

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

SATURDAY SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we have been in recess for a considerable portion of the day out of deference to certain Senators who are endeavoring to work out an agreement for the early disposition of the treaty and the reservations. I do not know what the disposition of the leadership would be, but I wish to suggest that personally I very much hope that the Senate will have a session Saturday, beginning at 11 o'clock a. m. and continuing as long as we can transact any business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sympathetic with the request. I realize the urgency of the Senator's situation in regard to the treaty and an important conference which is to be held at San Francisco, as we all know.

Mr. WHITE. I take it, however, that the Senator from Texas would not insist on the Saturday session if we disposed of the treaty before that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Maine has a very penetrating intellect. [Laughter.]

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 1945, at 11 o'clock.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Alfred Schindler, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Barrington Lockhart Flanigan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM MARCH 12, 1945

Lt. Col. Otto Frederick Lange, Infantry (temporary colonel).

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM APRIL 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Harlan Leslie Mumma, Quartermaster Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Alexander Mathias Weyand, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Ellis Slack, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Marvin Boyle, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harold Preston Kayser, Infantry (temporary colonel).

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Paul Vincent Kellogg, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

TO AIR CORPS

Capt. Richards Montgomery Bristol, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Willard H. Wright to be senior scientist, effective date of oath of office.

Dean A. Clark to be surgeon, effective date of oath of office.

Maurice Le Bosquet, Jr., to be sanitary engineer, effective date of oath of office.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant generals

Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg
Harold Lee George
John Kenneth Cannon

To be major generals

Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw
Clift Andrus
Charles Bertold Stone 3d
Isaac Davis White
Frank August Heileman
Hobart Raymond Gay
Walter Francis Kraus
Charles Andrew Willoughby
Albert Cowper Smith
Clark Louis Ruffner
Harold Whittle Blakeley
Donald Wilson
William Friske Dean
Carter Bowie Magruder
Lewis Andrew Pick
James Allen Lester
Paul Bernard Wurtsmith
James Edward Moore
Howard McMath Turner
Floyd Lavinus Parks
William Curtis Chase
Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr.
Frank Lewis Culin, Jr.

To be brigadier generals

Joseph Merit Tully
Homer Watson Kiefer
Morris Robert Nelson
William Lee Hart
John Harrison Stokes, Jr.
Thomas Benton McDonald
Ray Lawrence Burnell
John Murphy Willems
Andrew Christian Tychsen
Wentworth Goss
Charles Edward Dissinger
Mark McClure
James Wellington Younger
John Maurice Weikert
Frederic William Boye
Richard Clare Partidge
William Claude McMahon
Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr.
Patrick Henry Timothy
Ivan Lonsdale Farman
Edward Thomas Williams
Sidney Rae Hinds
William Ludlow Ritchie
Robert Leroy Dulaney
Elliott Raymond Thorpe
Charles Joseph Barrett
Thomas Dreux Hurley
William Edmund Waters
Milton Abram Hill
Paul DeWitt Adams
John William Middleton
George Bryan Conrad
Henry Ray McKenzie
Alfred Rockwood Maxwell
Bertram Francis Hayford
David William Hutchison
Richard Ulysses Nicholas
Joseph Stubbs Robinson
James Franklin Powell
Ira Platt Swift
Emerick Kutschko
George Russell Callender
Lemuel Mathewson
Robert Homer Soule

Charles Herbert Karlstad
Luther Deck Miller
James Leo Dalton 2d
Lloyd Henry Gibbons
John Clarence Gordon
John Harry Stadler, Jr.
Butler Buchanan Miltonberger
Isidor Schwander Ravidin
Maurice Milton Beach
Samuel Morgan Thomas
Donald Clinton Swatland

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1945

(*Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945*)

The Senate met in executive session at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend John Falconer Fraser, D. D., pastor, National Baptist Memorial Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art above all governments, eternal in Thy majesty and higher than all principalities and powers, we come to Thee to invoke Thy blessing upon this gathering. We would join our voices with the voices of angels and the redeemed hosts of the Lord, ascribing majesty and honor and glory to Thy holy name. We have no moral right to enter into the presence of Thy holiness, and we can only base our plea upon the merits of One in whom was found no stain of sin and who was for guilty sinners slain.

We would ask Thy blessing upon the President of the United States and all who are related to him in the affairs of Government. We would ask Thy blessing upon every assembly making laws for the various States. We would pray Thy blessing upon both Houses of Congress. Bless, we pray Thee, the body that is here, the body set apart to deliberate and determine such measures as will make for the benefit of our country and for the good of mankind. We would pray before Thee for the appointed officers in the fighting forces of our country and all who serve under their command. We would ask Thy greatest blessings to be upon the thousands who are yet prisoners of war, and pray that the day of their deliverance may be at hand.

We thank Thee for the promise of victory so near, victory in a war we are compelled to fight because it is the only road to peace. We would pray Thy blessing upon all conferences and assemblies looking toward post-war measures that will make for the uplift of the nations and for the understanding of various races and nationalities of people, and for the securing of peace on earth and good will among men.

Now we come asking Thy special blessing, O Lord our God, upon the thousands of homes receiving sad messages from abroad. Give the consolation and the comfort and the ministry of Thy divine spirit in every house of mourning. Grant that our Nation and our world may be established in righteousness as we look forward to that happy day when He shall come whose right is to reign, and

He shall reign forever and ever over all the kingdoms of mankind and men shall come to know God from the least unto the greatest, when every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. This we ask in and through that name that is above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1945.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, April 11, will be dispensed with, and the Journal will stand approved.

EUROPEAN INFLUENCES IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article written from Cuba by R. Hart Phillips and carried in the March 27, 1945, issue of the New York Times. I draw the attention of the Senate to this article for several reasons, all of which appear to me to be both pertinent and timely.

In the first place, the article makes plain the fact that another power, a European power, is extending its influence in the Western Hemisphere, apparently with the idea of indoctrinating the citizens of a neighboring country with ideas of government divergent from ours.

In the second place, the article makes plain the fact that that European power, namely Russia, is an ally of ours in war, and supposedly is engaged in an all-out war against our mutual enemy, and to that nation we have extended vast material aid through our lease-lend policy, but yet that power still has resources enough to pour large sums of money and to send a disproportionately large number of diplomats to Cuba.

In the third place, this article raises the important question: In so acting, is not Russia violating the spirit, if not the letter, of the Monroe Doctrine, so recently affirmed in a pan-American agreement?

Mr. President, our memory is short indeed if we cannot recall that only a few short months ago—in 1940, 1941, and 1942—the newspapers and magazines of this Nation were filled with facts concerning the huge fifth column built up in Latin America by a European nation that became our enemy—Germany.

Yet another growing European power—Russia—is building up strong material, trade, and spiritual ties in Latin America, and there are few articles con-

cerning it in our magazines and newspapers. This lone article is like a beacon shining in the news darkness. Why are not more articles written about this subject so as to give the people of this country an idea of the new force that is moving into the Western Hemisphere?

I do not challenge Russia's right to extend her influence here, if our Department of State does not challenge that right; but I challenge the wisdom of any European nation becoming strong enough to make or break governments in Cuba, or anywhere in Latin America; and I think that Senators and the people should be fully warned of what is happening.

It is a matter of common knowledge, as Mr. Phillips hints in his article, that today Mexico is a hotbed of communism. It is further generally known that other smaller Latin American nations are going in more and more for radical governments. It would appear that our good-neighbor policy, costly as it has been in recent years, has made few friends for our form of government.

Soon our representatives will go into conference with representatives of other nations to set up an instrumentality dedicated to the preservation of peace in the world, through better understanding among the nations of the earth. We must be frank in stating our position with respect to our future intentions if the plan desired becomes of lasting force. Have we not the right at this time to expect other nations, especially our major allies, to be equally frank in revealing their intentions toward us?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks this enlightening article by R. Hart Phillips, sent from Habana, Cuba, March 26 to the New York Times and headed "Communist drive centering on Cuba."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

COMMUNIST DRIVE CENTERING ON CUBA—SOVIET POURS IN PROPAGANDA IN BID FOR INFLUENCE AS GRAU AND LABOR GIVE SUPPORT

(By R. Hart Phillips)

HAVANA, March 26.—Russia's bid for influence in Latin America has made Cuba one of the focal points of Communist propaganda in the western hemisphere. Like the other United Nations, the Soviet Union is pouring a steady stream of propaganda into the Latin-American countries, but unlike her allies, who confine themselves largely to publicizing their war aims and efforts, Russia's purpose is to weld the masses into a solid bloc of opinion that can be utilized by her in future.

The United States, Great Britain, and the U. S. S. R. are the nations carrying on the largest campaigns among our southern neighbors today, but there is no doubt that of the three, the Soviet propaganda is the greatest in volume, the most attractive, the most appealing from a psychological viewpoint, and the most effective.

The Latin-Americans are in the process of being educated in communism and they are willing students. They are being shown the decadence of the capitalist system, the ways it can be combated, the tremendous advantages enjoyed by the working class in Russia as compared with other countries, the power of the proletariat.

STRONG GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

They also are being taught to consider Russia as the most powerful and progressive nation of the world and to look to her for guidance. By radio and newspapers, by magazines, pamphlets, books, lectures, art exhibits, and personal missionary work, by every conceivable means, the future opinion of Latin America is being shaped in the communist mold.

While it is conceded that Mexico is the No. 1 center of Soviet activities, Cuba is running that country a close race. In no other nation of the Americas has the Communist Party received the government support given it in Cuba, both by the Batista regime and the present Grau administration. In no other country do the Communists exercise such complete control over labor, or have at their disposal such excellent propaganda media as in Cuba.

These media include a powerful radio station with the only international channel assigned to the island, an excellent newspaper, daily direct cable service that furnishes news hot from the Moscow press, not only to the Communist organ, but to many other newspapers—free of charge; an organization which extends down into the smallest village of the island; publishing facilities for books, pamphlets, and other literature; as well as training schools.

HUGE DIPLOMATIC STAFF

Out in the exclusive Vedado residential district is the luxurious Soviet Legation, with some 50 staff members, including a press attaché. No other diplomatic representation in Cuba boasts such an official. All this despite the fact that Cuba had only a few Russian citizens when diplomatic relations were established with the Soviet Union in 1942. At present, the Cuban Foreigners Registration Bureau lists Poles, Lithuanians, Rumanians, and many other citizens of the small countries bordering the U. S. S. R. who have taken out Russian papers. Nor does Cuba do any business with Russia.

The Soviet Legation is doing a magnificent job selling communism to the Cubans, particularly to the masses. Its staff members are intelligent, hard-working, and enthusiastic, and the scope of their activities is amazing.

LABOR CHANNELS HELPFUL

The channels of propaganda open to them through control of all island labor unions by the communistic Confederation of Cuban Workers hardly could be improved upon. No movement or organization is too small to receive attention. It is in this way that the "free" movements here of the various European nations, often ignored by the United States and Great Britain, all have been gradually brought under the Russian wing.

One of the few failures of the Soviet agents has been their inability to bring together under Russian guidance the various organizations of the Spanish Republicans in Habana.

Cuba, undoubtedly, will become an even greater center of Russian activities. It is an ideal point of contact for organization and education, due to its strategic location and excellent travel facilities; and the unity of its labor organizations, the indifference of its wealthy classes, as well as the proximity of the island to the United States, make it an excellent proving ground for communism in America.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

REPORT OF EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the annual report of the Exchange Stabilization Fund for the year ended June 30, 1944, including a summary of the Fund from its establishment to June 30, 1944, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; ordered to lie on the table:

"Whereas Gen. George Smith Patton is the hero of many successful engagements on the battlefield in the European theater of operations in World War No. 2; and

"Whereas Gen. George Smith Patton, by virtue of his many brave and valorous deeds on the field of battle, his brilliant leadership and his willingness at all times to undergo the same hardships and the same hazards as the men in his command, thereby winning their undying loyalty, and the admiration of the entire Allied world; and

"Whereas the municipality of Patton, in the county of Cambria, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was founded by John Patton and is the only municipality in the United States so named; and

"Whereas the citizens of the municipality of Patton are eager to, and are making plans to pay homage to the great allied commander, Gen. George Smith Patton, who bears the same name as the founder of the municipality in which they reside; and

"Whereas the residents of the municipality of Patton take justifiable pride in the fact that they live in the only municipality of the name of Patton in the United States; and

"Whereas letters received by the postmaster of the municipality of Patton from residents in all sections of the United States, requesting mail which bears the postmark of the municipality of Patton, is an indication of the nation-wide attention which the municipality of Patton is attracting: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby commends the citizens of the municipality of Patton for their patriotism and loyalty, and is in hearty accord with their plans to honor Gen. George Smith Patton by staging a welcome home celebration at the end of the war, and inviting the President of the United States, Gen. George Smith Patton, and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to take part in this outstanding occasion; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Gen. George Smith Patton, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior; and to the Honorable E. L. Barlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in the seventeenth regular session assembled, does most respectfully represent:

"Whereas this legislature now convened is desirous of protecting the resources of Alaska,

not only to assure livelihood for present residents but also to give opportunity within Alaska to war veterans and civilian settlers after this present war; and

"Whereas reindeer constitute the only agricultural resource of the great tundra lands of western Alaska between Bristol Bay and Barrow; their skins are vitally needed by all residents for winter outer garments, sleeping bags, and other essential uses, and full development of the mineral, fur and game resources will be retarded without reindeer skins; they are essential for fresh meat, particularly during war periods as food for both soldiers and civilians in event shipping lanes are cut by enemy action; they have furnished 44,000,000 pounds of meat, worth an estimated \$8,880,000 to residents since original breeding stock was imported and, since the war, at least 75 tons have been used by the United States Army, defense workers and Government institutions and personnel; they are the only domesticated meat animals known to man which are able to convert the plants of this cold tundra land into valuable animal products by digging their own food from beneath the snow; and

"Whereas the caribou, wild deer, moose, and wild sheep of Alaska have been worth millions of dollars to residents thereof in food, clothing, receipts from hunters, and in tourist travel stimulated by the presence of such species, but these animals appear doomed to extinction unless wolves and coyotes are reduced by prompt action of the Federal Government before they have destroyed these valuable species, or have reduced breeding stock so much that recovery will take generations, it being self-evident that these predators, because of having large litters and their ceaseless killing, tend naturally to increase more rapidly than their prey until they are reduced only by the scarcity and final destruction of such prey; and

"Whereas wolves and coyotes have already caused reindeer to decrease from about 641,000 to 90,000 since 1932; have destroyed wild deer and moose in some sections; and are believed to have caused reduction of caribou in this Territory; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is making every effort within its power to destroy wolves and coyotes by paying high bounties thereon, but this has failed to reduce them in our great Alaska wilderness, where airplanes are essential for wolf killing and for transporting Government hunters; and

"Whereas the National Park Service of the Interior Department, notwithstanding the costly destruction caused by wolves and coyotes or the efforts being made by this Territory to destroy them, is breeding these destructive creatures in great refuges, namely, in approximately 6,700,000 acres of scattered national parks and monuments, by preventing any killing of them therein; and

"Whereas destruction of wolves and coyotes on reindeer ranges requires indirect attack on them by constant reindeer herding, and direct attack by use of suitable aircraft and other means for which natives and the Office of Indian Affairs lack funds; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Biological Survey has not been appropriated sufficient money for predator control in Alaska: Now, therefore

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in seventeenth regular session assembled, respectfully petitions the National Government: To increase the appropriation of the Office of Indian Affairs to an amount needed to support herding schools for natives at all reindeer herds, and to purchase and operate suitable aircraft for supervising herding and killing predators; to increase the appropriation of the Bureau of Biological Survey to an amount needed for full-scale attack on predators within Alaska; and to remove all restrictions upon killing

wolves and coyotes within national parks and monuments in this Territory.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"Approved by the Governor March 21, 1945.

"ERNEST GRUENING,

"Governor of Alaska."

Resolutions of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the construction and maintenance of a veterans' hospital in the city of Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. SALTSTALL) on April 11, 1945, p. 3264, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Saturday Lunch Club, of Minneapolis, Minn., commanding the President and pledging support to him in his efforts to further the cause of peace and unity; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 18

"Concurrent resolution in reference to improvements in the Indian River and Bay

"Whereas a bill having for its purpose the improvement of numerous harbors and streams in the United States is under consideration by Congress; and

"Whereas certain proposed improvements to the Indian River and Bay located in Sussex County, Del., are affected by said bill; and

"Whereas such proposed improvements are expected to have widespread and beneficial effect upon the population and business of the State of Delaware: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Delaware (the house of representatives concurring therein) That the Delaware Representatives in the Congress of the United States are earnestly requested and urged to give all possible support to the passage of the measure designed to make improvements in numerous rivers and harbors in the United States including a number of projects in the State of Delaware of which the dredging of the Indian River and Bay is one, and to contact and give assistance to the proper departments and agencies of the Federal Government, so that improvement to the channel in the Indian River and Bay may be accomplished at the earliest practicable date.

"That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives who represent the State of Delaware in the Congress of the United States.

"Approved March 26, 1945.

"WALTER W. BACON,

"Governor."

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Immigration:

"Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to endorse and to use every effort to have passed House Resolution 511, now pending in Congress, which is a bill to liberalize the naturalization laws

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States of America House Resolution 511, which is a bill to liberalize the naturalization laws, by providing that an alien 50 years of age or over who has resided in the United States for the period beginning July 1, 1924, or prior thereto, may become naturalized without being required to speak the English language, sign his declaration or petition in his own handwriting, or meet other educational requirements, providing also that a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States of America shall not be

required of any alien whose son or daughter has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; and

"Whereas House Resolution 511 has been approved and endorsed by the Naturalization Division of the Department of Justice and has also been sponsored by the Supreme Lodge of the Order Sons of Italy in America, which organization was responsible for the introduction of the measure: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are respectfully requested to endorse and to use every effort to have passed House Resolution 511, now pending in Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and Congress to take such steps as are necessary for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway immediately upon termination of the war; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LA FOLLETTE on April 11, 1945, p. 3265, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

MINIMUM SUBSIDY RATES FOR MILK AND CREAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture (cooperative), with reference to the fixing of minimum subsidy rates for milk and cream.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture (cooperative) go on record as supporting legislation that would fix minimum rates below which milk and cream subsidies should not be permitted to fall and that these minimum rates shall be announced for a period ending not sooner than March 31, 1946, in accordance with the following table:

Subsidy	Milk per hundredweight	Butterfat per pound
1945—April, May, June.	Not less than— 45 cents per hundred-weight.	Not less than— 15 cents per pound.
1945—July, August, September.	60 cents per hundred-weight.	Do.
1945—October, November, December.	70 cents per hundred-weight.	17 cents per pound.
1946—January, February, March.	do.	Do.

Provided further, That the subsidy on butterfat shall not be less than 25 percent of national weighted average rate for milk.

Provided, however, That the subsidy so paid on butterfat shall apply only if the fat is manufactured into butter.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of the Congress from Wisconsin and to the executive secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation.

PARTICIPATION BY ITALY AT SAN FRANCISCO PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD, and appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, petitioning the President of the United States to invite Italy to the San Francisco Conference.

This resolution was adopted by the Order of the Sons of Italy at their meeting in New York on Saturday, March 31, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD.

Whereas our organization, Your Excellency, by its constitution is specifically enjoined to maintain, consolidate, and promote the continuance of friendly relations between the people of the United States and the people of Italy; and

Whereas we, the executive committee of the committee to promote world peace, Supreme Lodge Order Sons of Italy in America, have been convened to consider the latest diplomatic events concerning the promotion of world peace; and

Whereas we note with regret that while 39 nations have been invited by the sponsoring powers, of which the United States is one, to attend the San Francisco Conference, Italy has been excluded; and

Whereas decisions will be taken at said conference which will affect the future of the world and all of its people, decisions dealing with the world that will emerge and function after Germany and Japan will have been defeated and peace declared; in short decisions establishing a peace organization to cope with the problems of the future, it is inconceivable that a nation of 47,000,000 people, the third largest population in Europe, including enemy Germany, a nation which for 2,000 years, despite repeated foreign invasions, oppression, and exploitation, has contributed outstandingly to the civilization and the progress of mankind (a record without parallel), should be excluded, while others, by comparison, small, obscure, and unimportant, should be invited. How any conference can purport to set up an organization to maintain peace on the continent of Europe, much less throughout the world, without recognizing the primary importance of the strategic geographical position of Italy, if it did not care to consider anything else, it is difficult to understand, unless, of course, some disposition concerning this position has already been determined which will neutralize what nature ordained in the beginning.

To extend an invitation to the Kingdom of Iraq, whose total population is less than four millions, to cite but one of those invited to participate, and to exclude Italy, is tantamount to say that 4,000,000 Iraqis are more important in the scheme of things as it will exist tomorrow—and it should always be kept in mind that the charter to be drafted is for the world of tomorrow—than 47,000,000 Italians.

Obviously, the conclusion cannot be true that Iraq, and this is not said in any disparaging sense whatever, is more to be preferred, or more important, in drafting a charter intended to maintain the peace of the world of tomorrow.

Without stopping to evaluate the comparative importance of the nations that have been invited and those which have not, or the justice of the formula followed in excluding some and inviting others, suffice it

to say that peace is indivisible and that anything which affects any sizable part or people of the world, affects the entire world. If we have learned anything from the grim tragedy of this war, we have learned that. We have also learned, to our infinite sorrow, that aviation has abolished isolation. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that this conference, which is really a constituent assembly, a first step in the planning of a better world, leave no stone unturned in bringing about a real meeting of the minds of the peoples who constitute the most numerous nations of the world. If this is to be a people's peace, all peoples must be heard. It necessarily follows that unless they are represented, they will not be heard. Without Italy being heard no lasting peace can be built. To attempt it without her would sow the seed of future discord, and fly in the face of the experience of the ages that peace is evanescent and lasts only so long as it remains upon the firm foundation upon which it was built, the foundation of justice. What we seek is peace, not a sword.

Certainly the Italy of tomorrow, democratic Italy, the new Italy, that we American citizens of Italian origin have labored to create at the request of our Government, first by our appeals beamed over the airways to the people of Italy to revolt against their Fascist-Nazi oppressors, lay down the arms, and accept the guarantees of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," and now by the blood and sacrifice of our soldier-sons, 1,000,000 strong, fighting on every European battle front, certainly that new Italy of tomorrow is not encouraged to press forward along the pathway of freedom and democracy, to take as your excellency has so well said, its respected place among the family of nations; that new Italy, is not encouraged, we repeat, to strive onward by being excluded, coldly and with calculation, from this first concert of those respected nations of the world.

