will cast a vote which, while not controlling, with be morally very potent.

The cumulative result of all of this will largely immobilize the force quotas. Possibly their potentiality, on paper, will deter some minor disturbances. However, their use presupposes a political unanimity of the great powers which has rarely occurred and which, if it prevails, will itself assure peace.

Our commission was aware of the difficulty of arranging for the responsible and effective use of force in the absence of adequate and world-accepted definitions of right and wrong conduct. We remembered that behind the policeman stands the executive, behind the executive stands a law-making body—and behind the law-making body there exists the moral consensus of the community. That is what is basic. Laws are ineffective unless they reflect that, and without laws there cannot be an executive—other than a despot—and without an executive there cannot be an effective administration of police power.

The great obstacle to world order is the lack of any universal moral judgments about national conduct. We cannot expect that until national groups have worked together in peace. Men harmonize and clarify their views about good and bad conduct when they are associated in common tasks. Victory in war is such a task, but there is so far no counterpart in peace. It is that which we would supply and it is that which our six pillars make primary. We want world organization to bring the nations together to work for stable economic and monetary conditions; to keep the treaty structure of the world abreast of changing underlying conditions; to make autonomy the genuine goal of colonial administration and to assure to individuals everywhere spiritual and intellectual liberty. Out of working together on such great tasks there can come a common judgment of what is decent national conduct, and a general agreement that, in matters of common concern, the general welfare should take precedence. That will, on the one hand, greatly reduce the occasions for the use of force, on the other hand it will make it possible to arrange so that force can be quickly and decisively used, when it needs to be used at all.

We can feel encouraged. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals contain great possibilities. The Economic and Social Council and related agencies can do much to develop fellowship among the nations. There still exists a possibility of broadening such functions so that they even more fully conform to our six pillars of peace program. The Security Council can be a forum where controversial matters are discussed, where public opinion may focus its pressures and where conflicting theories about national conduct may become reconciled. The World Court can be used to extend the reign of law. All of this can gradually engender the moral basis needed for a complete constitutional order.

The important thing is that we be realistic about the proposals and see their practical potentialities and work to develop them. In the present state of the world, the force proposals, as I say, are little more than scenery. We need not concentrate upon them all our concern. They alone cannot breathe life—either good life or bad life—into the world organization. Once we realize that, we can disengage ourselves from much of the current controversy about force and devote ourselves to developing those phases of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which can really give vitality to world organization.

To achieve world-wide fellowship, to promote judgments which reflect the moral law, are tasks for which the Christian churches are peculiarly qualified. Only the discharge of those tasks can bring to world organization the elements of solid reality. We can carry on with confidence, knowing that in this matter also the Christian approach is the realistic approach.

## ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND J. SHEIL, D. D., AT C. I. O. CONVENTION

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Most Reverend J. Sheil, D. D., at the C. I. O. convention, Stephens Hotel, Chicago, November 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE TREATY-MAKING POWER

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Ralph W. Page, entitled "Senate Two-thirds Rule Faces Show-down," published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of November 25, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Majority Rule," published in the Nashville Tennesseean of

November 25, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the 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 VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the debate which has been proceeding during the past week has brought forcibly to our attention and to the attention of the American people the need for some carefully planned, scientific method for the unified development of our great river basins.

For many years the complex problems of floods, droughts, soil erosion, seepage, silting, reforestation, and resource development have been under the jurisdiction of several conflicting Federal agencies—each one catering to some particular interest and seeking to solve some particular problem. Oftentimes these interests have been in conflict with each other. This situation has frequently brought into play arguments and disputes between these conflicting agencies blocking any unified program for the permanent solution of these problems.

On the lower stretches of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, for example, the problem has been exclusively one of floods. The endeavors of the people in those regions have been devoted entirely to protecting their homes and factories and schools and hospitals from being submerged annually by raging floods often reaching catastrophic proportions. The people in those sections may be said to have developed a sort of flood complex. All they can think of is the problem of escaping from destruction each year by building levees and embankments and taking similar protective measures. At the same time, the people in the upper reaches of the river have had to battle not only with periodic flood visitations but have had other problems, such as drought and soil erosion, to struggle with. Then there are others within the same watershed whose main interest is navigation.

The disastrous flood of June 1942 inundated tens of thousands of acres of fertile bottom lands, and rendered homeless thousands of people. The people of the valley had hardly had time to recuperate from that disaster, the like of which had not been known since 1903, when the valley suffered three intensive floods in 1943, when more than 7,000,000 acres of land were submerged, and damage to the communities estimated at more than $153,000,000 was caused.

While these problems have been mounting, while the lives of millions of our people in the Missouri watershed have been in constant jeopardy, the struggle of the conflicting interests has been going on unabated.

This situation was very clearly illustrated by the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on the floor of the Senate a few days ago. The Senator spoke only of protecting the States on the lower stretches of the river from the recurrent floods. The Senator said:

> This is a flood-control bill and is necessary because frequently in my section, we are under the water. The Senator from Montana may not be so much interested in it, but down at my end of the Missouri Valley, we are under the water every year. We have had as many as two or three floods a year, and the whole theory of setting up a Missouri Valley commission is simply that while we pursue the present system of keeping the water off us so far as we can, we adopt the methods which have been used in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Continuing his address, the distinguished Senator from Missouri said:

> The Senator from Montana, who lives on the upper reaches of the Missouri River, is in a position to regard the whole problem from an extremely theoretical view. I never in my life lived more than 15 miles from the Mississippi River and 20 miles from the Missouri River. I happen to live where the flood problems actually exist, and I therefore regard the subject from an extremely practical standpoint, not from a theoretical standpoint, not from reading newspaper editorials, not from reading Dave Lilienthal's book, not from reading anything of that sort. I regard it from the standpoint of a man who lives under the floods which come down.

Mr. President, of course, we all are in complete sympathy with the problem described by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, afflicting the people along the lower reaches of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. It is because we fully appreciate the disastrous effects of these recurring floods and are desirous of working out a program which will meet these problems successfully, and rescue the people of the suffering States from these annual devastations, that a Missouri Valley Authority is imperative. The M. V. A. is not based upon theory alone. That charge might have been leveled at the original T. V. A. bill when it was under debate in the Congress of the United States. From the experiences gained and the lessons taught as shown by the record of the Tennessee Valley Authority during the past 11 years, and from the manner in which it continues to operate, we know that the M. V. A. is no longer a mere theory, but is a sound and proven program.

It has demonstrated that it is more economical than any other method of regional development. It is the only way to bring about a unified development of the entire region in the best interests of all. Above all, we know that it is the most democratic way of doing the job that must be done in the Missouri Basin.

The theory of working out a solution from the standpoint of flood control alone has failed. It has failed continually for many years. Constant dredging and the building of levees and embankments have failed to solve the problem of navigation and flood control. Handling this problem by the piecemeal method will never bring relief to the people in the Missouri Valley or any other valley. This is the considered opinion of outstanding engineers and students of the problem and is not the product of mere theorizers.

Today, we are riding the crest of wartime prosperity. Our factories are producing at full blast. Everybody who wants a job can find one. Yet when the fighting is over, we will no longer be able to depend upon wartime production and wartime spending to keep our economy in high gear. War contracts will be canceled. Many war factories will be shut down. Ten million returning servicemen, and millions of men and women who are now working in our factories, fields, and mines will be looking for employment.

During the past few months, it has been my privilege to take an active part in the writing of many bills that have been described as post-war legislation. I am referring to the Contract Settlement Act, the Surplus War Property Act, and the Mobilization and Reconversion Act.

Yet these measures were almost entirely limited to the liquidation of war production. They were not intended to come to grips with the fundamental problems of providing full employment in the post-war period.

During the months which lie ahead of us, the people of our country will be looking to the Congress for affirmative post-war legislation to assure an expanding post-war economy that will guarantee opportunity and security for industry, labor, and agriculture.

I visualize a great post-war expansion in aeronautics, in railroad transportation, in plastics, in light alloys, in electronics, in housing and in many other fields of private enterprise.

I visualize constructive legislation by Congress in the fields of social security assistance for small business, taxation, and international trade—as a means of promoting the expansion of private business enterprise.

Yet, by themselves, these measures will not be enough. Let us not forget that total national production is now running at a level of $200,000,000,000 a year—and that almost half of this is for war production. It has been estimated that if after the war we allow the total national production to go back to the level of 1940, we shall have in this country 19,000,000 unemployed men and women.

Clearly, we need new and additional programs to provide the expansion that will be necessary to avert another economic crisis.

During the last depression, the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority was an important factor in helping to carry us forward on the road to recovery. In this period, I submit, the creation of the Missouri Valley Authority and of similar agencies in the other great river basins of the country will be a decisive factor in avoiding a post-war depression and in providing an increasingly higher standard of living for the people of our country.

There is much talk these days about helping small business. Well, let us do something concrete to help the thousands of small businessmen in the Missouri Valley and of the other great river basins of our country—by providing comprehensive river-valley programs that will bring cheap power and cheap trans-

portation within the reach of every small businessman.

We talk much these days about preparing plans for returning soldiers and sailors. The program I have described will open new opportunities for our fighting men—opportunities to develop land that has been reclaimed, opportunities to embark upon fruitful small-business enterprises of their own.

We talk about the post-war welfare of our farmers. Let us not confine ourselves merely to developing new methods of subsidizing farm distress after it has occurred. Let us provide an integrated program for our major river basins that will protect the soil of our country and help to build an expanding and self-sustaining agricultural economy.

We talk about post-war planning. Well, the proposal to establish seven T. V. A.'s throughout our land is post-war planning in the most concrete, most practical, and most effective form that has yet been presented to the Senate of the United States.

If we are to reach the economic goal which President Roosevelt has set—an annual national income of $150,000,000,000—it is necessary that the vast Missouri River be developed by a Missouri Valley Authority and that similar developments should take place in other river basins of the Nation. Everybody is in agreement that the country must have new developments—industrial and agricultural—if there is not to be a slump in the post-war period. This wide development and expansion of industry cannot take place wholly in the eastern sections of the country. The Eastern States are already overpopulated, in the opinion of individuals who have made a careful study of the subject. The Missouri Valley is one of America's great frontiers. We have the raw materials and the soil and the forests and the water. All that is needed is the application of a tried and tested system of development and exploitation. That work can be done successfully and economically only through a Missouri Valley Authority.

Mr. President, who is there who would deny that the world peace for which we are striving will depend on economic prosperity? Who is there who would deny that the prosperity of the world depends on the prosperity of the United States of America?

Mr. President, no one would accuse me of exaggerating when I say that the prosperity of America—and hence the welfare of the world—depends to a large extent upon the vision and the courage of those who represent our people in this Congress of the United States. In the days that lie ahead, there will be many great issues to test our vision and our courage—and I have a deep and stubborn faith that we shall not fail.

And by that token, it is my conviction that the next session of the Congress will see the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, and similar authorities in other areas, as an integral and indispensable part of our national program for full employment and prosperity.

On November 27, 1944, the President of the United States addressed a communication to the Senate reiterating his recommendations that a Missouri Valley Authority be created. The President stated that the technical differences in the reports submitted to the Congress by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers relating to the development of the Missouri River have been reconciled.

This so-called joint plan of the two Federal agencies, the President points out, represents merely a beginning in the solution of the problems of the Missouri Valley. It is only a beginning, as the President points out, because there are other important matters not within the scope of the joint report which bear very materially upon the entire region of the Missouri Valley. The President therefore concludes that only a single authority, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, could and would provide the necessary mechanism for the adjustment of the interests of the States in the Missouri watershed.

In order that there may be no question as to what he believes would be best for the divergent interests of the nine States of the Missouri watershed, the President says:

> A single authority, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, over the entire region would provide an adequate mechanism for the adjustment of the interests of the States and for the planning and development of the entire valley.

Mr. President, I ask that the President's message be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HALL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The President's message is as follows:

NOVEMBER 27, 1944.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: On September 21, 1944, I sent a message to the Congress recommending the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority that would be charged with the duty of preparing and carrying out a single coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States. At that time there was under consideration by the Congress two reports, the one presented by the Corps of Engineers, the other by the Bureau of Reclamation, which, while presenting comprehensive plans for the development of the Missouri River, were in conflict in many details. The two Bureaus have reconciled the technical differences in these two reports and have prepared a joint recommendation which, in conjunction with the two reports, constitutes a basic plan for the development and control of the waters of the Missouri River.

This joint plan represents a beginning in the solution of the problems of the Missouri Valley. But it is only a beginning, for other important matters not within the scope of this joint report bear very materially upon the entire region. As a practical matter, most of these cannot be dealt with by conference and agreement among the States directly involved working with separate Federal agencies, for the delay in getting action would be too great to bring about the objectives important to the economy of the entire region. A single authority, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, over the entire region would provide an adequate mechanism for the adjustment of the interests of the States and for the planning and development of the entire valley.

I am transmitting herewith a copy of that report of reconciliation, together with accompanying papers. I now recommend that the plans of the two Bureaus, published in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, and Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, as modified in accordance with recommendations of this joint report, be authorized as a basic engineering plan to be developed and administered by a Missouri Valley Authority, such as I have already recommended in my message of September 21.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in recommending the authorization by the Congress of the plans of the two bureaus, President Roosevelt makes it clear that they are to constitute "a basic engineering plan to be developed and administered by a Missouri Valley Authority."

When the T. V. A. was created 11 years ago, it was in a true sense a return to the spirit and vision of the pioneer. It was not intended to benefit the Tennessee Valley region alone. One of the compelling reasons for setting up the T. V. A. was that the country and the Congress of the United States were fed up with pork-barrel projects, such as dishing out millions of the taxpayers' money to dredge Podunk Creek, which solved no problem and was merely designed to benefit some company that got the contract and which, more often than not, proved to be unproductive of any public benefit. Enlightened citizens and legislators were disappointed by this unbusinesslike approach to a serious problem.

Businessmen and scientists are familiar with the term "pilot plant." Well, T. V. A. was designed to throw the light of actual experience—not just talk or theorizing, but actual experience—on the development of resources by a new method and a new principle. Eleven years ago, in setting up the T. V. A., Congress created a pilot plant designed to show the way river valleys could be most successfully developed for the benefit of all the people and not merely to satisfy the greedy appetites of the few.

The T. V. A., in other words, while developing the Tennessee Valley was designed to be a fact-finding undertaking which might guide us in developing similar valleys throughout the Nation.

Of course, I concede that valleys differ. In the Tennessee Valley there is ample rainfall, while parts of the Missouri Valley suffer from drought and need irrigation. But once a principle of regional development is demonstrated to be sound, it can and should be adapted to any region's particular physical conditions.

Mr. President, I shall later review the accomplishments of the T. V. A., but first, I should like to dwell for a moment on the contribution which this so-called pilot plant has made not alone to the progress and prosperity of the people of the Tennessee Valley, but to the successful prosecution of the present world struggle in which we are engaged, and to the saving of our Nation and all peace-loving peoples from the two barbarian enemies with which we are now locked in mortal combat.

The blunt fact is that without the electric power which the T. V. A. has been able to squeeze out of the waters of the Tennessee River at an early and critical phase of the war, the fortunes of the United Nations might have been much less promising than they are today. Permit me to read a brief quotation from a war correspondent who recently returned from the battle fronts of the world, dealing with the T. V. A.'s role in helping to shorten the war. In his recent book entitled "They Shall Not Sleep," Leland Stowe said that had it not been for the T. V. A. "American war production would have been reduced and delayed so greatly that the duration of this war would have been prolonged by very many months."

Mr. President, it is not difficult to visualize what this would have meant to the millions of men in the war zones and their relatives at home. I shall not speak of the additional billions of dollars it would have cost the taxpayers. It would have meant thousands upon thousands more of casualties in the ranks of the American and Allied armed forces.

During the critical days of the summer of 1940, the country turned to the T. V. A. for electric power in vast quantities—for the magic power which is the very lifeblood of modern war. By authority of the Congress, the T. V. A. began building 12 major dams at one time—the largest job of construction ever confronting any single organization in the history of this country. And by the time the Japs struck their treacherous blow at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, T. V. A.'s first wartime dam was completed. Other emergency dams followed in rapid succession, under schedules of speed that broke one world record after another.

The construction of airplanes means aluminum and more aluminum. Aluminum is chiefly the product of electric power. The average single heavy bomber represents as much electric power as would be consumed by the average American family over a period of 400 years; and there are thousands of such bombers over the Nazi nests in Germany every night. In that fateful June of 1940, while we faced the certain prospects of war, the United States did not have enough electric power to make aluminum for war planes in the vast quantities needed to outstrip the Axis air superiority. Every American should feel proud of this achievement I have described. We should all thank God for the vision and courage of those who fought the enemies of the T. V. A. legislation. The achievements of the T. V. A. in this alone—the production of electric power for the output of aluminum for the aircraft industry—more than justifies all the outlays of the Nation on the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In these days of global warfare it is important that our lines of communication be kept in constant operation, that our normal life go on without interruption, and that undue strain be kept away from the construction industry. This means the controlling of floods which periodically ravage our communities. This past spring the Tennessee Valley, too, experienced record-breaking rainfall, but no floods resulted there. There was no interruption of work in the war industries, no lives were lost, no communication lines disrupted, no agricultural production stopped. The same dams of the T. V. A. that protected the people from the swollen rivers simultaneously produced electric power for the munitions plants and the aircraft factories.

But a short distance away the people were not so fortunate. The people in the Missouri Valley experienced a second great flood in 2 years. It spread into the Mississippi River from just above St. Louis down to Cairo, and far beyond. The whole region was dislocated, affecting industry, railroads, farms, schools, and food supplies.

Mr. President, that is why the people of the Missouri Valley and the people of our whole country are so interested in the creation of the M. V. A. at the earliest possible time. It is inconceivable to me that anyone familiar with the achievements of the T. V. A. could possibly oppose our desire to apply to the Missouri Valley the basic principles we have found so successful in solving identical problems in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. President, it is our duty to ponder carefully the reasons why a single authority should be entrusted with the vital problems of the Missouri River Valley. I am confident that my colleagues in the Senate will wholeheartedly rally to the support of the M. V. A. legislation and help speed the adoption of such a law when they study the record of the T. V. A. I realize that there are many Senators here who know far more than I about the T. V. A.—because of the active part they have taken in supporting and strengthening the Tennessee Valley program. I am confident that at the proper time they will lend their powerful support to the extension of this program to the other great river basins of the country.

Like the work of the T. V. A., the task to be carried out in the Missouri Valley is not new. Since the beginning of our national history the people have from time to time placed upon the Federal Government responsibility for the development of our natural resources. For more than a century it was the Federal Government that shouldered the responsibility of making and keeping rivers navigable.

The same has been true of the controlling of floods. For many years the Federal Government developed and marketed electric power. The farmer has been looking to the Federal Government for soil conservation; mineral research has been a Federal function and has been of immeasurable value to the mining industry. Year in and year out, this Congress has been appropriating millions of dollars—nay, tens of millions of dollars—to maintain a whole department dedicated to the task of advising and helping businessmen, whose enterprises are based on the development or handling of the natural resources of the Nation.

Thus most of the specific undertakings assigned to the T. V. A. by the Congress of the United States were long familiar activities of the Federal Government. Nevertheless, the same baseless outcries which we hear today against the M. V. A. were heard in the days when the now successful T. V. A. undertaking was still in the realm of a mere proposal awaiting action by Congress.

What was new about the plan of the T. V. A., and which is also new about the proposed M. V. A., is that for the first time in our history a public body was given a unified responsibility to see that in one particular area the total job was done, that the opportunities of water and soil and forests and men were to be viewed as one problem, accepting the truism that they were indivisible, unified, and interrelated. That is their position in nature; that is the only way they are in the life of men.

That land and forest and water and minerals were interrelated and indivisible was no secret as early as 1933. It was then clear, as it is even clearer today, that what happened to one was bound to affect the fate of the other. It was quite elementary then, as it is now, that the well-being of men and women on the farms depended upon the purchasing power of the men and women who live in the cities.

Is there anyone who would deny the fact that navigation and industry and minerals and farm crops are not separate problems in the life of men? Since the enactment of the T. V. A. legislation the unity of those problems has become more and more apparent. Unfortunately certain people, whether because of ignorance or for some other reason, seem to desire to obstruct the march of progress. They arbitrarily seek to divide those problems according to the pigeonholes of historical accident and tradition. So we find one bureau taking charge of one problem and handling it without regard for the effects it may have upon a related problem handled by another bureau. One group of officials in Washington busied themselves with making a certain river navigable; another department was concerned with fish in that river, or the wildlife along its shores, or the soil of the valley, or the minerals of the same region, despite the fact that the fate of those very resources was affected by every change occurring in the river and by every use it was put to by men.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have been very much interested in what the Senator has had to say about the Tennessee Valley Authority. As a Member of the House of Representatives at the time when the Tennessee Valley Authority Act was written, as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, which had jurisdiction over that act, and as one who played a small part in the writing and passage of that act, I think it can well be said that the Tennessee Valley Authority has surpassed even the highest and fondest hopes and expectations of its authors. I think one reason why it has had such magnificent success and has rendered such great and far-reaching services to the people of the Tennessee Valley, as well as to the people of the entire country,

has been that the problems to which the Senator has so well adverted are being handled by the Tennessee Valley Authority as a unit. They are being handled together as one great problem, which they are.