Your excellency said, and we sincerely believe you, upon the occasion of your welcoming the first ambassador of Italy to be accredited to our Government since diplomatic relations were severed in December, 1941 that:

"The United States cherishes full faith and confidence that Italy will create in its own home and will help to create for Europe a political and social organization worthy of the hearts and mind of its people."

Recognition of Italy as a full ally, we are told, would have insured an invitation to Italy from the sponsoring powers to attend. Certainly the recognition would help Italy "to create in its home," where it is the most, that "political and social organization" envisioned by Your Excellency.

To the young government of Bonomi, set up with so many birth pangs, not the least of which was British interference, struggling now among a sea of troubles to gain for Italy that respected place as a sovereign nation, a bid to Italy to attend would have been of priceless help; her exclusion is not merely unfortunate, it may well be a death blow.

The power to avert any dire consequence from the failure to invite Italy rests with Your Excellency. There is still time to exercise it. We know how interested you have been and how valiantly you have striven to bring about the establishment of an organization to maintain international peace and security. But for you the miracle of Dumbarton Oaks would never have been achieved. We wholeheartedly endorse and praise, without reservation, all you have done in that regard.

We know how great your influence is with the sponsoring powers which have issued the invitation to attend and how a word from you will move them to issue an invitation to Italy. We respectfully petition you to say that word. We ask you to say it not

only because of what we have said above, but because this invitation will prove to the people of Italy who listened to our pleas from America and acted upon them that they have not been let down; that what the leaders of America said about the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" was not mere lip service; and, lastly, because the people of Italy have earned the recognition from the United Nations because of the invaluable military assistance they have rendered to the common cause to end the war victoriously. One of the latest American commentators, Marquis Childs, writing from Rome, recently said in part—

"In many ways the Italians are helping the Allied war effort. Military men with whom I have talked in this theater almost all agree that Italian divisions are performing a valuable service. The pressure on the Allied line that runs across the peninsula is great, and Italian regiments have helped to relieve that pressure. * * * Italian service troops using mules, have carried munitions and supplies right up to fox holes over almost impassable mountain trails. Again, their knowledge and experience have counted for a great deal. All this is evidence of the continuing vitality of the Italian people in spite of fascism, disgrace, and defeat. Perhaps, when once again the North and South are united, there will be a new focus for Italian hope, which today seems to have died utterly."

Do not let that hope die, Your Excellency. Rather, bring it to full, radiant life by welcoming Italy to this historic world conclave, the child of your heart and mind, so that she may take her respected place among the family of nations and work side by side with them for the realization of mankind's millennial dream, an organization to effectively maintain international peace and security.

Let this Easter, Your Excellency, signify the rise of a new Italy, to the end that purified by sorrow and sanctified by suffering, she may be reinstated to her former place as the mother of culture and religion in the world; and

Whereas it appears that there is doubt as to the exact diplomatic status of Italy as one of the United Nations, and how that status affects her eligibility to be invited to participate in the San Francisco conference and other matters, particularly lend-lease aid; Therefore be it

Resolved, That Your Excellency be and is hereby respectfully petitioned:

1. To recognize Italy as a full and equal ally.
2. To use your good offices to the end that the United Nations recognize Italy as a full and equal ally.
3. To use your good offices with the sponsoring powers to see to it that Italy be invited forthwith to attend the San Francisco conference.
4. To extend lend-lease aid to Italy so that her present economic distress may be relieved by the resumption of industry and production through said aid; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes and forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of State; the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

FRANK J. V. GIMINO, *Chairman*,
SALVATORE LO PRESTI,
FRANK PALLERIA,
Judge EUGENE V. ALESSANDRONI,
Judge FRANCIS GIACONE,
Committee to Promote World Peace,
Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of
Italy in America.

SUFFERINGS AND HARDSHIPS OF PEOPLE OF ITALY—RECOGNITION OF ITALY AS AN ALLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, a letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Mary Cornella and Mrs. Mary Giacometti, of Frontenac, Kans., regarding the indescribable sufferings and hardships now being endured by the unfortunate people of Italy and the recognition of Italy as an ally of the United Nations.

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

FRONTENAC, KANS., April 2, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senator of Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Lodge No. 15 of the Columbian Federation, the American-Italian fraternal organization, who fought fascism since its inception, beg of you to use all your influence in order that Italy be recognized as an ally, to extend lend lease aid to Italy, to use your good offices that American citizens of Italian extraction should be afforded ample opportunities to help, with their own means, their kin, who are suffering over there, by permitting packages of at least 11 pounds, as before the war, to be sent to all of liberated Italy.

These American-Italians' profound loyalty to our great country is unquestionable. Their sons and their brothers are fighting in the American services on all fronts all over the world; they have given and are giving ample proof of their devotion and valor and are laying their lives on the field of battle.

The recognition of Italy as an ally is in the interest of the speedy winning of the war, a permanent and democratic peace, and is consistent with our national policy of domestic and world stability.

Your cooperation will be an invaluable contribution toward speedy victory and a lasting democratic peace.

Respectfully,

MARY CORNELLA.
MARY GIACOMETTI.

SHORTAGE OF CARS FOR SHIPMENT OF GRAIN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the situation produced by inadequate transportation in the grain States of the Middle West is the worst I have ever seen. Grain is on the ground spoiling. Mills are running part time because there are no cars, either to bring the grain in from the country or to take flour out of the mills.

I ask unanimous consent to present a group of letters and telegrams I have received from Kansas particularly, and from other States in the Grain Belt as well, dealing with the very severe shortage of grain cars available for transportation. These communications are only a part of the hundreds I have received.

I ask that the letters and telegrams be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letters and telegrams were received, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, Mo., March 27, 1945.
Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Bexcar situation getting progressively worse. Mills going down intermittently. Three going down tonight nothing in sight for them tomorrow. Mills running out of wheat. Other types cars being used to move wheat to mills but this is poor substitute. Mills booked beyond ability to ship at present rate car supply. A. A. R., O. D. T., and I. C. C. have had ample opportunity to correct balance of cars as between East and West but have failed. Believe Senate can make real contribution by investigating the whole matter.

J. W. HOLLOWAY.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., March 27, 1945.
Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senator:

Shortage of grain and grain products boxcars critical over Kansas. According reports from our association membership and western half State in dire need grain cars to move hundreds of thousands of bushels wheat and milo now piled on ground out in open. This grain piled on ground getting out of condition fast and should be moved quick or thousands of tons food will become unfit human consumption. Elevators practically all full and unable receive additional grain until cars available relieve blocked situation. Must have relief soon. Please propose investigation by Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

O. E. CASE,
Secretary, Kansas Grain Feed & Seed
Dealers Association.

SALINA, KANS., March 27, 1945.
Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Car situation progressively worse. Have resorted to use open and closed hoppers and stock cars for wheat hauling but mill effort handicapped by failure of carriers to supply flour cars in sufficient quantities. Furthermore use of special equipment does not relieve coarse grain accumulations which will be with us when new wheat crop moves unless cleaned up soon. Apparent indifference of those in authority has created a condition which is leading to chaos. Suggests program for construction of new cars. Meanwhile should have Senate investigation make cars available and prevent spoilage of crops.

THE ROBINSON MILLING CO.,
ED MORGENSTERN.

TOPEKA, KANS., March 27, 1945.
Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Office Building:

Car situation here desperate. Have been unable at times to get enough cars to keep running and our wheat shippers with whom we have many thousands of bushels of wheat contracted are not able to get cars for shipment and we are almost out of wheat. We have heavy Army shipments to make besides our domestic shipments to our baker customers. Believe Senate should investigate situation. Urge return of western-owned cars by eastern railroads and give western railroads help and encouragement in building new cars. We dread what will happen when new crops come on market.

THE THOMAS PAGE MILL CO.

NEWTON, KANS., March 29, 1945.

Senator CLYDE REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Boxcar situation serious, forcing shutdown our mill with large Government flour contracts unshipped. Superintendent Santa Fe advises they received from eastern lines at Chicago last week average four cars daily. Trying buy wheat Hutchinson, Wichita, Salina, Dodge City, Enid, but unable find single car. Situation critical advise immediate Senate investigation car situation eastern lines.

NEWTON MILLING & ELEVATOR CO.

KANSAS CITY, MO., March 27, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The boxcar situation is so serious that it is threatening the complete close-down of our mills. Have only been able to operate our Hutchinson, Kans., mill two-thirds of the time since March 14, which has been caused by lack of boxcar equipment. Our activities have been limited at our other mills—North Kansas City, St. Joseph, and Clinton, Mo., for the same reason. More serious is the fact that wheat is not moving from the country elevators to the mills. Unless something is done immediately the mills will not have wheat to grind. Use is being made of coal cars to move wheat, but this does not give us boxcars in which to ship flour. The available supply of suitable coal cars is very limited and also unsatisfactory to protect the quality of the grain. This situation has been caused by boxcar tie-up on the eastern railroads and their failure to return them to the western lines, and also that a great percentage of cars returned are unuseable for grain. In our opinion, unless relief is received immediately, there will be a complete shut-down of the mills. All grain and milling interests have brought this matter to the attention of A. A. R., O. D. T., and I. C. C. continuously, and useable boxcars are still not reaching us. We respectfully urge that the Senate institute an investigation of the boxcar supply immediately, to prevent a collapse of our industry.

COMMANDER LARABEE MILLING CO.,
T. C. MCGRATH, Vice President.

NORTH KANSAS CITY, MO., March 27, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE REED,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate your very great interest in car problem facing grain and milling industry in this area. Your work has always been the most effective in this matter of anyone in Washington. We feel you should know railroads are not complying with their promises as to number of cars they would deliver daily to western lines. We believe you should instigate Senate investigation of this situation. We are not getting half the cars needed to supply our wheat requirements and to load out-bound flour and feed. We operate mills at Newton, Kans.; Blackwell, Okla.; and North Kansas City, Mo., in addition to 15 country stations. Just have advice from our Newton, Kans., manager unless he gets empty cars tonight Newton Mill must cut running time, as warehouse space filled and railroads promise no relief. Our mill-feed stocks at these mills is very big, as we have held back loading it in order to get out flour, but this mill feed is needed by feeders and we are behind on shipments on feed contracts. We have requested Missouri Pacific to furnish cars at Newton for purposes of loading wheat from our country stations, but are advised they will only furnish cars when houses are completely filled. Army is pressing for delivery of flour contracts. Also many domestic bakers inform us they are running dangerously low on flour and must have shipments. We do not know where the cars are, but

cannot help but be very suspicious. Eastern lines are simply not releasing them in accordance with orders we understand they were given. The situation is fast approaching chaotic stage. Flour production will be cut very seriously unless something is done immediately.

THE MIDLAND FLOUR MILLING CO.

KANSAS CITY, MO., March 27, 1945.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

We operate mills in Kansas City, Topeka, Lindsborg, McPherson, and Russell, having total capacity of 20,000 hundredweight daily. We have given Army and lend-lease about 25 percent of our output. For past several months our ability to produce has constantly been hampered with shut-downs at one mill or another due to lack of boxcars to transport flour. Finally that situation has penetrated so deeply that it has affected our ability to get wheat so that presently we are confronted with both lack of wheat in our elevators and shortage of cars to load flour. Recently we started using open gondolas and boarded up cattle cars to transport wheat, but it is not helping us to load cars of flour. We struggle from day to day not knowing whether or not we can operate next 8 hours. Located in center of country, with large quantity our production going to eastern seaboard and Gulf ports. Empties have a way of being picked off en route here as they start their journey back. We feel that a Senate investigation of what happens to boxcars would be helpful. Also suggest priorities for building additional cars.

L. S. MYERS,
General Manager, Rodney Milling Co.

WICHITA, KANS., March 28, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Surveys indicate that eastern lines are hogging western lines boxcars which are needed in Kansas and other grain-producing States to move the huge amount of accumulated grain now on farms in country elevators and terminal houses. Large amounts of grain now piled on ground. Estimate it would require all boxcars now owned by railroad to move grain now on farms. Of 25,000 cars said to have been delivered western lines, within last 30 days, no appreciable number have appeared in grain-producing territory west of Mississippi River. From July 1 to March 10 12 primary grain markets have received 35,000 less carloads grain than for corresponding period year ago, and crops have increased over 20 percent over year ago figure. Grain receipts at these markets are now 9,000 less cars per week than for corresponding period year ago. Suggest an immediate congressional investigation, and that a directive be issued to the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue a car-service order that requires eastern lines to immediately deliver to western lines all cars in excess of eastern lines ownership that eastern lines have misappropriated to their own lines use, and that western lines have cars in excess to their own ownership to handle grain that is in distress on farms and the large accumulation in country elevators and terminal houses before the coming bumper crop is on us for handling.

THE WICHITA BOARD OF TRADE.

MARIENTHAL, KANS., April 7, 1945.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. REED: The grain car shortage in this community is affecting the farmer here to such an extent that I feel it my duty to write to you asking you to help our community in securing cars to relieve this critical situation.

There is much grain deteriorating from lying on the ground all winter that the country and farmer are suffering a great loss. I have been having to turn down one truck load after another because my elevator is filled to capacity, and I am unable to secure cars for the movement of this grain.

The prospects of another bumper crop is so good at present that unless help is given in the way of improving this car shortage to move this grain to the terminals, much more grain will have to be piled on the ground. It's a proven fact that a great number of bushels of grain is lost by this practice.

It seems to me that the eastern railroad lines are taking advantage of the situation by holding cars that normally would be coming to the West to handle grain shipments. I would like to know the reason for their attitude.

Hoping you will devise ways and means of easing this situation for us out here in this getting this grain moved. I remain,

Respectfully yours,
ROMAN DROSTE, Manager.

SUSAN, KANS., April 7, 1945.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you in regards to the boxcar situation because I feel that you can help us.

Much grain has been turned down because the elevators have been filled and the inability to secure cars for the movement of these grains.

The farmers have been complaining bitterly because of the shortage of cars, since much of their grain has deteriorated. We are faced with a bumper crop, and unless some help is given in the way of improving this car shortage the country and the farmer will suffer a great loss.

Why should the eastern lines be allowed to hold cars that normally would be coming to the West to handle grain shipments?

I wish to thank you and appreciate the effort that you will do to correct this car shortage for us.

Yours very truly,
VERNON OCHS, Manager.

D. F. CARTER LAND AND ABSTRACT CO.,

Leoti, Kans., April 9, 1945.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR REED: I wish to compliment you on the stand that you are taking in Congress regarding the transportation matter, which so vitally affects our community here. While you are very likely familiar to some extent with these local conditions, no doubt, you will appreciate additional, dependable information regarding our situation here in Wichita County, Kans.

Leoti, the county seat of our county, and the principal market for grain has had but 9 cars for grain since January 16, and those were cars unloaded here from incoming freight, and reloaded. Our elevators are full, there is a great deal of grain that has been on the ground on account of lack of cars to ship out from here, and we have the prospect of another good wheat crop, the harvest for which is only about 60 days off.

It is certainly vital to this territory as well as saving a lot of grain in order to get a bunch of extra cars in here to handle this situation, and to make a great saving in grain, which is vital to the war effort at this time. We supervise for the nonresident landowners, and have the handling of a lot of grain here, much of which should have been settled for along in January, but the tenants can do nothing but bring us the same story, that the elevators are full and no cars. We can't help but feel that something can be done about this, if enough pressure is brought to bear on those companies and those who have the control of this matter to loosen up

this car situation, and let us get this last year's crop on to the market, as well as getting ready for the one that is in prospect.

We are advised that there are a lot of cars on short lines that could be diverted if enough pressure is brought to bear as well as from other points. Now, Senator, let me again say we appreciate the effort you have made in our behalf, and we hope that you will get results. You, or rather we, can get resolutions from our local civic organizations, as well as city and county governing bodies if desirable.

With kind personal regards, and awaiting your convenience, I am,

Yours very truly,

D. F. CARTER.

CEDAR KANS., April 7, 1945.

HON. CLYDE REED.

DEAR SIR: I am manager of the Morrison-Gregg-Mitchell Elevator here, and I am writing to you about the car shortage, as there is a large amount of 2-year-old wheat on the farms and a large amount of last year's wheat, and also a large amount of the corn that is still on the ground as they don't have bin room to shell it, and another bumper wheat crop coming on, so, if we don't get cars soon to get this grain out of the way, it sure will be a big loss to the farmer at harvest time. I haven't had a car since February 2, 1945, so if you can do some thing for the farmers, now is the time to do it.

Yours respectfully,

ALLEN KELLING.

THE KANSAS MILLING Co.,
Wichita, Kans., March 30, 1945.

HON. CLYDE M. REED,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have seen some reports that the car situation was easing up and getting better, but I wish to advise you that in our area, it is not better; it is even worse. There has been no relief whatsoever and the railroads here do not give us any encouragement.

We were down about a third of the time last week for lack of cars, some of our products going to the Army and some of it is going to industrial alcohol plants.

The cars are just not being delivered to the roads serving this area; or if they are, they are being used for purposes other than milling and grain.

Yours truly,

D. S. JACKMAN,
Vice President and General Manager.

SMITH CENTER COOPERATIVE
MILL & ELEVATOR CO.,
Smith Center, Kans., April 9, 1945.

HON. CLYDE M. REED,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you with regard to the boxcar situation here in Smith County on the Rock Island Railroad system.

We have only had 9 cars to load with grain so far in 1945, and could have used at least 100.

To make it plain, the need is critical out here, as the corn is on the ground and starting to spoil, and if there isn't something done immediately the farmers will have a great loss when the spring rains start.

Please do what you can to help, and we will appreciate it very much.

Yours truly,

OREN FLINT, Manager.

FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR,
Downs, Kans., April 7, 1945.

HON. CLYDE M. REED,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: We are sure you are doing all you can regarding the boxcar shortage in the West, but want to let you know the situation here. There are thousands of

bushels of corn and sorghums on the ground, and spoiling, and as germination time comes and spring rains will spoil much faster.

We have had an unusual crop of both, and the farmers do not have cribs and bins for same, and unless some relief is afforded they will take a heavy loss.

What incentive is there for farmers to raise foods if they have to lose them?

We have had 9 boxcars since the 1st of January and could of used 40, at least, and to make things more complicated have the promise of a bumper wheat crop coming on by June 20.

We are only one of three elevators here, and all have had the same experience.

Just Colonel Johnson out of his office and get someone that is competent.

We sure appreciate your efforts in this matter and all others that you think are right and the way you get things done and are 100 percent for you.

Thanking you very much, we are,

Sincerely yours,

A. G. BLANKENSHIP.

Manager.

CORNING GRAIN Co.,

Corning, Kans., April 7, 1945.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you in regard to the grain-car situation in this community.

On February 17 we had 12,000 bushels of corn in the elevator and quit buying corn on account of the high moisture content of the grain. Since that time we have not bought any corn, and we still have 6,000 bushels in the elevator.

I would estimate there is 25,000 bushels of corn in farmers' hands that is piled on the ground and in open cribs in this territory that will undoubtedly spoil unless we get some relief soon.

Thanking you for your interest in the matter, I remain

Yours truly,

R. W. CONNER.

UHLMANN GRAIN Co.,

Kansas City, Mo., April 6, 1945.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,

Senator from Kansas,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: We operate quite a number of country elevators in Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, where, as you know, there is a great deal of grain on the ground waiting for boxcars to be shipped to terminal markets and to other parts of the country. This grain is in a very critical condition and millions of bushels are going out of condition every day on account of lack of shipping facilities. We even tried to haul some of it by truck, but the O. D. T. in Washington, Kansas, and Omaha consistently refused us permits to buy trucks.

We operate 22 elevators and have only 1 truck, whereas we ought to have 2 trucks for each elevator in order to give farmers at least a semblance of service. However, boxcars are the crying need at this moment, and so far we have hardly received 1 car per week at each of our elevators, whereas we ought to get at least 1 car a day at each elevator. Consequently, we have a great deal of grain, especially corn and sorghum grains, going out of condition and becoming unfit for even feed.

We are sending you a sample of corn of which car after car is coming to market now on account of having been left on the ground and in country elevators too long waiting to be moved. This corn was perfectly good 3 or 4 weeks ago, but now it is unfit for use.

We request, therefore, that you please demand from the O. D. T. and the I. C. C. that adequate shipping facilities be furnished immediately to western States; otherwise many millions of bushels of grain will perish,

which grain is badly needed, both at home and abroad, by millions of starving people. The Army also needs tremendous quantities of flour and feed, which demand the grain trade and the flour mills are unable to fill on account of lack of cars.

Your immediate attention to this matter, therefore, is urgently needed.

Yours truly,

S. FETO.

FARMERS COOPERATIVE
ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION,
Greenleaf, Kans., April 7, 1945.

Hon. Senator CLYDE M. REED,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to take a little of your time in calling to your attention the very serious condition brought about by the shortage of grain cars here.

In January 1945 our sales were over \$47,000. We shipped out 17 cars of grain and received 5 cars of coal and feed. The Missouri Pacific Railroad Co. has just set 1 car for us since it was not shipped into Greenleaf full. Our elevator is now carrying over 15,000 bushels of wheat and over 15,000 bushels of damp corn. We are moving the corn from one bin to another every week trying to keep it in condition. We do not know whether or not we can keep it in condition by moving it when the germination season arrives.

We shipped out 2 cars of grain in March. We received 1 car of seed oats and 1 car of oyster shell and refilled them to get these 2. We are unable to purchase any more corn from farmers until we can ship some of what we have in the elevator. We were offered about 12,000 bushels this last week which we were unable to purchase on account of the car shortage.

Our 1945 wheat crop is very promising and lots of farmers have been able to sell their 1944 crop and clear bins, so will be obliged to do something with their wheat outside of their own storage as wheat cannot be piled outside on the ground and be kept on account of too much moisture.

If there is anything that can be done to force the eastern roads to return cars that belong to the western roads, it should be done and not let this corn and wheat go to waste out here.

Yours very truly,

L. J. HOOVER, Manager.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation, a list of records transmitting to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2348. A bill to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 187).