The mistake of the past has been in large measure in endeavoring to separate these problems and to have one agency handle one problem and another agency handle another problem. To obtain the best results, to secure the maximum benefits and services for the people and for the regions affected, the various problems must be handled as the Tennessee Valley Authority has handled them; namely, as a unit.

I wish to take this opportunity again to commend the Senator from Montana for his devotion and for his continued and unfailing efforts to bring before the Congress and before the people of the Nation the need and necessity for the Missouri Valley Authority.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very illuminating remarks and for the encouragement he gives me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I must confess that I have not yet read the Senator's bill through, but I wish he would tell us a little at this time about what the relationship between the Missouri Valley Authority and the State and local governments would be under the provisions of his bill. Is authority to be granted for levying taxes of any kind under the Missouri Valley Authority bill? What are the provisions for the building of new highways and the relocating of other highways? How far could the authority go in establishing parks or even camps or schools or in performing other functions which naturally come under State and local governments? Can the Senator tell us something about that? I assure him that I am very much interested in his proposal.

Mr. MURRAY. The bill, as finally formulated, will contain provisions covering all the matters to which the Senator from Vermont has adverted. All these matters will be handled under this measure in the same manner in which they are handled under the T. V. A. It will contain provisions for a method of compensating the localities wherein it operates for failure to receive taxes on its property. The exact provisions of the bill in that respect I will not undertake to detail at this time, but I may say that when the bill is finally brought up for hearing it will be given thorough study, and all the matters to which the Senator has adverted will be found to have been given recognition in the legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. I am to understand then that the provisions will be roughly similar to those contained in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, the Tennessee Valley Authority pays no taxes on its own property, but it does compensate the States by the payment of a percentage of its income or some such method.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. What has been the experience of the T. V. A., according to the Senator's knowledge, with local and State governments?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand it has the very highest approval and commendation of the local people; and the contribution it is making to the communities is a substantial one, and is increasing. I am sure that the contribution the Missouri Valley Authority will make to the region in which it will operate will also be very great and that it will meet with the entire approval of the people in the area involved.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator satisfied that the recompense to the local and State governments would far exceed any losses which might be incurred?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. I am inclined to think that it will be much greater than the taxes which might have been collected.

Mr. AIKEN. That will not include the new developments which are bound to follow the development of power and other resources, of course.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. In addition, of course, as a result of its activities, it will create a vast amount of new taxable property which will vastly increase the total taxes paid in the area involved. That is a matter which should be remembered, because as a result of this development there will be a tremendous increase in taxable values.

Mr. AIKEN. Will it have the result of lowering production costs and transportation costs and thereby benefiting consumers who may be, perhaps, 2,000 miles away from the actual site of the development?

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely true. It will also reduce electric-power charges, and that will result in great savings to the people in the area of the development.

(At this point Mr. MURRAY yielded to Mr. MCFARLAND, who asked for the consideration of House bill 3592, and debate ensued, which appears in today's RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. MURRAY's remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in resuming my discussion I wish to express my appreciation of the contribution made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] a few moments ago. I realize, as I have said during the course of my remarks, that many Senators are more familiar with the subject and with problems which were solved by T. V. A. than I am. I know that the distinguished Senator from Alabama made a very considerable contribution to the enactment of the T. V. A. legislation, as did the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the late George W. Norris, of Nebraska, and many other Senators whom I am unable to name because I was not a Member of the Senate during that period. I desire to thank the Senator from Alabama especially for his very illuminating remarks a few moments ago.

The creation of the Missouri Valley Authority, Mr. President, is one of the major links in translating into reality the supreme plan before our people, which is to make this country the best place on the face of the earth. This is particularly imperative at this stage of our history when such frontiers as were available, for example, after the American Civil War, are no longer present. Then the problem of the returned northern soldier was solved by giving him a homestead on the western frontier. With the possible exception of Alaska, there is no section of the United States where the young man with little or no capital and limited experience can set his roots. Farming today cannot and should not be started without substantial capital, proper equipment, and careful training and experience. Even then, as has been proved during recent depressions, the best and most skillful farmers go bankrupt. There are large areas of the country where the small farmer finds it almost impossible to compete with a giant agricultural enterprise operated on a factory basis, with huge machines and regiments of poorly paid farm hands living in barracks.

Some of the vast power projects, such as those in the Pacific Northwest, will bring irrigation to arid or semiarid regions and thus make possible the creation of a large number of new small farms suitable for rather individualistic types of farming like fruit and dairy enterprises. But even here, the rule that the farmer must have money, experience, and aptitude holds good; and in any case these irrigated areas must be greatly expanded if they are to take care of more than a very small proportion of the returning solders. I realize that if the irrigation projects which are contemplated by the measure now before the Senate are completed they will provide for a very substantial program of settlement by returned soldiers when this war is over; but agriculture is not the only answer to the veterans' employment problem. At the same time the pledges made by the President to our people must be redeemed. The benefits which could come to the people of the Missouri Valley as a result of the application to that region of the principles we have found so effective in the Tennessee Valley constitute a part of our pledge to the people. It would help open up new opportunities, new frontiers to the people of the valley and to many thousands more outside the valley.

The M. V. A. idea has been branded by its enemies as idealistic, as authoritarian, as a number of other unpleasant things. Fortunately, we now know too much about how a valley authority works to accept such charges when they have practical answers. From the experiences of and the lessons taught by the history of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and from the way it operates, we know the M. V. A. idea is a sound business proposition, that it is more economical than other methods of regional development, that it is the only way to bring unity for the good of all to a region that is now divided over special interests. Above all, we know that it is the most democratic way and the most efficient way of doing a job that has got to be done in the Missouri Basin.

T. V. A. moves highly trained crews, highly specialized equipment such as

concrete pourers, hammerhead cranes, and the like, and highly specialized housing for construction workers from job to job. Other agencies, Army engineers, and Reclamation Bureau do most of their work through contract or by force account. Obviously, the T. V. A. method is the soundest business method from the standpoint of construction. It is believed that the Sloan estimate of $1,350,000,000 for the combined plan of Bureau and engineers could be cut to not more than $1,100,000,000 by eliminating unnecessary dams and by the T. V. A. method of construction.

SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION

The idea, in T. V. A., as in an M. V. A., is to apply the corporation principle, as developed by private enterprise, to fields of development which are traditionally those of the Federal Government. The administrative problems resulting from trying to develop the Missouri Basin by half a dozen different Government agencies would create an appalling situation. To do a job similar to that done in the Tennessee Valley it would take the best work of these agencies, to name a few: Reclamation Bureau, Army Engineers, Bureau of Mines, Department of Agriculture, and United States Geological Survey, Office of Indian Affairs, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Power Commission. How can they be coordinated? Is it good business to continue that kind of scrambled, wasteful, piecemeal approach to a big job when there is on hand a businesslike administrative method of doing it—a method that has been tried and found wondrously successful in the Tennessee Valley? Which is likely to cost the taxpayers of the whole country more? The answer is simple. The answer is practical. M. V. A. is good business.

UNITY

The Missouri Valley is now divided by subregional conflicts. They have flared here in the Senate several times in the past few days. Irrigationists and the organizations they work with and through are fighting navigationists and the organizations they work with and through. Each thinks its side is right. Under the combined plan of the Bureau and the engineers, as the President in his message has indicated, those fights will go on. Under what circumstances will either side yield? Is it not the clear duty of Congress to spend the money of all the taxpayers for the maximum benefit of all interests—flood control, irrigation, power, and navigation, with emphasis on the first two because they are the most essential and most pressing?

Is it not the clear duty of Congress to set up an agency that will arbitrate all the petty disputes now disuniting the Missouri Basin, without fighting for favoritism for any one interest?

DEMOCRATIC

Those who oppose M. V. A. say, without basis, that it would have too much power. We know from the charter of T. V. A., and from the way it operates, that this is not true. T. V. A. has no power to coerce or compel any of the people in the Tennessee Valley to do anything—except for its power to condemn land, which private utilities also have. M. V. A. would get the same mandate from Congress that T. V. A. got—to work with and for and through existing county, municipal, and State agencies in the valley to accomplish its work. We know from the Tennessee region how popular and how democratic that method is.

Development of the Missouri region through an M. V. A. can work miracles in bettering the lives of the people who live there, raising their standard of living. It can do so because the very aim and object of a valley authority is to make new opportunities for private enterprise. With less expensive power it invites industry. With less expensive transportation it invites industry. It can bring about new security for owners of drought-stricken lands, for stockmen who are dependent on those lands for auxiliary feed as well as pasturage. It can bring about new security for owners of gullied and eroded land; of land invaded each year by flood; of land that must be used curatively, with the right fertilizers and terracing and contour plowing and the planting of root crops. It can create cheaper power for the development of mines in Colorado, Wyoming, Montana. It can open up a great new market, not just for the necessities of life, but for electrical appliances, automobiles, luxury items of all kinds.

These things are the essence of democracy, because they contribute to the stability of living standards, to the stability of private enterprise. No group of agencies with their interests divided by law as well as by tradition can hope to bring about similar development of all the region's resources for the greatest good of the greatest number of people.

What the people of the Missouri Valley do in the coming years in using the tools of modern up-to-date organization in developing the natural resources of their valley will largely determine the future growth of business, industry, and agriculture in that entire area.

The people of the valley want modern methods and modern systems for the development of their resources and not those of the ox-cart era. A Missouri Valley Authority is the only answer to their prayer, and it is up to us here in the Congress of the United States to give it to them.

I cannot conclude my remarks today without expressing my appreciation of the splendid work of the Nation's press in bringing this issue before the American people. The press has been uniformly fair in presenting the issues involved, and is performing a valuable service to the entire Nation.

In particular, I call attention to the high quality of the editorials and special articles which have appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Star-Times dealing with the subject. These two papers have pioneered in bringing to the attention of the people in the Missouri Valley the need of a comprehensive plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin under a Missouri Valley authority similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the last issue of Collier's entitled "One More River To Boss" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MORE RIVER TO BOSS

(By Kyle Crichton)

The Missouri is the mad elephant of rivers. Once a year and sometimes oftener it comes charging out of the mountains of Montana through the fertile Middle West in a roaring, insane torrent that overwhelms farms, railroads, town, and humans. Homeless families sleep in schoolhouses and churches until the water subsides and they can return to look at the ruin of their lives. Some manage to start over again; others surrender in the face of a disaster that seems to delight in repeating itself. The two floods of 1943 did damage estimated at $63,000,000.

Army engineers perform prodigies in a technical battle they can never win. They widen channels, build jetties, construct dikes. But when the inevitable floods come, the massive jetties are crushed, the fertile lands along the riverbanks are denuded to fill the channels with silt and little towns bury their dead with the silent fatalism of habit.

In the upper reaches of the river, United States reclamation engineers struggle with the problem of getting water for irrigation on arid acres to be used for settlement of returning servicemen and demobilized industrial war workers. In Montana and the Dakotas, water means the life of the country. But from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri, Army engineers and interested citizens think of flood control and navigation. Because of this conflict of interests between those who want the water and those who dread it, the Missouri makes mock of the best intentions. It just keeps rolling along—often as a murderous force of nature.

The Missouri is a valley of a half billion acres, comprising one-sixth of the area of the United States and taking in a territory the size of Germany, France, and Italy combined. It is populated by 11,500,000 people along a river course of 2,469 miles. It starts at Three Forks, Mont., northwest of Yellowstone National Park, where three mountain streams, the Jefferson, the Madison, and the Gallatin, unite. From there it flows north through the mountains, then east across the Great Plains into North Dakota, then south and southeast until it joins the Mississippi 17 miles north of St. Louis. Its watershed embraces Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, and Missouri—one of the largest river valleys in the world.

It directly serves great cities like St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha. Along its banks lie three State capitals—Bismarck, Pierre, and Jefferson City. It taps the copper deposits of Montana and the great Corn Belt of the Middle West. It floods the lower valley and starves the upper valley, the Dust Bowls of the Dakotas. Its tributaries include the Milk, Yellowstone, Little Missouri, Platte, Kansas (Kaw), James (in the Dakotas), Big Sioux, Grand (north Missouri), Osage, Republican, Big Horn, and Gasconade.

SPECTACULAR FAILURES IN FLOOD CONTROL

Its swift tributaries in the mountains of the north are capable of producing power; the fertile valleys of the middle and lower river need only protection from floods to be among the great producing areas of the world. It is a great river and a wild river. Elaborate man-made attempts to tame the monster have all ended in spectacular fail-

ure. The efforts of the engineers have been no more successful than the incantations of the weathermen. But it required the two serious floods of 1943 to bring matters to a head. Plainly, enough was enough, and something had to be done.

The first savior who came galloping forth with a plan was Col. Lewis A. Pick, Army engineer in charge of the Missouri River division at Omaha. In 3 months' time Pick produced a report based on 50 years of surveys in the Missouri Basin. It called for a system of 12 dams on the Missouri and its tributaries and levees from Sioux City to its mouth, at a total cost of $490,000,000.

The United States Reclamation Bureau now perked up. For 5 years it had been working on a survey of the Missouri, and now it had the survey ready. Perhaps the hullabaloo of the Army engineers stimulated the reclamation people; anyhow, they submitted a plan to spend $1,257,654,700 for dams, reservoirs, power plants, and irrigation works.

Although the Pick plan was criticized as being far from adequate even for flood control, the real storm of objection came over an obscure passage in it, discovered by Governors Moses of North Dakota, Ford of Montana, and Hunt of Wyoming. This passage related to a proposal to deepen the navigation channel of the Missouri from Sioux City to its mouth, from the present 6-foot channel to a standard depth of 9 feet. It observed, rather innocently, that the engineers thought they would need a specified amount of the flow of the river for navigation purposes.

The embattled governors found, to their consternation, that the amount mentioned was practically all the average flow for each of the past 10 years. They raised the roof and promptly presented, in self-defense and retaliation, an amendment sponsored by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, which would reserve to the upper valley States control of all waters originating within their boundaries.

The Bureau of Reclamation maintained that the amendment merely gave all States a chance to be heard before a project was authorized. The Army engineers stated flatly that under the amendment any project would be ineffective if objected to by any affected State. They insisted that the amendment would give the States power of veto over legislation enacted by Congress and approved by the President. The amendment was defeated in committee but will undoubtedly be brought up again.

This really threw the fat in the fire, and the resulting uproar was deafening. The Army engineers hastily averred that there was plenty of water in the Missouri for both irrigation and navigation. The reclamationists objected that if this were true, why had the Army been in such a rush to get priority on water for navigation?

The Army engineers declared that if there were ever a conflict between irrigation and navigation, they wouldn't dream of standing in the way of irrigation. The reclamationists said that was fine and would the Army engineers put it in writing? The Army huffed up at this and asked if their word couldn't be trusted. The reclamationists thereupon decided to mistrust them more than ever.

It was at this juncture that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch stepped in and said, "Hold! Enough!" The way this was going it could only end in civil war and, in the meantime, the Missouri would be playfully washing away half the Middle West. What the Post-Dispatch asked was if anybody had ever heard of the T. V. A. They said forthrightly and with no quibbling that the Tennessee Valley Authority was one of the greatest things that had ever happened in America, and all anybody had to do to prove it was to go down and talk with the people in Tennessee.

Now, therefore, let it be resolved, said the Post-Dispatch, to stop all this nonsense about upper river and lower river and talk in terms of the Missouri Valley. What we need, it added, is an M. V. A., and the sooner the better.

AN INVITATION TO SOUND OFF

It addressed a letter to the editors of the Missouri Valley asking for their opinions, criticisms, and cooperation. It put one of its crack reporters, Sam J. Shelton, on the story and told him to stay there until the M. V. A. became a reality.

If the Post-Dispatch wanted criticism, it now received it in showers. The Kansas City Star said very promptly that it wanted no part of a project that would irrigate 4,000,000 additional acres to afford competition for Kansas and Missouri farmers.

The Montana Standard, of Butte, E. G. Leipheimer, editor, wrote: "We are praying for an end to bureaucratic dictatorship and regimentation. We want to have a hand in our own development. We can hardly imagine a board sitting in perpetuity to control our economic destiny. We fear that such a board may be responsive entirely to demands of the lower States because of their large populations, powerful in politics, while we wither and die, neglected. We point out that there are substitutes for water navigation in the valley but no substitute for water in the soil."

The Omaha World-Herald looked with horror on the suggestion, referring to it as a "colossus which would be operated completely by the bureaucracy." Governors Hickenlooper, of Iowa, Sharpe, of South Dakota, and Vivian, of Colorado also harped on the dictatorship theme, with Governor Vivian adding that anything done in the valley should be handled by private interests.

The Post-Dispatch answered the Kansas City Star by saying that it was the shortsightedness of sectional interests that had brought the valley to its present plight. It said further that the States' rights people were talking through their hats. How could they object to M. V. A. when both the Reclamation Bureau and the Army engineers were Federal agencies operated out of Washington?

In truth, it continued, the greatest triumph of T. V. A. has been that it operates entirely in the Tennessee Valley and with no interference from Washington. There is the closest cooperation between T. V. A. and the people it serves. When Senator MCKELLAR sought to have the hiring of T. V. A. employees brought under the control of Congress, the outcry from the Tennessee Valley was so great that the measure was defeated.

Before the Post-Dispatch had proposed the M. V. A. plan, its Mr. Sam Shelton had pointed out that there were only four points of serious physical conflict between the Pick plan, sponsored by the Army engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation plan, to wit:

1. At Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir in North Dakota, completed by the Army engineers in 1939 and now operated for navigation, flood control, and power, the Bureau of Reclamation plan proposed to draw heavily on the storage capacity of 19,400,000 acre-feet of water to irrigate additional arid farming land. (An acre-foot of water is a unit of volume which covers a level acre to a depth of 1 foot.) The Army engineers object to use of this stored water for irrigation before equivalent storage capacity in aid of navigation and flood control is made available farther down the main stem of the Missouri.

2. The Bureau of Reclamation's proposal to eliminate the Pick plan's recommended Garrison Dam in North Dakota (17,000,000 acre-feet capacity) is objected to by the Army engineers because this would cause a reduction of 10,000,000 acre-feet in flood control in the main river. The Army engineers assert the resulting flood protection would be inadequate.

3. A proposal of the Bureau of Reclamation to irrigate 1,000,000 acres in the Souris Basin in North Dakota, near the Canadian border, with water diverted from the Missouri below Fort Peck, is objected to by Army engineers.

4. The proposed 9-foot channel is a major point of disagreement with all who seek a comprehensive plan for over-all development of the Missouri River Basin.

Both the Army engineers and the Reclamation people have agreed that reconciliation of the plans could be worked out in a practical way, but the prospects of collaboration seem less promising when Congress is reached.

In the House the various phases of river-basin development are handled by three committees: Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, and Irrigation and Reclamation. In the Senate the Commerce Committee handles both flood control and navigation matters, but there is a separate committee on irrigation and reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation is under the Secretary of the Interior, and the Army engineers are under the Secretary of War.

This was confusing enough without the complication of the O'Mahoney amendment which enjoyed the sponsorship of 21 other Senators and flew in the face of the United States Supreme Court decision in the New River case in 1940, which gave Congress widely extended rights over the navigable streams of the country.

FOLLOWING THE T. V. A. PATTERN

On August 18 of this year the problem was placed on a new level by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, who introduced a bill in the Senate to create a Missouri Valley Authority. It followed closely the original T. V. A. bill, but offered additions that had been worked out during the 11-year life of the Tennessee project. What gave special tone to Senator MURRAY'S words, however, was the viewpoint from which he surveyed the problem.

"Mr. President," he said, "it is clear that the job to be done is tremendous. It challenges the imagination. It throws down the gantlet to our engineering skill, our scientific knowledge, and our know how as to methods and management. * * * It is a job for modern pioneering on a grand scale in the national interest."

The introduction of the Murray bill has been followed by a similar measure offered by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, of Iowa. On September 21, of this year, President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress advocating M. V. A. and asking for consideration of other projects on the Arkansas and Columbia Rivers. This has taken the Missouri Valley problem out of the discussion stage into the realm of action.

As a post-war plan for providing jobs and stimulating industry, nothing else comes even close. What has been done in the Tennessee Valley will pale before the achievements in the Missouri if the project is started and carried through. The Tennessee is 652 miles long, the Missouri is 2,469 miles. The area of the Tennessee basin is 41,000 square miles, the Missouri basin has an area of 529,000 square miles, nearly 13 times as large.

M. V. A. has not, of course, been authorized and no engineering construction has been ventured, but one may get an idea of the magnitude of the possible plan by studying the suggestion made in the Pick plan and the larger plan of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Pick plan proposes 12 new Missouri Valley flood-control reservoirs, 5 on the main stem of the river, 5 on tributaries of the Republican River in Nebraska and Kansas, and 2 in the Yellowstone basin. These

are in addition to 10 already authorized by Congress but not constructed because of the war emergency. Six of those authorized are in Missouri.

MORE FLOOD-CONTROL STORAGE

The 5 new reservoirs proposed for the main stem of the river in North and South Dakota would have aggregate storage capacity of 35,200,000 acre-feet of water. The 2 in the Yellowstone Basin would store 5,750,000 acre-feet. These projects, together with the existing Fort Peck (Mont.) Reservoir's 19,400,000 acre-feet, would provide flood-control storage above Sioux City, Iowa, of more than 60,000,000 acre-feet.

The very regimentation that the objectors fear may, say the proponents of the plan, be a means of saving one of our most fruitful regions. The Tennessee Valley authorities have worked hand in glove with the farmers.

The Bureau of Reclamation's plan would store 35,446,000 acre-feet in the upper main stream and the upper tributaries. This plan, however, includes many other irrigation reservoirs, with aggregate capacity of 45,700,000 acre-feet. Even the most prosaic individual must be stirred by the magnitude of such an undertaking. The national importance of M. V. A. is obvious. In a section where soil erosion, silted river beds and lowered water levels have threatened the very life of the land, the harnessing of the Missouri (known as the Big Muddy) will be an achievement of incalculable value.

A picture of what may be the future for the Missouri Valley may be suggested by what Benton J. Stong, editor of the National Union Farmer, has to report on the T. V. A. "I saw the enormous success of T. V. A. in an alfalfa patch," he writes. "When I knew it 9 years ago, it had been a 'shotgun cornfield'—so steep that, according to local legend, the farmer planted it by shooting seed into the field from the opposite hillside. Then it had been one of those deeply gullied wastelands, thick with underbrush and tiny streams that carried away the little remaining soil. But when I saw the field this month, it was covered with a green blanket of alfalfa and blue grass, its deep scars wiped away and replaced with terraces. It was part of the 55-acre hillside farm of Henry Clark, which has been restored by T. V. A. phosphate and lime.

"Ten years ago Henry Clark scratched his hillside with a little black mare and a sled and got little more than $200 cash income. Last year he cultivated it with a tractor, a mowing machine, grain drill and other modern equipment and took in $4,600 from hay, dairy products, tomatoes, tobacco, and poultry. Ten years ago, Henry Clark's home was a cabin. Today it is a fine farmhouse with electricity, electric range, electric washing machine, refrigerator, and lights.

"T. V. A. is not a power project. It is not an agricultural project. It is an integrated development of all the resources of an area, integrated so that water is harnessed, the lands are restored, the minerals are developed, and men live a better life. It is a pattern that may be developed all over America."

The floods in the Missouri have obscured the even greater losses from lack of water in the upper valley States. The great jalopy exodus from the Great Plains during the drought decade saw 350,000 persons leave their homes in the distressed region. The amounts unpaid on December 31, 1942, on grants and work relief from the federal government reached a total of $1,246,557,087. This approximates the estimated cost of the Bureau of Reclamation plan. It is estimated that 150,000 men could be employed, in the immediate post-war period, on construction sites under the Bureau of Reclamation project and an even greater number employed in factories to furnish materials for the dams, canals, and jetties.

The Tennessee Valley is now a show window for what electrification can do. Every farm is electrically lighted and possesses the electric devices that make life more pleasant and efficient. Here is the contrasting situation in the Missouri Valley States:

*Rural farm dwellings*

| | With electric light | With mechanical refrigeration | With running water | With installed bathtub or shower |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| United States | 31.3 | 14.9 | 17.8 | 11.8 |
| Montana | 27.8 | 12.7 | 14.7 | 9.0 |
| Wyoming | 31.0 | 13.2 | 16.1 | 10.3 |
| Colorado | 34.6 | 14.9 | 21.3 | 12.4 |
| North Dakota | 15.5 | 2.3 | 6.0 | 4.7 |
| South Dakota | 17.9 | 4.8 | 11.8 | 3.2 |
| Nebraska | 28.5 | 12.2 | 22.3 | 14.0 |
| Kansas | 27.3 | 17.1 | 15.7 | 11.5 |
| Iowa | 39.5 | 16.3 | 21.5 | 15.4 |
| Missouri | 15.9 | 8.5 | 6.3 | 4.7 |

This suggests eloquently the opportunity for an improved future in the Missouri Valley if that future is worked out with determination.

Dr. John L. Coulter, former member of the Federal Tariff Commission, of Washington, D. C., stated in June of this year before a Senate committee, that America, with its population increasing at the rate of a million people a year, will have to increase its acreage if we are to maintain present standards of living.

"We are at a point now where we are importing more products of agriculture than we are exporting," he said.

This being so, the M. V. A. or some alternative plan for bringing more land into cultivation in the Missouri Valley becomes a national imperative. A survey made this spring in North Dakota determined that of some 6,300 young men from that State in the armed services, more than 5,500 desire to be farmers after the war. The survey showed that only 675 now have farms, and therefore, for that group alone, about 4,850 farms are needed.

Therefore, we need farms, we need flood control, we have the men at hand for farming. Everybody acknowledges that the problem of the Missouri must be tackled, but it is over M. V. A. that the big slugfest will come.

There arises the question of who will pay for M. V. A. Under current proposals, the financing will come from the Federal Government, but there would be profits on power and assessments on benefits to lands and city properties. The Edison Electric Institute, representing private power interests, maintains that the ultimate cost of T. V. A. will be $1,000,000,000, or five times as much as estimated for the original program, and is expected to pay for itself in 60 years but without interest. David E. Lilienthal, director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, estimates that T. V. A. will cost $700,000,000 and will be paid off in 30 years.

In the case of the much larger Missouri Valley plan, power will be a minor consideration and could not possibly pay the total cost of the project. But supporters of the M. V. A. argue that, in the public interest, the Missouri has to be tamed; that the Nation will receive great benefits from anything that brings greater productivity to the Missouri Valley, prevents flood damage and saves land under cultivation.

Although electric power is only one phase of M. V. A. (with an estimated 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 kilowatts possible), it is quite possible that some defenders of private enterprise will swing their shillelaghs. M. V. A. is a great challenge, the sort of battle that stirs the pioneer instincts still in the breasts of most Americans. Its supporters do not deny that it will also be a giant stepping on many toes and that outcries must be expected. A great deal will depend on the legislators guiding the bill through Congress. There will be no George W. Norris to lead the fight, as there was in the case of the T. V. A. Great interests will be lined up on each side, and mighty blows will be struck.

DISPARITY BETWEEN COMMITTEES

The people who feel that it might be wiser to work out a plan between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have found that in Congress it has been impossible to get the separate committees to sit down together to discuss an over-all solution. The interests of the two Government agencies are entirely disparate. Reclamation people have been taught to think in terms of land; Army engineers are concerned with watercourses. M. V. A. advocates believe it is impossible that the two could ever work in harmony.

One big plan is needed, and time will tell whether it will come through M. V. A. or another agency of like character.

It's going to be a tough fight, but the Missouri has been kicking its region around for hundreds of years, and it either has to be stopped soon or it will run out of competition. Americans always like a challenge of that kind.

The M. V. A. is going to be something to watch and wonder over when it gets going.

PREVENTION OF DOUBLE TAXATION ON INCOMES

During the course of Mr. MURRAY's speech the following occurred:

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3592, Calendar No. 1056.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask that the Senator from Arizona make a statement with regard to the nature of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. The bill would prevent double taxation. Under the present law some Federal employees who are working in the District of Columbia, as well as many who are employed in some of the States, are being taxed in two different jurisdictions. The bill would permit them to be taxed only in the State of their domicile.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the bill in any way change the present system of collection of income taxes from South Carolinians who might be residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; it would permit the collection of taxes from residents of the State of South Carolina, but would prohibit them from being taxed by some other State or the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, the bill would not in any way make it possible for those who are now domiciled in the District of Columbia and paying income taxes to change their domicile to some jurisdiction under which they could pay a lower income tax.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; they would have to maintain a genuine domicile in the State in which they paid the taxes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would they have to own any real estate or property within such State?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think in any State the ownership of real estate or other property is necessary in order to make a citizen subject to income taxation.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the statement of the Senator. Would there be any limit on the time in which taxpayers could change their domicile?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has some amendments which he would like to offer. I believe the amendments might clarify the matter. If there is no objection to proceeding to the consideration of the bill I believe the Senator from Virginia will offer his amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I will withhold any further questions which I may have until the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has offered his amendments. I understand that some of our State tax officials have discussed with Virginia State tax officials the possibility of a number of high-salaried Government officials, as well as others, being relieved from the payment of taxes for this year by the enactment of some law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I still reserve the right to object to proceeding to the consideration of the bill, but if it is the pleasure of the Senator from Arizona to have the Senator from Virginia explain his amendments, I have no objection. However, I reserve the right to object to consideration of the bill after the Senator from Virginia shall have concluded.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill for which the Senator from Arizona has requested consideration provides that a Federal employee may choose his State of domicile. If the bill should be passed in its present form it would afford an opportunity to Federal employees to choose a State of domicile which did not require the payment of an income tax, and therefore would permit an evasion of the payment of a tax which such an employee otherwise would be compelled to pay. For example, the bill provides that a Federal employee who has lived in Virginia for 30 years, and has obtained all the benefits of schools and other privileges which the State provides, could choose a domicile in some other State and thereby evade the payment of Virginia income taxes.

If the bill is taken up I propose to offer an amendment providing that the date when the provisions of the bill shall become effective shall be December 31, 1944. At the present time the bill has no effective date. Therefore, should the bill become law there would be created a condition of chaos with regard to what part of the calendar year would be subject to tax in one State or another.

I propose to offer another amendment which would provide that in order that a Federal employee may be relieved of the payment of a tax in a State which may impose such tax, such employee shall be required to furnish a tax receipt proving that he is domiciled in another State which assesses an income tax. If this bill should be taken up, and the amendments to which I have referred should not be adopted, considerable discussion would be provoked in the Senate before the bill could reach final enactment. I think the bill in its present form leaves wide open the door for wholesale tax evasion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Virginia that I would offer no objection to his amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3592) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I have no personal objection to the proposed legislation; but there are Senators on this side of the Chamber who have an interest in the bill. I refer particularly to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. I do not wish to consent to the bill being taken up until he has reached the floor. He is not now present. If necessary, I shall make the point of no quorum. I do not want to do that because it may result in an unnecessary waste of time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I had understood that the Senator from Connecticut had no objection to the bill. The bill has been on the calendar for some time. I do not wish unduly to delay the Senator from Montana. I may as well withdraw my request.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will wait for 2 or 3 minutes I believe the Senator from Connecticut will be present and then he can speak for himself. I do not know whether he is hostile to the bill or whether, with the amendments suggested by the Senator from Virginia, he would support the bill. However, there will be a possible opportunity of disposing of the bill as soon as the Senator from Connecticut reaches the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. If I have the floor I will yield, but I do not wish unduly to delay the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope that before any action is taken on the bill we will have a quorum call and then have the amendments agreed to. I can very well see that many Federal employees could take advantage of the provisions contained in the bill unless the amendments of the Senator from Virginia were agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator object to taking up the bill at this time?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if I might suggest to the distinguished Senator that very likely he will expedite the passage of his bill if he will withdraw it at this time and then when the Senator from Connecticut comes in renew his request.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would rather have the RECORD show that there is objection, because I have received volumes of mail in regard to this bill, which I thought was noncontroversial with the amendments of the Senator from Virginia adopted. I repeat, I would rather an objection be shown. I have no personal interest in the proposed legislation at all, but, if any Senator objects to the bill, I would rather have the RECORD show the objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I still think if the Senator would possess himself in patience for a moment or two, until the Senator from Connecticut can be here, the bill might be disposed of; but I am not going to consent to having the bill taken up unless and until the Senator from Connecticut is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona that I deeply appreciate the position in which he finds himself in view of the many requests that the bill be considered, because some employees are paying income taxes in two States, first where they work and then where they live. I have no objection to the bill, provided first the amendments of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are adopted to the effect that one paying income tax today in South Carolina or any other State must continue to pay that State unless he is a citizen of another State and pays the other State. It is not fair for individuals of States to pay and Government employees be allowed to change their residence to States that have no tax and avoid payment. Of course they should not pay in two States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands objection has been made. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has the floor.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

After the conclusion of the debate on House bill 3592, the Senate resumed the 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.

(Mr. MURRAY resumed and concluded his remarks.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a short amendment to the bill now pending before the Senate, and ask that it be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, following line 19, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph as follows:

The project for flood control on Farm Creek, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report of November 16, 1944, at an estimated cost of $3,017,900.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I should be very glad to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. LUCAS. I am happy at the Senator's graciousness, and I thank him for his generosity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that immediately after the convening of the new Congress we will take up the matter of the Missouri Valley Authority. It is my understanding further that such an agreement has been made by all the different agencies involved, and by the responsible leadership of both the majority and minority groups.

I merely wish to say at this time that the people of my State feel under a keen sense of obligation not only to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for having introduced the measure, but also to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who has been most cooperative in the passing of the flood-control bill, as a result of which approximately a million two hundred thousand acres in North Dakota will be irrigated.

At the present time in North Dakota the total amount of irrigation is, roughly, 21,615 acres, compared with Montana, which has 1,711,409 acres. We feel that for the first time the State of North Dakota will, through the passage of the pending measure, get that to which it is entitled. However, we feel that we prefer the enactment of the M. V. A. bill. I have received many hundred telegrams from the State of North Dakota, from both men and women, and from different organizations, in favor of the M. V. A. I have placed none of them in the RECORD up to this time. It is not my intention to do so until after we begin the real consideration of the M. V. A. bill in the coming Congress.

Mr. President, I want this body to know that I believe no one could have better expressed the real purpose of the M. V. A. than did the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on August 18, and also in his address on the floor of the Senate this morning. I endorse every word he uttered upon each of those occasions.

In order that this body may know exactly what the situation of the Northwest is relative to having light and power upon the farms, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks pages 6 and 7 of the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives on rural electrification. I may add that this shows that today North Dakota is lower than any other State of the Union in the number of farms having electricity for light and power. Roughly, they number 6.9 percent of all the farms of the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Comparison of rank, percentage, and number of farms electrified with central-station service, 1935, 1940, and 1943, by States and for the United States*

| Area | Farms, Jan. 1, 1935,[1] number | Farms receiving central-station electric service Dec. 31, 1934 | | | Farms, Apr. 1, 1940,[1] number | Farms receiving central-station electric service Apr. 1, 1940 | | | Farms receiving central-station electric service June 30, 1943 [2] | | | Increase in electrified farm from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1943 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number [3] | Percent | Rank | | Number [1] | Percent | Rank | Number | Percent | Rank | Number | Percent | Rank |
| United States | 6,812,350 | 743,954 | 10.9 | ------ | 6,096,799 | 1,853,249 | 30.4 | ------ | 2,454,100 | 40.3 | ------ | 1,710,146 | 229.9 | ------ |
| Alabama | 273,455 | 11,053 | 4.0 | 33 | 231,746 | 33,907 | 14.6 | 41 | 56,200 | 24.2 | 39 | 45,147 | 408.5 | 15 |
| Arizona | 18,824 | 5,577 | 29.6 | 12 | 18,468 | 5,607 | 30.4 | 24 | 7,600 | 41.2 | 25 | 2,023 | 36.3 | 46 |
| Arkansas | 253,013 | 2,943 | 1.2 | 47 | 216,674 | 21,303 | 9.8 | 45 | 35,900 | 16.6 | 44 | 32,957 | 1,119.8 | 3 |
| California | 150,360 | 81,093 | 53.9 | 1 | 132,658 | 107,904 | 81.3 | 4 | 115,000 | 86.7 | 3 | 33,907 | 41.8 | 45 |
| Colorado | 63,644 | 7,145 | 11.2 | 25 | 51,436 | 14,823 | 28.8 | 25 | 22,900 | 44.5 | 24 | 15,755 | 220.5 | 27 |
| Connecticut | 32,157 | 10,138 | 31.5 | 10 | 21,163 | 16,995 | 80.3 | 5 | 18,300 | 86.5 | 4 | 8,162 | 80.5 | 39 |
| Delaware | 10,381 | 1,791 | 17.3 | 20 | 8,994 | 3,545 | 39.4 | 21 | 4,900 | 54.5 | 20 | 3,109 | 173.6 | 29 |
| Florida | 72,857 | 5,700 | 7.8 | 26 | 62,248 | 15,476 | 24.9 | 28 | 19,600 | 31.5 | 32 | 13,900 | 243.8 | 23 |
| Georgia | 250,544 | 6,956 | 2.8 | 41 | 216,033 | 42,409 | 19.6 | 33 | 67,700 | 31.3 | 33 | 60,744 | 873.3 | 5 |
| Idaho | 45,113 | 13,433 | 29.8 | 11 | 43,663 | 25,439 | 58.3 | 13 | 32,400 | 74.2 | 13 | 18,967 | 141.2 | 35 |
| Illinois | 231,312 | 28,379 | 12.3 | 23 | 213,439 | 80,027 | 37.5 | 22 | 113,000 | 52.9 | 21 | 84,621 | 298.2 | 17 |
| Indiana | 200,835 | 23,476 | 11.7 | 24 | 184,549 | 91,127 | 49.4 | 17 | 125,600 | 68.0 | 14 | 102,124 | 435.0 | 14 |
| Iowa | 221,986 | 32,047 | 14.4 | 22 | 213,318 | 73,308 | 34.4 | 23 | 108,100 | 50.7 | 22 | 76,053 | 237.3 | 24 |
| Kansas | 174,589 | 13,224 | 7.6 | 28 | 156,327 | 27,960 | 17.9 | 37 | 39,100 | 25.0 | 36 | 25,876 | 195.7 | 28 |
| Kentucky | 278,298 | 8,480 | 3.0 | 39 | 252,894 | 38,607 | 15.3 | 40 | 57,900 | 22.9 | 41 | 49,420 | 582.8 | 10 |
| Louisiana | 170,216 | 2,826 | 1.7 | 46 | 150,007 | 16,058 | 10.7 | 44 | 24,200 | 16.1 | 45 | 21,374 | 756.3 | 9 |
| Maine | 41,907 | 13,959 | 33.3 | 8 | 38,980 | 20,221 | 51.9 | 15 | 24,200 | 62.1 | 17 | 10,241 | 73.4 | 41 |
| Maryland | 44,501 | 6,791 | 15.3 | 21 | 42,175 | 17,170 | 40.7 | 20 | 24,500 | 58.1 | 18 | 17,709 | 260.8 | 21 |
| Massachusetts | 35,094 | 14,494 | 41.3 | 7 | 31,897 | 26,220 | 82.2 | 2 | 26,900 | 84.3 | 5 | 12,406 | 85.6 | 37 |
| Michigan | 196,517 | 42,152 | 21.4 | 17 | 187,589 | 131,126 | 69.9 | 7 | 151,000 | 80.5 | 7 | 108,848 | 258.2 | 22 |
| Minnesota | 203,302 | 13,783 | 6.8 | 30 | 197,351 | 50,075 | 25.4 | 26 | 76,800 | 38.9 | 26 | 63,017 | 457.2 | 12 |
| Mississippi | 311,683 | 2,802 | .9 | 48 | 291,092 | 26,078 | 9.0 | 46 | 44,300 | 15.2 | 46 | 41,498 | 1,481.0 | 1 |
| Missouri | 278,454 | 17,893 | 6.4 | 31 | 256,100 | 39,204 | 15.3 | 39 | 59,800 | 23.4 | 40 | 41,907 | 234.2 | 25 |
| Montana | 50,564 | 2,768 | 5.5 | 32 | 41,823 | 7,947 | 19.0 | 34 | 10,300 | 24.6 | 37 | 7,532 | 272.1 | 19 |
| Nebraska | 133,616 | 9,544 | 7.1 | 29 | 121,062 | 22,832 | 18.9 | 35 | 31,300 | 25.8 | 35 | 21,756 | 228.0 | 26 |
| Nevada | 3,696 | 946 | 25.6 | 15 | 3,573 | 1,555 | 43.5 | 19 | 1,700 | 47.6 | 23 | 754 | 79.7 | 40 |
| New Hampshire | 17,695 | 9,495 | 53.7 | 2 | 16,554 | 10,845 | 65.5 | 10 | 13,600 | 82.2 | 6 | 4,105 | 43.2 | 44 |
| New Jersey | 29,375 | 15,162 | 51.6 | 4 | 25,835 | 21,298 | 82.4 | 1 | 22,500 | 87.1 | 2 | 7,338 | 48.4 | 43 |
| New Mexico | 41,369 | 1,350 | 3.3 | 37 | 34,105 | 4,479 | 13.1 | 42 | 6,400 | 18.8 | 42 | 5,050 | 374.1 | 16 |
| New York | 177,025 | 57,825 | 32.7 | 9 | 153,238 | 102,283 | 66.7 | 9 | 114,900 | 75.0 | 11 | 57,075 | 98.7 | 36 |
| North Carolina | 300,967 | 9,672 | 3.2 | 38 | 278,276 | 67,627 | 24.3 | 29 | 94,100 | 33.8 | 29 | 84,428 | 872.9 | 6 |
| North Dakota | 84,606 | 1,968 | 2.3 | 43 | 73,962 | 3,218 | 4.4 | 48 | 5,100 | 6.9 | 48 | 3,132 | 159.1 | 32 |
| Ohio | 255,146 | 48,048 | 18.8 | 19 | 233,783 | 137,680 | 58.9 | 11 | 174,000 | 74.4 | 12 | 125,952 | 262.1 | 20 |
| Oklahoma | 213,325 | 5,648 | 2.6 | 42 | 179,687 | 20,149 | 11.2 | 43 | 31,000 | 17.2 | 43 | 25,352 | 448.9 | 13 |
| Oregon | 64,826 | 17,839 | 27.5 | 14 | 61,829 | 36,369 | 58.8 | 12 | 46,500 | 75.2 | 10 | 28,661 | 160.7 | 31 |
| Pennsylvania | 191,284 | 45,182 | 23.6 | 16 | 169,027 | 94,081 | 55.7 | 14 | 109,800 | 65.0 | 15 | 64,618 | 143.0 | 33 |
| Rhode Island | 4,327 | 1,975 | 45.6 | 6 | 3,014 | 2,457 | 81.5 | 3 | 2,800 | 92.9 | 1 | 825 | 41.8 | 45 |
| South Carolina | 165,504 | 3,796 | 2.3 | 44 | 137,558 | 27,568 | 20.0 | 32 | 49,100 | 35.7 | 27 | 45,304 | 1,193.5 | 2 |
| South Dakota | 83,303 | 2,939 | 3.5 | 36 | 72,454 | 3,981 | 5.5 | 47 | 7,100 | 9.8 | 47 | 4,161 | 141.6 | 34 |
| Tennessee | 273,783 | 9,727 | 3.6 | 34 | 247,617 | 38,884 | 15.7 | 38 | 60,600 | 24.5 | 38 | 50,873 | 523.0 | 11 |
| Texas | 501,017 | 11,466 | 2.3 | 45 | 418,002 | 79,127 | 18.9 | 36 | 117,900 | 28.2 | 34 | 106,434 | 928.2 | 4 |
| Utah | 30,695 | 16,130 | 52.5 | 3 | 25,411 | 17,411 | 68.5 | 8 | 19,300 | 76.0 | 9 | 3,170 | 19.6 | 47 |
| Vermont | 27,061 | 7,945 | 29.4 | 13 | 23,582 | 12,213 | 51.8 | 16 | 14,700 | 62.3 | 16 | 6,755 | 85.0 | 38 |
| Virginia | 197,632 | 14,954 | 7.6 | 27 | 174,885 | 42,144 | 24.1 | 30 | 56,100 | 32.1 | 31 | 41,146 | 275.2 | 18 |
| Washington | 84,381 | 40,060 | 47.5 | 5 | 81,686 | 58,283 | 71.4 | 6 | 65,400 | 80.1 | 8 | 25,340 | 63.2 | 42 |
| West Virginia | 104,747 | 3,647 | 3.5 | 35 | 99,282 | 25,199 | 25.4 | 27 | 32,200 | 32.4 | 30 | 28,553 | 782.9 | 8 |
| Wisconsin | 199,877 | 39,206 | 19.6 | 18 | 186,735 | 87,556 | 46.9 | 18 | 106,700 | 57.1 | 19 | 67,494 | 172.2 | 30 |
| Wyoming | 17,487 | 527 | 3.0 | 40 | 15,018 | 3,474 | 23.1 | 31 | 5,100 | 34.0 | 28 | 4,573 | 867.7 | 7 |