ENTERTAINMENT OF DISTINGUISHED VISITORS BY FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 109, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 109) submitted by Mr. CONNALLY on March 23, 1945, and which had been previously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the unexpended balance of amounts made available under Senate resolution 163, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to July 1, 1943, shall remain available for expenditure during the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress for the purposes stated in said resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to explain the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress the Committee on Foreign Relations was given a small fund with which to pay for entertainment, lunches, and so forth, for distinguished foreign visitors. I will say to the Senator that up to that time the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate as well as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House had borne these expenses out of their own personal purses. A very small amount was expended from the fund. I do not recall what the exact amount was. There is a small balance left over. So we ask that that balance be made available during the present session of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator if he will tell us how large the balance is.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from Illinois know?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was advised about it. It is only two or three hundred dollars.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution No. 111, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized, during the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ additional clerical assistance to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$3,600 per annum.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have an explanation of the resolution. I am a member of the committee, and should at least like to know what the committee is doing about the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been informed of practically every matter that has been considered by the committee. I have just conferred with the

Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], my colleague. The Senator from Nebraska was not on the floor at the time. This is a simple resolution which had previously been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations asking for an additional clerk at the rate of \$3,600 per annum to be paid at that rate until June 30, 1945.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that in keeping with the present policy?

Mr. LUCAS. It is in keeping with the present policy which has heretofore been laid down by the committee of which the Senator from Illinois is chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the chairman of the committee. Had we had a committee meeting in which we dealt with the resolution, I should have been glad to agree to the resolution, as I am now.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, submitted by Mr. CONNALLY on March 26, 1945, and which had been previously reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The amendments of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate were, in line 2, after the word "authorized", to strike out the comma and "during the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress," and in line 5, after the words "per annum", to insert "until June 30, 1945."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized to employ additional clerical assistance to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$3,600 per annum, until June 30, 1945.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, an agreement has been reached between the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate with respect to the discharge of the Committee on Interstate Commerce from further consideration of House bill 37 and reference of the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Nevada is acting in consequence of an arrangement which has been worked out between him and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. The resolution refers to a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 94.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 94) which had been submitted by

Mr. McCARRAN on March 26, 1945, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 37) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

THE CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the period at the end thereof and to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That when reported to the Senate, such bill shall be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary have agreed to this arrangement, the bill to be first dealt with by the Committee on the Judiciary and then referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 37) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary: *Provided*, That when reported to the Senate, such bill shall be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 865. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Allberry; to the Committee on Claims.

(**Mr. MAGNUSON** introduced Senate bill 866, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Ruby Doris Calvert, as administratrix of the estate of Frederick Calvert, deceased (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments for the benefit of their local political subdivisions based on the fair value of national-forest land situated therein, and for other purposes.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 868. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 869. A bill relating to disbursement of joint funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

BENEFITS TO WIDOWS OF PERSONS WHOSE DEATH RESULTS FROM SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, when Congress passed the so-called G. I. bill of rights, I think it unconsciously and perhaps inadvertently eliminated a very small category of individuals who are justly entitled to the benefits under the act. I refer to the widows of those who might be killed in action or who died as the result of diseases contracted in line of duty. I am today introducing a bill to include such widows, who compose a very small category of American citizens. They are justly entitled to these benefits. The bill provides that a widow shall have the same rights to buy a home or continue her education as if the deceased were living. I think they should be included in the act.

I have discussed this matter informally with officials of the War Department and officials of the Navy Department and others in the military, and they all believe the bill represents a very just and equitable amendment to the act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Washington will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 866) to extend benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the widows of persons whose death results from service in the armed forces was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON SURVEY OF FISHERY RESOURCES

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 2, 1945, transmitting, pursuant to Public Law No. 302, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 14, 1944, a report on a survey of the fishery resources of the United States and its possessions, be printed as a Senate document, and that 33,100 additional copies shall be printed, of which 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 22,100 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 500 copies for the use of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and 500 copies for the use of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

POST-WAR SAVINGS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THEIR INVESTMENT

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 117), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed (1) to investigate and determine as

to the post-war era the source and magnitude of savings by individuals, corporations, and businesses of all kinds, and by governmental units—Federal, State, and local, (2) to investigate and determine the opportunities for the investment and employment of savings in the post-war period, and (3) to assemble and analyze all data tending to show to what extent, and how, the savings and capital proceeding from the national income of our people, when fully employed, may be absorbed and utilized in proper investments or may tend to stagnate and produce depressions. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations with respect to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed \$1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL OF RADIO PATENTS

Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. WHEELER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 118), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the relationship of foreign companies and persons to radio and other communication in the United States and the effect of such relationship upon the national economy and safety of the United States, with particular reference to patents owned or controlled by such foreign companies or persons and arrangements or agreements made by such foreign companies or persons concerning radio and other communication. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; to employ such clerical and other assistants; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE—ADDRESS BY THE AMBASSADOR OF GREECE

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Ambassador of Greece, at Worcester, Mass., March 25, 1945, in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of Greek independence, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN OPEN LETTER FROM GENEROSO POPE, URGING INVITATION OF ITALY TO THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter from Generoso Pope, publisher of *Il Progresso Italo-American*, to the members of the United States security delegation, dated April 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION IN OUTPUT OF FARM MACHINERY—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Farm Machinery Cut 23 Percent in Output," published in the New York Times of April 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF LUMBER OVERSEAS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release of the War Production Board concerning authorization for the use of lumber overseas, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 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	Ferguson	Magnuson
Austin	Fulbright	Millikin
Bailey	George	Morse
Ball	Green	Murdock
Bankhead	Hart	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Briggs	Hawkes	Overton
Brooks	Hill	Saltonstall
Burton	Hoey	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Kilgore	Tunnell
Capehart	La Follette	Walsh
Capper	Langer	Wherry
Chavez	Lucas	White
Connally	McCarran	Wiley
Donnel	McFarland	Wilson
Downey	McKellar	
Eastland	McMahon	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] is absent on official business with the Special Committee to investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are attending committee meetings and on official business pertaining to their respective States.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is detained on official business of the Senate.

The following Senators are detained in committee meetings and on official business:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOURT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVE TO ATTEND COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Committee on Education and Labor was in session this morning when the quorum call came. The chairman of the committee asked us to be back in committee in 15 minutes. Under the ruling as reported by the press and supposed to have been made by the Chair yesterday, is it necessary to ask for official permission to leave the Chamber now in order that we may go back to the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the committee is meeting in the Capitol Building and the members are immediately available on call of the Senate, there is no reason for asking permission.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What if it is meeting in the Senate Office Building?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then they must ask permission, because some time is required to get from the Senate Office Building to the Capitol.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask permission to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask that the Senators who are members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy may have leave of absence from the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and leave of absence is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has an engagement of several days standing with Gen. Breton H. Somervell, commanding general of the supply forces of the Army. I ask unanimous consent that members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs may be permitted to keep this engagement at the Pentagon Building, and may absent themselves from the Senate, and from the call of the Senate, during such time as the meeting may occupy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am under an engagement to make a Jefferson Day address at Knoxville, Tenn., tomorrow night, and I ask unanimous consent to be excused until next Monday.

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

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Reserving the right to object, does the distinguished Senator intend to make the usual eloquent and oratorical address which he generally makes? [Laughter.]

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am unable to say.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am sure he will do so, and therefore I make no objection to his being absent.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and leave is granted.

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—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 201. An act for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation;

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau;

H. R. 206. An act for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss;

H. R. 266. An act for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.;

H. R. 510. An act granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.;

H. R. 685. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Murray B. Latimer;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate;

H. R. 807. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wilma Louise Townsend;

H. R. 914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Margaret G. Potts;

H. R. 934. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 945. An act for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse;

H. R. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring;

H. R. 990. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Ray L. Smith;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.;

H. R. 1135. An act for the relief of Gus A. Vance;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello;

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of George Webb;

H. R. 1353. An act for the relief of J. P. Harris;

H. R. 1396. An act for the relief of Anne Loacker;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix of the estate of Leon Connor Childers;

H. R. 1483. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice;

H. R. 1534. An act to amend the Fact Finder's Act;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.;

H. R. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased;

H. R. 2013. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 2055. An act for the relief of Ben Crumstein.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the treaty (Executive A, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers, and (Executive H, 78th

Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol supplementary to the treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the reservations proposed yesterday by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to the pending Mexican water treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of all Senators to the fact that there is now printed and lying on the desk of each Senator a copy of the resolution of ratification which I offered. Attached thereto are certain reservations which have been very carefully drawn. They have been thoroughly considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. They were offered by me at the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, yesterday afternoon, through an excess of caution, the committee authorized and directed a subcommittee to hear interested Senators who had complaints to make respecting the reservations, or who desired further reservations. As a result, I wish to modify reservation (b) on page 4, which I understand I have the right to do, by adding certain language.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee has the right to modify its reservations. The modification will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 11, of the resolution of ratification, in reservation (b), after "United States", it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following: "or as impairing the power of the Congress of the United States to define the terms of office of members of the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission or to provide for their appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate or otherwise."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate again just what the amendment is.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a modification of reservation (b), on page 4 of the resolution of ratification, by adding certain language.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reservation is modified accordingly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, at the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to modify reservation (c) on page 4 of the resolution of ratification by striking out reservation (c), on page 4, after line 11, down to and including all of line 22 on page 4, and substituting certain language in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modification will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4 of the resolution of ratification, after line 11, it is proposed to strike out:

(c) That nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of State of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, or the United States Section of said Commission, to interfere with the domestic administration within the United States of the appropriation, distribution, or use of water: *Provided*, however, That nothing herein contained shall be con-

strued as in any way impairing the obligations of the United States of America to the United Mexican States under the treaty and the protocol.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

That nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of State of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, or the United States Section of said Commission, to alter or control the distribution of water to users within the territorial limits of any of the individual States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reservation is modified accordingly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, those are the two modifications which I suggest. The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is interested in an amendment to reservation (j) on page 6 of the resolution of ratification. I have been conferring with him. I am glad to yield to him at this time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and myself, I offer a substitute for the committee's reservation (j).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6 of the resolution of ratification, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

(j) That the quantities of 1,500,000 acre-feet and 1,700,000 acre-feet of water referred to in subparagraph (b) of article 10, and in paragraph E of article 15, of the treaty, include, and are not in addition to, the quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water, the delivery of which is guaranteed under subparagraph (a) of article 10.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(j) That the 1,700,000 acre-feet specified in paragraph (b) of article 10 includes and is not in addition to the 1,500,000 acre-feet, the delivery of which to Mexico is guaranteed in subparagraph (a) of article 10; second, that the 1,500,000 acre-feet specified in three places in said subparagraph (b) is identical with the 1,500,000 acre-feet specified in said subparagraph (a); third, that any use by Mexico under said subparagraph (b) of quantities of water arriving at the Mexican points of diversion in excess of said 1,500,000 acre-feet shall not give rise to any future claim of right by Mexico in excess of said guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am willing to accept the amendment to reservation (j).

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the amendment which the Senator from Utah offers a substitute for reservation (j), or is it an addition?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is a substitute for reservation (j) as offered by the committee. As I understand, the chairman of the committee agrees to accept it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I agree to accept it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, my purpose in offering the substitute for

reservation (j) submitted by the committee is to resolve a very genuine and sincere doubt in my mind, in which doubt I am joined by other Senators, as to the language contained in article 10 of the treaty which allots water to Mexico from the Colorado River. Yesterday I made a statement to the subcommittee which was considering these matters for the Committee on Foreign Relations, and presented my reservation. I believe that the language of the substitute offered by me clarifies beyond question the meaning and intent of the language of article 10. In my opinion, the most important part of the treaty with Mexico, as it involves the Colorado River, is the question of quantity.

Having that language fully clarified to my satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], it is my intention now to vote for the ratification of the treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah (Mr. MURDOCK) to reservation (j) in the resolution of ratification on page 6, after line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has a reservation to which I shall have to give some attention in a few minutes.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has been good enough to point out that the text of a resolution which I offered and had printed last week has been inserted in the modifications to the reservations which he has submitted today.

My reservation was intended to make clear that the Congress of the United States does not sacrifice any of its power or jurisdiction to fix the terms of office of members of the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and does not impair the right of the Congress to provide for confirmation of the appointment of such members by the advice and consent of the Senate, or otherwise. That suggestion has been adopted, and I thank the Senator and the Committee on Foreign Relations for having acceded to that suggestion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his generous remarks with respect to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I use them to balance some of the things which have been said on the other side of the question.

Mr. President, I am extremely anxious that the Senate should fix a time to dispose of the reservations to the treaty. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote upon the reservations to the treaty and all amendments thereto not later than 2 o'clock p. m. on next Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if he is willing to change the agreement so that it will provide that the vote shall be taken at 3 o'clock next Monday instead of at 2 o'clock?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senate will agree to it, I am willing.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I also desire to ask the Senator if he is willing to change the agreement so that the vote shall be taken at that time instead of at no later time.

Mr. CONNALLY. At that time? I think that if we say "not later than 3 o'clock" and we conclude the debate before that time, we may proceed to vote. The language of the agreement guarantees that so long as any Senator is able to stand on the floor and debate, the vote will not come until 3 o'clock on Monday. I mean to include in my request the understanding that at 3 o'clock the Senate shall proceed to vote on the reservations and amendments thereto without further debate.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, there are other Senators who are vitally concerned in this matter who desire to present their arguments on Monday. In view of that fact, I ask the Senator from Texas if he is willing to modify his unanimous consent request so as to provide that the vote shall take place on Monday not later than 3 o'clock?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I said.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. But if there were no speakers present say at 4 o'clock or 3 o'clock this afternoon, it would still be understood that the vote would go over.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. What does the Senator mean by "go over"?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield for a suggestion, I may say that I appreciate the fact that many Senators wish to know precisely when the vote will take place. I see an advantage in agreeing that we will vote at 3 o'clock sharp on Monday next instead of not later than that time. I think that Senators would like to be assured that if the debate runs out before that time the vote will not be taken until 3 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes. I desire to know if the distinguished leader will accede further to me in this matter. In my opinion, the reservations which the Senator from Texas has presented have very greatly improved the treaty. I am far from being satisfied with the treaty, even with the reservations, but they certainly very greatly improve it. However, the reservations are very technical. Changes have been made in them since yesterday. I wish to do all I personally can do to accelerate the work of the Senate in connection with this matter. I feel quite sure that justice will be served if the reservations of the Senator from Texas are not taken up until tomorrow. They should be printed in final form and an opportunity should be afforded to all Members of the Senate to study them. Therefore, I think that we should have an understanding at this time that the reservations will not be taken up and discussed until tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from California object to any Member discussing the reservations?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I have no objection to that. I should like to have the opportunity—and this is not made as a condition—to sit down with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], as well as other Senators who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee, to see if we cannot clarify our minds in three or four respects in connection with these reservations. I believe certain technical defects are involved which the Senator himself would wish to have corrected; but, knowing the very fine intellect of the Senator from Georgia, I may be the one who will be converted. I think that what I am saying is in the interest of saving the time of the Senate, as well as good policy. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he is willing to sit down with us in a discussion of these reservations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that is a matter of private arrangement between the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, another understanding in which I am sure the distinguished Senator will immediately join, is that the unanimous-consent agreement is dependent upon a quorum being present in the Senate today, Friday, and Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about Sunday? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I do not believe we should be obligated to vote if no quorum were present from now until 3 o'clock next Monday. Many of these controversial matters can be argued and disposed of if a quorum is present. I have understood that a quorum will not be present tomorrow and that we shall not be able to do business. Manifestly, we cannot enter into unanimous-consent agreements if a quorum is not present.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think a quorum will be present in the Senate. It is difficult to fix a time for voting with a proviso that the agreement will be nullified if at any time today, tomorrow, or on Monday next, a quorum is not present.

I am satisfied there will be a quorum in town the rest of today and tomorrow and Monday. I will make use of all the parliamentary authority I have, and the Senator from Texas will do the same, to provide that a quorum shall be present; but the Senator knows that there is no way on earth that we can guarantee that 49 Senators will be here at every minute during the remainder of today and tomorrow and Monday.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am not endeavoring to raise any technical point. I am not now striving for a greater state of perfection such as the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is now envisioning. I am not requesting that. So far as the

remainder of the afternoon is concerned, I would not raise any question, because I personally want to go over the reservations presented by the Senator from Texas. But if the Senate in its session tomorrow attempts to dispose of 10 or 15 of the reservations, by way of voting on them and getting them out of the way—and I hope that will be done—and if a quorum is not present and we can not do any business, how can the Senator expect me to obligate myself under those conditions?

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator a question. I understand that the unanimous-consent request to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday is a request to vote on all the reservations. As I understand, it is not contemplated that the Senate will vote tomorrow on all the reservations, but that the Senate will begin to vote on them, and that on Monday at 3 o'clock the Senate will vote on all the remaining reservations, and that they may be discussed between now and then by any Senator who wishes to discuss them. That is my understanding of the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Kentucky has stated the situation precisely as I understand it to be, and I earnestly hope that the request of the Senator from Texas will be agreed to, so that we shall all know with definiteness when voting is to begin and when voting is to conclude on all the reservations and on the treaty itself.

I simply do not see how it is practicable to arrive at an agreement as to any contingencies which might nullify or take away the vitality of the unanimous-consent agreement which is pending. What little influence I may have, I assure the Senator, will be exerted to the full toward keeping all Members of the Senate in the Senate Chamber so that they may have the benefit of the discussion which may occur during the next 2 days.

Notwithstanding all the complexities of this problem, I feel strongly that it is a matter of moment, that it has been pending for weeks on end, that there has been long and learned discussion of many of its phases, and that we should bring the discussion to a conclusion, and should dispose of the matter, whatever may be the outcome on the basis of the votes which will be cast.

I hope the Senator from California will not interpose objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think the implication which may be drawn from some of the remarks just made is not wholly fair. I know of no other matter so complicated and so important as the pending treaty which has occupied such a small amount of the time of the Senate. The principal arguments have been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and myself,

with the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] taking 1 day. There have been only 4 or 5 days of straight time occupied in this very important and complicated discussion. The time has been almost equally divided. On my part, I desire to accelerate the matter in every way I can.

Let me say further—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation at this point?

Mr. DOWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as the division of time is concerned, I am willing to have the opponents of the treaty have two-thirds of the remaining time, the proponents to have one-third.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me continue my remarks in this way: I did not mean to indicate, although I presume my language probably could have been so interpreted, that on all the reservations and the amendments thereto no vote would be had until Monday. I thought the Senate would be in session, say, tomorrow, voting on amendments to the reservations and on reservations, and would get as many as possible out of the way, and that at 3 o'clock on Monday the Senate would vote on all reservations which had not previously been disposed of, and also would vote at that time on the treaty itself.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is all right.

Mr. DOWNEY. My friend the distinguished senior Senator from Texas says to me, "That is all right." The difficulty is, suppose a quorum is not present tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. A vote cannot be had if a quorum is not present—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that if any Senator makes the point of the absence of a quorum, the Senate cannot vote until a quorum is present. I pledge to the Senator, even though I may get still farther in the dog house with my colleagues, that I will use every ounce of influence I have to see that a quorum is present. I know the Senator wishes to help facilitate the handling of this matter.

My notion is that if any Senator objects to having a vote taken on any of the reservations tomorrow, the Senate will vote on them beginning at 3 o'clock on Monday. I grant that it is possible that some of the reservations may encounter no opposition; they may be acceptable to all Senators, and no Senator may desire to discuss them.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, of course the difficulty in that connection is that it is probable that many Senators will be voting on reservations which they have not heard discussed or argued at all. Perhaps they would vote even more intelligently under such circumstances; I do not know, but I am not willing to assume.

Mr. BARKLEY. In respect to any such reservation, a request on the part of any Senator that consideration of the reservation go over until 3 o'clock on Monday would be granted, even if the request included all the reservations.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me propound a parliamentary inquiry: Would a unani-

mous-consent agreement that the reservations and any amendments thereto could be called up and could be voted on tomorrow, even if a quorum were not present—

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; that could not be done, if any Senator raised the point of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If any Senator were to raise the point of the absence of a quorum, a quorum would have to be developed before the Senate could vote on the reservations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that he was in favor of nearly all the reservations.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then there will not be any debate on them, if we are able to eliminate debate on them in that way.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have no argument to make on many of the reservations, but I have some reservations which I wish to present.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say in conclusion—and I have been leading up to this climax—that there is one reservation which I desire to present. If the distinguished Senator from Texas will accept it, that will permit me to greatly reduce my argument on the floor of the Senate. The reservation to which I refer is one to which I think most Senators will accede, on the ground that it is a fair one.

I should like to read the reservation to the Senate, and then I shall ask the Senator whether he will agree to accept it, as a part of the unanimous-consent agreement:

That within 6 months after the date of entry into force of this treaty the two Governments shall enter into negotiation of a protocol to this treaty, which shall provide that each section of the Commission shall be headed by three Commissioners, and that one of the Commissioners of the United States Section shall be a resident of the Lower Rio Grande Basin; one a resident of the Colorado River Basin; and the third shall be a person not now residing in a State within, or partially within, either of said basins: *Provided*, That if such protocol is not made within 1 year after the date of entry into force of the treaty, thereafter the United States Commissioner shall be a person not now residing in any State within, or partially within, either of said basins; and that this understanding will be mentioned in the ratifications of this treaty as conveying the true meaning of the treaty, and will in effect form a part of the treaty.

I desire to point out to the distinguished Senator, before he expresses himself on the reservation, that it is merely a request by the Senate of the United States that Mexico consider a protocol such as I have suggested in the reservation. If Mexico is willing to consider it, and if she presents some matters in that connection, the reservation and such additional matters will then come back to the Senate of the United States, for its further deliberation and possible acceptance.

The reservation contains the proviso that if within 1 year a new treaty increasing the personnel of the International Boundary Commission is not made,

thereafter no individual who is a resident either of the Rio Grande Basin or the Colorado River Basin may be the Commissioner.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that I do not believe he himself would believe that a man from either basin should deal with Mexico in regard to the respective contrasting rights or obligations in both the lower basins. I have no desire to stand upon the floor of the Senate and go through the record made in the hearings, taking *seriatim* the testimony of Mr. Lawson, showing how loose and inaccurate and ignorant he is about the treaty, showing how he failed to investigate vital matters concerning the treaty. So far as I am concerned I am going to take all the time I can be allowed by the laws of nature and by the Senate in order to convince the Senate that we in the Colorado River Basin should not be under the dominion and control of Mr. Lawson in future operations. The reservation would give him an opportunity to retain his position as one of the three, if it should be worked out; if it should not be worked out, it would give him time to rearrange his affairs thereafter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from California has many times on the floor bitterly attacked Mr. Lawson because, he says, he is a Texan. As a matter of fact Mr. Lawson is not a Texan. He is a career man of the Reclamation Service. He became a member of the Boundary Commission because he was regarded as an excellent engineer and as being familiar with the engineering problems involved and the duties that would attach to the Boundary Commission. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lawson graduated from one of the universities of California; at the moment I cannot say whether it was the University of California or Leland Stanford, but I think it was Leland Stanford. The testimony in the record before the committee was that his first experience with waterways was on the Colorado River, where he went as a young engineer as long ago as I now recall as 1902; in any event many years ago, before he ever had any connection with the Boundary Commission or even any connection with the Rio Grande. That is Mr. Lawson's background. He resides at El Paso, Tex., because the duties of his position require that he reside somewhere on the border, so that he may properly perform his duties.

Mr. President, I cannot agree to accept this sort of a reservation. The question involved is not a proper subject of reservation. The reservation is a change of the treaty; it is a rejection of the treaty, and if it should be adopted as a reservation Mexico would very likely say, or could say, "You have rejected the treaty and therefore it will be necessary to enter into a renegotiation of the whole problem." I cannot agree to the reservation because, after all, it proposes legislation; it undertakes to legislate on behalf of the United States in a treaty as to what shall become of a boundary commissioner and what his duties shall be and how he shall be appointed in the future.

I do not mind saying to the Senator that I would have no objection, indeed I should encourage, the State Department to take this matter up independently of the treaty with Mexico, and if an agreement could be worked out in the intervening time well and good; but I cannot see my way clear to accept the reservation; I think it is unreasonable; I think it is absolutely beyond serious contemplation that anybody could agree to that sort of a reservation to a treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. HAWKES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish the attention of both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California. It seems to me that the reservation suggested by the Senator from California very largely deals with a matter of domestic legislation on the part of Congress. Would not the Senator's purpose be served by the adoption even of an independent resolution by the Senate, not a part of the treaty or the resolution of ratification, suggesting to the State Department that they open negotiations with Mexico with a view to increasing the size of the Commission? I doubt very much whether a reservation on this treaty saying where the Commissioners shall reside or where they shall not reside would be a proper matter for a reservation to the treaty, but the Congress could provide for that by legislation which it might enact, following an agreement with Mexico increasing the size of the Commission. We could provide by our own domestic legislation where our member of the Commission should come from. Personally, I should be glad to cooperate in support of an independent resolution of that sort, but I think that to put it on this treaty really goes beyond the scope of a legitimate reservation.

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. HAWKES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think both the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee misapprehend the purport of this reservation. It in no way seeks to bind Mexico. All it does is to direct our State Department to begin negotiations with Mexico to ascertain if Mexico will consent to a new treaty or a new protocol increasing the personnel of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield further, let me say that, in addition, it provides that if at the end of a year a treaty has not been made on that subject, then our representative on the Commission shall not come from a certain territory, which is a matter of domestic legislation which would have to be agreed to by both Houses of Congress. We can pass that character of legislation, but certainly in determining where an appointee of the United States, to be confirmed by the

Senate, should come from both Houses have to take part. We cannot do that, it seems to me by a reservation to the treaty.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator for an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. HAWKES. No; I do not desire to insert anything in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a moment.

Mr. HAWKES. Unless the Senator yields to me I am going positively and definitely to object to the request for unanimous consent agreement. Let me say—

Mr. CONNALLY. I am under so much compulsion and pressure—

Mr. HAWKES. I am not trying to bring any pressure on the Senator, but I have asked him two or three times to let me make a brief statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have said to the Senator that as soon as we could pass on the question of fixing a time to vote I would yield to him.

Mr. HAWKES. I desire to speak to that question after I refer to an aspersion made on my character by a newspaper editorial.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know anything about the editorial.

Mr. HAWKES. Someone knows about it, and I want to find out who he is.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to have a ruling on this question as soon as I can. Mr. President, I renew my request that the Senate vote not later than Monday at 3 o'clock on all reservations then pending and not adopted and on the treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

Mr. HAWKES. I object.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator asked me to yield to him, yet he has just objected.

Mr. HAWKES. I had to object. The Senator, it seemed to me, was trying to put something over.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator had my assurance that as soon as we passed on the pending matter I would yield to him.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I inquire what is pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request for unanimous consent.

Mr. HATCH. That has been objected to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the reservation proposed by the Senator from Texas on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the pending Mexican Water Treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey, as I told him all

the time I would yield as soon as we could obtain action on the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, it is amazing to me that this great body seems to think it is more important to ratify the Mexican Water Treaty before the meeting of the San Francisco Conference than it is to protect the interests and the rights of the American people. I cannot understand it. I am in favor of ratifying this treaty before the San Francisco Conference is held if we can do it intelligently and know what we are doing, but I certainly shall not vote to ratify the treaty if it is to be rushed through the Senate in great haste so that it may repose on the table at San Francisco. I insist that the Senate should act wisely and well, because the treaty will be the supreme law of the land and will live in perpetuity, unless the Mexican people agree to change it. I am one of those who do not wish to act in haste and repent at leisure, and I do not propose to be placed in that position.

Now, let me say, Mr. President, that I believe my colleagues in the Senate are entitled to know what I am about to say. In the Washington Post of April 11 there appeared an editorial which was inspired by the distinguished majority leader's statement about absenteeism in the Senate, and Senators failing to fulfill their duty and failing to be on the job. The newspaper editorial ascribes motives to me which I wish to discuss frankly before the Senate. I cannot believe that a man like Mr. Eugene Meyer, who is the publisher of the Washington Post, would knowingly lend himself to a statement such as was made in the Post editorial yesterday.

Let me read it:

In recent days, when our inter-American unity has been awaiting a test on the vote on the Mexican water treaty, they—

The Senators—

have been compelled to listen to the specious and long-winded opposition of Senators DOWNEY and HAWKES.

Mr. President, what statement could be more ridiculous and absurd than that? My constituents back home are all the time asking me why I do not talk on the floor of the Senate. There is not a Senator in this Chamber today who can say I have ever been long-winded or specious. If there is one, I should like to have him rise and say it. I give him a chance.

Let me read further:

Senator DOWNEY thinks that on the ruins of pan-Americanism he can protect the dreams of California.

All the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] wants to do, and all I want to do, and all every decent American should want to do, is to protect the contracts and the compacts which have been made with our States, public agencies, and private citizens, under the authority of this great Government which we represent here as the elected representatives of the people back home.

I will ask Senators to listen to this, if they want to hear something strange:

Senator HAWKES has his Californian landholding son-in-law to think about.

Mr. President, my colleagues are entitled to know that my son-in-law never had a dollar's worth of real-estate property in his life. He is just a young man who is trying to make a living. He does not even own the house in which he lives. I own it. And with the exception of that house in Pasadena, I do not own a dollar's worth of real-estate property west of New Jersey. Think of this newspaper trying to smear me and reduce my power in the Senate in working for what I believe to be right.

I know the Members of the Senate do not believe for one moment that the discussions we have had have not aided us in thinking more wisely. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has submitted a series of reservations, although the treaty in its original form as reported from the committee by the distinguished Senator from Texas was supposed to be ready for ratification without change. The debate which has been had in this body, participated in by numerous Senators, has tended to bring about clarity and produce a better understanding of the treaty and its meaning. I do not hesitate to say that even yet there are very few Members of the Senate who understand all the implications of the treaty.

I do not intend to call names. I could say this editorial was a deliberate lie. I could say it was an inspired editorial, as some of my friends have said. Some of them have even named the lawyer connected with the Boundary Commission who was in the editor's office the day before the editorial appeared. I shall not touch on that.

President Lincoln made a very wonderful statement, which I leave with the Senate, when he said:

I do not have the time to read, much less the time to answer, all the attacks that are made upon me. If I did so, this shop might just as well be closed for any other business. I am doing the best I know how, the very best I can, and I intend to keep on doing so to the end, knowing that if what I do turns out all right, I shall need no defense, whereas if what I do turns out wrong, the angels swearing that I was right would make no difference.

Mr. President, that is a pretty good philosophy. I am going to give Mr. Meyer a chance to apologize for his editorial.

I am telling my colleagues—not with venom or bitterness at all, for the world is on fire and I do not wish to add to its intensity—that if we are to have peace, it must be founded in truth and justice.

I should like to say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Texas, and my very good friend, whom I respect very highly, that I have offered two reservations to the treaty. I have not heard anything from him about them, even though I appeared before the subcommittee yesterday. The two reservations, I believe, should be acceptable to any legislator and any American citizen. At least I have no doubt of my ability to convince the people on the subject.

The first reservation would clear up the point about who has the right to declare a drought in this country. Under the treaty as now framed, the American Commissioner has the right to declare

there is surplus water so that we can give Mexico 200,000 additional acre-feet. Inasmuch as we have made it possible for three-fourths of the water we are giving to Mexico to be available at all, why should we not have the right to declare when there is a drought and not leave that question open? The State Department says it is clear; that it is intended or that "it is assumed"—those being the words—that we have the right. I ask why leave it to assumption?

I wish to read the reservation:

With the understanding, as a part of this ratification—

That the fact of existence of extraordinary drought, the reduction of consumptive uses in the United States attributable thereto, and of all other factors interfering with the delivery to Mexico of water of the Colorado River under the last paragraph of article 10 of this treaty shall be determined by the United States Section.

Mr. President, this reservation merely says what the State Department tells the Committee on Foreign Relations in its hearings is assumed to be a fact. Why leave the question open, subject to argument and disagreement, perhaps to be decided by an international arbitration court, when it is so easy to clear it up? If the State Department testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations is correct—and I sat in the meeting and heard it—if we are honestly informed, as I assume we are, then I say to the Senate let us make the meaning clear.

I also have a reservation which it seems to me every American citizen and every Member of the Senate should favor. The reservation is designed to protect those who have relied upon compacts and contracts with the Government of the United States. If we cannot protect our own citizens, if we cannot keep faith with our own States and our own public agencies and our own citizens, then I ask what right a foreign power has to rely upon our good faith under any treaty we may make with such foreign power when it suits our convenience to break it, and we have the power to break it. The reservation reads:

With the understanding, as a part of this ratification—

That nothing in this treaty shall impair or require violation of any valid compact or contract heretofore made by the United States, with its States, public agencies, or citizens.

That is all there is to it—that we will not impair or violate any contract. Suppose I make a contract with some of my colleagues, or tell them they can rely upon something, and they do rely upon it, and then when I am making a contract with another group I say that the second contract will not cause me to fail to fulfill my contract with my colleagues. It is just a matter of keeping faith.

Mr. President, I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Texas tell us how he feels about the two reservations; but I wish to state very frankly that unless they are acted upon by the Senate my objection to a vote on Monday at 3 o'clock p. m. will stand.

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

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMITH. As the colleague of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey, I wish to state to the Senate that I had overlooked the editorial to which he has just referred, and I am deeply shocked by it. I have known the Senator for many years, and to attribute such motives to him is absolutely inexcusable.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

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

Mr. HAWKES. I will yield in a moment; but before doing so I wish to say that while I appreciate the remarks of my colleague, and receive them with a sense of appreciation, I have a very definite feeling in my heart that there is not a Senator in this Chamber, on either side of the aisle, who does not know that I would not have been standing in the Senate advocating these things in connection with the treaty if I had one dollar's worth of interest in it, directly or indirectly, or if any member of my family had one dollar's worth of interest affected by the treaty, directly or indirectly, or if any friend of mine, to my knowledge, had an interest which would be affected by the treaty directly or indirectly.

Mr. President, I want to make the statement so specific that there can be no question about it. Of course, this is merely the same kind of a smear, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, which the New Deal wished on me from the day I was elected. They threatened to investigate me, but never came near me. The very day I was nominated they began to threaten me in the newspapers. My answer was, "Come and see the records. They are all here waiting for you, and I am also." They never came near me, but the smear continued for 2 years. The report of the Senate committee was delayed month after month; but when it was made to the Senate, I was found to be fully white and pure.

Mr. President, we now have something to think about. I am not talking about this matter because I am angry. I am talking about it because we in America who believe in what we have had must stand up for honesty and truth and must stand together.

I should like to leave with the Senate the little thought that in the testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee the attorney general of the State of California produced evidence showing that W. O. Jenkins, who, on February 26, 1918, was appointed American consular agent at Pueblo, Mexico, holding that position until November 30, 1930, when the Pueblo office was closed and he handed in his resignation, and who is now a citizen of Mexico, together with his associates—and I know of no one in this body who knows who his associates are; at least I do not—apparently bought 550,000 acres of land in Mexico from the syndicate of which Mr. Chandler, of the Los Angeles Times, was a member, at a price of from 50 to 75 cents an acre. If any Senator knows anything about what that 50-cent-an-acre property is worth when water is placed on it 3 feet deep a year, he will wonder, as I do, who Jenkins is and who are Jenkins' associates.

Senators, why be hurried into ratifying this treaty, which will live forever if we keep faith, and unless Mexico lets us out—and I will guarantee Mexico will not let us out. Let us consider the treaty carefully. Let us make the treaty wisely so we can live with it. Let us make it on a basis which will satisfy the people of the United States, who are looking only for justice. Let us make it on a basis which will promote peace and good will.

I should be delighted, Mr. President, if the senior Senator from Texas would tell me how he feels respecting my two reservations. If he does not wish to do so at the moment, I ask that my objection stand as it is, and it will stand positively until the Senate has considered these matters. I shall have much more to say about why we, as the representatives of the people of the various States of the American Union, should be as keenly alert to protect the interests of the people of the United States as we are to play Santa Clause and make foreign nations happy, and try to buy their friendship, and make them into good neighbors by being extravagantly generous at the expense of our own people.

Will the Senator from Texas give me his comments at the moment?

MR. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that at the moment I should not care to undertake to discuss the reservations as an interruption of the Senator's address. They will be discussed by some Member of the Senate on this side before debate is concluded. I wish to say that I have no sympathy with attacks in the press upon the conduct of the Senator from New Jersey. I knew nothing about them one way or the other.

MR. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator raise his voice?

MR. CONNALLY. I said, Mr. President, that I have no sympathy with the attack in the press to which the Senator from New Jersey referred. I knew nothing about it until after it was printed in the press. I myself did not even read it. Someone called it to my attention. Of course, neither the Foreign Relations Committee nor any member of the committee had anything whatever to do with such a report.

MR. HAWKES. Mr. President, I want to emphasize and reemphasize the point I made when I began to speak, that there is no hurry in the world about ratifying the treaty. According to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, negotiations about the matter have been proceeding for 40 years and work on this document has been under way for several years. The Mexican Legislature, which must ratify the treaty, will not be in session until September 10. I plead with the Members of this body not to be rushed into taking action so that this treaty may be in San Francisco by April 25, and then be sorry about it the rest of their lives and be criticized, possibly, by some of our returning soldiers to whom we may wish to allocate land in these arid regions, and then have them find out there is no water; that we have simply sent them out to a desert.

Mr. President, I know the section of country which would be affected by the

treaty. I am not just a wayfarer who wandered into California once upon a time. I have been going there for 44 years. I have seen the development of the great city of Phoenix, Ariz., from nothing but a town with sand roads into a beautiful city. I also know what water means. It is more precious than gold. One can eat what grows out of the ground if there is the magic combination of water and sunshine. Crops which grow from the ground can be eaten, but gold cannot be.

MR. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. HAWKES. I yield.

MR. McCARRAN. I understood the Senator to propound a question to the Senator from Texas respecting his two reservations. I further understood the Senator from Texas to state that the matter would be discussed later on, but that he did not agree to accept the reservations. Have I correctly stated what occurred?

MR. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Texas should be expected to rise in the Senate and say, "Yes, we will accept the reservations," without giving them some consideration. I am frank to say that at the moment I am not agreeable to accepting them.

MR. McCARRAN. The reservations came before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations and were discussed before the subcommittee. I wonder if any action was taken by the subcommittee respecting the reservations?

MR. HAWKES. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the subcommittee, is present.

MR. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee authorized the chairman of the committee to offer in connection with the resolution of ratification certain reservations, and the chairman of the committee did offer those reservations to the Senate. Then the question arose whether those reservations might be improved or might be changed or modified in any way that would be helpful to other Members of the Senate who had certain objections to the treaty. A subcommittee was appointed. I was designated as chairman. I believe the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was designated as a member. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] was also designated as a member of the subcommittee. The Senator from Kentucky did not serve, because it was necessary for him to be present on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Florida sat with the other members of the subcommittee for about 2 hours yesterday.

The subcommittee went over the reservations offered by the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, which the full committee had authorized him to offer as committee amendments; but it did not consider that it had any jurisdiction to accept or reject any other reservation which might be submitted by any Senator. The particular matter covered in the two reservations offered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] was not covered by

any one of the reservations offered by the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Texas. Therefore, we were of the opinion that we had no jurisdiction either to reject them or accept them, our sole duty being to consider the amendments which had been authorized as committee amendments, for the purpose of perfecting them, if we could, or so modifying them as to bring about an agreement. I am happy to say that we succeeded, with respect to two or three of the controversial reservations, in so modifying them as to obtain an agreement, which has already been announced on the floor today by the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. We did not, therefore, affirmatively pass upon the two reservations which the Senator from New Jersey has offered. However, he can, of course, offer them to the treaty on the floor, and they can be discussed here.

The Senator is open-minded and very fair. I believe that on reflection he will see that the amendments, although they seem fair looked at from one point of view, could not be put in a treaty without really denying effectively the power of the Federal Government to negotiate treaties with foreign countries.

MR. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

MR. HAWKES. Let me say to my very distinguished colleague from Georgia that if what he has just stated is true, I could never agree to any treaty. In other words, if I were asked to approve a treaty which prevented me from saying that the Federal Government shall not breach its compacts or contracts with its own States and citizens, I could never consent to do so.

MR. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator does not quite understand what I am saying. If he will allow me to interpose, let me say that I regret the publication of anything in a newspaper which reflected upon him. He certainly knows that I am not responsible for it in any way.

MR. HAWKES. I certainly do; and I wish to have the RECORD show that I know the Senator is not responsible.

MR. GEORGE. I am not responsible and do not concur in it at all. I greatly deplore such reckless and unfounded statements regarding the Senator from New Jersey or any other Member of this body.

With respect to the merits of his reservations, two of which he submitted to the subcommittee, we did not reject them, for the reason which I have stated. We had no jurisdiction. We were not authorized to consider them, unless by way of amendment to one of the reservations offered by the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee. I have not before me now the two reservations. One of them relates to the question of who shall have the authority to say when an unusual or extraordinary drought occurs. Of course, that means in the United States. It means in the area from which the waters which form the Colorado River system come. I believe the Senator will find that the treaty

very definitely provides that any disputes which may arise shall be settled by the tribunal established under the terms of the treaty. We did have one amendment defining disputes as meaning disputes between the United States and Mexico, so as to remove any question which might have existed in the mind of anyone that the commission or other tribunal provided for under the treaty for the settlement of disputes would have any authority to settle disputes arising between any individual and the United States Government or the Mexican Government.

The situation is, as will be found by reading and studying the treaty, that if a dispute arose about a drought, namely, whether an extraordinary drought existed—and such a question is always a factual one, and there would be no way to preclude its consideration as such—the dispute would, of course, be determined upon the evidence obtained in this country. It would be obtained largely on the basis of our own records, on the basis of official findings by our own Government, because Mexico would have no jurisdiction to come into the United States and make a determination of the question. But if there were an actual dispute between the United States and Mexico, it would be a matter for diplomatic adjustment between the two Governments. If they could not adjust it, it would be a matter which would be settled, as all other disputes must necessarily be settled, by the two Governments whenever they have such disputes.

I should like to submit a question to the Senator, as a fair-minded Senator: Would he think a treaty would command itself to any other government if we were to say, "We propose to make a treaty with you, but we propose to have the exclusive right to make findings as to any disputed facts with reference to the treaty which we are proposing to make."

I think the Senator must agree that an attitude of that kind would preclude the possibility of ever agreeing to a treaty on any matter which depended, finally, upon a fact regarding an event which might subsequently occur.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, my distinguished friend the Senator from Georgia, asks me questions and then answers them himself. I am sure he is more able to answer many questions than I am; but I wish to say to the Senator, and I ask him not to forget it, that in the hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations, not only I but a number of other persons asked who would determine when there was an extraordinary drought. The answer from the State Department was, "We would"—in other words, the United States Commissioner.

I asked, "How can you prove that? Where is that provided for in the treaty?"

The witness for the State Department said, "It is assumed."

I said, "Let us not assume it."

I am only asking that the treaty be expressed in language so clear and precise that we will be able, so far as possible, to avoid disputes which would have to be submitted to arbitration, because I

know something about disputes which are made the subject of arbitration.

I do not think there is anything unfair about the request I have made. Unless someone is able to assure me that the matter is settled so that there will not be a dispute in the future over something which then will lie exclusively within our own country, I shall vote against the treaty.

Mr. GEORGE. I can understand that, if that is the attitude of the Senator, if he is really opposed to the treaty, of course.

Mr. HAWKES. I am not opposed to a treaty.

Mr. GEORGE. I assume that the Senator is not opposed to it.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I ask the Senator to consider frankly and candidly what his proposal amounts to. We are considering a condition, namely, an extraordinary drought in the United States, which, if occurring in the future, might greatly diminish the amount of water which we, under the pending treaty, would solemnly agree that Mexico should have under the treaty; but the Senator desires that we alone determine any questions in that connection.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, is the Senator forgetting what I have just stated, namely, that the State Department has said that we alone would settle it?

Mr. GEORGE. I assume it is meant that we alone will settle the question, in the sense that we will keep all the records, and that we will have in our country all the records regarding rainfall, the measurements of water, and similar data.