[1] U. S. Census Bureau.
[2] Rural Electrification Administration survey, 1943.
[3] Edison Electric Institute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BAILEY, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. BILBO, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. BURTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks be authorized to renumber the sections of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3961, the river and harbor bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, reported with amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The CHIEF CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gerry | O'Mahoney |
| Austin | Gillette | Overton |
| Bailey | Green | Radcliffe |
| Ball | Gurney | Reed |
| Bankhead | Hall | Revercomb |
| Bilbo | Hatch | Reynolds |
| Brooks | Hawkes | Robertson |
| Buck | Hayden | Russell |
| Burton | Hill | Shipstead |
| Bushfield | Holman | Stewart |
| Butler | Jenner | Taft |
| Byrd | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capper | La Follette | Tunnell |
| Caraway | Langer | Vandenberg |
| Chandler | Lucas | Wagner |
| Clark, Mo. | McClellan | Wallgren |
| Connally | McFarland | Walsh, Mass. |
| Cordon | McKellar | Walsh, N. J. |
| Danaher | Maloney | Wheeler |
| Davis | Maybank | Wherry |
| Downey | Mead | White |
| Eastland | Millikin | Wiley |
| Ellender | Murray | Willis |
| Ferguson | Nye | |
| George | O'Daniel | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3961.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I feel very much encouraged in proceeding to the consideration of the river and harbor bill after the final passage through the Senate of the flood-control bill. That bill presented a number of controversial provisions. Every opportunity was given in the hearings, and also on the floor of the Senate, to discuss the problems which were germane to the bill, and I am very happy that those problems have been satisfactorily resolved and that the bill has now passed the Senate.

Mr. President, there is something more to be done besides passing this and the flood-control bill through the Senate. Not only must they go to conference between the two Houses and be agreed upon by both Houses, but they must be approved by the President before they become law. After they become law, final and detailed plans and specifications must be prepared by the Corps of Engineers with reference to those projects. That all takes time.

Following that, appropriations must be made by the Congress with reference to the projects which have been authorized. Of course, as the Senate knows, this is merely an authorization bill, and carries with it no appropriation of money whatsoever. When the bill has been finally passed and approved, detailed plans must be prepared, and then Budget recommendations must be prepared, and appropriations made. Therefore we are a long way from proceeding with the construction of any of these projects.

We all look forward to a reasonably early termination of the conflict in Europe. When that conflict is at an end many of our veterans will be discharged from the service and will be back seeking employment in this country. Besides, there will probably be far less manufacture of munitions, implements, and matériel of war. Therefore there will be a crying need for additional employment. I do not believe that any legislation admits of better opportunity for employment or more employment than do the flood-control and river and harbor bills. It has been generally estimated that 80 percent of all sums expended on river and harbor and flood-control projects goes directly or indirectly into the pockets of labor. Certainly not less than 75 percent of the money so expended is spent on labor.

The pending bill carries with it in all 290 projects. The total estimated cost of the projects, as the bill is reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce, is $498,784,931.

The importance of improving our inland waterways has been shown by abundant testimony taken in the course of the hearings on this particular bill. Those hearings disclose that navigation upon our inland waterways has tremendously increased, not only as a result of the war effort, but prior to the war effort, during the past 10 or 12 or 14 years.

The record shows that beginning in the year 1932 the total inland waterway traffic was 4,915,000,000 ton-miles. That was in the midst of the depression. At the end of 1935, 3 years later, we had still not come out of the depression, but the ton-mileage had increased from 4,915,000,000 to 6,300,000,000 ton-miles. By the end of 1937 the ton-miles had leaped to 9,300,000,000, or a doubling of the waterborne commerce upon the inland waterways of the United States. At the end of 1939, when World War No. 2 began, the inland waterways traffic had increased to 11,300,000,000 ton-miles. By the end of 1941, at the time the United States entered the present war, the traffic had grown to more than 18,000,000,000 ton-miles. That was 3 years ago; and I think it is fairly reasonable to assume that now the inland waterway traffic equals or is in excess of 20,000,000,000 ton-miles a year. That represents an expansion of approximately 400 percent, in the last 12 years.

Mr. President, I have prepared a breakdown, by States, of the projects contained in this bill, just as I prepared a similar break-down in the case of the flood control bill.

I ask unanimous consent that this break-down may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it is to be noted that this tabulation includes the total cost of projects in more than one State where projects affect more than one State. Such projects are marked by an asterisk. Projects for maintenance only are marked "M. O."

Mr. President, I should like to speak longer in making a preliminary statement regarding the bill, but I know time is of the essence in connection with the passage of the bill. I have stated its general policy and its general outline.

EXHIBIT A

*Projects in H. R. 3961 as reported out by the Committee on Commerce*

(NOTE.—The tabulation below includes the total cost of projects in more than one State. Such projects are noted with an asterisk. Projects for maintenance only are marked M. O.)

| | *First cost to United States* |
|---|---|
| Alabama: | |
| *Alabama and Coosa Rivers | $60,000,000 |
| Mobile Harbor | 475,000 |
| Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers | 6,750,000 |
| Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers | 115,000 |
| *Waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers | 66,000,000 |
| Dauphin Island Bay | 83,000 |
| Bayou Coden | 6,880 |
| Bayou La Batre | 27,500 |
| Alaska: | |
| Metlakahtla Harbor | 120,000 |
| Craig Harbor | 80,000 |
| Meyers Chuck Harbor | 25,000 |
| Wrangell Harbor | 189,000 |
| Wrangell Narrows | 2,731,000 |
| Sitka Harbor | 285,000 |
| Skagway Harbor | 16,000 |
| Petersburg Harbor | 80,000 |
| Port Alexander | 31,000 |
| Gastineau Channel | 155,000 |
| Elfin Cove | 38,000 |
| Seldovia Harbor | 50,000 |
| Arkansas: Ouachita and Black Rivers, near Felsenthal | No cost |
| California: | |
| San Diego Harbor | 165,000 |
| Newport Bay Harbor | 259,000 |
| Santa Barbara Harbor | No cost |
| Morro Bay | 800,000 |
| Monterey Harbor | 74,000 |
| Monterey Bay, Moss Landing | 350,000 |
| Redwood Creek | 483,000 |
| Oakland Harbor | No cost |
| Oakland Harbor | M. O. |
| Richmond Harbor | 25,000 |
| Pinole Shoal and Mare Island | 7,600 |
| Noyo River | 600,000 |
| Crescent City Harbor | 1,610,000 |
| Crescent City Harbor | 200,000 |
| Connecticut: | |
| Mystic River | 20,000 |
| Thames River | M. O. |
| Connecticut River below Hartford, at Old Saybrook | 72,900 |
| Clinton Harbor | 21,900 |
| Guilford Harbor | 21,500 |
| New Haven Harbor | 1,673,000 |
| Bridgeport Harbor | 529,000 |
| Norwalk Harbor | 29,500 |
| Mianus River | 26,500 |
| Greenwich Harbor | 31,000 |

| | First cost to United States |
|---|---|
| Delaware: | |
| Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay | $224,000 |
| Indian River | 151,000 |
| *Nanticoke River | 54,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | 1,036,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | 3,380,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | M. O. |
| Florida: | |
| Fernandina Harbor | No cost |
| St. Johns River, Jacksonville to the ocean | 725,000 |
| St. Johns River, Jacksonville to the ocean | 3,200,000 |
| St. Johns River, Jacksonville to Lake Harney | 290,000 |
| St. Johns River, Jacksonville to Lake Harney | 25,500 |
| Intracoastal waterway from Jacksonville to Miami | 11,789,000 |
| Intracoastal waterway to Vero Beach | 7,300 |
| Sebastian to intracoastal waterway | 19,000 |
| Canaveral Harbor | 811,000 |
| St. Lucie River | 46,000 |
| Lake Worth Inlet | 711,000 |
| New River | 60,000 |
| Miami Harbor | 5,781,000 |
| Miami River | 78,000 |
| Intracoastal waterway, Miami to Key West | 1,830,000 |
| Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas | 208,000 |
| Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas | 5,100 |
| Intracoastal waterway from Caloosahatchee River to Withlacoochee River | 3,200,000 |
| Little Manatee River | 77,000 |
| Tampa Harbor | 189,000 |
| Tampa Harbor | 60,000 |
| Tampa and Hillsboro Bays | 607,400 |
| Anclote River | 10,000 |
| Pithlachascotee River | 51,000 |
| St. Marks River | 71,000 |
| Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to St. Marks River | 32,500 |
| *Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers | 6,500,000 |
| St. Josephs Bay | No cost |
| St. Josephs Bay | 225,000 |
| Watson Bayou | M. O. |
| Pensacola Harbor | 162,000 |
| Georgia: | |
| *Savannah River and Clarks Hill Reservoir | 28,000,000 |
| Savannah Harbor | 281,000 |
| Altamaha, Oconee, Ocmulgee Rivers | No cost |
| Intracoastal Waterway via Fredrica River | No cost |
| *Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers | 6,500,000 |
| *Alabama and Coosa Rivers | 60,000,000 |
| Hawaii: | |
| Keehi Lagoon, Oahu | M. O. |
| Port Allen Harbor, Kauai | 75,000 |
| Idaho: *Snake River | 58,625,000 |
| Illinois: | |
| *Mississippi River at Chain of Rocks | 10,290,000 |
| Mississippi River at Alton | No cost |
| *Illinois Waterway and Indiana Harbor and Canal | 25,900,000 |
| Waukegan Harbor | 34,000 |
| *Calumet Harbor and River | 910,000 |
| Indiana: | |
| *Illinois Waterway and Indiana Harbor and Canal | 25,900,000 |
| *Calumet Harbor and River | 910,000 |
| Iowa: *Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth | 6,000,000 |
| Kansas: *Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth | $6,000,000 |
| Louisiana: | |
| Bayous L'Loutre, St. Malo and Yscloskey | 35,000 |
| Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf | 4,200,000 |
| Intracoastal Waterway vicinity of Algiers at New Orleans | 8,000,000 |
| Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre and Carlin | 160,000 |
| Calcasieu River | 55,000 |
| Maine: | |
| Northeast Harbor | 94,500 |
| Isle au Haut thoroughfare | 28,000 |
| Hendricks Harbor | 6,000 |
| Portland Harbor | 780,000 |
| Portland Harbor, Casco Bay | M. O. |
| Josias River, Ogunquit-Perkins Cove | 32,000 |
| Maryland: | |
| *Nanticoke River | 54,000 |
| Havre de Grace | 18,000 |
| Baltimore Harbor | 2,388,000 |
| Curtis Creek | 150,000 |
| Mill Creek | 4,200 |
| Broadwater Creek | 30,000 |
| Cadle Creek | 5,500 |
| Channel to Island Creek, St. George Island | 10,000 |
| St. Catherines Sound | 10,900 |
| Black Walnut Harbor | 21,000 |
| Town Creek | 25,000 |
| Duck Point Cove | 19,500 |
| Lower Thoroughfare, Deals Island | 22,000 |
| Crisfield Harbor | No cost |
| Pocomoke River | 4,250 |
| Massachusetts: | |
| Newburyport Harbor | 68,000 |
| Gloucester Harbor and Annisquam River | 46,667 |
| Manchester Harbor | 207,300 |
| Salem Harbor | 43,000 |
| Marblehead Harbor | 60,000 |
| Boston Harbor | 660,000 |
| Dorchester Bay and Neponset River | 322,400 |
| Weymouth Fore River | 225,000 |
| Cohasset Harbor | 62,000 |
| Duxbury Harbor | 71,000 |
| Chatham (Stage) Harbor | 43,500 |
| Wellfleet Harbor | 64,000 |
| Hyannis Harbor | 62,500 |
| Cape Cod Canal (Onset Bay) | 48,000 |
| Nantucket Harbor | 31,500 |
| Menemsha Creek, Marthas Vineyard | 37,500 |
| Michigan: | |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Chippewa Harbor, Isle Royale | 41,000 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Black River | 70,300 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Eagle Harbor | 27,800 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Lac La Belle | 38,190 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Grand Traverse Bay | 75,560 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Big Bay | 37,765 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Little Lake | 57,670 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Whitefish Point | 156,950 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—St. James Harbor, Beaver Island | 7,500 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Hammond Bay | 91,400 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Harrisville | 131,600 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Oscoda | 20,400 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Port Austin | 172,100 |
| Michigan—Continued. | |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Port Sanilac | $134,000 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Point Lookout | 104,500 |
| *Menominee Harbor and River | No cost |
| St. Joseph Harbor | 74,000 |
| Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River | 150,000 |
| Manistee Harbor | 147,000 |
| Sault Ste. Marie power plant | 3,500,000 |
| St. Clair River at Southeast Bend | 135,000 |
| Detroit River | 85,300 |
| Minnesota: | |
| Mississippi River near Hastings | No cost |
| Mississippi River at Red Wing | 11,500 |
| Mississippi River at St. Paul | 88,800 |
| Mississippi River at Winona | 17,000 |
| Mississippi River at Minneapolis | No cost |
| Great Lakes harbors of refuge; Lutsen | 66,800 |
| Great Lakes harbors of refuge; Beaver Bay | 39,000 |
| Baudette Harbor | 15,000 |
| Knife River Harbor | 14,000 |
| Mississippi: | |
| Biloxi Harbor | 4,000 |
| Biloxi Harbor | 6,000 |
| Pass Christian Harbor | 17,000 |
| Bayou Galere | 6,000 |
| *Waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers | 66,000,000 |
| Missouri: | |
| *Mississippi River at Chain of Rocks | 10,290,000 |
| *Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth | 6,000,000 |
| Nebraska: *Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth | 6,000,000 |
| New Jersey: | |
| Passaic River | M. O. |
| Newark Bay | 3,390,000 |
| Way Cake Creek | 30,000 |
| Compton Creek | 16,000 |
| Shark River | 118,000 |
| New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway | 1,500,000 |
| Manasquan River | 143,000 |
| Toms River | 141,000 |
| Cold Spring Inlet | 71,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | 1,036,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | 3,380,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | M. O. |
| Delaware River—Camden | 373,000 |
| New York: | |
| Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway | 1,010,000 |
| Jamaica Bay | 270,000 |
| Jones Inlet | 900,000 |
| Northport Harbor, N. Y | 15,000 |
| Peconic River | 20,000 |
| Lake Montauk | 65,000 |
| Orowoc Creek | 15,200 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Barcelona | 295,500 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Grand View Bay | 79,400 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Oak Orchard | 170,700 |
| Great Lakes Harbors of Refuge—Port Ontario | 211,300 |
| Buffalo Harbor | 3,171,000 |
| Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor | 108,000 |
| Wilson Harbor | 131,000 |
| Rochester Harbor | 10,000 |
| Sackets Harbor | 121,000 |
| Cape Vincent Harbor | 59,000 |