However, suppose that, notwithstanding, there is a dispute, and suppose that the amount of water Mexico will get—whether she will get any water or will get none or will get half the amount of water which is guaranteed—will depend upon the outcome of the determination of the dispute. If the Senator takes the attitude that we alone must settle a dispute of that kind which may arise in the future, then I think he is opposed to the treaty, because I do not think a treaty could be negotiated with any other country on that basis.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator at that point what he thinks is meant by the statement by the Department of State of the United States, as it was made before our Committee on Foreign Relations—

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have already said to the Senator that I think it would mean, and all it could mean would be that we would have in our possession all the data bearing upon the question whether an extraordinary drought had occurred. Our officials would have made all the measurements and would have obtained all the data. The only question would be as to a simple, factual finding based upon our data, upon the official findings of our own Government.

But if, beyond that, Mexico were to say, "Nevertheless, we dispute what you say; we contend that an extraordinary drought did not occur"—and of course I refer to such an occasion arising at

some time in the future, because we are dealing with the future—then there would be a dispute which could only be dealt with diplomatically by the two governments; and if the governments were not able to settle it or adjust it by means of the machinery set up by the treaty itself, the question would become the subject of arbitration, just as would any other question which could not be disposed of by other means.

The point I make is that I do not think the Senator is irrevocably opposed to the treaty. If he is not irrevocably opposed to the treaty, I do not see how he can insist that, upon the finding of a vital fact which will directly affect all the benefits which Mexico will receive under the treaty, we would not even consider with Mexico the question whether we were right or wrong in determining that fact. If that is to be our attitude we shall never have a treaty with Mexico or with any other government, I should say.

Therefore, I think the Senator, after taking a full view of the matter in the light of everything provided by the treaty, could not desire to insist that provision be made in the treaty that the United States would be the final judge with respect to such facts.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I wish to have my two reservations presented for action by the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that, of course. The Senator has a perfect right to present them.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his remarks; and think that he and I have a right to be the same good friends and still have a very distinct difference of opinion in regard to the matters which we have been discussing. After all, that is what we are fighting the war for, namely, to preserve the right to have and express difference of opinion. I do not think that the fact that I wish to have the treaty made clear indicates in any way that I do not wish to have a treaty. It means that I do not wish to have a treaty which will bring trouble, grief, and disputes to the United States of America. I wish to have a treaty which will preserve the rights of our citizens. I wish to have a treaty which will be made as clear as it is possible to make it with the proper use of the English language.

Mr. President, I have requested consideration of my reservations. I shall conclude by saying that I wish to have the reservations I have offered receive the same consideration which has been received by the reservations offered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate for 2 or 3 hours to keep an appointment with the Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the treaty (Executive A, 78th Cong.,

2d sess.), between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers, and (Executive H, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol supplementary to the treaty.

Mr. MCFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hatch	Moore
Bankhead	Hawkes	Murdock
Barkley	Hayden	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Connally	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Langer	Tunnell
Ferguson	McCarran	Vandenberg
Fulbright	McFarland	Wherry
George	McKellar	White
Gerry	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Magnuson	Wilson
Hart	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. WALSH answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. BARKLEY. 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 Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. MORSE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe that no State in the Colorado River Basin is more vitally affected by the Mexican Water Treaty than Arizona. We in Arizona have a high appreciation of the value of water and its proper and conservative use. I do not believe there is a State in the Union which has produced more with the amount of water available than has Arizona. With an average annual run-off of little more than a million and a half acre-feet in the Gila and Salt Rivers, Arizona citizens have placed into cultivation approximately 750,000 acres of land and have made the barren desert one of the garden spots of the world. In addition, Arizona has irrigated approximately 60,000 acres in the original Yuma project from the Colorado River and some other small areas along the Colorado River. And

there remain approximately 5,000,000 additional acres of fertile land which could be irrigated if only water were available. Our water rights date back to an early date. There are adjudicated rights on the Salt and Gila Rivers dating back to the 1860's.

I believe it is pertinent to review briefly here the history of irrigation in Arizona. The first dam for storage of water to be built in our State was the Roosevelt Dam, which has a storage capacity of approximately 1,637,000 acre-feet of water. Construction of Roosevelt Dam was begun in 1903 and was completed about 1910. Since that time three other dams have been constructed on the Salt River and two dams on the Verde River, a tributary of the Salt River. Thus, the total capacity of all reservoirs in the Salt River project is somewhat in excess of 2,000,000 acre-feet of water. Within the borders of the Salt River Valley project there are 242,000 acres of irrigated lands, producing crops valued in excess of \$30,000,000 annually. There are four other smaller projects near the Salt River Valley project, irrigated partly by gravity and partly by pumps. On the Gila River we have the San Carlos project which is a joint Indian-white project comprising some 100,000 acres irrigated from the Coolidge Dam, which has a storage capacity of 1,200,000 acre-feet of water. Upstream from this project, there is the upper Gila project of about 50,000 acres which is dependent entirely upon the normal flow of the river and not upon stored water. Finally, we have a large 100,000 acre project in the Casa Grande Valley, irrigated solely by pumped water.

But here again, we are in the same position as many other irrigation projects in the west—our water supply simply cannot keep up with our agricultural and horticultural development. The Salt River project alone, for example, has grown from 100,000 acres to approximately 242,000 acres since the construction of the Roosevelt Dam. And, while in the past we have been able to save crops and maintain our economy by pumping water, this source of water supply is being rapidly depleted. We are, in fact, overpumping; we are constantly lowering the underground water level, and are reaching the stage where it is becoming uneconomic to continue to pump water at greater and greater depths. It is plain that in Arizona we shall be forced to reduce the number of acre-feet of water pumped each year. This simply means that acreage already cultivated and prosperous will again have to become a part of the desert unless we in Arizona can supplement our water supply from another source—and the only remaining source is the Colorado River.

At recent hearings in the West before an Irrigation and Reclamation Committee subcommittee, of which I happen to be chairman, testimony was given summarizing the amounts of additional water needed by the various Arizona projects. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a brief table covering this aspect of the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Summary

Project	Area	Supplemental water	Reduced pumping
BELOW ELEVATION 1,300 FEET			
1. Salt River Valley Water Users Association	Acres 245,000	Acre-feet 250,000	Acre-feet 50,000
2. Roosevelt water conservation district	40,000	75,000	50,000
3. Roosevelt irrigation district	40,000	90,000	70,000
4. Maricopa County municipal water conservation district	35,000	70,000	15,000
5. Buckeye irrigation district	20,000	30,000	15,000
6. Gillespie Water Co.	20,000	50,000	15,000
7. Marinetta and Bumstead lands	20,000	40,000	20,000
8. Southwest Cotton Co.	12,000	25,000	10,000
9. Gila River Indians	50,000	75,000	None
10. Upper Gila lands	50,000	75,000	None
11. Deer Valley	5,000	15,000	10,000
Total	537,000	795,000	255,000
BELOW ELEVATION 1,520 FEET			
12. San Carlos irrigation district	50,000	75,000	None
9. Queen Creek area	15,000	30,000	15,000
17. Magma area	7,000	15,000	5,000
Total	600,000	915,000	275,000
BELOW ELEVATION 1,575 FEET			
13. Electric district No. 2	40,000	80,000	40,000
Total	649,000	995,000	315,000
BELOW ELEVATION 1,700 FEET			
14. Electric district No. 4	40,000	80,000	40,000
15. White electric district	35,000	50,000	20,000
Total	724,000	1,125,000	375,000

NOTE.—Supplemental water required is net at head of district's canal system.

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

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield for that purpose?

Mr. MCFARLAND. No; I do not yield for that purpose. I thought the Senator from North Dakota wanted to insert some matter into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona declines to yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, it is clear from this summarization that central Arizona needs a minimum of additional 1,125,000 acre-feet of water above and beyond what is now being obtained from irrigation reservoirs and by means of pumping. It will be noted the State must reduce its present water-pumping supply by at least 375,000 acre-feet of water in order to prevent the lowering of the underground water table to the stage where it will become uneconomic to maintain further pumping.

Stated in another way, if central Arizona is unable to supplement its present water supply by an additional 1,125,000 to 1,500,000 acre-feet, we will experience a situation whereby farmers will have to move off the land, and lands once fertile and productive will go back to desert

wastes. Arizona is an agricultural State; its economy rests largely on the welfare of its farmers and the productivity of its lands. Reduce the water supply and you reduce the tillable land. This relation between water and our economy is already hanging by too narrow a thread; cut it only by the slightest amount and our agriculture will not be able to support our cities and towns.

I am not overdramatizing the situation. I am stating plain facts which people who are not familiar with this question between water and land in desert areas find hard to understand. We in Arizona face a most serious problem. We have looked forward to the time when we could utilize the much-needed Colorado River water—a lifesaver for our people. We have looked forward to that day, not alone because we need additional water for present projects but because in Arizona we have hundreds of thousands of additional acres of the finest land in the world, waiting only for water to produce abundantly, land which will make ideal homes for the veterans of this and the last war.

I think that the Senate should understand that it is somewhat incongruous for some of us to stand here before our own people and plead for a share of what is ours, particularly in these times. After all, I am not speaking for Arizona alone, or for Arizona's citizens alone. I am concerned with Arizona's problems, of course; it is my duty to present her peoples' case here as forcibly as I can. But we in the United States find ourselves facing a food shortage. A Senate committee is investigating food shortages; a House committee is doing the same; the O. P. A. is conducting a full-scale investigation of the same subject. On all sides we hear the cry to produce more agricultural commodities, more livestock. We must help feed the world, our President tells us. Well and good. But how are we going to do that if we take away from our States the ability to increase food production? In speaking here for Arizona and her legitimate requirements for additional water, I am not speaking for Arizona alone; I am, I hope, speaking for the welfare of our United States and their economy, and their ability to produce more and more to feed and clothe our own people and the stricken people of other parts of the world.

I do not believe there is a single Colorado River Basin State which can now or will in the future be able to more profitably use the waters of the Colorado River than Arizona. Moreover, Arizona has a fair and equitable claim to share in these waters. It was testified during the hearings on the treaty that the total drainage basin of the Colorado River is 244,000 square miles. Let us see how that drainage basin is divided:

Mexico has 2,000 square miles—the smallest area in the basin from which practically no water reaches the river.

California has 4,000 square miles, the smallest of any State in the basin from which practically no water reaches the river.

Nevada has 12,000 square miles; Wyoming has 19,000 square miles; New Mexico has 23,000 square miles; Colo-

rado has 39,000 square miles; Utah has 40,000 square miles; and Arizona has 103,000 square miles. Thus Arizona has 43 percent of the total area of the entire Colorado River Basin—in short, almost half the entire basin is in Arizona and more than 90 percent of Arizona is within the Colorado River Basin. And may I add, to emphasize the Federal Government's interest in looking out for Arizona's interests, that more than 74 percent of the land in Arizona is owned by the Federal Government.

These are facts, not fancies. I cite them, not because I claim that Arizona's vast area within the basin means that she furnishes the most water to the Colorado—Arizona does not—but rather because they are compelling statistics in consideration of the equities in allocating the waters of the Colorado River.

The Colorado River rises in Colorado and flows in that State for a distance of 245 miles, thence in Utah for a distance of 285 miles, thence in Arizona for a distance of 292 miles. From that point it forms the boundary between Arizona and Nevada for a distance of 145 miles, thence the boundary between Arizona and California for a distance of 235 miles, thence to form the boundary between Arizona and the United States of Mexico for a distance of 16 miles, and from that point for 75 miles it flows through the Republic of Mexico into the Gulf of Lower California.

Thus, the Colorado River runs through and as a boundary of Arizona for a total distance of 527 miles, as compared to 235 miles as only a boundary of California. This fact, coupled with the larger water basin in Arizona, certainly gives Arizona a greater right to the waters of the Colorado River than our sister State of California. Yet California up to date has received by far the greater portion of the benefits from the Colorado River.

I do not mean by this that I have any fault to find with the fact that California has fought hard to get every drop of water possible from the Colorado River, and especially do I not have any fault to find with the able Senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who has an enviable record in his fight to develop the use of the Colorado River for the benefit of his State. He has served California well. He has fought hard and I have the greatest respect for him and for his ability, as I do for the Junior Senator of that State [Mr. DOWNEY], who also is making a splendid record and a very hard fight against the treaty. But I mention these matters because I want the Senate of the United States to understand that we in Arizona are just as much interested in this problem as is California; that we need every drop of water possible just as much as do our neighbors in the State of California.

Therefore, when I take a different position on some of the issues of this fight, it is because of my conviction, after long and deliberate study, of the soundness of my position.

However, I am sure that we can at least agree upon this much, that the lower-basin States lose more from the allocation of water to Mexico under this treaty than do the upper-basin States. The reason is simply that under the

Colorado River compact the amount of water allocated to Mexico under this treaty must first be supplied from the surplus waters, and then, if there is any deficit in the allocation, the deficit would have to be made up equally by the upper and lower-basin States. But the surplus water from which Mexico is to receive her allocation is water for which Arizona, California, and Nevada have a contract; Arizona has a contract for 2,800,000 acre-feet of 3-A water, plus one-half of the surplus water less one-twenty-fifth which is contracted for by the State of Nevada; California has contracts for 5,362,000 acre-feet—4,400,000 acre-feet of 3-A water and 962,000 acre-feet of the surplus water, which I understand is estimated to be California's half of the surplus as provided for under the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the California Exclusion Act. The important thing is that these surplus waters which will have to be used under the compact to supply Mexico with whatever amount may be granted her, are waters which California and Arizona have expected to use.

According to the testimony of the Government engineers, the surplus will be adequate to supply the water guaranteed under the Mexican Treaty. So it is perfectly natural that the upper basin States would be easier to satisfy with the Mexican Treaty than are the lower basin States. After all, if the engineers are correct, the upper basin States will not lose any water by the treaty, while the lower basin States stand to lose vast amounts of water.

Mr. Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, testified with respect to the records of the flow of the river since 1897, and stated that the average original flow at the international boundary is approximately 17,750,000 acre-feet. As agricultural and economic developments in the Colorado Basin area increased and with future developments projects, conflicts arose between the affected States as to the proper division of the waters of the Colorado River. It was these conflicts that brought about the signing of the Colorado River compact in 1922. By this agreement 7,500,000 acre-feet were apportioned permanently to the upper basin area above Lees Ferry, a point on the river near the Utah border, and 7,500,000 acre-feet were apportioned to the lower basin States. In addition, however, the lower basin States were given the right to increase their use by 1,000,000 acre-feet annually. This was done to reciprocate for the flow of the Gila River system in Arizona, representing approximately the amount of the water delivered by the Gila River and its tributaries to the Colorado. So the original allocation of water by the compact amounted to 16,000,000 acre-feet.

This proposed Mexican Treaty would give Mexico the right to use 1,500,000 acre-feet of water, which would, under Mr. Bashore's figures, practically complete the allocation of all the waters of the Colorado River. The engineers' figures may vary a little as to estimates of water available. But, if we accept Mr. Bashore's figures, California cannot expect more than the original 4,400,000

acre-feet of consumptive use, nor Arizona more than 2,800,000 acre-feet of consumptive use, plus the waters in the Gila River system, and when we view the immediate and prospective needs of central Arizona to supplement the water supply for the lands already in cultivation and hundreds of thousands of acres of additional lands which could be placed into cultivation, it must be clear why the citizens of Arizona are seriously concerned.

Of course, some of the engineers, including Mr. Tipton, estimate there will be some surplus. We in Arizona certainly hope so, because I believe it is obvious that the 2,800,000 acre-feet of water allocated to us will not begin to meet the needs of Arizona. This much is clear and beyond dispute—if there is to be a surplus it will be small indeed. Therefore, to be completely realistic and practical, we should in our consideration of the treaty and its effect on the States of the Colorado Basin, accept the consensus that whatever surplus there may be will be of no material concern.

Let us analyze the provisions of the treaty and the objections made to it to determine whether it is desirable that it be approved. I am, of course, confining my remarks to the provisions of the treaty in regard to the Colorado River, for Texas and New Mexico are in accord in their approval of the provisions as they relate to the Rio Grande River.

Mr. President, in analyzing the proposed treaty with Mexico to determine whether the Senate should advise and consent to its ratification, it is my opinion that the first and most important question is how much water Mexico is entitled to from the Colorado River. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate had long and exhaustive hearings upon this subject.

An Attorney General of the United States, Judson Harmon, in a letter in the year 1895 stated that the United States owed no obligation to a lower riparian state; that a state exercised exclusive sovereignty over the waters within its own borders. However, it was recognized by all of the witnesses in the hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, both those opposing and supporting the treaty, that Mexico, as a matter of equity and comity, is entitled to some of the waters of the Colorado River. There were those who contended that Mexico should be limited to the maximum use before the construction of the Boulder Dam, but all agreed that the Republic of Mexico is entitled to some water.

The question then naturally arises, if, because of comity between nations the United States must permit water to go down the Colorado River for use in Mexico, by what yardstick should we measure the waters to which Mexico is equitably entitled? Personally, I believe that in equity the proper yardstick to use is the determination of how much, under the laws of prior appropriation, the laws of the States involved, would Mexico be entitled to receive under the facts as they exist. It is, of course, admitted that this question must be settled by treaty or by arbitration.

I will discuss the matter of arbitration a little later. It is conceded that the

maximum use of water by Mexico at the time the Boulder Dam was built was 750,000 acre-feet a year, delivered at her laterals, and, I believe the testimony shows that over a period of time—the preceding years—the average was about 600,000 acre-feet. At any rate, under the law of prior appropriation, we must admit that Mexico had appropriated to beneficial use 750,000 acre-feet of water, delivered at her laterals. It is contended by some that Mexico should be limited to this amount of water under any treaty negotiated between our respective nations. On the other hand, there was testimony to the effect that Mexico diverted and used 1,805,000 acre-feet in the year 1943. If this amount was diverted by Mexico in the year 1943, the next question is whether under the law of prior appropriation Mexico established a right to the use of this amount of water.

The argument has been made that Mexico could not have diverted this amount of water had it not been for the building of the Boulder Dam. The Government engineers testified they could. This is an engineering question. As to the availability of water, that is also an engineering question. I would refer to the testimony of Mr. Tipton on page 1195 of the hearings, in which he stated:

Under natural-flow conditions with the development in the United States, as it was immediately preceding the placing in operation of Boulder Dam and for such a period of run-off as 1902 to 1940, there would have been sufficient water in the river each year, so far as quantity is concerned, to have provided Mexico with 1,500,000 acre-feet. However, the seasonal distribution would not have been parallel in all years with the seasonal distribution of the 1,500,000 acre-feet, in accordance with the manner in which Mexico is using water.

Also, on page 1196, he gave further testimony along this line. Mr. President, I will not read this testimony in full, but I ask unanimous consent that page 1196 of the hearings be incorporated at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

For 26 years of a 39-year period, 1902 to 1940, the maximum deviation from an assumed ideal requirement would have been 1 percent or less per annum.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Were you there in 1902?

Mr. TIPTON. No, sir; I was not, sir.

There would have been 7 years when the deviation would have been greater than 5 percent, 5 years when it would have been greater than 10 percent, and 2 years when it would have been greater than 15 percent. The same conditions were to some extent true with respect to the lack of parallelism between the water supply and the requirements of the Imperial irrigation district.

An analysis was made of the records of run-off at Yuma. Those records were adjusted for increased uses that had taken place upstream during the period of record. The Gila River flow was entirely eliminated, because it is largely unusable on account of its flashy character. It was found that after taking care of the Imperial irrigation district and taking care of the 1,500,000 acre-feet of the Mexican area and the Imperial irrigation district, whose requirements was assumed of 2,500,000 acre-feet, there would have remained in the stream a very substantial quantity of water, ranging from a minimum amount in

1934, which was the lowest year of record, of only 4,000 acre-feet, to a maximum of 19,000,000 acre-feet. The next lowest year was 1940. Three million six hundred thousand acre-feet would have remained in the stream unused in that year.

I wish to correct my statement. The next low year would have been 1902, when there would have been 2,625,000 acre-feet remaining unused.

The shortages to the Mexican area, assuming the conditions that I have described, would have been as follows:

In 1902, 432,000 acre-feet—understand, when I say shortages, it is the lack of parallelism between the flow in the stream and the requirements—1903, 62,000 acre-feet; 1904, 15,000 acre-feet; 1905, 18,000 acre-feet; there were no shortages in 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909; 1910, 47,000 acre-feet; 1911, no shortage; 1912, no shortage; 1913, 1,000 acre-feet; 1914, no shortage; 1915, 31,000 acre-feet; 1916, 1917, and 1918, no shortages; 1919, 14,000 acre-feet; 1920, 1921, 1922, and 1923, no shortages; 1924, 152,000 acre-feet; 1925, no shortages; 1926, 29,000 acre-feet; 1927, no shortage; 1928, 13,000 acre-feet; 1929 and 1930, no shortages; 1931, 228,000 acre-feet; 1932, no shortage; 1933, 87,000 acre-feet; 1934, 673,000 acre-feet; 1935 and 1936, none; 1937, 42,000 acre-feet; 1938, none; 1939, 173,000 acre-feet; and 1940, 194,000 acre-feet.

I wish to call attention to the fact that this analysis was made on a monthly basis, and within many of these months there could have been a shortage on a daily basis. The river could have been dry or substantially less than the momentary requirement. I wish to call attention to the fact, however, that plants are tolerant. They live off the soil moisture, whether they get the water required today or next week; so long as it is in the soil from a previous application of water the plants will subsist.

Shortages as great as these and much greater exist under many large canal systems in the upper basin. So it is my opinion that Mexico could have diverted and carried on successful irrigation requiring the diversion of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water prior to Boulder, with uses in the United States as they were immediately prior to Boulder.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, the substance of Mr. Tipton's testimony is to the effect that Mexico could have diverted and carried on successful irrigation requiring the diversion of more than 1,500,000 acre-feet of water prior to the construction of Boulder Dam, with uses in the United States as they were immediately prior to Boulder. Other engineers testified there was sufficient water of the Colorado River after the building of Boulder Dam for Mexico to establish a right to 1,800,000 acre-feet in the year 1943.