| | First cost to United States |
|---|---|
| North Carolina: | |
| *Inland Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C. | $39,000 |
| *Chowan River, N. C., and Blackwater Creek, Va. | 135,000 |
| Pembroke Creek | 9,500 |
| Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe | 5,000 |
| Pamlico Sound to Avon | 16,500 |
| Rollinson Channel | 27,000 |
| Swan Quarter Bay to Deep Bay | 22,500 |
| Neuse and Trent Rivers | 11,000 |
| Thoroughfare Bay — Cedar Bay Channel | 20,000 |
| Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Harbor | 35,000 |
| Pamlico Sound (through Core Sound) to Beaufort Harbor | 7,000 |
| Back Sound to Lookout Bight | 50,000 |
| Beaufort Harbor | 54,000 |
| Beaufort to the Cape Fear River, including Waterway to Jacksonville, N. C. | 24,000 |
| Beaufort to the Cape Fear River, including Waterway to Jacksonville, N. C. | 9,000 |
| Cape Fear River, at and below Wilmington | 675,000 |
| Cape Fear River, at and below Wilmington | 790,000 |
| Northeast (Cape Fear) River | 73,000 |
| *Santee and Congaree Rivers | 25,000,000 |
| Ohio: | |
| *Beaver-Mahoning Rivers | 1,500,000 |
| Sandusky Harbor | M. O. |
| Lorain Harbor | 30,000 |
| Lorain Harbor | M. O. |
| Cleveland Harbor | 191,000 |
| Cleveland Harbor | 30,000 |
| Ashtabula Harbor | 38,000 |
| Oregon: | |
| Chetco River | 190,000 |
| Coquille River | M. O. |
| Umpqua River and Harbor | 55,000 |
| Umpqua River and Harbor | 34,000 |
| Yaquina Bay and Harbor | 162,000 |
| Depoe Bay | 214,000 |
| Salmon River | 5,000 |
| Bayocean Peninsula | 120,000 |
| Willamette River | 3,600,000 |
| *Snake River | 58,625,000 |
| Columbia River at Bonneville | 50,000 |
| Columbia River at Arlington | 39,000 |
| *Columbia River at Umatilla Dam | 49,470,000 |
| Pennsylvania: | |
| *Beaver-Mahoning Rivers | 1,500,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | 1,036,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | 3,380,000 |
| *Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea | M. O. |
| Erie Harbor | M. O. |
| Erie Harbor | 467,000 |
| Puerto Rico: | |
| San Juan Harbor | M. O. |
| Ponce Harbor | 400,000 |
| Fajardo Harbor | 211,000 |
| Rhode Island: | |
| Wickford Harbor | 22,000 |
| Great Salt Pond (Inner Harbor Block Island) | 8,000 |
| Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove | 30,000 |
| South Carolina: | |
| Anchorage Basin near Myrtle Beach | 11,000 |
| Winyah Bay | 1,260,000 |
| Beresford Creek | 21,000 |
| *Santee and Congaree Rivers | 25,000,000 |
| Charleston Harbor | 1,820,000 |
| Shipyard River | 246,500 |
| Abbapoola Creek | 10,800 |
| South Carolina—Continued. | |
| Russell Creek | $15,500 |
| *Savannah River, Clarks Hill Reservoir | 28,000,000 |
| Tennessee: *Waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers | 66,000,000 |
| Texas: | |
| Intracoastal Waterway at Barroom Bay | 6,300 |
| Intracoastal Waterway, Channel from Aransas Pass | 48,000 |
| Intracoastal Waterway to Harlingen | 600,000 |
| Sabine-Neches Waterway, Beaumont turning basin | 10,000 |
| Sabine-Neches Waterway, Port Arthur west turning basin | 18,000 |
| Sabine-Neches Waterway, Beaumont-Kirby Canal | 27,000 |
| Neches and Angelina Rivers | 23,000,000 |
| Trinity River | 15,000,000 |
| Lavon Reservoir on East Fork of Trinity River | 3,733,000 |
| Houston Ship Channel, Brady Island | 21,300 |
| Houston Ship Channel | 3,675,000 |
| Houston Ship Channel | 484,000 |
| Clear Creek and Clear Lake | 30,000 |
| Aransas Pass-Corpus Christi | 830,000 |
| Chocolate Bayou, Bastrop Bayou, and Oyster Creek | 108,000 |
| Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca | 120,000 |
| Lavaca and Navidad Rivers | 85,000 |
| Lavaca and Navidad Rivers | 348,000 |
| Guadalupe River | 8,500,000 |
| Brazos Island Harbor | 127,500 |
| Brazos Island Harbor | 635,000 |
| Virginia: | |
| Waterway on the coast of Virginia | 263,000 |
| Occohannock Creek | 37,000 |
| Oyster Channel | 29,000 |
| Onancock River | No cost |
| Tangier Channel | 10,100 |
| Cranes Creek | 7,500 |
| Totuskey Creek | 44,000 |
| Hoskins Creek | 16,000 |
| Urbanna Creek | 9,600 |
| Whitings Creek | 11,500 |
| Broad Creek | 20,500 |
| Pamunkey Creek | 10,000 |
| Appomattox River | 110,000 |
| Hampton Creek | 15,000 |
| Cape Charles City Harbor | 153,000 |
| Norfolk Harbor | 35,000 |
| Little Creek | M. O. |
| James River | 27,000 |
| *Inland Waterway from Norfolk, Va. to Beaufort Inlet, N. C. | 39,000 |
| *Chowan River, N. C., and Blackwater Creek, Va. | 135,000 |
| Washington: | |
| Columbia River at Kennewick | 30,000 |
| *Snake River | 58,625,000 |
| Columbia River at Camas | 45,000 |
| Columbia River, Cowlitz River | 12,000 |
| Columbia River at Longview | 81,000 |
| Columbia River, Baker Bay | 170,000 |
| *Columbia River at Umatilla Dam | 49,470,000 |
| Bay Center Channel, Willapa Harbor | 30,000 |
| Quillayute River | M. O. |
| Port Angeles Harbor | 10,000 |
| Olympia Harbor | 83,000 |
| Tacoma Harbor | 160,000 |
| Stillaguamish | 35,000 |
| Lake Crockett | 225,000 |
| Wisconsin: | |
| Ashland Harbor | 24,000 |
| Mississippi River at Cochrane | 33,000 |
| *Menominee Harbor and River | No cost |
| Wisconsin—Continued. | |
| Green Bay Harbor | $56,000 |
| Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal | 11,000 |
| Milwaukee Harbor | 110,000 |
| Racine Harbor | −2,100 |
| Racine Harbor | 47,000 |

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I now move that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 3, line 4, after the name "Congress", to insert "except that the useful work done on the project by local interests shall be accepted toward the fulfillment of the requirements of local cooperation."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before that amendment is acted upon and before other committee amendments are acted upon, let me state that there are amendments which have been prepared by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Those amendments are the same as certain ones which were introduced to the flood-control bill and were agreed to by the Senate. They have the same application to the river-and-harbor bill that they had to the flood-control bill. Inasmuch as the amendments affect committee amendments to the bill, and also contain certain declarations of general policy, I suggest that the Senator from Wyoming be recognized in order to propose the amendments. They are identically the same as those which were agreed to in reference to the flood-control bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether consideration of those amendments will be had prior to consideration of the committee amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. The amendments referred to really are part of the committee amendments, because they relate to certain committee amendments; and they would obviate the necessity of acting on certain committee amendments, for the reason that they supersede them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is it contemplated that the amendments to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred may be acted upon before the committee amendments are acted upon?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, they are part and parcel of the consideration of the committee amendments. They affect the committee amendments. Inasmuch as there is no controversy about them, inasmuch as they have been agreed upon after long, careful, prayerful, and thorough consideration and study, and inasmuch as they were presented before this body upon the consideration of the flood-control bill, I think it would be well to adopt them now, and then proceed to consideration of the noncontroversial items of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHITE. Let me inquire about the amendments which are not noncontroversial. Is consideration of them to

await disposition of the committee amendments?

Mr. OVERTON. I think that is the better course. I have given that point considerable thought. If the Senator has any objection, I shall be willing to proceed differently. But the ones to which I have referred are committee amendments covered by the O'Mahoney amendments.

Mr. WHITE. That is what I thought.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has been kind enough to refer to the amendments as the O'Mahoney amendments. I think the RECORD should show that I am acting only as the spokesman of a group of Senators who have participated for several months in conferences leading to the drafting of the amendments and in conferences with the very able, and, I may say, most patient Senator from Louisiana leading to the adjustment of apparent controversies.

The Senators on behalf of whom I am offering this amendment are the following:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all these Senators for the effort and advice they have contributed to the accomplishment of this work, and particularly I should like to express my personal appreciation to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who has labored indefatigably on this work.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am reluctantly compelled, on imperative duties, to attend a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs this afternoon. In that committee we have up for consideration the confirmation of certain nominations for members of the Surplus Property Board.

The pending bill carries an amendment by the Committee on Commerce in which I am very much interested. It has to do with deleting from the bill an amendment which came over from the other House, eliminating the 160-acre limitation from the Central Valley project. I know how heavily burdened the Senator from Louisiana has been, and I dislike very much to add to his burdens. But I wonder if he can consent to a unanimous agreement that consideration of the matter may go over until Monday, so that this afternoon I may attend the meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs. I promise him that if he does give such consent, my remarks on Monday will be much more brief than my remarks today would be, because over the week end I shall make considerable progress in their preparation. In any event I shall not speak for more than 30 minutes, I assure him.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I rather regret that the request is made in the form of a unanimous-consent agreement, because other Senators wish to have certain other matters go over, and if we agree to one unanimous-consent request we will soon be met by others of a similar nature. I assure the Senator that the matter to which he has referred will not be handled this afternoon, and if he will withdraw his request that will facilitate our progress.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have every appreciation of the unfailing courtesy and cooperation of the Senator, and therefore I am glad to withdraw my request.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment on behalf of myself and the Senators whose names I have enumerated, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

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 as herein authorized, 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, as heren authorized to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; to facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive and coordinated development; 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 appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users.

In conformity with this policy:

(a) Plans, proposals, or reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, for any works of improvement for navigation or flood control not heretofore or herein authorized, shall be submitted to the Congress only upon compliance with the provisions of this paragraph (a). Investigations which form the basis of any such plans, proposals, or reports shall be conducted in such a manner as to give to the affected State or States, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and, to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. If such investigations in whole or part are concerned with the use or control of waters arising west of the ninety-seventh meridian, the Chief of Engineers shall give to the Secretary of the Interior, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. The relations of the Chief of Engineers with any State under this paragraph (a) shall be with the Governor of the State or such official or agency of the State as the Governor may designate. The term "affected State or States" shall include those in which the works or any part thereof are proposed to be located; those which in whole or part are both within the drainage basin involved and situated in a State lying wholly or in part west of the ninety-eighth meridian; and such of those which are east of the ninety-eighth meridian as, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, will be substantially affected. Such plans, proposals, or reports and related investigations shall be made to the end, among other things, of facilitating the coordination of plans for the construction and operation of the proposed works with other plans involving the waters which would be used or controlled by such proposed works. Each report submitting any such plans or proposals to the Congress shall set out therein, among other things, the relationship between the plans for construction and operation of the proposed works and the plans, if any, submitted by the affected States and by the Secretary of the Interior. The Chief of Engineers shall transmit a copy of his proposed report to each affected State, and, in case the plans or proposals covered by the report are concerned with the use or control of waters which rise in whole or in part west of the ninety-seventh meridian, to the Secretary of the Interior. Within 90 days from the date of receipt of said proposed report, the written views and recommendations of each affected State and of the Secretary of the Interior may be submitted to the Chief of Engineers. The Secretary of War shall transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, the proposed report together with the submitted views and recommendations of affected States and of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of War may prepare and make said transmittal any time following said 90-day period. The letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

(b) The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein authorized for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior, in making investigations of and reports on works for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall, in relation to an affected State or States (as defined in paragraph (a) of this section), and to the Secretary of War, be subject to the same provisions regarding investigations, plans, proposals, and reports as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section for the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. In the event a submission of views and recommendations, made by an affected State or by the Secretary of War pursuant to said provisions, sets forth objections to the plans or proposals covered by the report of the Secretary of the Interior, the proposed works shall not be deemed authorized except upon approval by an act of Congress; and subsection 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project

Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) and subsection 3 (a) of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended, are hereby amended accordingly.

On page 21, line 25, add the following:

The general comprehensive plans set forth in House Document 475 and Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, are hereby approved and the initial stages recommended are hereby authorized and shall be prosecuted by the War Department and the Department of the Interior as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements.

(b) 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, is hereby expanded to include the works referred to in paragraph (a) to be undertaken by the War Department; and said expanded plan shall be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

(c) Subject to the basin-wide findings and recommendations regarding the benefits, the allocations of costs and the repayments by water users, made in said House and Senate documents, the reclamation and power developments to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior under said plans, shall be governed by the Federal Reclamation Laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except that irrigation of Indian trust and tribal lands, and repayment therefor, shall be in accordance with the laws relating to Indian lands.

(d) In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken under said expanded plans by the Corps of Engineers.

(e) The sum of $200,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken under said plans by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I ask the Senator from Wyoming if any of these amendments, which were read rather hastily at the desk, would affect in any way, so far as developments are concerned, the present reclamation policies under this bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendments were agreed to by all those who had any part at all in the consideration of the bill, including the Bureau of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior. The amendments originally proposed to the flood-control bill which, by action of the Senate upon the motion of the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, have not been presented. They are not included in this bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I believe it is unnecessary for me further to explain the amendments, and I ask that they be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I filed a statement of minority views in connection with the river and harbor bill. A large part of that statement was in connection with the amendments which have just been agreed to, and which were previously included in the flood-control bill. I ask unanimous consent to delete from my statement everything in it beginning with the words "In case of navigation projects" in the fourth paragraph on page 4, and concluding on page 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to address an inquiry to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. OVERTON. Before the Senator does so, I should like to understand what was the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wyoming. I could not distinctly hear him.

Mr. ROBERTSON. My request was to delete all language in the minority views dealing with the amendments which have just been agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, among the subjects which were under discussion and studied by the group of Senators on behalf of whom I just presented the amendments, was the problem of the Snake River in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] who is unfortunately detained from the Chamber, had an amendment to that portion of the bill on page 28 which deals with the Snake River. He requested me to propose the amendment on his behalf. I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether it is desirable to present the amendment now or later.

Mr. OVERTON. I think it would be more appropriate to present it later when we reach the subject of the Snake River.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand that an agreement was reached between the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Louisiana with respect to a modification of the provision concerning the Snake River?

Mr. OVERTON. No objection will be made to the amendment. I believe the provision in the bill can be appropriately rephrased without changing its meaning.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall defer offering the amendment until later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment on page 3, beginning in line 4, is agreed to.

The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 19, to insert:

Boston Harbor, Mass., House Document No. 472, Seventy-eighth Congress; except that the construction of a seaplane channel at an alternate location is not authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 12, after the name "Congress", to insert "except the further improvement of Quinnipiac River."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 17, to insert:

Mianus River, Conn.; House Document No. 549; Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 21, to strike out:

Larchmont Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 697, Seventy-sixth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 12, to insert:

Santee and Congaree Rivers, North Carolina and South Carolina; Senate Document No. 189, Seventy-eighth Congress; and the sum of $25,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the initial and partial accomplishment of said project.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have a short amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the desk and ask the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill if he will not accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 17, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That this authorization is not to be construed as final approval for the construction of a dam at Buckingham Landing."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I might say in this connection that the people of the section affected feel that they have not had sufficient public hearings. Of course, it is my desire to see that they have such hearings, and that the provision in the Army engineers' report should not be construed as final until hearings are held and it is found that the dam is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 19, to insert:

Shipyard River, S. C.; report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 11, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 22, after the name "Congress", to insert a comma and "and in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 23, 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 13, to insert:

Lake Worth, Inlet, Fla.; House Document No. 530, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 11, after the name "Congress", to insert "and Senate Document Numbered 183, Seventy-eighth Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 5, to insert:

Waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers; in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the report submitted in House Document No. 269, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is a controversial amendment. It relates to the project known as the Tombigbee project. I will ask that it be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 3, to insert:

Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Algiers at New Orleans, La.; Senate Document No. 188, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 6, to insert:

Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre and Carlin, La.; House Document No. 594, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 5, after the name "Texas", to strike out "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated February 10, 1944" and insert "House Document Numbered 533, Seventy-eighth Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 5, to insert:

Aransas Pass-Corpus Christi Channel, Texas; House Document No. 544, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 22, to insert:

Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, Pennsylvania and Ohio; from the Ohio River to Struthers in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers for this section of waterway, in the report submitted in House Document No. 178, Seventy-sixth Congress: *Provided*, That compliance with the conditions of local cooperation shall be limited to those features that are usable in this section of the waterway.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is a controversial amendment, and I ask that it be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 15, to insert:

Saint Marys River, Michigan; the construction of a new hydroelectric power plant in accordance with the plan recommended in House Document No. 339, Seventy-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That only the first step of the recommended development, involving an installation of approximately fourteen thousand kilowatts at an estimated cost of $3,500,000, shall be constructed at this time, and no further development in addition to said first step shall be undertaken until hereafter authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the existing United States hydroelectric power plant at Sault Sainte Marie shall be abandoned upon completion of the new plant: *And provided further*, That the electric energy generated in the operation of said new plant shall be sold by the Secretary of War, and any surplus water available to the United States which is not required for the operation of facilities owned by the United States may be leased by the Secretary of War upon such terms and conditions as he shall determine: And *provided further*, That pending construction of the new United States plant he may also enter into such arrangements for continued operation of the existing Government plant and the use of water as he may deem advisable in the public interest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 11, after the word "numbered", to strike out "1, 4, 7, and 10" and insert "1 to 10, inclusive"; and in line 17, after the word "concerned", to insert a colon and the following provisos: "*Provided*, That surplus electric energy generated at the dams authorized in this item shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior for disposition in accordance with existing laws relating to the disposition of power at Bonneville Dam: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as conferring the power of condemnation of transmission lines."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in reference to this amendment, which has to do with the Snake River, I suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that it is the one to which I think he desires to offer amendment for the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. I think the amendment of the Senator from Idaho takes in the first part of the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it does. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS and Mr. CLARK], I send forward amendments to this provision and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 11, after the word "of", it is proposed to insert the word "such."

On page 28, line 11, to delete the words "numbered 1 to 10, inclusive", and insert in lieu thereof "as are necessary."

On page 28, line 12, after the word "of", to insert the words "providing slack water."

On page 28, line 15, after the word "modifications", to insert "as do not change the requirement to provide slack-water navigation."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming on behalf of the Senators from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 2, after the word "the", to strike out "State" and insert "States"; and in the same line, after the name "Oregon", to insert "and Washington."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 21, after the name "Congress", to insert a colon and the following provisos: "*Provided*, That surplus electric energy generated at said dam shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior for disposition in accordance with existing laws relating to the disposition of power at Bonneville Dam: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as conferring the power of condemnation of transmission lines."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 16, to insert: "The aforesaid dam heretofore referred to as the Umatilla Dam shall when completed be named the McNary Dam in honor of the late Senator Charles L. McNary, and shall be dedicated to his memory as a monument to his distinguished public service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 4, to insert:

Sitka Harbor, Alaska; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 14, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 22, to insert:

San Juan Harbor, P. R.; maintenance of existing entrance channel and turning basin to Army terminal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 23, to strike out:

Sec. 4. The excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands which will receive a water supply from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for section 4 as reported by the Senate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, in lieu of section 4 as recommended by the committee, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 4. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior that any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works in connection therewith as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and after subsequent specific authorization of the Congress by an authorization act; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and reservoirs operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized hereafter for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of this section, but the foregoing requirement shall not prejudice lawful uses now existing. This section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the Army engineers, which provides conservation storage of water for irrigation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the substitute amendment; what change it makes and otherwise what is proposed by the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this is very similar to the amendment which was agreed upon in consideration of the flood-control bill and which is now in the flood-control bill as it passed the Senate. There is one, I think, very important exception provided for in this amendment, and that is that hereafter projects for reclamation and irrigation must be authorized by Congress with respect to the dams which have been constructed by the Army engineers.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does that make any material change in existing law?

Mr. OVERTON. The change is this: Whenever the War Department desires to construct any public works in connection with rivers and harbors and flood control, it must obtain authority from the Congress to do so after making a recommendation and after consideration by the committees of Congress. But, under existing law, with respect to projects which the Department of the Interior desires to have constructed in connection with the disposition of surplus water from projects which have been constructed by the Army engineers, the Secretary may, without going to Congress, authorize such a project upon his finding that such a project is economically justified and is feasible. It was the opinion of the committee that the Secretary of the Interior should not undertake such a work without getting the authorization of the Congress.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, right at the moment I do not know just what the effect of the proposed change would be. I do know that this does make a material change in existing law as it relates to irrigation and reclamation projects, and to general law. I wondered why in a rivers and harbors bill there should be an attempt to change general legislation.

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment relates, not to irrigation projects generally, but only to reservoirs and dams which have been constructed by the War Department under the supervision of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers. Surplus waters from those dams are to be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior under projects which will be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. HATCH. But the Senator says it does change existing law.

Mr. OVERTON. No; it does not change general irrigation and reclamation law.

Mr. HATCH. Then why is it put in this bill?

Mr. OVERTON. It does not change any existing law except as the same may possibly relate to projects which are river and harbor projects, or are flood-control projects, such as were authorized in the flood-control bill. It is my understanding that this meets with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. In fact, he recommended it. The irrigation amendment submitted by the Secretary of the Interior was finally modified in the particular I have just mentioned and agreed to by the Senate Commerce Committee, and likewise the power amendment that was recommended by the Senate Committee on Commerce met with the approval of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. HATCH. I do not desire particularly to object to this amendment, except as to the manner of legislation. We do have here a bill which has been before us for some time, containing a specific committee amendment, to which I think everyone was agreeable. Now a substitute is offered, and we have not had a chance to study it; but if the Senator assures me that this matter has been considered and has been studied by the Reclamation Service and they are agreeable to it, of course, I shall not interpose an objection.