If water was available, was there anything in the building of the Boulder Dam which prevented Mexico from establishing a right to the use of this water? I do not believe that anyone would seriously contend that the building of the Boulder Dam, the Parker Dam, and even the Davis Dam, which was authorized before this treaty was negotiated, would appropriate sufficient waters to prevent lower users from establishing a definite water right to 1,800,000 acre-feet of water, even assuming that the construction of these dams carried with it an appropriation of all the waters for all of the lands for which they were intended to irrigate. This is so because of the 7,500,000 acre-feet of water allotted to the upper basin States, only 1,952,000 acre-feet have been placed to beneficial use, and when the present construction is

completed for the diversion of waters in the upper basin States, the total diversion will be 2,624,000 acre-feet, which leaves a remaining amount of 4,876,000 acre-feet which no one could contend had been appropriated under the law of prior appropriation. Of course, there are plans to put these waters to beneficial use, just as we have plans to put all the water in the lower basin States to beneficial use, but Mexico was not a party in the Colorado compact and would not be bound by it. Therefore, so far as Mexico is concerned even if we conceded that the building of the lower dams was an appropriation of all of the waters to which we are entitled under the Colorado River compact, there still is not an appropriation of the balance of the waters in the upper basin States as against someone not a party to the compact.

So I believe it is plain that if Mexico were a State in the United States, its users would have, under the doctrine of prior appropriation, established a beneficial use of this amount of water. This is on the premise that we accept testimony of the engineers that the waters were available from the normal flow of the river, since the whole of the Colorado River has not been appropriated and put to beneficial use.

Personally, I want to see Mexico held to the lowest possible amount of water. I feel that it is my duty and the duty of the United States Senate to see that such a policy is adopted for the protection of the rights of the people—not only of the State of Arizona, but of the entire Colorado River Basin.

It is the duty of our Government to insist upon the protection of the rights of these citizens, but in determining what is right, we must, of course, take into consideration the rights of other nations and we must recognize that those nations will some day assert their rights.

It has been stated by those who favor the treaty that we would be forced to arbitrate this question of water rights under the Inter-American Arbitration Treaty which was signed on behalf of the United States in 1929 and ratified by the Senate in 1935. Article 1 of the Arbitration Treaty provides as follows:

The high contracting parties bind themselves to submit to arbitration all differences of an international character which have arisen or may arise between them by virtue of a claim of right made by one against the other under treaty or otherwise, which it has not been possible to adjust by diplomacy and which are juridical in their nature by reason of being susceptible of decision by the application of the principles of law.

In article 2 it is provided that there are excepted from the terms of the treaty controversies "which are within the domestic jurisdiction of any of the parties to the dispute and are not controlled by international law."

Article 4 provides that "the parties to the dispute shall formulate by common accord, in each case, a special agreement which shall clearly define the particular subject-matter of the controversy, the seat of the court, the rules which will be observed in the proceedings, and the other conditions to which the parties may agree."

It is also provided that if an accord is not reached within 3 months the agreement should be formulated by the court. In connection with this article, I wish to point out that the United States made the following reservation:

That the special agreement in each case shall be made only by the President, and then only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Article 7 provides that an award settles the dispute definitely and without an appeal.

Mexico, at the time of the ratification, made the following reservation:

Mexico makes the reservation that differences which fall under the jurisdiction of the courts shall not form a subject of the procedure provided for by the convention, except in case of denial of justice, and until after the judgment passed by the competent national authority has been placed in the class of res judicata.

I am of the opinion that if requested we would have to submit this question for arbitration.

On the other hand, those opposing the ratification of the Mexican water treaty contend that questions under it would not have to be submitted for arbitration under the arbitration treaty because of the reservations which I have just quoted. Regardless of which position is correct, I think we must all recognize that our historic and present policy of taking a leading role in trying to bring about peaceful settlements of disputes between nations binds us morally to in some way fairly and equitably settle this question. Whether it be by treaty or by a board of arbitration or by some international court of justice that might be set up in the future for the settlement of such disputes is beside the point.

We cannot, and must not, assume the role of being a powerful Nation which expects to maintain by force anything that is not equitable and just. Nor would the people of the United States want our Government to assume such a position. On the other hand, none of us wants to give away a single right belonging to our people.

But as I have pointed out before, the question we must decide is what is right, what is equitable, and what, in the name of comity, Mexico is entitled to in the settlement of the rights of the Colorado River. As I analyze the testimony, I wish to point out that the Department of State and the engineers representing the Government of the United States have made a record before the Foreign Relations Committee which could be used effectively against the United States at any future date this matter might come up for settlement through arbitration or otherwise.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me that the point which the Senator has made with respect to the law of arbitration cannot be repeated too often on the floor of the

Senate in connection with this important debate. Candidly, it is one of the controlling forces which finally caused me to make up my mind to support the treaty. After listening to the testimony before the committee day after day and analyzing it, I reached the very definite conclusion that in the very near future the United States must in some way settle the great questions relating to water which now exist between Mexico and our Government.

I agree with the Senator that unless we settle those questions by treaty at this time, we shall be morally bound to submit them to arbitration for final settlement. In my opinion, if we should refuse to arbitrate them, we would stand before the world in a bad light.

That point has been made over and over again; the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and other Senators have made it. To me it is one of the controlling factors. In other words, this question must be settled either by means of a treaty or through arbitration.

So far as I am concerned, the evidence before the committee is fairly definite, conclusive, and clear that we would obtain more through the treaty which is now pending before the Senate for ratification than we would be able to obtain through arbitration. That is the testimony, and I think it is conclusive. I refer to the testimony of witnesses who had no particular interest in the controversy one way or the other. The testimony along that line which I followed was given by two or three witnesses. I considered their testimony to be absolutely fair and impartial, and not colored in any way from the standpoint of interest in California, Utah, Arizona, or any other State. To me it is one of the most important considerations in the entire controversy, and I am glad that the able Senator from Arizona has touched upon it in the way he has. It cannot be repeated too often. Members of the Senate who read the testimony should view the question not only from the standpoint of the national aspect of the problem, but also from the standpoint of world interest, and from the standpoint of the settlement of the peace to come.

A Senator said a few minutes ago, as I recalled—I think it was the able senior Senator from New Jersey—that he hoped the treaty would not be approved before the delegates arrived at the San Francisco Conference. I wish to make an observation on that point. It seems to me that one thing the Senate should do is to act on the treaty before the San Francisco Conference meets. In my humble opinion, the delegates at the San Francisco Conference should know whether the Senate of the United States is going to ratify the treaty.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, since I was referred to?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MCFARLAND. When the Senator from Illinois concludes, I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I merely wish to correct a statement the Senator from Illinois just made. He said that I said I

hoped the Senate would not approve the treaty before the San Francisco Conference met. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask what the Senator did say.

Mr. HAWKES. I said I hoped the Senate would not approve the treaty without giving it very careful thought and consideration, just because it was desired to have it approved before April 25. That is a vastly different thing.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. HAWKES. I must object to having the Senator say that I said things which I did not say at all.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not do that; but I think I drew a fair inference from the statements the Senator made.

Mr. HAWKES. But the Senator can not think for me.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not attempt to do that.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator must not do that.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I would not do that. I would not wish to be in that category at all.

The Senator from New Jersey referred to the San Francisco Conference, and he left the impression with me that he hoped consideration of the treaty might continue until after the San Francisco Conference. I do not wish to have the treaty rushed through the Senate. Mr. President, but I think all Senators fairly well understand by now how they will vote on the treaty. It has been discussed for several weeks, and hearings on it were held for 6 or 8 weeks. I am of the honest opinion that the best thing the Senate could do would be to vote on the treaty one way or the other before the deliberations begin at approaching the San Francisco Conference. That is another reason why I should like to have the Senate vote on the reservations as expeditiously as possible.

I do not wish to have anything rushed through the Senate; but I undertake to say that if the Senate cannot ratify a treaty with Mexico by the two-thirds vote which is required under the Constitution of the United States, our delegates will go to the San Francisco Conference handicapped in the eyes of the rest of the world. Under those circumstances, the other delegates to the Conference will say, "If the Senate of the United States has taken 8 weeks in hearings before a committee to hear testimony and has taken 6 weeks or 8 weeks"—whatever the time may be—"in debate upon a proposed treaty between the United States and Mexico, and still the Senate cannot agree on it, what will the Senate do when it comes to consider the great problems involving the whole world when the peace treaty comes before it for ratification?"

No one can tell me that such delay on the part of the Senate will not leave in the minds of the delegates to the San Francisco Conference a doubt and a cloud regarding what the Senate will do. They will think of what happened in 1920, when the Senate debated the League of Nations, and finally killed it with reservations. That is exactly what will be said and thought by the delegates to the San Francisco Conference unless the Senate

makes some kind of decision one way or the other on the pending treaty. I hope the decision will be in favor of the treaty, as a matter of comity, good will, fairness, and equity, not only to the United States but also to Mexico, and as an instrumentality showing the way to the delegates at the San Francisco Conference. I hope the Senate of the United States will act favorably on the pending treaty between the two countries.

I am sorry to have trespassed upon the time of the Senator from Arizona. I thank him for permitting me to interrupt him.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for making a valuable contribution to my remarks upon the pending subject.

I wish to say to the Senate that, so far as I am concerned, I have not tried to rush consideration of the pending question. I do not believe it has been rushed. The treaty has been pending before the Senate for almost a year. The Committee on Foreign Relations held exhaustive hearings on it. The Senate has now been debating the treaty for days. I have arrived at my decision, after careful and deliberate study, and I believe that other Senators have arrived at their decisions. When Senators have done that, I believe it is important for us to make the decision at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. President, the point I was endeavoring to make was that I personally believe we are bound by the testimony of the Government witnesses and engineers in the hearings. I believe that any board of arbitration or any court would say, "The representatives of the Government of the United States testified at the hearings to certain facts, and we will not go beyond their testimony."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that the facts, as testified, are not disputed?

Mr. MFARLAND. I do not mean to say that the facts testified by the engineers from California are not disputed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I refer to other engineers as well.

Mr. MFARLAND. In reference to other engineers, I say that when engineers representing the Government of the United States testify to certain facts a board of arbitration or a court would not go beyond their testimony. If the able senior Senator from Nevada were a judge in a certain case, and if the issues as between two States or two nations were presented by representatives of those States or nations, and if the representatives of one of them testified to certain facts and representatives or engineers on the other side of the case testified to the same facts, would the Senator go behind those facts? Would he not bind that nation by the testimony of its own representatives?

Mr. McCARRAN. Most certainly not; and when the Senator from Arizona was serving as a judge in a court he would not have done anything of the kind either; it would be the last thing he would have done. The Senator would look for the truth in regard to all the facts, as he looked for it when he sat as a judge in a court. He did not take the testimony of the Government every time the Government testified, did he? I hope

he did not. If he did, he went wrong many a time.

Mr. MFARLAND. Let me say to the Senator that if those who represented a company—or in this case a nation—made certain definite admissions—

Mr. McCARRAN. Who made definite admissions?

Mr. MFARLAND. The representatives.

Mr. McCARRAN. The representatives of what?

Mr. MFARLAND. The representatives of whoever might be the litigants. In this case they would be representatives of the Government of the United States—our representatives. If our representatives testified to certain facts, their testimony would be accepted. The persons who are representing us have testified to these facts; there is no dispute as to them.

Mr. McCARRAN. They dispute among themselves. What is the use in referring to representatives of the Government? The Government is not in accord on this matter. The Bureau of Reclamation says that we do not now have sufficient water from the Colorado River to meet the necessities. Why say that the Government is in accord?

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I am talking about the facts which were testified to by the Government representatives.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator says that he would decide in favor of the Government against everything else, then I cannot argue with him.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not say that, as a matter of law, any court or board of arbitration would be bound to decide in any particular way. But the knowledge that our own engineers had testified to these facts would be very persuasive when presented before any board of arbitration or any court. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Nevada interprets the facts differently than I interpret them.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; but the Government engineers did not testify unanimously on what were considered to be the facts. Representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation testified contrary to the testimony of others, and stated that the river does not now have sufficient general flow to supply the necessities of the area which needs water. That statement was published, and it is now in the form of a Senate document.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Bureau of Reclamation was in favor of the treaty, was it not?

Mr. MFARLAND. Representatives from the Bureau so testified.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Bureau of Reclamation is in favor of the treaty. I may state further, in line with what the distinguished Senator from Arizona has said, that whatever the testimony may be, it is a matter of record and any court of arbitration which may be called upon to look into this case at some time in the future will be bound, under the rules of law, to give that testimony the weight which it deserves. As the Senator said a while ago, the engineers who testified before the Committee on

Foreign Relations testified with regard to many matters, and they could not repudiate their testimony even if they wished to do so. Of course, a court would take that testimony into consideration. The court would look for the truth; but certainly the testimony of high-ranking engineers of the United States Government, with expert knowledge upon technical matters of the kind involved, would be given consideration by any court or board of arbitration which wanted to be fair.

Mr. MFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois. He has stated the point which I was trying to make. Any board of arbitration or court would take into consideration the testimony of representatives of the United States Government in regard to these matters. If such testimony were corroborated by the testimony of representatives of other nations, I seriously doubt that a board of arbitration or a court would accept the testimony of independent engineers with regard to estimates which might differ.

Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished junior Senator from California that all the water Mexico used in 1943 was not measured. I refer to the testimony of Mr. Lawson in which he gave the following data in regard to the diversion of water by Mexico in the year 1943: Area irrigated from the Alamo Canal, 191,700 acres; irrigated from other sources 101,400 acres, making a total of 293,100 acres. Water diverted through the Alamo Canal, 1,152,000 acre-feet; and from other sources, 653,000 acre-feet, making a total of 1,805,000 acre-feet in the year 1943.

I do not think there is any question about the amount of water diverted by the use of the Alamo Canal because it was properly measured by the canal company. The remaining amount of 653,000 acre-feet was estimated. I refer to the testimony of Mr. Lawson, beginning on line 10 of page 962 of the hearings and ending at the bottom of page 962. Mr. Lawson testified that approximately 104,000 acre-feet of the water which was diverted was from waste and drainage of the Yuma project. I understand that this is a reasonably correct estimate. As to the remaining 550,000 acre-feet, these figures were arrived at in the following manner: First, it was estimated that there were approximately 90,000 acres under cultivation in the lower delta irrigated by pumping and gravity from the lower river. This estimate was based on aerial photographs and field investigation, as well as from cotton gin finance company records.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator too frequently, but I noted that he spoke of 1943.

Mr. MFARLAND. I was speaking of the year 1943.

Mr. McCARRAN. How much land did Mexico have under irrigation prior to the time the people of the United States constructed Boulder Dam?

Mr. MFARLAND. I believe the testimony may vary on that point; but, as I understand, Mexico was irrigating ap-

proximately the same acreage from the Alamo Canal, or 191,700 acres.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I think the agreed statement was that they had not to exceed 750,000 acre-feet.

Mr. MFARLAND. The Senator misunderstood me. I thought he asked me about acres.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I am speaking of acre-feet of water.

Mr. MFARLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not think there is any question that prior to the construction of Boulder Dam the maximum amount of water which Mexico had used was 750,000 acre-feet a year.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amount of water which Mexico used was more nearly 600,000 acre-feet.

Mr. MFARLAND. As I had stated before the Senator came upon the floor, I believe the testimony was that over a period of years the average was 600,000 acre-feet.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. We built Boulder Dam at a cost of approximately \$260,000,000. The dam was built not by the United States, but by the people of the section which it serves. They are paying for it day by day. They are also paying interest on the money which they borrowed. When the dam is paid for the United States will not have been put to one single dollar of cost for the construction of Boulder Dam. The situation is one of rare occurrence in connection with the construction of dams in this country. The Grand Coulee Dam and other dams were built by the Government of the United States. Boulder Dam was built by the people of the section which is served by the dam. It was built by the people of Arizona, the people of my State of Nevada, and the people of California. It is being paid for now by taxation imposed upon the people of the State of Arizona, the people of my State, and the people of the State of California. During the time the Senate was considering the Boulder Canyon Act it was stated on the floor of the Senate by my predecessor, who afterward became chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the water conserved by Boulder Dam would be the property of the people of the United States and would not be considered for utilization by the people of Mexico. That statement was later confirmed by action of the Senate. Shall we now repudiate the statement and say to the people with whom the contract was made, namely, the people of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and of California, as well as other States, "We will repudiate the contract and set it aside. Every water right which you have under it is to be set aside"? Is the Senator from Arizona going to join in that repudiation? I hope not.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, in answer to the senior Senator from Nevada, I would state that I agree with what he has to say, but I do not know of any law in the United States or any law between nations to the effect that when a State builds a dam across a river all the water of the river is appropriated.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator's own State—and he was a Judge in his State and he knows what the laws of Arizona

are—and every one of the western arid and semiarid States have written into their constitutions a repudiation of the riparian act and have set up the law of prior appropriation. That being true, the rule of prior appropriation applies to every State in the Colorado River system, and the ending treaty would set aside forever that law because the right of prior appropriation would be subject to the dictates of those who control arrangements under this treaty.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, as I stated a little while ago, if we accept the principle of law that the building of Boulder Dam was an appropriation of all the water of all the lands which were intended to be irrigated by that dam, and then if we include the Parker Dam, and the Davis Dam, which has already been authorized by the Congress of the United States, all the waters of the Colorado River would not be appropriated because the upper basin States have not completed their appropriation of waters, and there would still be water going down the river from which Mexico, not being a party to the compact, could appropriate under the law of prior appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator now revokes his statement that the testimony of the Government should be binding. The testimony of the Government, through the Reclamation Bureau, is to the effect that there is a deficit when the waters of the Colorado River are utilized in keeping with the rights of the Colorado River system. So, the Senator must now blow hot or he must blow cold; he must either say that he will stand on his first proposition that the testimony of the Government will be binding and we will not look for any further testimony except that of the Government of the United States, or he will reject the testimony of the Government of the United States as set forth in the record coming from the Bureau of Reclamation in which they say there is a deficit. He can take either horn of the dilemma he likes.

Mr. MFARLAND. I leave it to the Senate as to whether I am blowing cold and hot at the same time. My position is that the estimate of the Government engineers and their testimony should be carefully weighed in passing upon this matter, for the reason that a board of arbitration would give great weight to such testimony if this question were ever submitted in the future to such a board.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have heard a great deal about a board of arbitration. I am wondering just what value a board of arbitration would be to a farmer whose head gates are shut down in midsummer by order of the Boundary Commission. When water is needed in an irrigated area it is needed at once, not after an

arbitration passes on the question, because it is then too late. I am wondering what the Senator from Arizona, knowing the arid and semiarid West as we all know it, thinks about a board of arbitration that would act through the machinery of this particular treaty, when, as a matter of fact, no one can successfully deny that the Boundary Commission can say to every water user in the entire Colorado River system, "You must shut down your head gates because we have guaranteed to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet, and we are unable to deliver it unless we can shut down the head gates now and let the water run through. I am wondering what the Senator will say with regard to arbitration when, as has been done quite recently in the past, the gates of the Boulder Dam are shut down by order of the State Department, or, under the treaty, by order of the Boundary Commission because we are short 1,500,000 acre-feet for Mexico. I am wondering what the people of his own State will say when power is shut off from Boulder Dam.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, I do not believe there is a State in the Colorado River Basin, indeed, I do not believe there is a State in the United States that has a higher appreciation of the value of water than has the State of Arizona.

I should like to say further in answer to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that we are not in the happy position in which the people of his State are, for they have been allocated by contract under the Boulder Dam Act all the water they can put to beneficial use.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is in error about that. We have been allotted 300,000 acre-feet.

Mr. MFARLAND. I think that was estimated by your own agencies, and if they had asked for more it would have been granted.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be true, but let me say to the Senator from Arizona that Arizona persistently refused to come into that arrangement. Arizona could have had the same thing if she had so desired.

Mr. MFARLAND. We refused, Mr. President, because we did not feel that we were getting an equitable share of the water by reason of the claims being made by our sister State of California. We could never get an agreement with California. We have more lands that could be irrigated by Colorado River water by far than both California and Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, and that is what I am fighting for and that is what I wish the Senator from Arizona would join us in fighting for, to reclaim the lands of his own State by the waters of the Colorado River, instead of sending them down across the international boundary to reclaim lands in Mexico.

Mr. MFARLAND. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that if I thought for one moment that Arizona could get more water by rejecting this treaty, I would vote against it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Awhile ago the distinguished Senator from Nevada made a statement, if I understood him correctly, that the Boundary Commission could interfere with privately owned headgates.

Mr. McCARRAN. I certainly do say that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If there is any provision of that kind in the treaty, I respectfully suggest that it has been removed by interpretative reservations which have been offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have seen none such, and I know of none. I am taking the treaty as I find it. If there are removals from the treaty, I should like to know of it, but today we stand on the treaty, and I do not think the Senator from Colorado will deny that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In a moment—

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Colorado deny that?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do deny that there is any such power in the treaty, and if it is in the treaty it has been definitely clarified by interpretative reservations.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let the Senator please clear up this one question. He says that if it is in the treaty it has been set aside by reservations not yet adopted. The fact of the matter is, it is in the treaty, because the whole administration of this matter is in the hands of the Boundary Commission, and the Boundary Commission is the one which will say that 1,500,000 acre-feet must be passed to Mexico. How will they say it? When a shortage of water occurs, they will say, "We have guaranteed to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet. It is up to us to get it," and they will go right up the river system, to the Senator's State, and to mine, and to others, and say, "We have got to fulfill our guaranty," and down go the headgates.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada that the operation of the Boundary Commission will not in anywise resemble the description he has given of it. Under the treaty, the protocol, the interdepartmental understandings, and the interpretative reservations, the Boundary Commission and those agencies which have to do with the delivery of water to Mexico will be entirely in the hands of the Federal Government. Davis Dam, which will be the principal works to meter out the allocation of Mexico, will be under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation. It involves no contact between the Boundary Commission, or the American section of the Boundary Commission, and any private user of water.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish the Senator were correct. There would be no trouble at all to surmount this difficulty if he were. But the Senator is in error. The whole matter of administration is in the

Boundary Commission. That being true, the delivery of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water is for the Boundary Commission. Whenever a shortage occurs, the Boundary Commission can be called upon by Mexico to deliver the guaranteed quantum of water. If the Senator can find anything in the treaty which refutes my position, I should be glad to have it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As soon as I can get to my papers, I shall read to the Senator from Nevada the reservation.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. I am not talking about reservations. The reservations are not before us. The treaty is before us, and the Senator from Arizona is discussing the treaty.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor. Does he yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator permit me to finish my question?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. When I first challenged the correctness of the statement of the senior Senator from Nevada, I think I said that by virtue of the treaty and the committee reservations which have been offered here it would be made very clear that the Commission could not interfere with any private headgate. The Senator from Nevada, if I may refresh his memory, told me that I, too, was blowing hot and cold—

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat the statement, and in a moment or two I shall find the specific reservation, and if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I shall read it into the RECORD.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be very glad to know of any such reservation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We are discussing the treaty and the reservations.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The statement has been made that the reservations are not before the Senate. A parliamentary inquiry. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the reservations as proposed yesterday by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to the pending Mexican water treaty.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that the Senator from New Mexico referred to me. I make no such statement. I said the reservations have not been accepted by the Senate. I say so again.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Arizona will yield further—

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have no desire to enter into a controversy with the Senator from Nevada. I distinctly understood the Senator to say that the reservations were

not before the Senate, and that prompted the parliamentary inquiry. Certainly they have not been accepted. If they had been accepted, I do not think we would be debating them.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall cover some of the matters just mentioned, and particularly the reservation referred to, later in my remarks. Some of the questions which have been raised were covered by me in the earlier part of my address.