Mr. OVERTON. That is my understanding, Mr. President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHERRY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not seen the text of the amendment until this morning, but as I read it, it seems to me to be susceptible of this explanation: An effort has been made, in the consideration of the pending bill, to harmonize the operations of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. It has been found that in the construction of flood-control works, heretofore and now exclusively under the control of the Army engineers, it is feasible to effect storage of water which may be used for irrigation and reclamation. With respect to all such projects in the future, under this language, if it means what it seems to me to mean, water determined by the Secretary of the Interior in a flood-control project to be susceptible of use for irrigation and reclamation must be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior under the reclamation law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In what respect does the substitute for section 4 now offered differ from the amendment offered by the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall have to look at the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I think it differs in this respect—and I wish the senior Senator from Louisiana would correct me if I am incorrect—that under the committee amendment as it now stands, and under existing law as it now is, if there are surplus waters which may be used for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior may make a finding that it is feasible to use those waters for irrigation purposes, and upon the Secretary making such finding, the construction of a supplemental project, such as a distribution system, may be carried on by the Secretary of the Interior through the Reclamation Service without authorization by Congress. But as I have gathered the import of the substitute which is offered, before that can be done under the substitute, Congress itself must specifically authorize the construction of the distribution system to use the waters for irrigation purposes. Am I correct in that, or not?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. There is another difference between the original and the substitute committee amendment, and that is in the provision with reference to the allocation of costs. It is provided that—

> Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and after subsequent specific authorization by Congress by an authorization act.

That is one matter which the Senator just discussed. The other is contained in the provision:

> And within the limits of the water users' repayment ability such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes.

But these modifications meet, I think, the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and, with the exception of specific authorization by Congress of a project, were by him recommended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, in view of the fact that this amendment is not printed, if he would not be willing to let the matter go over until Monday.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The junior Senator from California, as I understand, intends to raise a question about the committee's action in striking out the House text of section 4, and this matter is somewhat involved in the same issue, as I see it, and I should like to have it go over.

Mr. OVERTON. The main reason for substituting the amendment which I sent forward as a substitute for the first committee amendment is to make it conform to the amendment adopted by the Senate in the flood-control bill. The substitute amendment which we now have under consideration is verbatim what was adopted by the Senate in the flood-control bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator is willing, I should like to have it go over, and have an opportunity to study it over the week end.

Mr. OVERTON. I should be very happy to have it go over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Has the amendment been read, so that it will appear in the RECORD?

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry. Has the amendment been read in full?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been read.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, under the unanimous consent request preferred by the Senator from Wisconsin, the substitute amendment and the committee amendment go over until next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment and the substitute offered will go over.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment to section 4, as reported by the committee, and the substitute which is now offered by the committee for the committee amendment, be both printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered. Let the Chair state that there seems to be some misunderstanding at the desk. It is the understanding of the present occupant of the chair that the committee amendment to section 4, beginning on page 35, line 24, and the committee amendment on page 36, after line 3, and the committee substitute therefor, are to be passed over.

Mr. OVERTON. Insofar as they relate to section 4 only, but not as to section 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the present occupant of the Chair that the committee's proposal to strike out section 4 of the House text beginning on page 35, line 24, and going over to line 3, on page 36, is also to be passed over.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; that is the understanding, Mr. President. What happened was that the Committee on Commerce struck out certain language which appeared in the House bill as section 4, and inserted a new section 4. Now for the section 4 as originally reported by the committee, the Senator from Louisiana has presented other and different language. So it is the original section 4 reported by the committee, and a substitute which is now offered from the floor by the Senator from Louisiana, which ought to appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, in conformity with the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming, the committee amendment beginning on page 35, line 24, and ending in line 3, on page 36, the committee amendment, section 4, beginning in line 4, page 36, and ending in line 23 of the same page, and the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] in lieu of that language will be passed over, and they will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, what is being passed over is on page 35, beginning with line 24, and continuing down to line 23, on page 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, as well as the substitute for the original committee amendment. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

From line 24, page 35, to line 3, page 36, proposed by the committee, to be stricken out:

"SEC. 4. The excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands which will receive a water supply from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937."

From line 4 to line 23, page 36—original committee amendment:

"SEC. 4. In connection with dams or works authorized by this act which the Secretary of War determines, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and upon the authorization by the Congress; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and works authorized by this act may be utilized for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of said Federal reclamation laws and this paragraph."

On page 36, in lieu of section 4 as recommended in the committee report, insert:

"SEC. 4. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior that any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works in connection therewith as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and after subsequent specific authorization of the Congress by an authorization act; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and reservoirs operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized hereafter for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of this section, but the foregoing requirement shall not prejudice lawful uses now existing. This section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the Army engineers, which provides conservation storage of water for irrigation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 23, to insert:

SEC. 5. The Chief of Engineers may authorize the employment of physicians under agreement, to make such physical examinations of employees or prospective employees as he may consider essential, on a fee or regular employment basis without regard to civil-service requirements, and all agreements heretofore entered into for such purposes are hereby validated and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for reasonable payments heretofore made for such services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 6. Electric power and energy generated at projects authorized by this act and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is not authorized to construct or acquire transmission lines in competition, direct or indirect, with any existing company operating transmission lines for the sale of electric power; except as otherwise authorized by other sections of this act relating to Umatilla Dam and the Snake River project.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the amendatory language contained in section 6 on page 37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, in lieu of section 6 as proposed in the committee report, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 6. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in explanation of the substitute amendment, I wish to state that this substitute amendment is in exact conformity with the power amendment originally recommended by the Senate Committee on Commerce. Subsequently the Senate committee recommended a modification of that amendment, which was presented by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the flood-control bill. After considerable discussion the Bailey amendment was defeated. Thereupon I offered the original recommendation of the Senate Committee on Commerce dealing with the distribution of power. When the committee recommended this provision, which has just now been read as a substitute amendment to the flood-control bill, the committee authorized me to offer it as a substitute amendment to the river and harbor bill. This section was thoroughly discussed, thoroughly aired, and thor-

oughly understood, I think, by all Senators when we considered the flood-control bill, and it was unanimously adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the amendment which the Senator has now offered accord in all respects with the action of the Senate on the flood-control bill with respect to the distribution of power?

Mr. OVERTON. It does. And it is word for word in line with the Senate amendment to the flood-control bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that the rejection of the Bailey amendment by the Senate when the flood-control bill was under consideration eventuated in the adoption of this language on the flood-control bill which the Senator is now offering to the river and harbor bill?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that this matter is important enough so it ought to be printed with the other amendments before we act upon it. It sounds satisfactory, as it was read, but at the same time I think a matter of this importance ought to be printed and placed before the Members of the Senate before we act upon it. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to let it go over with the other amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be very happy to do so if the Senator insists upon it, but I wish to call attention to the fact that that amendment was debated on the floor of the Senate when considering the flood-control bill longer possibly than any other amendment, and it was adopted. The Senate has acted on this amendment word for word in the flood-control bill. The sole purpose of the amendment is to make the provision in both bills the same, so that the provision in the river and harbor bill will conform to the provision in the flood-control bill. Of course, if there is anything wrong about it, I shall be very glad to have the vote by which it was agreed to reconsidered on the Senator's motion.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not expect there is anything wrong about the substitute which the Senator is offering. However, the original provision incorporated in the bill seems to me to be at least partially the Bailey amendment, in that it might be interpreted so as to prevent the building of transmission lines to deliver the power. I understand the Senator's amendment is intended to correct that possibility of its being wrongfully interpreted. But at the same time I wonder if the Senator would not be willing to let it go over until Monday.

Mr. OVERTON. This is the amendment, word for word, which was recommended to the committee by the Director of the Irrigation Division under the Secretary of the Interior. Presumably he would not have made the recommendation if it had not had the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. It is not objected to by any agency of the Government, and, as I have stated, was thoroughly considered here and debated on the floor of the Senate and agreed to. This is only a reproduction of the same amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if we may have the amendment read again?

Mr. OVERTON. I will give the Senator a copy of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to read it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the language of this amendment is identical with that which the Senate wrote into the flood-control bill with reference to the matter of preference to States, counties, municipalities, and so forth, and with reference to the construction of transmission lines.

Mr. OVERTON. It is identical, word for word. The amendment undertakes to encourage the widest distribution of power. It gives preference to cooperatives and other public bodies in the disposition of power generated at any dams authorized in the bill. Furthermore, it limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to construct and acquire transmission lines and related facilities to those which may be necessary in order to make the power and energy developed at such projects available in wholesale quantities only—not at retail—for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

Mr. AIKEN. In case there were private utility lines at or near the dam, would not this amendment be construed as making it unnecessary for the Secretary of the Interior to construct or acquire transmission lines in order to distribute the power?

Mr. OVERTON. He would sell to private power companies at wholesale; and the limitation on the construction of transmission lines is that they may be constructed only for disposition at wholesale. So if there are 20 private power company lines within 20 feet of a dam, he can build the necessary transmission lines to connect with all the private power company lines.

I am perfectly willing to let the amendment go over.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish the Senator would do so. I still think I shall have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I find that in presenting the amendment agreed upon at the outset today, I neglected, in the amendment which I sent to the desk, to ask that on page 21, the proviso beginning in line 22 be eliminated. The Senator will recall that this proviso deals with the subject matter of the entire conference with respect to prior rights, so that language is not necessary, and I ask unanimous consent that the proviso on page 1, beginning in line 22, and extending through line 25, be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming that the proviso beginning in line 22 on page 21, and ending in line 25, be stricken out? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 7, to insert:

Boothbay Harbor, Maine, particularly the Mill Cove Area.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 18, to insert:

Mystic River, Mass.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 18, to insert:

Hudson River, N. Y., from Albany to New York City.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 10, to insert:

Deep Creek, Md.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 11, to insert:

Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md., with a view to providing a harbor for small boats.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 5, to insert:

Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay and connecting waters, Virginia, with a view to preparing a plan of improvement and estimate of cost, particularly to prevent shoaling, in the interest of shellfish production and navigation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 18, to insert:

Cooper River, S. C., from Charleston Harbor to the Pinopolis Power Plant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 12, to insert:

Barge channel in vicinity of Baton Rouge, La., extending from the Mississippi River through Devils Swamp or along its eastern edge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 12, to insert:

Galveston Bay and contiguous waters, Texas, with a view to providing a seaplane channel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 19, after the name "Sabine River", to strike out "Texas" and insert "and tributaries, Texas, in the interest of navigation, flood control, and other water uses."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the remaining amendments are preliminary survey amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana that the remaining committee amendments in the bill be agreed to en bloc?

Mr. OVERTON. They are preliminary examination and survey items, and they have all been sponsored by Senators from the States in which they are located.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is somewhat unusual, I take it, to ask that

amendments in a bill be agreed to en bloc. I do not know that it is wholly without precedent; but if there is a precedent, it is not a good one.

Mr. OVERTON. I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 21, after the name "Neches River", to strike out "Texas" and insert "and tributaries, Texas, in the interest of navigation, flood control, and other water uses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 9, after the word "to", to strike out "Warren, Pennsylvania" and insert "Olean, New York."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 10, to insert:

Humboldt Bay, Calif.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 11, to insert:

Bays, inlets, and rivers along the coast of Oregon with a view to providing an adequate number of deep-draft harbors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 18, to insert:

Coos Bay, Oreg.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 20, to insert:

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 4, to insert:

Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view to providing a deep-sea fishing base at Hoquiam.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 1, to insert:

Arecibo Harbor, P. R., with a view to determining whether modifications in the authorized project would be desirable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments with the exception of those passed over.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is a survey item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, line 10, after the word "drainage", it is proposed to strike out the period, add a comma, and insert "and for the prevention of stream pollution and salt-water intrusion."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. This is also a preliminary survey item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, between lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to insert the following:

For flood control, irrigation, navigation, and drainage, and for the prevention of stream pollution and salt water intrusion, on all streams and bayous in southwest Louisiana, west of the Atchafalaya Basin protection levee, and south of the latitude of Boyce; on all streams and bayous in Louisiana lying between the east Atchafalaya Basin protection levee and the Mississippi River; and on Amite and Tangipahoa Rivers and tributaries, Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. This is also a preliminary examination and survey item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, it is proposed to strike out lines 4, 5, and 6, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

Bayou LaFourche, La., from Donaldsonville to the intracoastal waterway, via Bayou Bouef, Assumption Parish, or other streams, in the interest of navigation, flood control, beneficial uses of water, malarial control, prevention of stream pollution, and of the location of locks at the head of said bayou at or near Donaldsonville, La.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 56, it is proposed to strike out line 25, reading, "Aguadillo Harbor, Puerto Rico."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 57, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix V. I., with a view to improvement for navigation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is noncontroversial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway; Senate Document Numbered 248, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 52, after line 7, it is proposed to insert "Double Bayou, Tex."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk a noncontroversial amendment relating to the Scioto River, at Portsmouth, Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the bottom of page 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

Scioto River, at Portsmouth, Ohio; such works as the Chief of Engineers may find advisable to provide a harbor channel equivalent to that existing prior to initiation of the Portsmouth flood-control project; the cost of such works in no event to exceed $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I offer a noncontroversial amendment relating to Kenosha Harbor, Wis. I send it to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 53, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert "Kenosha Harbor, Wis."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

Channel leading from Tampa Bay channel directly north to the vicinity of Mullet Key and with a view to providing a protected harbor and turning basin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further noncontroversial amendments.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

Channel 40 feet deep, to serve as a deep-water outlet to the Gulf of Mexico from the harbors of Mobile, Ala., and Pascagoula, Biloxi, and Gulfport, Miss.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, let me inquire whether that is for a survey.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I think that completes all the noncontroversial amendments.

The first controversial amendment is that relating to the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, after line 5, it is proposed to insert:

Waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers; in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the report submitted in House Document No. 269, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 16, it is proposed to strike out the period and to insert the following: *"And provided further,* That no inland-waterway project, the necessity or justification for which depends in whole or in part upon the purposes of navigation and transportation, shall be authorized until the Interstate Commerce Commission, after public hearing, shall have submitted a report to the Congress concerning the public convenience and necessity for the navigation and transportation features of the project."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, such an amendment, if offered, would be a very controversial amendment. We are now considering committee amendments. I think the amendment now before the Senate is the committee amendment which was read a moment ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, am I to understand that the amendment beginning in line 6, on page 17, is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the amendment with which we now deal is no minor matter. We are now discussing $75,000,000. That is still a sizable amount of money, in spite of the magnified mathematics with which we are entirely surrounded in government these days. I submit that there is no warrant for any such present commitment on the basis of the record or on the basis of the physical facts involved. I wish to present the basis for this statement to the Senate, so that it may, from my viewpoint, intelligently assess its responsibilities in this connection.

The first thing I wish to point out, Mr. President, is that this project is precisely the same one, based on precisely the same Government reports, which last appeared before the Senate on April 24, 1940. It is to be remembered that it is precisely the same project, based on precisely the same engineering reports and recommendations.

When it was last submitted to the Senate, on April 24, 1940, it was defeated on a yea-and-nay vote by a vote of 56 to 17. I know of nothing which would perhaps be more helpful in reminding Senators of what is involved in this situation than for me to indicate the names of the Senators whose judgment at that time recommended against the so-called Tombigbee project. The following were the Senators who, the last time the project was submitted, said it was not justified, and reached that conclusion on the basis of precisely the same engineering reports which are presented today as the basis for the improvement: The late Senator Adams of Colorado, for whose judgment we all have as great respect as we have affection for his memory; Senator Austin; Senator Bailey, the chairman of the Commerce Committee; Senator Barbour; Senator Bridges; Senator Brown; Senator Bulow; Senator Burke; Senator Byrd; Senator Byrnes, the present Assistant President of the United States; Senator Capper; Senator Chandler; Senator Chavez; Senator Clark of Idaho; Senators Clark of Missouri, Danaher, Donahey, Ellender, Frazier, George, Gerry, Glass, Green, Gurney, Hale, Hatch, Johnson of California, Johnson of Colorado, King, La Follette, Lodge, Lucas, Lundeen, McKellar, Maloney, Mead, Minton, Neely, Nye, O'Mahoney, Reed, Russell, Schwellenbach, Shipstead, Slattery, Smathers, Smith, Stewart, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Townsend, Vice President-elect Truman, Vandenberg, Van Nuys, White, and Wiley.

Mr. President, I repeat that the vote was 56 nays to 17 yeas, upon precisely the same project as the one which now presents itself, so far as the underlying justification on the basis of engineering reports is concerned. It was a bipartisan vote, with 20 Republicans and 36 Democrats voting in the negative.

Mr. President, I do not intend to labor this subject, but I wish to present to the Senate again, in very compact fashion, the reason why the Senate was opposed before, the reason why the House refused to put this particular project in this particular bill, by a yea-and-nay vote of 195 to 157, and why I am constrained, in my sense of responsibility to the taxpayers of the United States, to oppose its adoption by the Senate now.

The Tombigbee project is a waterway substantially paralleling the Mississippi River. It involves 41 miles of canal, 18 locks, 8 dams, and 200 miles of river drainage and channel from Pickwick Landing, Tenn., to Demopolis, Ala. Over-all it is a 260-mile project which, with interest during construction added, will cost approximately $75,000,000, with a perpetual annual carrying charge of $500,000.

It is officially before us on the basis of an old report—House Document No. 269, Seventy-sixth Congress, 1939—which has never been brought down to date. Subsequent factors, both pro and con, clearly and indisputably make this old report unreliable and wholly inadequate as a basis for congressional action.

I repeat that I concede that the old report is inadequate. I concede that conditions have changed. They have changed pro, and they have changed con in respect to the project. But since it is the habit and practice of Congress to base these authorizations upon conclusive reports from the Chief of Engineers in the War Department, since there is available to us no up-to-date report covering those changed physical conditions, and since this project is not to be undertaken except in the post-war years, I submit that the logical thing to do is to ask for a new report, if the proponents of this project are confident of its justification, instead of seeking a Senate commitment on the basis of an old report which, I shall again clearly indicate, makes an affirmative vote ridiculous.

Mr. President, how did this project get here? First, there were historically four adverse reports on it by the Board of Rivers and Harbors Engineers—1913, 1923, 1932, and 1935. In other words, it is a hardy perennial. A favorable report of the Board was obtained in 1939. But, Mr. President, the favorable report was with such obviously reluctant comment on the part of the engineers that in effect it damned the project with faint praise, as I believe I can demonstrate.

In any event, on the basis of this tentatively favorable report, the project came to the floor of the Senate, I repeat, on April 24, 1940, and was rejected by a vote of 56 to 17, which is a rather conclusive verdict from this same jury on this same subject.

The project arises again this year in the form of an amendment inserted in the bill by the Senate Commerce Committee as a result of a closely divided vote, after the House of Representatives had rejected it, I repeat, by a roll call vote of 195 to 157. I believe that any of us who have had any experience with House-Senate conferences upon bills of this nature will subscribe to the validity of my statement that when we insert in a House bill an amendment which the House has disapproved on a roll-call vote, there is no chance on earth of the House conferees surrendering to the Senate position. So, among other things we are engaging in a futility which, in my judgment based on the facts involved, is not to our credit.

Mr. President, this is not an ordinary river and harbor decision which the Senate must now make. It is totally different from anything we have ever confronted in connection with the approval of a river and harbor project.

Usually, Senators can turn to a report of the Chief of Engineers and comfortably rely upon his affirmative findings. What is the situation in connection with the Tombigbee project? General Schley, Chief of Engineers at the time this report was made, obviously had many misgivings in reporting the equivocal attitude of his Board, as Senators will see if they will read the House document upon which the project tenuously rests. After frankly questioning some of the calculations made by his own engineers as they strained for proofs of economic justification which they could not find in fact, General Schley said:

> All these intangibles or indirect benefits must be considered in addition to the direct savings in transportation costs in order that this project will show a substantial excess of benefits over costs. They—

Referring to the intangible or indirect benefits which had to be trumped up in order to create an affirmative basis for even a pretense of engineering approval—

> are difficult to evaluate, and appear to me to be questions falling within the realm of statesmanship, to which the Congress can best assign the proper values.

In this lonesome instance, which I believe to be the only instance of its kind

during the entire history of river and harbor legislation, the Senate cannot rely upon the Chief of Engineers. In the language of the street, he "passes the buck" to Congress. Instead of asserting, as is otherwise the uniform rule, that the project is justifiable on the basis of provable economic benefits, he frankly notifies us and warns us that in order to create an economic justification his engineers had to consult factors which are none of the engineers' business, but which lie within the jurisdiction of legislative judgment in the Congress.

Therefore, Mr. President, in this one instance, and in this one instance alone, so far as I have any knowledge, we are on notice that the decision to be made is to be made by us, and that we are not entitled to rely upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers.

In one of his typical efforts to be fair the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee [Mr. BAILEY] asked the present Chief of Engineers whether he could send to Congress a more definitive down-to-date report in respect to the Tombigbee project. Senators will find Major General Reybold's reply to Senator BAILEY at page 506 of the hearings. The present Chief of Engineers does not feel justified in making a statement, as I indicate by quoting his language. General Reybold said:

> You are informed that, in the absence of a full review and reconsideration of this proposed project, I do not feel justified in making a statement supplementing the report in House Document No. 269, Seventy-sixth Congress.