At the time I was interrupted I was discussing the matter of the 1,805,000 acre-feet of water which the Government engineer testified was used by Mexico in the year 1943. As I pointed out, I do not think there is any question about the amount of water diverted by the use of the Alamo canal, for the reason that it was properly measured by the canal company. The remaining amount of 653,000 acre-feet was estimated.

I refer to the testimony of Mr. Lawson, beginning in line 10, page 962 of the hearings, and ending at the bottom of page 962. Mr. Lawson testified that approximately 104,000 acre-feet of the water which was diverted was from waste and drainage of the Yuma project. I understand this is a reasonably accurate estimate. As to the remaining 550,000 acre-feet, this figure was arrived at in the following manner. First it was estimated that there were approximately 90,000 acres under cultivation in the lower delta irrigated by pumping and gravity from the lower river. That is an estimate based on aerial photographs and field investigations, as well as from cotton-gin finance company records.

I might interpolate here that if the same system were used that is used in the United States, the finance companies would base the amount of their loans on the number of acres cultivated.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I ask if the distinguished Senator should not in fairness say that Mr. Lawson, at the end of a long cross-examination, was compelled to admit that every alleged fact, all data he pretended to give to the committee concerning the amount of water diverted below the border into Lower California, came from sources in Mexico, that the airplane maps were prepared by Mexican aviators, and not by persons from the United States, and that all the investigation was by Mexico, except that he sent one man down there who took the word of the Mexican officials?

Mr. MFARLAND. I believe Mr. Lawson testified that these acres were investigated—even if it were by one man—by visiting the lands, and that was coupled with evidence which was obtained by the finance company as to the amount of acres under cultivation.

I know that in Arizona, if a man wants to borrow money to finance his crops, the finance company sees to it that it knows how many acres he is cultivating. Otherwise it would find itself suffering great losses by advancing too much money.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The evidence further showed that these finance companies, the cotton ginning companies, are themselves located in Mexico, and are dependent upon this water supply, and will greatly benefit and profit by an enlarged water supply. Does the Senator think that the Senate of the United States, in a solemn matter of this kind, should have as one of its chief sources of information, as to the amount of water used in Lower California, statements from cotton ginning companies in Mexico which will profit by the pending treaty?

Mr. MFARLAND. I say to the Senator that certainly we should take into consideration all possible evidence of any nature whatsoever which we can obtain in the Republic of Mexico. I do not know how we can go down there and measure water or measure land without the consent of Mexico.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say that Elwood Mead found a way in 1928. For 18 months the joint engineering staff of the two Governments investigated the amount of water used from the Rio Grande both by the United States and Mexico, as well as from the Colorado River. After Mr. Lawson had represented to the Foreign Relations Committee that there had been a thorough and complete investigation, he was finally compelled to admit that he had one man down there for a certain length of time—I do not know for how long—who obtained all his information by way of statements of individuals in Mexico hostile to us, whose interests are opposed to ours. That might have satisfied the Senator when he was a judge in Arizona, although from his high reputation I doubt it, but the fact that Mr. Lawson, the Commissioner from Texas, takes all his information from our adversary in this case, does not satisfy me.

Mr. MFARLAND. I admit there was no measurement of the water used on these lands. I understand that the individuals and companies irrigating this land kept no record of measurements of the amount of water diverted or pumped. I might state that while irrigation districts in Arizona keep records as to pumped water, individual farmers do not keep such a record. The estimate of the amount of water which was used on these 90,000 acres was made upon the assumption that the water duty was the same as that of the lands under the Alamo canal.

While, as stated by the junior Senator from California, these are only estimates—it would of course have been desirable to have had accurate measurements of the amount of water which was used—in fairness to the State Department I do not know of any way this information could have been obtained nor do I know of any way it could be obtained in the future without the consent of the Mexican people and the Mexican Government. They, of course, could keep an accurate record, but we would

have no way of compelling them to do so, nor would we have any way of checking their measurements unless they permitted such checking. However, the 1,152,000 acre-feet figure is accurate, leaving only 340,000 acre-feet of the 1,500,000 acre-feet actually guaranteed under this treaty.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does the distinguished Senator have any information about what statements of adverse use were made in connection with the 1,100,000 acre-feet used in Lower California through our appliances? Does not the distinguished Senator think that of great importance if the water was given to Mexico upon the condition that temporary use for 1 year should not be a precedent for future years? I think the distinguished Senator ought to discuss that point.

Mr. MFARLAND. I know of no law which prohibits an appropriator of water under prime appropriation from changing its point of diversion. As a matter of fact, the State laws which I have examined are to the effect, and all the decisions are to the effect that you may change your point of diversion. The fact remains that they did use this amount of water. The engineers say that they can divert it in the future regardless of what we may do. The distinguished Senator from California may not agree with the engineers, but that is their testimony.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator again yield?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not think the Senator has quite understood the point I am endeavoring to make. If Mexico were in vital need of water and we agreed with our own appliances from our own country to help her get extra water to save her crops when she could not obtain the water from pumping, but we attached to the delivery of the water the understanding that it should constitute no precedent for future deliveries, it seems to me it would be not only an important but an all-conclusive statement. A man would have a pretty tough time being a good neighbor if he could not say to his friend, "Sure, you can use my lawnmower this Sunday, but do not think that gives you any right to take it every Sunday. And do not think that because I let you borrow my lawnmower on Sunday you can have my rake and hoe on Tuesday and Wednesday."

What we were trying to do was to be a good neighbor to Mexico to save her crops by using our appliances. Mexico is raising no claim that she is not bound by that precedent. But our State Department failed or neglected to state that essential fact to the committee and would not produce the documents in the case.

Mr. MFARLAND. I understood from the testimony at the hearings that the Mexican people did have some kind of a contract. I believe testimony in detail was given as to the right to the use of water from the Alamo Canal. I do not

think that is disputed by the Senator from California.

Inasmuch as the 104,000 acre-feet which was diverted from the waste and drainage of the Yuma project is a reasonably accurate estimate, I personally believe that we can be reasonably sure that at least 1,500,000 acre-feet was diverted by the Mexican people in the year 1943. But even if we take the position, as did the junior Senator from California, that the State Department did not have sufficient data upon which to make the estimate of 1,800,000 acre-feet, the engineers of that Department have, by giving that testimony, made an admission on record of the use of this amount of Colorado River water by the Mexican people. If this question were ever arbitrated in the future, or if it were placed before an international court, if one should be set up for the settlement of such dispute, would not a court or arbitrators immediately say to the United States, "Your engineers testified that Mexico used this amount of water?" And when Mexico herself testified that she used this amount of water, it seems to me that it would be indeed difficult for the United States ever to go behind these figures.

So, looking at it from a practical standpoint, it is my opinion that we are and will be bound by the testimony of our own engineers, and, for the purpose of determining whether we should accept the present treaty as just and equitable, we must accept the figures and the testimony of the State Department as accurate.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I assume that the implication from the Senator's remarks is that since Mexico was using 1,500,000 acre-feet of water, more or less, therefore it gives her a right to that amount of water. Is that the implication from the Senator's statement?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I tried to point out and analyze the testimony for the purpose of determining whether under the law of prior appropriation Mexico would have established under those laws the right to divert and use that amount of water. I am sorry the Senator missed a portion of my remarks.

Mr. DOWNEY. I did hear that statement. That was merely preliminary to another question. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator a question, and I ask it purely in a judicial spirit. Does the Senator take the next step, that since Mexico is entitled to 1,500,000 acre-feet of water, more or less, whatever it may be, she is entitled to about the same quality of water she is now using, or does the Senator think in the future we could substitute 1,500,000 acre-feet of worthless water?

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to discuss that subject when I come to it. I shall reach it a little later.

As I was saying, on the basis of the laws of prior appropriation, if we accept the testimony of the engineers that Mexico could have diverted and used this amount of water if the Boulder Dam had not been constructed, and when we look

at the records and find that we have not begun sufficient construction which when completed, would have appropriated this remaining water, we must admit Mexico has, in effect, established an equitable right to 1,800,000 acre-feet to beneficial use.

Of course, some of this testimony is disputed by the engineers from California, but I say again that it is my opinion that in any future settlement that we might make we would be bound by the testimony of our Government engineers. In the event that in the future we should be faced with the question of how much water was used by Mexico, Mexico would immediately say, as would the Senator from California if he were representing a client, "Your engineers admitted that we used 1,800,000 acre-feet in 1943."

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I cannot help adding this observation—and the Senator may not wish to pursue it: If I assume that Mexico is entitled to 750,000 acre-feet of water because she was using that amount before Boulder Dam, and the distinguished Senator assumes that she is entitled to 1,500,000 acre-feet of water since Boulder Dam, regardless of who is right, it seems that we are both irresistably driven to the conclusion that on the basis of international equity we would be compelled to allow Mexico to get usable water of about the same quality as that with which she established her right. I cannot conceive of any rule of international equity which would bind us to give 750,000 or 1,500,000 acre-feet, but enable us to qualify that obligation by saying, "Surely, you had 1,500,000 acre-feet of good water, but we are obligated to give you that much only in saline water, which you cannot use." That would cut out the heart and soul of equity law, and common sense; yet if I correctly understand, that is the position of the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I previously stated, I will discuss that question when I reach it.

In other words, the engineers have made a record in these hearings which, in any dispute between our Government and the Government of Mexico, would undoubtedly be accepted by a board of arbitration as correct.

I point out these matters not for the purpose of casting any reflection upon their testimony, but for the purpose of calling to the attention of the Senate the necessity of accepting their testimony.

The treaty calls for a guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet. This is 300,000 acre-feet less than what was used in the year 1943. Mexico receives the advantage of regulated flow, which is worth a great deal to it. On the other hand if we were compelled to grant Mexico 1,800,000 acre-feet, the extra 300,000 acre-feet would be worth a great deal to us during most years.

I do not want to give away any more water than is absolutely necessary. However, after giving careful study to all of the testimony introduced before the committee, as well as careful considera-

tion to facts already within my knowledge, I feel that it is better to allow Mexico this amount of water than to take the chance of her establishing a legal right to a larger amount in the future.

One of the objections made to the treaty is that it is contended that under article 10 (b) Mexico could establish a use of 1,500,000 acre-feet which could be interpreted to be additional to the 1,500,000 acre-feet guaranteed under article 10 (a). However, this objection, I understand, is removed by the reservation which was presented and adopted, which will give the interpretation that the 1,500,000 acre-feet mentioned in article 10 (b) is meant to be the same as that mentioned in article 10 (a), and to the effect that the amount of water to which Mexico has a right under this treaty is limited in total to 1,500,000 acre-feet.

It is also contended that Mexico may temporarily increase her use of water by means of a dam made possible by this treaty, and that this increased use would become permanent through a second treaty or by arbitration decisions on American ambiguities in the treaty. I do not believe that this fear is well founded, particularly in view of the reservation which I have just discussed. I know that it has been suggested that we should place in the treaty a restriction against Mexico's using more than a definite amount of water, regardless of whether we use the water or not, and regardless of the fact that it may be flowing into the Gulf of Mexico. I cannot conceive of the Republic of Mexico or anyone else ever agreeing to such a proposition. When the waters of the Colorado River pass over the boundary line of the United States into Mexico, we lose any right which we previously had to control or claim them. Such a provision in a treaty would certainly be a novel one. Such a provision in irrigation law would certainly be a novel one, and I think an unjust one. In my opinion, the limitations contained in this treaty would forever bar Mexico from ever claiming the right to any additional water above that provided in the treaty, when we take into consideration the reservation which I have just discussed.

Another objection has been made to the language contained in article 10 (b), which provides:

In the event of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the United States, thereby making it difficult for the United States to deliver the guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet a year, the water allotted to Mexico under subparagraph (a) of this article will be reduced in the same proportion as consumptive uses in the United States are reduced.

I agree that in my opinion this paragraph could have been made much more desirable so far as the United States is concerned. I admit there could be a great deal of dispute and argument as to what constitutes an extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system. It is my opinion that this provision of the treaty should have been spelled out in more definite terms. I believe provision could have been made for a reduction when the total water of the river in the United States in any year was below a definitely fixed amount.

However, when we examine this provision we find that it is not worth a great deal to the respective users. In other words, if our consumptive use in the United States were ordinarily 16,000,000 acre-feet per year and we had to reduce our consumptive use by as much as 20 percent, which would be a very material reduction in the use of water, Mexico would be required to reduce her consumptive use by a total of only 300,000 acre-feet. If 300,000 acre-feet of water were spread out among all of the American users of the 16,000,000 acre-feet, it would not give any single user very much relief. But, of course, whatever relief is given is worth something, and whatever relief we can get out of the present wording will be worth something.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does not the distinguished Senator agree with me that it would not be spread out among the persons using 16,000,000 acre-feet or 15,000,000 acre-feet of water? Does not the Senator agree that it would fall solely, absolutely, and destructively upon the water users with the lowest priority?

Suppose 100,000 acre-feet fell upon California, and suppose the city of San Diego had the lowest priority. It would not reduce San Diego's priority by 20 percent; it would totally wipe it out.

Mr. MFARLAND. There might be certain instances in which that would be true; but the reduction would be spread out as between users with the same water rights.

As to whether there ever would be a need for reducing the consumptive use would depend largely upon how many acres of land were irrigated in the United States with the 16,000,000 acre-feet. If we spread our use out over too large a number of acres, we would have in some years a greater shortage than we would have if we kept a safe amount of storage in our reservoirs. I am sure we would be unwilling to place any limitation upon the water belonging to us. So, as I stated above, although I would like to see improvement made in the wording of this paragraph, I do not think it involves sufficient objection to warrant rejection of the treaty.

Much has been said in regard to the use of our storage works for the benefit of Mexico. I think there is no question that this would be true. Mexico would receive a regulated flow of the river. For this she would give up the right ever to claim 1,800,000 acre-feet of water per annum, the approximate amount which she used during the years 1943 and 1944. Also she would give up the right ever to establish a use for a larger amount of water. Objection is also made to having this amount guaranteed to the Republic of Mexico. We can only make the same answer to this objection that I have just made, namely, that Mexico would give up the right ever to claim a larger amount of water. I may add that this is in line with the Colorado River compact which requires the upper basin States to allow a flow of 75,000,000 acre-feet of water over any 10-year period. While the guarantee of

1,500,000 acre-feet would have its disadvantages, it also would have the advantage of permitting us to use the remainder of the water of the Colorado River, regardless of how large the flow might be, above the average quantity in any particular year. We, of course, have dams to regulate the flow so that we, too, can depend with reasonable certainty upon a definite amount of water from year to year. Also, if we were to admit that Mexico had established a right to the use of 1,800,000 acre-feet, we would be receiving the right to use the extra 300,000 acre-feet, which should offset the guaranty.

Mr. President, another objection made by some of those opposing the treaty is that it does not specify the quality of water to be delivered. I know of no decree in the United States adjudicating water rights which contains such a provision. It is strange, indeed, that water users in the Colorado River Basin should be insisting upon such a provision when they themselves do not have such protection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator has said he knows of no precedent for a provision of this kind. Does the Senator know of a similar situation anywhere else in the United States or in any other part of the world, where water is used to the extent that it is used in the lower areas of the Colorado River Basin?

Mr. MFARLAND. I do not think there is any difference between the use of water by the lower-basin States, the use of water by the upper-basin States, and the use of water by Mexico.

It is proposed that under the contract we in our State would have to use the return flow from the State of Colorado, regardless of the fact that it would contain a higher degree of salinity than it would have when it reached the State of Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but the Senator knows that the water which would go down the Colorado River from Colorado would not contain a dangerously high content of salt and alkali. The Senator knows that the water that would be given to Mexico, that would cross the boundary line, would be heavily impregnated with salts and alkalis of every description. So the situation regarding the water crossing the boundary line into Mexico would be different from the situation regarding water used by the States in the other parts of the Colorado River Basin or water used from other rivers in the United States.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to complete my explanation on this point. I say they do not have such protection, for the reason that if the quality of the water were mentioned in the treaty, Mexico would without question want quality defined and spelled out. It will be noted that the treaty provides: "Such waters shall be made up

of the waters of said river whatever their origin." This provision, in my opinion, would give us a great advantage, in that we would receive credit for all return flow and seepage water which would get into the stream. No objection is there made to the quality of such seepage and return waters.

The Salt River Valley water users case, which has been mentioned in the debate and in the hearings, which is the only case bearing upon the salinity of irrigation water that I know of, was tried in my own State. I happened to be the trial judge. In that case some of the water users asked the court to enjoin the Salt River Valley water users from delivering pumped water or from mixing pumped water with gravity water from the Salt River, which contained a much smaller salt content, in supplying the water to which they were entitled under a decree of the court. They contended that they had old, established water rights which entitled them to pure river water—that is, until that course of supply was exhausted. There were three sources of water supply: what is known as the normal flow of the river, the stored water impounded by the reservoirs, and the pumped water. Those were recognized sources of supply of water which the Salt River Valley Water Users Association was required to deliver to its users. I found from the facts which were introduced that the pumped water was less desirable, inasmuch as it contained a higher salt content, but that by delivering a greater quantity of the pumped water the same results could be approximated as those obtained by the use of pure river water. I held that the Salt River Valley Water Users Association was bound to do equity to its users and that, therefore, where pumped water was used, a greater quantity should be given to the users.

But, Mr. President, the basis of the decision was that a greater supply of water was required when pumped water was used. The water rights were attached to the lands, and in adjudicating water rights the duty of the water naturally becomes very important. But the Mexican Treaty is a mere contract for the delivery of a definite number of acre-feet of water, and no reference is made to water rights for particular lands or to the water duty for those lands.

The number of acres which Mexico irrigates with the waters she receives under the treaty is a matter entirely in Mexico's hands. And when we talk about usable water as far as the salt content is concerned, this is a relative term. Water can be used with salt content up to at least 3,000 parts per million if sufficient quantity is used to wash the salt on through the land, but the less salt the more usable the water.

There is nothing in the Colorado River compact which provides for the quality of the water to be delivered by the upper-basin States to the lower-basin States. Indeed, we all know that the upper-basin States are entitled to and will get credit for their return flow and that we are in the lower-basin States and will get a little less desirable water under the compact than will the upper-basin States.

So I say, Mr. President, the Mexican Government understands the problems of the Colorado River just as we do. As a matter of fact, some of the Senators have stated that Mexico understands them better than we do. But in any event, Mexico knows its water will be a little less desirable than the users above just as we in the Lower Basin States know that our water will be a little less desirable than that of the Upper Basin States. And when we take into consideration the provision that I have just mentioned; namely, such waters shall be made up of the waters of said river whatever their origin. I do not think that there is any doubt this problem of quality of water is well understood by both governments.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Arizona kindly permit me to revert to his statement with reference to the case that came before him while he was a judge? I refer to the Salt River case.

Mr. MFARLAND. I am glad to have the Senator refer to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. In that case the question of usability of the water was paramount, was it not?

Mr. MFARLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. That question was really the crux of the controversy, was it not?

Mr. MFARLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. If this treaty is entered into, what do we guarantee to Mexico? Do we guarantee usable water?

Mr. MFARLAND. We guarantee to Mexico waters out of the river, whatever their origin.

Mr. McCARRAN. What about the quality of the water?

Mr. MFARLAND. Mexico is to receive the water, whether it is return-flow water or not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. I propounded a similar question to the Assistant Secretary of State when he was testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I asked him whether we were bound to deliver usable water and he refused to answer. Have we "put something over" on Mexico in this treaty?

Mr. MFARLAND. As I have already stated to the Senator from Nevada, I think Mexico understands this matter as well as we do. She understands the value of water as much as do the Senators in this Chamber. As a matter of fact, she may understand this treaty even better than we understand it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no doubt about the Senator's last statement because I think we have not tried very hard to understand the treaty.

Mr. MFARLAND. I hope the Senator's statement does not include me. I have tried to understand the treaty.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think there were no more than approximately five members of the committee present at any meeting of the committee when I was present during the consideration of the treaty.

Mr. MFARLAND. I did not miss a single hearing.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe there were only approximately 20 Members of the Senate present on any day during the debate on the treaty. What the Senator has said is perhaps true; Mexico may understand the treaty better than do some Senators. I do not think she understands it any better than some of us who are from States the interests of which are affected.

Mr. President, I repeat my question: Is this water to be usable water or is it to be of any quality that we may deliver? Will not the answer to that question come out of the record, and is it not the record that we are furnishing this water for irrigation purposes? Would not Mexico be in position to say to us, "You knew you were guaranteeing this water for irrigation purposes, and you are furnishing water so saline that it is destructive to irrigation. You have, therefore violated the treaty and you must furnish us with water which is usable for irrigation." In that case would not the great Senator of today from Arizona, and the great judge of yesterday in Arizona, decide in the affirmative, as he did in the Salt River case?

Mr. MFARLAND. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is entitled to them. They are coming to him.

Mr. MFARLAND. I thank the Senator. I am glad that the Senator agrees with my statement that the record is the answer to his question.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the record is the answer, then we must purify the water which we furnish to Mexico.