In other words, the Chief of Engineers, upon whom it is the habit of the Congress to rely for its authority in justifying these enormous river and harbor expenditures, says to us that there is not available at the present time, and that there cannot be without another survey, adequate information upon which to base an intelligent and authentic verdict. Yet, the Senate is asked by the Commerce Committee through the adoption of this amendment to express a judgment in respect to it. The Senate is asked to commit $75,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to this enterprise even though the most highly responsible officer of the Government in connection with these affairs says that it is impossible to make an intelligent or justified judgment at the present time. That, Mr. President, is why I submit that, since this project is not intended to be pursued except in connection with a post-war prospectus, there is ample time in this bill to order a new survey and new report instead of attempting to commit the Senate in advance of the official information which the Chief of Engineers says he is unprepared to give us at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has several times mentioned the sum of $75,000,000. I suppose that that is the amount set forth in House Document 269, which I do not happen to have before me.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator tell us whether $75,000,000 is the total amount which is to be required to complete the entire project, or whether it is the amount necessary to inaugurate and partly complete the project?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is my understanding that it is the amount sufficient to complete the entire project as based upon prices in 1939.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now to resume the thread of the rather brief argument which I wish to make.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the cost of the actual construction of the project is $66,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is without including interest on the investment during construction, which always has been included as a legitimate item. So there are no hairs to be split at that point.

I was saying that the Chief of Engineers, even though he submitted a tenuously favorable report upon this project in 1939, is notifying us in plain language in his letter to the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the chairman of the Commerce Committee, that there is nothing available upon which he would be willing to make a new estimate of justification for this project. Yet we are asked to do it without any such new and official justification.

Now let me very briefly review the salient points in the synthetic build-up of an alleged justification for this $75,000,000 enterprise. Of course, Senators are familiar with the system upon which the rivers and harbors engineers proceed when they are reporting upon a rivers and harbors project. The engineers figure economic justification in terms of transportation savings, and so forth; then the cost figure is set down against the benefit figure and, unless the benefit figure reasonably exceeds the cost figure, a favorable report is not submitted.

The Tombigbee annual cost figure was set down as $3,561,000. They had to show compensatory annual benefits, and they had to pile up the benefits across the line of $3,561,000 before they could even have a pretense of justification for asking the Senate and the House of Representatives to authorize the appropriation. In this instance the engineers finally wobbled over this parity line and built up an annual benefit figure of $4,143,000 and finally reached the thin benefit ratio of 1.16 to 1. But how did they reach this precarious justification? They did it by inserting in the benefit inventory items which appear in the justification of no other river and harbor project than has ever come before the Congress.

First, they found $2,168,000 in savings to the public in transportation charges. That is a legitimate item by way of justification, if the figure is correct; but, of course, this figure has long since gone out the window as the result of reduced railroad rates in this area. If there is any doubt in anybody's mind on that subject I read from Colonel Feringa's testimony at page 398 of the hearings:

> Senator VANDENBERG. Well, according to the report upon which you are relying, is it not a fact that you compute a saving of $2.14 a ton on petroleum products?
>
> Colonel FERINGA. I think you are absolutely right, Senator.
>
> Senator VANDENBERG. And is it not also a fact that at some time in 1940 the Interstate Commerce Commission authorized the reduction of freight rates on petroleum in that area amounting to $1.06 a ton?
>
> Colonel FERINGA. I think you are absolutely correct, sir.

So, by the testimony down to date of the officials of this survey and the Board of Rivers and Harbors Engineers, the first item in the benefit inventory is all out of line with modern realities.

Furthermore, 52 percent of the traffic which is contemplated to be allocated to this new improvement, and which has to be allocated to it in order to build up this beneficial justification, consists of petroleum products; and two new pipe lines already serve this area since the report was made. Who in his right mind is going to say that an engineering report is worth the paper on which it is written when it has to rely upon 52 percent of traffic in petroleum producers borne by water carriers, when the area has already been invaded by two pipe lines and when pipe-line transportation is the obvious new and effective method of transportation for petroleum products? That, however, is the first item in justification and it amounts to $2,168,000.

Mr. OVERTON. What the Senator has to say is very true, that there is testimony to show that after the report made by General Schley, then Chief of Engineers, a reduction in the railroad rates was authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may interrupt the Senator, if he is about to indicate the changes which are favorable to this project, I prefer to do it myself when I come to them, because I want to be absolutely fair in the presentation of this subject.

Mr. OVERTON. I merely wish to say that the testimony does show that the water-borne traffic, essentially water-borne traffic, has at least doubled.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am coming to that, and I am going to show it. I should like to be permitted to present the balance sheet as I see it, even though it might make the impact of the balance sheet less effective if I were detoured here and there.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have given the first item of justification. The second item of justification—and remember, they had to build these items up in order to reach this justification level before they would even have the face to come to Congress and ask for this $75,000,000—the second item in the build-up is a million dollars a year "savings to upbound traffic on the Mississippi River." Perhaps that is a good item, I do not know, but I know what General Schley, the Chief of Engineers, said in the same

report regarding this item. This is what he said:

I doubt the wisdom of dependence upon diversion of any considerable part of Mississippi River traffic to justify this new project, even though the credit is confined to the additional saving in transportation costs.

So, when we reach the second item in the prospectus, one of the more favorable items, if Senators wish to be charitable about it, even at this point, the Chief of Engineers speaks up, puts a red flag on the report at that point, and says, "Don't take this too seriously."

After they had gotten through building up these two transportation credits, which, I repeat, is a legitimate method of building up such a report, they did not have enough. They had only $3,168,000, against an annual cost of $3,561,000. So they had to look around for something else. They could not find anything in the ordinary routine of river and harbor estimates to justify the cost, so they had to find something else.

The first thing they found when they started drumming these additional synthetic assets, the first thing they found when they raked together these rather unique intangible values, was $600,000 "value as a facility for national defense." They said there was $600,000 of national defense advantage in the Tombigbee Canal, down in the heart of the country. Of course, it is sheer speculation. It could have been $300,000. I suppose if they had needed $3,000,000, they would have made it $3,000,000. It is a wholly unsound and ineligible economic factor, and it never before or since has entered into the benefit estimates by the engineers to justify a river and harbor project.

After they had gotten that $600,000 in, they still were shy, and they had to find something else. Then they put in $275,000 for "enhancement of land values in the tributary area," whatever that means. I shall pass that; there is no explanation from anyone as to what that can mean.

Still they did not have enough. They had to drum up something else. They finally got $100,000 for recreational values. I suppose that could have been $500,000 or $1,000,000 or $2,000,000. At any rate, we never heard of such a thing before in one of these benefit estimates. It is only found in this instance; and I submit it is no wonder that General Schley, the Chief of Engineers, when he transmitted this report to the Congress, felt as though he should rather apologize for what he was doing, and warn us that we had better look for the bug under the chip. That is just about what he did, because it was only by mobilizing these extraordinary estimates, utterly unrelated to navigation, utterly unrelated to the economics which should be taken into account with respect to river-and-harbor projects—it was only by mobilizing these extraordinary values that they finally staggered into mathematical port with a thin ratio benefit of 1.16 to 1. It is no wonder, I submit, that the Senate turned them down by a vote of 56 to 17.

Now we come to 1944. It is the same project, based on exactly the same reports, and all these funny values. On the record it is exactly the same proposal which the Senate so overwhelmingly rejected before. But the Tombigbee proponents say that conditions have changed—I agree that they are right about it—and I am not being sarcastic—I agree that conditions have changed, and I give full credit, by way of due justification, where the conditions have changed.

Unquestionably the war has produced tremendously enhanced water traffic on the Mississippi River, on the Tombigbee, and in this general area; unquestionably the traffic is two or three times larger than it was. There is no doubt about that. I suppose that if we want to use temporary war figures as a basis for our mathematics, we can substantially increase the reality of economic benefits which may now be assessed to this undertaking. I agree to that.

Another change favorable to the project is that the last time it was before us, T. V. A. opposed it, and opposed it because they thought it represented an annual loss of about $100,000 of power. T. V. A. has withdrawn its opposition, and now approves the undertaking. I agree that both those factors change the circumstances and the situation, and change them favorably to the project.

On the other hand, Mr. President, there are changes which are adverse to the project. The first change is the reduced freight rates, which on the face of the record wipe out at least half the originally claimed justification. The second change in the situation is the existence of pipe lines for the transportation of petroleum products, which obviously is the method of petroleum products transportation which is going to be the great reliance of the future.

But the basic point upon which Senators have a right fundamentally to rest their judgment is this: It does not make any difference what I say about the change in conditions in the Tombigbee area, and, with all respect, I submit that it makes no difference what the able Senators from that area will say when they try to tell us that conditions have changed to the advantage of the project. I say it makes no difference, because there is no official report available from the Chief of Engineers in respect to either side of this contemporary argument; there is no official document upon which we are entitled to base our judgment, because we most certainly are not entitled to make our own engineering estimates.

Since we are called upon to vote on the basis of the documents as they were submitted in 1939, and since the Chief of Engineers says he cannot undertake an amended estimate except as he has a new survey and a new investigation, I submit again that the logical course, the fair course, in respect to the taxpayers of this country is to take this item out of the authorization, and put it over into the surveys, so that we may obtain another report, an official report, from the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to show what the modern conditions in connection with this project really are.

On the question of freight rates, I do not want anybody to misunderstand me or to think that I speak without justification. Colonel Feringa, speaking in our latest hearing before the Commerce Committee, said, at pages 398 and 399:

Senator VANDENBERG. If the railroads' tariffs have changed, that figure ought to be reduced accordingly, should it not?—

Referring to the estimate in the benefits—

Colonel FERINGA. I think it should be, and if we made a report now, Senator, it would be changed.

When I asked Colonel Feringa about the savings which were allocated by way of benefits to petroleum transportation, Colonel Feringa said:

Certainly the saving is not as great as we set up in that report, but I think there is a saving, Senator; how large, Senator, we would have to make a new report to find it out, sir.

It does not make any difference where we turn in connection with this testimony, no matter how enthusiastic the proponents of this enterprise may be—and I interrupt myself to say that I have never known of more enthusiastic and earnest support of an enterprise than this area has given to this undertaking—I submit that wherever we turn we find the necessity for a new report if we want to base our $75,000,000 judgment on justified official facts. There are no official facts in the ordinary habit of our dealings with this subject available to change the situation from the time when the Senate rejected this project in 1940 by a vote of 56 to 17.

Speaking of changed times and conditions, Mr. President, there is one thing in which there is no change, and that is in the attitude toward the Tombigbee project—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is the Senator willing to be interrupted for a moment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a moment. There is no change in the attitude of public authorities charged with general responsibility for our natural recources toward the Tombigbee project, and I will justify that statement just as soon as I have yielded to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is speaking about change. As the Senator knows, General Robins, who is today the Deputy Chief of Engineers, and who was a member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors which investigated this project, and which made the favorable report on the project, was the officer who with Colonel Feringa testified on behalf of the engineers on the project and in favor of the project.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. General Robins had first-hand knowledge. He sat on the Board and studied the subject and went into it, and made the investigation. He is the Deputy Chief of Engineers, and was speaking, of course, for the engineers before the committee. The Senator spoke about sending the item back for further report. I quote what General Robins said in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Commerce:

We can go back to the field and 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.

Before making that statement General Robins said this——

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the Senator asking me?

Mr. HILL. The Senator stated that he wanted the Senate to understand this matter. I do not wish to take up too much of the Senator's time, but I think I ought to read this language, if the Senator will yield further. General Robins stated before the Senate Committee on Commerce:

If we—

Meaning the engineers—

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 river itself at an estimated cost of $66,000,000, I think you would all take off your hats and cheer. 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.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. HILL. And I thank the Senator from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Alabama always lures me with his mellifluous eloquence. I shall never forget the night I turned on the radio and heard the voice of the Senator from Alabama asserting the unassailable necessity of another term, a third term for the Presidency of the United States, and from the persuasive success of that moment down to date I always yield with fear and trepidation to the Senator from Alabama, but in this instance I am prepared to answer what he said.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANAHER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will say that I always stand in awe of the Senator's stentorian sentences and his magnificent eloquence. I will say this about that appeal for a third term: We not only got the third term, but we are even now getting ready to enter upon the fourth.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I understand that, and are already talking about the fifth [laughter], which leaves me no more composure than I had before the Senator spoke.

Mr. HILL. I will relieve the Senator's pain by saying that as yet I have heard no serious talk about a fifth term. I am sure that will be a source of relief to the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me go back to the substance of the suggestions submitted by the able Senator from Alabama. The Senator says that General Robins and Colonel Feringa came before the committee and spoke as he has indicated. I agree to that. I have great respect for General Robins and Colonel Feringa, although I thought in this instance that they were almost too emphatic and not quite sufficiently judicial in their attachment to this particular enterprise. But, again with great respect, I submit that it makes no difference to the Senate what General Robins thinks or what Colonel Feringa thinks.

We are committed by law to follow the reports of the Chief of Engineers. The Chief of Engineers says to the chairman of this committee:

You are informed that in the absence of a full review and reconsideration of this proposed project, I do not feel justified in making a statement supplementing the report in House Document No. 269, Seventy-sixth Congress.

This is the top man speaking. Mr. President, until the Chief of Engineers feels justified in accepting the new optimism of General Robins and Colonel Feringa, I do not propose to accept it; and I submit that under the law the Senate and the House have no business going back of the basic proposition that they are bound by the reports of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. President, before we dropped off on an Alabama detour I was saying that the attitude of those public authorities who are primarily responsible for this sort of business in the Government has not changed. They have not changed their minds about it. The report of the National Resources Committee on April 7, 1939, read in part as follows:

In the opinion of the Water Resources Committee, the benefits—

On the Tombigbee prospectus—

ascribed to national defense, land value, and recreation—

Those were the "funny" items to which I referred a little earlier, which had to be dragged in in order to justify any sort of favorable report—

the benefits ascribed to national defense, land value, and recreation are speculative and should be given careful scrutiny as to the effect that their acceptance may have on the formation of national policy.

Further:

A further basic issue of policy is raised by the relation of the proposed water-transportation facilities in this project to the most effective coordinated system of water, railway, highway, and pipe-line facilities to serve the transportation needs of the region.

I interrupt myself to say that that is the point with respect to which the very interesting amendment offered this afternoon by the able Senator from Wyoming very appropriately challenges the attention of the Congress in respect to all river and harbor projects.

Continuing with the National Resources Committee report:

This—

Referring to the Tombigbee project—

and similar problems should be considered more fully if a sound conclusion is to be reached concerning a justification for the project in relation to transportation needs and facilities of all types in the region.

It may be said that that was back in 1940. That is correct. But May 8, 1944, is reasonably down to date. I asked for a down-to-date opinion from these same authorities; and under the indicated date I have a letter from the Acting Director of the Budget, in the Executive Office of the President of the United States. He states:

The project file record for the waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers includes as the most recent action of the National Resources Planning Board a memorandum, dated July 11, 1941, stating that at its meeting on May 20, 1941, the evaluation subcommittee considered this project and rated it "SC." This rating means that in the opinion of the subcommittee the possible project described should not be authorized at the present time or in the immediate future, and is of such a character that before authorization at any future date it should be reconsidered in the light of conditions at that time.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say with respect to this matter. I submit that the taxpaying public of the United States, in spite of the Gargantuan mathematics with which we are fiscally surrounded, have a right to expect the Senate of the United States to justify the authorization of an expenditure of $75,000,000. I submit that since on the record the Senate overwhelmingly defeated this project the last time it was submitted, and since on the record the House of Representatives defeated it on a yea-and-nay vote this year, there must be overwhelming proof of new justification before the project is entitled to an affirmative vote. I submit that we cannot find any new justification upon which we are entitled to rely, no matter how earnestly the proponents of this project may urge their enthusiastic dreams.

I submit that, upon our responsibility as Senators to the taxpayers of this country, we are not entitled to find any new justification outside a new and official report from the Chief of Engineers. If this item is transferred to the list of survey projects, and if subsequently the Chief of Engineers presents a justified assessment of benefits and an affirmative recommendation, without reservation, for this project, I will withdraw all opposition to it. But until that sort of official report is submitted to the Senate, I submit that we are not entitled to rely upon outside testimony or upon external argument.

Mr. President, I believe that completes my statement. I leave the matter to the conscience of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, lines 6 to 9.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, it is now about 20 minutes to 4. I should like to know from the acting majority leader if it would not be agreeable to him to take a recess until Monday, because it will take me some time to reply to the observations of my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and I should not like to keep the Senate in session so late. I do not like to have my remarks broken into by a recess. I wonder if the acting majority leader would enter-

tain a suggestion to take a recess at this time. I trust the suggestion will be acceptable to the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I inquire if any other Senator wishes to speak to this amendment? Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi and to the acting majority leader that time is of the very essence in acting upon this proposed legislation. I should like very much to accommodate any Senator who wishes to postpone consideration of any part of the bill; but when we do so, and take a recess at the hour of 3:40, we are not making the progress which we ought to make. I was in hopes that we might get through with this amendment today.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I think I can say to the Senator from Louisiana that so far as this particular amendment is concerned we will not consume more than 2 or 3 hours on Monday before we will be ready to take a vote on it. I know of only three or four Senators who will wish to speak on the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Then I wonder if we could have a unanimous-consent agreement that we will vote at a certain hour on Monday on the amendment.

Mr. BILBO. I would not agree to that, because at this juncture I cannot tell what will be said.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am put in this embarrassing position; I have the duty of undertaking to get this legislation through the Senate. Not only have I been working on the floor of the Senate for 2 weeks to pass the flood-control bill, but, long prior to that, I have been working in committee day after day and day after day. I wrote to the Senator from Mississippi and to other Senators whom I thought would be interested in this amendment, some 2 or 3 weeks ago—I think it was 3 weeks ago—and I called their attention to the fact that the bill was coming up and that they were interested in this project, and I asked them to be prepared to speak on the subject. I so wrote to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and to perhaps one or two other Senators, in order that they might be prepared to proceed with consideration of the amendment dealing with this project.

I should like very much to accommodate the Senator, but——

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. BILBO. I am afraid the Senator from Louisiana misunderstood me in regard to my objective in asking that consideration of the matter be suspended at this time until Monday's session. It is not a question of being ready. I am reminded of a conversation which took place between President Woodrow Wilson, who was perhaps one of the best speakers this country has ever produced in clarity of thought and in forceful expression, and one of his admirers. He was asked how long it would take him to prepare to make a 10-minute speech. He replied, "It would take me about 3 months."

Then he was asked how long it would take him to prepare for an hour's speech.

He replied, "It would take at least 2 months."

The next question was, "Well, how long would it take you to prepare for a 2-hour speech?"

He said, "One month."

"Well," his questioner then asked, "how long would it take you to prepare to speak longer than that?"

Mr. Wilson replied, "I am now ready to speak."

So, Mr. President, I am ready.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BILBO. I am right glad to yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In view of the fact that the Senator from Mississippi is going to make the principal speech on this project, I think a quorum should be present. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BILBO. I appreciate that, because it will take me approximately 4 hours to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Danaher | McKellar |
| Bailey | Davis | Millikin |
| Ball | Eastland | Murray |
| Bankhead | Ferguson | O'Mahoney |
| Bilbo | George | Overton |
| Brooks | Hill | Revercomb |
| Buck | Jenner | Robertson |
| Burton | La Follette | Vandenberg |
| Connally | McFarland | White |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven Senators have answered to their names, not a quorum. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GERRY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HALL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. REED, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, and Mr. WHERRY answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

The Chair will entertain a motion that the Sergeant at Arms request the attendance of the absent Senators.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ELLENDER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in the very beginning I wish to state that it will be impossible for me to conclude my address this evening, but I wish to begin by telling the Senate my opinion of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I think he is one of the most delightful, pleasant, congenial, cultured, intellectual men in the Senate, and I would give half a fortune to possess his vocabulary. He is a delightfully entertaining speaker, and personally I am very fond of him. But he is also interesting and amusing at times.

The Senator attempts to bolster up a flimsy cause by reading into the RECORD the roll call the last time the pending proposal was before the Senate, and he gloats much over the fact that the vote on that occasion 4 years ago stood 17 for to 56 against the proposal.

Mr. President, I admit we were lacking in numbers, but what we lacked in numbers we made up in quality favoring the proposition. I wish to call attention to the names of a few of those who supported the measure 4 years ago.

First there was Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi. All Senators know how beloved he was in this body, and what a strong leader he was. Senator Harrison supported the bill.

Senator McNary, the leader of the Republican Party on the floor of the Senate 4 years ago, supported the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, and I trust the cause of the Republican Party on the other side of the Chamber has not fallen into unfortunate hands.

Senator Norris, an independent, who had been a Republican all his life until he could not stand the party any longer and he became an independent, supported this measure 4 years ago.

Senator Pittman, of Nevada, the then President pro tempore of the Senate, elected as such repeatedly by this body, honored by this body, who lived in the far West, saw the righteousness of a proposal which would benefit the people of 34 States when it should finally become law and should be put into effect.

Senator Sheppard, of Texas, the most beloved man who ever occupied a seat on the floor of the Senate, favored the proposal.

They were some of the men who supported this matter 4 years ago, and I am not ashamed to be found in their company. I note that of the 56 who voted against the proposition 4 years ago, 25 have either answered the last call and are now dead, or they resigned, or were defeated. They are gone. There are only 31 left. I was impressed by the fact that the Senator from Michigan tried to leave the impression that these 31 remaining out of the 56 were so hidebound and phlegmatic in their thinking that they could not even have a vision, and be informed and have their eyes opened and vote intelligently for a proposition when it is presented as it is now by the Board of Engineers.

My friend the Senator from Michigan insists that we should not place this burden on the taxpayers of the country until the Chief of Engineers reports on this project wholeheartedly. When the St. Lawrence waterway project comes before the Senate, which will cost the poor taxpayers the Senator is crying about about eight times as much as the Tennessee-Tombigbee project will cost, and which will benefit a smaller number of States and a lesser number of the population of this country, I wonder what the Senator will have to say about the welfare of the poor taxpayer? The St. Lawrence project will cost four or five hundred million dollars—seven or eight times more than the Tennessee project will cost.

Mr. President, it is very evident that we will not be able to conclude the discussion of this bill today, and that it will be passed upon finally probably Monday or Tuesday. I think we can finish with the bill by that time, not later than Tuesday, which will give the Members of this body plenty of time to read this famous House Document No. 269, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. I wish to urge the membership of the Senate to read this report in its entirety between now and the time the roll is called on the adoption of this amendment. It will be very interesting, especially in the light of the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I do not know whether my friend the Senator from Michigan is a lawyer; I understand he belongs to the fourth estate, that he is a newspaperman; but he missed his calling if he is not a lawyer, because when it comes to getting something out of nothing, and coloring things to prejudice the public mind, he could sweep any jury off their feet in any court of the land. He has taken a report which is indicative of the importance, the necessity, the feasibility, the advisability, and the success of this project, and yet he would push aside every one of those elements and leave the impression that we are taking an awful risk by adopting this proposal before we shall have a further survey made.

On page 2 of the report Senators will find what Major General Schley, the Chief of Engineers, had to say on the 27th day of February 1939. He said:

> I have no doubt that benefits of value to national defense, from enhancement of land values, and from increased use of recreational areas will be produced. Furthermore, provision of a direct water route to the Gulf of Mexico from the Tennessee Valley may hasten the development in that valley resulting from the navigation project and electric-power system now being constructed there by the Federal Government. The large amount of construction involved in this connecting waterway to the Gulf would provide substantial direct employment over a period of 8 years and large orders to cement and steel mills and to the lumber industry. All these intangible or indirect benefits must be considered in addition to the direct savings in transportation costs in order that this project will show a substantial excess of benefits over costs. They are difficult to evaluate and appear to me to be questions falling within the realm of statesmanship to which the Congress can best assign the proper values.

In other words, the only point that General Schley makes is that the undeniable benefits enumerated in his letter to the Congress are to be evaluated by the Congress itself, something which he did not undertake to do.

Mr. President, if my friend, the Senator from Michigan, had given that keen scrutiny of which he is capable to the study of the report and the testimony adduced before the Commerce Committee, he would have discovered that General Robins and all the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the Corps of Army Engineers insist that now under present conditions the benefits to be obtained by the completion of this project are four times as great as they were when this report was made. I am not talking about recreational facilities; I am not talking about intangible things; I am talking about the tangible things, the savings of dollars and cents in the transportation of the commerce not only of the Tennessee Valley, not only in Mississippi, not only in Alabama, but commerce from Pittsburgh to New Orleans, from Chicago to New Orleans, from Sioux City, Iowa, to New Orleans, all up and down the great Mississippi Valley, involving 34 States and many million people, not only for this year but for all time to come. It is strange to me that the Senator from Michigan should read out of the record and discredit the testimony of General Schley, the Chief of Engineers, given in 1939, when, as the evidence shows, the benefits now resulting from completion of the project would be four times as great. It shows that the Senator knows he does not have a case. He is trying to mislead Senators and he tries to predicate his argument upon a condition which he says does not obtain today as it obtained 5 years ago when General Schley wrote this letter about which the Senator makes so much.

The Senator from Michigan says that if we can have another survey made by the Board of Engineers, which, of course, would include the Chief of Engineers, and if the Chief of Engineers would come back to the Congress and O. K. this project, the Senator would withdraw his objection. That proposition was made to General Robins, who is Deputy Chief, United States Engineers. General Robins says:

> The Congress can send me back and send the Board of Engineers back to make another survey, but I tell you now you need not do it, because when we come back we will bring you the same facts and figures as we brought before, except to recite the changes which have taken place since 1939.

If my friend the Senator from Michigan wanted to be totally fair about the matter he would tell his colleagues who have learned, possibly, to depend upon his statements, that General Robins, the Deputy Chief, United States Engineers, says:

> Another investigation will do no good because we will bring back the same identical report, except we will show that the need for this project is four times as great as it was in 1939, and the saving will be four or five times as great.

On page 3 of House Document No. 269 will be found the heading:

> Report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

The Senator from Michigan says he wants the people's board to tell the Congress what to do about the matter before we vote this authorization. Here is the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on the 24th of January, 1939:

> Subject: Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway.

Let us see what they say about it. General Schley has already said that the project shows that it will be self-liquidating, it will pay for itself, it is feasible, it is possible, it is practical, and he says, "There are other things that I, myself, would not pass on, but will let you Members of Congress pass on." But General Schley approves the project.

But the Board said:

> 9. The Board concurs generally with the Special Board as to the feasibility of the project. The Yellow Creek-Mackeys Creek route is a practicable route for the crossing of the divide; the lateral canal appears to be the best means for providing a navigation channel of satisfactory alinement in the upper part of the Tombigbee Valley; and the proposed cut-offs will materially improve the natural channel in the river above Demopolis.
>
> * * * * *
>
> 12. The Board recommends that the United States undertake the construction of a waterway to connect the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers, by way of the East Fork of the Tombigbee River, Mackeys Creek, and Yellow Creek, so as to provide a channel of not less than 9 feet in depth and a minimum bottom width of 170 feet in river and canal sections and 115 feet in the divide cut, with locks approximately 75 by 450 feet clear inside dimensions, substantially in accordance with the general plan presented in the report of the Special Board, at an estimated first cost to the United States of about $66,000,000 and an estimated annual cost of $500,000 for maintenance and operation.

The Board of Engineers, in conference, took the special report, to which I shall refer directly, and after making a thorough investigation, came to the Congress and said to the Congress that the Tennessee-Tombigbee project should be built, not only because it was feasible, but because it was self-liquidating.

Let us turn to page 11 of this report. I wish Senators would read it. This is the abbreviated survey report by the special board. By the way, that report of the Board was signed by Gen. M. C. Tyler, brigadier general, Corps of Engineers, senior member of the Board. He signed for the entire Board.

The abbreviated survey report by the special board which did the survey work represents a report by those who waded in the mud and went up and down Yellow Creek, Mackeys Creek, and the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers, got the facts, and obtained measurements with chains and instruments.

The report is signed by F. B. Wilby, colonel, Corps of Engineers; Roger G. Powell, colonel, Corps of Engineers; R. Park, colonel, Corps of Engineers; and Bernard Smith, major, Corps of Engineers, members of the Board. That was the special board appointed by the gen-

eral board to make the survey, and upon the report of these four members of the Board which made the special survey, the general board put the stamp of its approval upon this project.

On page 24 of that report it will be found that the date of this special survey was December 23, 1938. Let us see what the special board said to the Congress. This is found on page 110:

CONCLUSIONS

221. The Board is of the opinion that construction of a waterway to connect the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers substantially as outlined in this report is feasible from an engineering viewpoint, and that the benefits which would accrue to the general public by reason of its construction are of sufficient magnitude to warrant the undertaking of the project by the United States.

RECOMMENDATIONS

222. The Board recommends:

(a) That the United States undertake the construction of a waterway to connect the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers, by way of the East Fork of the Tombigbee River, Mackeys Creek, and Yellow Creek, so as to provide a channel of not less than 9 feet in depth and a minimum bottom width of 170 feet in river and canal sections and 115 feet in the divide cut, with locks 75 by 450 feet clear inside dimensions, substantially in accordance with the general plan presented in this report, at an estimated first cost to the United States of about $65,500,000 and an estimated annual cost of $477,000 for maintenance and operation.

(b) That the prosecution of this project shall be subject to the conditions that local interests shall give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will—

Certain conditions were set forth, which have been taken care of.

The general board of the Board of Army Engineers says that this work should be done. The special board, which made the investigation, composed of members of the general board, especially emphasized the fact that the project was feasible and self-liquidating, and should be constructed. General Schley, who was Chief of Engineers at the time, said that the project was self-liquidating, and he recommended its inauguration and completion. But he happened to mention some of the intangible benefits which we know will accrue to the people of this great section of the South. He said, "I will leave it to you, Members of the Congress, to evaluate what it is worth in dollars and cents." That is all the objection that General Schley had, and that is all he said that was detrimental to the proposal. Now we find, under changed conditions, after a period of 5 years, that the saving to the American people from the building of this project, instead of being $1,000,000 a year, will be $4,000,000 a year.

The suggestion which my friend the Senator from Michigan advances that another survey should be made, to my mind, is ridiculous. Of course, if the Senate should see fit to vote down this amendment, we will ask for the survey; but what is the sense of spending the extra money and asking for another survey when General Robins, who is Assistant Chief of Engineers, comes to the Congress and says, "You can send me back to make another survey if you wish to do so. We will do what the Congress says; but I will tell you now that if you do, we will bring back the same report as to the facts about the construction, its feasibility, and the possibilities and potentialities of this great project."

So why delay it any longer? This project has been on the program for the development of the inland waterways of the United States for a long time. The first survey was made in 1875. The next survey was made in 1913. The third survey was made in 1923. The fourth survey was made in 1932. The fifth survey was made in 1935. And the last, or sixth, survey was made in 1939. We have already had six surveys of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project. Now, my friends, the Senator from Michigan pleads with the Congress to have another survey. I see nothing to be gained from his position on this question except further delay. His slogan is, "Put it off, and let us delay the evil day."

It is true that the House defeated this proposal on an amendment by a few votes. But I am assured by the friends of the project that there have been a sufficient number of conversions in the House so that if the Senate should see fit to attach this amendment to the bill the House would accept the amendment when it reached the House again. I should like to make a proposal to my friend, the Senator from Michigan. He believes that the House is hopelessly against it. He believes that the House will vote it down again. Then why should he have any fear of the Senate placing this amendment in the bill? I should like to make the proposal to him that we be good sports about it and put this amendment in the river and harbor bill, and let it go back to the House and see what the House will do with it. I believe that the House would adopt it. He says it would not. He had better put it up to the House as it is now constituted rather than wait until after the 3d of January, because I understand that there will be quite a number of new faces in the House after the 3d of January, and that the political complexion of the House will be changed. So far as his position on the bill is concerned, his cause would fare better with the present House than with the House after the 3d of January, when there will be a plurality of about 53 Democrats in the House.

Mr. President, is it the pleasure of the acting majority leader that I continue speaking, or is it about time to take a recess until Monday?

Mr. HILL. I wonder if we may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. BILBO. Would it please the Senator from Louisiana to allow me to discontinue my speech now, and finish on Monday? I have concluded one phase of the subject.

Mr. HILL. Is that suggestion agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. OVERTON. I will offer no objection.

Mr. BILBO. I should like to have it understood that I will have the floor to continue my remarks on Monday.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Perry, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4366) for the relief of Alex Wylie, and the estate of James Evans.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2825) for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PETERSON of Georgia, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5453. A bill authorizing the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., a railroad corporation, of certain perpetual easements near Afton, in Augusta and Nelson Counties, Va., being a portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway land of the Shenandoah National Park; and

H. R. 5518. A bill to amend section 119 of the Judicial Code.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1795. An act to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army;

H. R. 86. An act to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veterans subsequent to June 26, 1905; and

H. R. 5386. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 5453. A bill authorizing the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., a railroad corporation, of certain perpetual easements near Afton, in Augusta and Nelson Counties,

Va., being a portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway land of the Shenandoah National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 5518. A bill to amend section 119 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 5453. A bill authorizing the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., a railroad corporation, of certain perpetual easements near Afton, in Augusta and Nelson Counties, Va., being a portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway land of the Shenandoah National Park; without amendment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HALL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations of postmasters, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters; and

Rachel Elgiva McCracken, to be postmaster at Galt, Mo., in place of D. S. Vencill, transferred (adversely reported).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY—NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, which nominations had previously been passed over.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Army be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. In conformity with the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until Monday, December 4, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 1 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Homer J. Ward, Titus, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARKANSAS

Elmer Freas Crutchfield, Batesville, Ark., in place of V. J. Butler, transferred.

Sara M. Higginbottom Wickes, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Simon O. Norris, Williford, Ark., in place of S. O. Norris. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Catherine V. Andrews, Los Nietos, Calif., in place of A. J. Frutchey, resigned.

Charles K. James, Robbins, Calif., in place of J. E. James, resigned.

Perry M. Hawkins, Tionesta, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

COLORADO

Floyd L. Templeton, Derby, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONNECTICUT

James M. Abbott, Gales Ferry, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marion B. Foster, South Glastonbury, Conn., in place of Willis Hodge, retired.

ILLINOIS

Emma L. Marinko, Alhambra, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clarence J. Hendron, Clifton, Ill., in place of W. M. Donovan, deceased.

William Herman Truebe, Pocahontas, Ill., in place of G. G. Gillespie, resigned.

Carroll E. Taylor, Shipman, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

INDIANA

Wanda R. Barnett, Michigantown, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Vern Hahn, Wakarusa, Ind., in place of H. W. Doering, transferred.

IOWA

James R. Horton, Conesville, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KANSAS

Albert L. Ruggels, Beverly, Kans., in place of A. F. Cassell, resigned.

Edwin H. Huerter, Goff, Kans., in place of R. T. Ingalls, resigned.

Marie A. Donart, Princeton, Kans., in place of Esther Wetterau, retired.

MAINE

Wendall M. Lewis, Boothbay, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ethel Pinkham, East Holden, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harold M. Smith, Hollis Center, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Laurence H. Hern, North Windham, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Paul J. Cody, Poland Spring, Maine, in place of P. J. Cody. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1941.

Ralph L. Harrington, Steep Falls, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSISSIPPI

Norma B. Johnston, Enid, Miss., in place of A. B. Johnston, deceased.

MISSOURI

Paul Harrison Burns, Gobler, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Paul M. Blanchard, Warsaw, Mo., in place of M. N. White, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Frances L. Mooberry, Dorchester, Nebr., in place of Russell Mooberry, retired.

John A. Graf, Talmage, Nebr., in place of J. D. Juilfs, deceased.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Miriam C. Emerson, Contoocook, N. H., in place of J. W. Hazeltine, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Roland A. Brooks, Midland, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OHIO

Edna Waid Kindle, Houston, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank J. Papa, Hubbard, Ohio, in place of J. J. Boyle, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Charles D. Trippett, Haskell, Okla., in place of F. R. Clement, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Laurence A. Gossman, North Girard, Pa., in place of J. W. Hatch, retired.

TENNESSEE

Paul E. Sams, Erwin, Tenn., in place of W. W. Ryburn, transferred.

VERMONT

Frank A. Curran, Newport, Vt., in place of R. P. Skinner, deceased.

Oney B. Lafont, Wolcott, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WISCONSIN

Jules G. Pierre, Brussels, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George V. Carolan, Glenbeulah, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

---

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 1 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Jesse B. Pope, Brooksville.
Bertha D. Vincent, Brownsville.
Louisiana G. Palmer, Ekron.
John T. Powell, Grahn.
William G. Kelly, Maceo.
Donovan Rogers, Mackville.
Myrtle B. Withers, Muldraugh.
Cornelia L. Snyder, Pewee Valley.
Oleva C. Bailey, Rineyville.
Maude H. Brown, Stanley.
Arley O. Perkins, Woodbine.

MAINE

Florence E. Nunan, Cape Porpoise.
Pearl S. Robinson, Chebeague Island.
Joseph M. Tanguay, Greene.
Margaret F. Hanson, Lee.

MONTANA

Oscar L. Henry, Belfry.

NEBRASKA

Ora E. Swartz, Byron.
Violet P. Adams, Daykin.
Lissa L. Fanders, Diller.
Leo R. Conroy, Eddyville.
Marie Nielsen, Elba.

Stanley R. Wheeler, Giltner.
Faye Morrissey, Grafton.
Edwin F. Winter, Hoskins.
James M. McMahan, Inman.
Jens W. Jensen, Litchfield.
Harold L. Shepherd, Madrid.
Ruth L. Reinhart, McCool Junction.
Leroy Buell Gorthey, Murdock.
Mamie R. Hale, Naponee.

PENNSYLVANIA

Roy H. Tyson, Alderson.
William A. Raffensperger, Arendtsville.
Joseph D. McNelis, Beaver Brook.
Howard C. Philson, Berlin.
Mildred G. Cooper, Brownstown.
Clarence T. Johnston, Buck Run.
Samuel J. Bondi, Canonsburg.
George A. Crawford, Centre Hall.
Mary R. Guldner, Delano.
Lewis S. Helmick, Ernest.
Gladys M. Glass, Fallentimber.
Edward K. Lennon, Feasterville.
Frederick E. Riegner, Garrett Hill.
Lawrence C. Nees, Geistown.
Anna T. Connor, Glen Olden.
J. Ralph Mingle, Mifflintown.

TENNESSEE

Alleen W. Stansberry, Boyds Creek.
Leona F. McKinley, Buffalo Valley.
William H. Fox, Graysville.
Bessie H. Parrish, Hermitage.
Doris P. Lyell, Lyles.
Bernice Cress, Martel.
Finis E. Sims, Medina.
Glenn L. Garrison, Niota.
Roger Q. Williams, Norris.
Carney B. Thweatt, Orlinda.
William H. Higginbotham, Riceville.
James Arthur Medlin, Sardis.
Alfred H. Gill, Silver Point.
Thomas R. Grayson, Trade.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

O Thou who didst come to earth to be our example, lead us to walk each day in contemplation of a better world. Amid the shocks and distractions of the crowds, open our eyes to the invisible that the Divine Spirit may have a greater part in our lives. In the mystic ministry of the Upper Chamber exalt us in Thy converting power, and, with pitying hearts, we beseech Thee to help us to cause the dreary and the waste places of earth to blossom as the rose.

Thou who art Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, we pray for Thy blessed peace to rest on our minds and spirits that the heat of labor may be the ardor of intense devotion to duty. If injury or regret come, Thou wilt suppress and adapt them to our need—"Our help cometh from the Lord," and Thy humanity is more than any name we can put upon it. Do Thou subdue unruly passions where they exist, build up fidelity in those who are unfaithful, and give grace to those who know the way. Almighty God, the night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and put on the whole armor of light. Let us walk honestly as in the day, not in strife nor in envying; O guide us with Thy counsel and afterward receive us into glory. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1795. An act to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1827) entitled "An act for the relief of Oliver N. Knight"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROBERTSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2105) entitled "An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the postwar construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

H. R. 4485. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BAILEY, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. BILBO, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. BURTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

### SOCIAL SECURITY TAX

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5564 and that those who desire to file a minority report may have the same privilege.

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

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an excellent address which I heard Hon. James Farley deliver to the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a clipping from the Lexington Gazette, concerning Rockbridge County, Va.

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

There was no objection.

### SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5453) authorizing the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., a railroad corporation, of certain perpetual easements near Afton, in Augusta and Nelson Counties, Va., being a portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway land of the Shenandoah National Park.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is approved by the Department of the Interior, as well as having a unanimous report from the gentleman's committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. I mentioned the matter to the distinguished majority leader, to the distinguished minority leader, and I asked the chairman of the committee to clear it with his committee. He telephoned me this morning that it was all right to ask for consideration of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman briefly explain the bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In order to move war freight from the Midwest to the Hampton Roads, it was necessary for the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway to build a new tunnel under the Blue Ridge Mountains. The Department of the Interior granted temporary permission to build that tunnel. It has been built and freight is moving, but the Department of the Interior did not have the right to grant a permanent easement, because it was the Shenandoah National Park that was involved.

The tunnel goes so far under the mountain that nobody in the park knows the trains are going under there. The tunnel has already been built as a war measure, and the freight is going through. This simply confirms the action of the Department of the Interior in permitting the tunnel to be built as a war measure.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway is a very efficient railroad and is well operated, is it not, and has been doing great service during the war?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would say next to the Norfolk & Western, the best in the United States.