Mr. MFARLAND. As I understand the testimony—I have studied it very carefully—it is to the effect that Mexico must accept whatever water comes out of the river, no matter what its origin may be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have listened to the speech of the Senator from Arizona with a great deal of interest. I find myself in complete agreement with his arguments. I think they are logical. He has covered the situation in a very able and enlightening manner.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, on the basis of the statement of the Senator from Colorado, I think I should make a double bow. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. However, the Senator made one point with which I am unable entirely to agree. I refer to his statement with regard to the quality of the water which we must furnish Mexico. Perhaps I am more sensitive on that point than are other Senators, for I once sustained a considerable loss in connection with irrigated lands because of the saline content of the water which was used for irrigation purposes. I know the dangers which are involved. The section of the treaty dealing with the quality of the water which Mexico is to receive is one which I greatly fear. I hope that it may be clarified. I hope that before this debate shall end an amendment will be agreed to with re-

spect to the quality of the water which we must deliver to Mexico. Unless such an amendment shall be agreed to I think that the fear of the Senator from Arizona, namely, that the whole matter will be thrown into an international controversy, will prove to have been justified.

Mr. MFARLAND. Does the Senator wish to give Mexico water of a better quality than is provided for in the treaty?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. MFARLAND. Does the Senator wish to give Mexico water of a quality inferior to that provided for in the treaty?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. MFARLAND. What does the Senator wish to give Mexico?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want it to be understood what the quality shall be. The Senator from Colorado is willing to give to Mexico a million and a half acre-feet of water as provided in the treaty. However, the Senator from Colorado wishes the treaty to provide that we will furnish that amount of water to Mexico regardless of its quality. Then the Senator from Colorado would be satisfied. He would be willing to let nature take her course as to whether the water is to be better, worse, or whatever condition it may be.

Mr. MFARLAND. So far as the Senator from Arizona is concerned, he thinks that matter is very plain and well understood by Mexico.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if I understand the meaning of what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Arizona he is of the opinion that the pending treaty means that Mexico must take water regardless of quality, does he not?

Mr. MFARLAND. Yes, I think so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then, if it might prevent several days of debate and uncertainty and clear up the ambiguity in the minds of such Senators as the junior Senator from Colorado and the junior Senator from California, would not the Senator support us in adding to the treaty, "It is understood that the water to be taken by Mexico shall be taken regardless of quality"? Why not?

Mr. MFARLAND. I do not believe we should add any more reservations to this treaty than are absolutely necessary. I feel that adequate reservations have already been presented. We have all presented our reservations to the committee and the committee has carefully weighed the views of all of us. There is much involved in the wording of the reservations. Now if we say to Mexico "regardless of quality," if we put in reservations such as that, it would make Mexico think that we were going to try to deliver to her the worst water we could. We are not going to do that; we are going to give her exactly what we are entitled to in the lower-basin States, that is: the water which comes from the upper-basin States. We are going to give her the water of the river. If we are for this treaty then let us be for it; if we are against it let us be against it. Let us not put into the treaty something which will lead Mexico to believe we intend to put

something over on her. She understands this river. I will say again that I believe Mexico understands this river and the problems of the river thoroughly; she understands what we are getting. Why should we be so concerned about her welfare all of a sudden.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am not concerned about the welfare of Mexico, though I want a fair and decent treaty for Mexico; but I am concerned because I know that no court of international arbitration would ever stultify itself by compelling Mexico to take this practically useless saline return flow, and that means the water users in Arizona and in California and in all the other basin States would face a tremendous disaster by the imposition of some kind of a standard of salinity.

If the distinguished Senator will yield to me for one further question, since he has said that there is no standard of salinity set up in the Colorado River compact; I ask him has not Arizona already been given a contract under the Boulder Dam Compact Act for 2,800,000 acre-feet of consumptive use?

Mr. McFARLAND. And for half the surplus.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, and half the surplus. Does that not mean that there can be a million acre-feet more or less added to that 2,800,000 acre-feet to wash out the salt, and that the State of the distinguished Senator will only be charged the actual amount of water used and there will be deducted from the amount applied to take care of the salt the amount of the return flow?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is somewhat remarkable it seems to me that California interests are concerned and are afraid that Mexico is going to get some water that is not useful. If it would not be useful for Mexico, it would not be useful for California, and why are they insisting that they have unusable water and that fresh and usable water be guaranteed to Mexico?

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. If this water is so unusable that it cannot be availed of by either Arizona or California—and both States are certainly going to use it so long as it is of decent quality—and Mexico does not have to take it, that means, undoubtedly, we would have to give to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water of the same quality and of the same standard now as that in Lake Mead, which would be ruinous to us all.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish I could be sure that the Senator from Colorado would be willing to give us 3,800,000 acre-feet of water to supply the 2,800,000 acre-feet contract.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is not talking and not acting under the delusion, is he, that either Utah, Colorado, or Wyoming is going to deliver his State any such pure water to reduce salinity?

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought the Senator from Utah would respond to that, but if the Senator from California is willing to give Arizona that amount, the Senator from Utah does not think I would refuse the offer, does he? If he will give it to me, I will take all the water for Arizona that I can get.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will yield, I want to serve notice on him now, and I think the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who was here a moment ago, will join me in serving notice on Arizona, California, and Nevada that, so far as the quality of water that arrives at Lee's Ferry is concerned, that is not the responsibility of the upper-basin States; if it is not good water, it is your funeral and not ours.

Mr. McFARLAND. I regret very much that the junior Senator from Utah is not as liberal about water with us in Arizona as is the Senator from California, but I might say that this is the first time I have ever known California to be liberal to Arizona when water is concerned.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. It sounds to me as though the distinguished Senator from Arizona does not understand the plans and the program of the Bureau of Reclamation and the provisions of the Boulder Dam Project Act. The truth is the Bureau of Reclamation under the allocation to Arizona of 2,800,000 acre-feet of beneficial use expects to deliver to Arizona 3,800,000 feet of water. That 1,000,000 acre-feet of water, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, will go back into the river as a return flow and will go to Mexico.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is a different proposition; that is consumptive use. Of course, we are entitled to and will receive credit for the return flow, but I understood the Senator—perhaps I misunderstood him—to say that we would be entitled to an extra million acre-feet because of the salinity of the water. I was very happy that he was generous, and was unhappy that the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Colorado and the other Senators from the upper-basin States could not go along with him.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not believe the Senator from Arizona yet understands the situation. The very reason that Arizona will be given 3,800,000 acre-feet of water to apply in Arizona is that Arizona is entitled to 2,800,000 acre-feet consumptive use. In order to get the 2,800,000 of consumptive use, she will have to use 3,800,000 acre-feet, that being the percentage according to the Bureau of Reclamation. The extra 1,000,000 acre-feet will return to the river, and, of course, Arizona will get credit for that, which will reduce Arizona's consumptive use to 2,800,000 acre-feet. I might say that in all probability a court of inter-

national arbitration will figure Mexico's right by the same standard as the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and, in order to get the beneficial use of 1,500,000, she will be given 2,500,000 or 3,000,000 or 3,500,000 acre-feet, just as Arizona and California will be given. If we have a water right in California of 1,800,000 acre-feet of consumptive use, the owner of the water right will have so long as the water is in the river and available to demand two or three or five hundred thousand acre-feet of water additional in order to wash the salt out of the land.

I say again, if the distinguished Senators do not realize that, following the rule of the Boulder Canyon project compact, Mexico would be entitled to far more than 1,500,000 acre-feet, some time in the future the water users of our State will have an unhappy awakening.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. In a moment. I should like to say to the distinguished junior Senator from California that I leave it to the Senator who understands this proposition. I would not even suggest he did not understand it, but I think I do understand it. I believe I will have made myself clear when I shall have concluded.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I understood the Senator from California correctly, he made the statement that consumptive use in California meant diversion less return.

Mr. DOWNEY. Less return flow to the river, of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the Senator is correct when he says consumptive use under the treaty, under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and under the compact, is diversion less return flow to the river, but it is rather difficult for the Senator from Utah to understand how California can take the water clear out of the river system and have any return flow to the river.

Mr. McFARLAND. It does not have any return flow.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I understood—return flow which may develop from diversions.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I primarily was talking about Arizona. We have a different problem in California.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am satisfied the Senator is correct in what he says about Arizona; that is, from whatever is diverted the return flow to the river is deducted in figuring consumptive use.

Mr. McFARLAND. In other words, we have a right to divert that much more water above in order to get the 2,800,000 acre-feet.

Mr. MURDOCK. Arizona has the right to take credit for the return flow in her consumptive use.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. But if the water is taken clear out of the river, and the return flow does not return to the river, such return flow is not deductible from diversion in order to ascertain the consumptive use. Am I not correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I wish to say that I am entirely in agreement, and my remarks applied only to those cases in which there was a return flow which necessarily had been used, and providently used, to wash out the salt. If I understand the distinguished Senator from Arizona, there is now no argument between us, because he has stated that they are entitled to additional water for the purpose of washing out the salts, and to obtain a net beneficial use.

Mr. MFARLAND. Certainly we are entitled to credit for the return flow to the river. As I understood the Senator from Utah, I do not believe he would for one moment state that if we received, for instance, 2,800,000 acre-feet, we diverted that amount, and 500,000 acre-feet returned to the river, we would be entitled to more than the 500,000 acre-feet, because the other water which we used had a high salt content.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am not trying to say what either Arizona or California is entitled to. What I wanted to keep the record straight about was the definition of consumptive use, which in my opinion is very important. Under the compact, as I understand, consumptive use, if I may state it again, is the water diverted less return flow which goes back into the river.

Mr. MFARLAND. That is correct, whether it has a high salt content or is pure water.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is correct. The salt content has nothing to do with the use, as I understand.

Mr. MFARLAND. That is correct. So we do not get any extra water because of the salinity. I wish we did. I would hope that the Senator from Utah would be generous to us and give us that extra million acre-feet the Senator from California is going to give us; but I am afraid he will not.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator made a statement in his argument this afternoon on two or three occasions about which I want to be sure. It is with reference to the 1,800,000 acre-feet which is claimed to have been used by Mexico in 1943. I think the Senator has stated a time or two that the United States Government would probably be bound by the evidence of our engineers at some future time in a court of arbitration.

Mr. MFARLAND. That is, if we do not ratify the treaty. I want to add that. If I did not make it clear, I should have made that clear.

Mr. MURDOCK. My reason for calling the Senator's attention to the statement with reference to the 1,800,000 acre-feet is that at some time in the future Mexico might even want to take his statement before a court of arbitration. As I understood the Senator, he was not admitting that Mexico had established a right to the 1,800,000 acre-feet, but was

merely using that figure for purposes of argument. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MFARLAND. I am merely using it for purposes of argument. I have never stated that that is the correct figure. I stated that that was the testimony of our engineers, the representatives of our Government. I say that our engineers have made a record here, whether it be correct or not, which would be used against us in the future if there were an arbitration. I do not want to be understood as casting any reflection upon their testimony. The other Senators can make up their own minds as to whether it was correct or not, and whether it was based upon proper measurements or not. I was using that, not for the purpose of accepting it myself, but for the purpose of the necessity of considering it in determining whether we should ratify this treaty or not, and for that purpose only.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator certainly does not want to make a record at this time in the United States Senate that Mexico has established a right to 1,800,000 acre-feet of water.

Mr. MFARLAND. No; and if we do not ratify the treaty, I will be present at any proceeding trying to show that Mexico is not entitled to very much water, just as the Senator from Utah and every Senator from other interested States would be.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure the Senator would be, and I did not want him to make the record.

Mr. MFARLAND. I should like to give her less water, if I could get by with it. I am frank in saying I am selfish to that extent in favor of the United States, if one wants to call it selfishness. As the Senator knows, the water problem is a very serious one to us in the West.

In further answer to the question as to the salinity of the water, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Colorado again that the question as to whether water is useful is a relative one. We have users in Arizona who are pumping water, not using gravity water, but who are pumping water which has a salt content as high as 12,000 parts to a million. I know that that is altogether too salty, and many of the users have had to abandon their farms because the salinity was too high. But there are users who are using very saline water, water with a pretty high salinity, and making some of the best alfalfa in the United States.

I spent 3 months trying the case we have mentioned, listening to the evidence regarding salinity of water, and the important matter is that if we use only enough water to penetrate, for instance, 3 feet into the soil, all of the salt content in the water will stay in the upper 3 feet of soil. If enough water is used to wash the salt on down through and carry it off, then the users can get by with water with a higher salt content. For that reason more water is required, if one is using water with a high salt content.

With that explanation I should like to point out that this question is pretty well decided in the treaty, in article 10 (b), which states that:

Mexico shall acquire no right beyond that provided by this subparagraph by the use of the waters of the Colorado River system, for any purpose whatsoever, in excess of 1,500,000 acre-feet annually.

That does not state that if the water is less usable she will obtain a greater amount, but it states that she will acquire no right beyond 1,500,000 acre-feet of water. I will discuss a little more in detail later on concerning what the salt content will be in the water which Mexico will receive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad the Senator has discussed this point in detail in the light of his experience in cases which have come before him when he was on the bench, because to me it is the heart and soul of the whole treaty whether we are to deliver 1,500,000 acre-feet of poor water or of a certain other quality. I want to support the treaty, in fact, I am supporting the treaty, and I expect to vote for it, but I have been greatly troubled by this one point. So I am grateful to the Senator for clearing the point up as much as he has cleared it up, and I am glad to have him state for the record that the treaty does not provide for the delivery of any more water than 1,500,000 acre-feet. That, I understand, is his understanding of the treaty.

Mr. MFARLAND. That is my understanding of the treaty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And that that amount is regardless of quality.

Mr. MFARLAND. Regardless of quality, yes. I think that is plain. I do not want to be continually referring to a case which I tried, but it is the only case I know of on the subject, and therefore I should like to tell a little bit about some of the evidence, in just about one paragraph. One of the witnesses testified in the case that he used pump water with a very high salt content to wash out the salt in the ground, and the reclaimed ground which had already had a high degree of salt, so high that it could not have been cultivated before. So water with a high degree of salinity can be used, if a sufficient quantity of it is used.

As to what the salt content will be brings us to the question of how much return flow there will be for which we will receive credit. The testimony of the Government engineers, based on an estimate of 930,000 acre-feet of return flow, shows that the return flow will contain 2,700 parts of salinity per million which is usable. Of course, when the water is mixed with water delivered from the Imperial Dam the quality of the mixture will be much improved and more desirable.

Mr. Robert L. Lowry, engineer for the American section of the International Boundary Commission, testified that the 1,500,000 acre-feet to be delivered to Mexico will ultimately be supplied from the following sources: Return flow, 930,000 acre-feet; desilted, 160,000 acre-feet; unused Gila flow, 100,000 acre-feet, making a total of 1,130,000 acre-feet which will be supplied from below the

Imperial Dam. Little of this water could be used by the United States except by pumping.

Mr. John R. Riter, engineer in the Reclamation Service, broke the return-flow figures down as follows:

One hundred and thirty-five thousand acre-feet of return flow from the Yuma project.

Four hundred thousand acre-feet of return flow from the Gila project, which is based on 160,000 acres of land irrigated by 960,000 acre-feet of water.

Three hundred and thirty thousand acre-feet of return flow from central Arizona. This estimate is based upon the release of 440,000 acre-feet from the Gillespie project. That is the last central Arizona project on the Gila River of any size. However, 110,000 acre-feet of this return flow would be lost by evaporation and seepage if the river is channelized. Of course, if the river were not channelized, an additional 110,000 acre-feet would be lost according to Mr. Riter's testimony. This would amount to fully 50 percent of the water released from the Gillespie project.

It should be emphasized, however, there is no return flow to the Colorado River from the central Arizona projects. The virgin flow of the Gila River at Gillespie Dam is estimated by the Reclamation Service to be 1,753,000 acre-feet. It is admitted by all that none of this water reaches the Colorado River except a little in flood flashes. We use and reuse the water and what little water is released from the Gillespie Dam is lost by evaporation and seepage.

Testimony was also given that the records kept on the Salt River show that when we have had wet years, and even with the water which came in from rainfall below Gillespie Dam, the loss is practically 50 percent which bears out the testimony of Mr. Riter that there would be a loss of at least 50 percent if water were allowed to go on down the Gila River into the Colorado without the river being channelized. For a distance of approximately 150 miles from the Gillespie Dam to the Colorado River the water flows in a sandy river bed where there is also a large amount of evaporation, particularly in the summer months. So it is a question of how much water Arizona will want to allow to go on down the river; whether our users will prefer to use water of a little higher salt content rather than lose half of the water.

However, this is a question for Arizona to decide. As pointed out by the engineers representing California, we may try to save some of this return flow from the lower Gila project as well as the Yuma project. But I cannot see how the other States of the basin are concerned with this problem because we in Arizona are entitled to consumptive use. Naturally if, for example, as to the 2,800,000 acre-feet, we allow 500,000 acre-feet, for example, to reach the Colorado River, we will of course divert 500,000 acre-feet more in its place.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator allow me to congratulate him upon the very

clear, precise statement he has just made?

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Where will the return flow from the Arizona projects reach the channel of the river? Will it be below the Imperial Dam?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. It will be below the Imperial Dam.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will there be any return flow above the Davis Dam?

Mr. McFARLAND. Very little.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand, the Boulder Dam is the highest dam on the Colorado River. Next will be the Davis Dam. Am I correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is correct in his statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. And then the Parker Dam?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. And then the Imperial Dam?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is a diversion dam.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the lowest dam on the river at the present time is the Laguna Dam?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Which, as I understand, is not used at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. No. The Imperial Dam took its place.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Imperial Dam was substituted for the Laguna Dam.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. But the great volume of the return flow, whatever it is, will come into the river below the Laguna Dam?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, the Senator is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. The point I am trying to make is whether or not the United States, with its present dams, taking the Laguna Dam as the lowest dam on the river, will have any control whatever over return flow reaching the limitrophe section of the river?

Mr. McFARLAND. Only in the event that we should pump it back into the canal.

Mr. MURDOCK. Unless it is pumped back, the United States will have no control over the great volume of return flow.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understood the distinguished Senator, he claimed—if I correctly remember the term—that in fulfilling the treaty obligation to Mexico the United States Government would receive credit for the return flow to the limitrophe section of the river. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to have the Senator address himself to this problem: In the hearings no consideration was given to the fact that California may some day have a return flow of half a million or a million acre-feet of water. Does the Senator conceive that there is

any legal or moral reason why California should not work out some arrangement to receive credit similar to that which Arizona will receive by returning its flow to the river?

Mr. McFARLAND. Unfortunately there is no return flow from California, and could not be without a considerable lift. The water flows on down to the Salton Sea. It would be fine if there were a return flow, because we would have that much more water in the basin. But it flows on down to the Salton Sea, and no one can receive any credit for it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, the engineering problem and the cost involved in catching that water before it gets into the Salton Sea and pumping it over a 150- or 250-foot rise into the Colorado River would be insignificant. The value of the water for which we shall receive credit when we do that—and I believe we undoubtedly shall—will be 100 times the engineering cost. I believe that any full consideration of this problem ought to embrace the possibility of California, as well as Arizona, having a return flow of 500,000 or 1,000,000 acre-feet of water to the Colorado River. If we do not consider that possibility, we fail to consider one of the major potential facts in this whole area.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me say to the Senator from California that I am not an engineer, and I am not going to pass upon that question. I have heard the Senator from California testify quite a bit on that question, but I am not going to testify on it. I am going to assume that this thing is to be done in the way in which it has been done in the past; so I am not going to pass upon that engineering question.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am rather reluctant to continue interrupting, but, as I understand, there is no burden on Arizona, California, or any of the Colorado River Basin States in connection with this treaty with Mexico. As I understand, under the treaty the burden is a burden on the Federal Government, and not on any individual State.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct; and of course, the water will have to be supplied in accordance with the Colorado River compact.

As I was about to say, we are entitled to consumptive use, just as each of the other basin States is entitled to consumptive use. I do not believe that it makes any difference to the other basin States what we do with our water—whether we use it all, and reuse it until it is all used up, and there is no return flow, or whether we let a larger amount go down.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand the evidence, the return flow of the Arizona projects to the limitrophe section of the river will be below a point where it could be redirected and reused in Arizona, except by pumping.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Frankly, I have serious doubts that there will be the amount of return flow

estimated by the Government engineers. But even if there is half of the estimated amount of return flow, it is still important. All of the States are interested in seeing that the United States gets credit for all of the water in the Colorado River which flows into Mexico. This is the principal reason for the treaty provision for a diversion dam to be placed in the river.

This brings us to the question of whether a diversion dam should be allowed to be constructed in the imitrophe section of the river.

The people of Yuma have for many years fought the building of a dam in this locality and now fear damage from seepage and flood in the event one is constructed. The treaty provides in article 12 that "Regardless of where such diversion structure is located, there shall simultaneously be constructed such levees, interior drainage facilities and other works, or improvements to existing works, as in the opinion of the Commission shall be necessary to protect lands within the United States against damage from such floods and seepage as might result from the construction, operation, and maintenance of this diversion structure. These protective works shall be constructed, operated, and maintained at the expense of Mexico by the respective sections of the Commission, or under their supervision, each within the territory of its own country.

With this section in the treaty coupled with the reservation which my colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] and I presented and which the committee has accepted providing that the United States recognizes a duty to require that the protective structures provided for under article 12, paragraph (a) be so constructed, operated, and maintained, as to adequately prevent damage to property and lands within the United States, from such construction and operation. By this reservation the Mexican Government is given notice of the dangers to property and lands in the United States from these structures. I feel the Yuma people can rely on our Government's seeing that no damage will occur. Surely we can rely on the promise of our Government.

There are other objectionable features in the opinion of some of us which have been removed by the reservations presented by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY]. I shall not discuss them, for with the reservations they become unimportant. However, one of the reservations meets an objection of our largest irrigation project, the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association. I refer to the reservation presented which prevents any interference or control over the irrigation within the boundaries of the respective States. This reservation does not relieve our Government of its duty to supply the amount promised in the treaty to Mexico. It does protect old-established water rights such as those on the Salt and Gila Rivers which existed prior to the passage of the Boulder Canyon Act and the building of the Boulder Dam, and this reservation together with others and the wording of the treaty itself makes it clear that it is not the intent

of the treaty to in any way modify our domestic laws.

Mr. President, because this reservation is an answer to the objection which was made by the senior Senator from Nevada—I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at this moment—I should like to read the reservation into the RECORD:

That nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of State of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, or the United States section of said Commission, to alter or control the distribution of water to users within the territorial limits of any of the individual States.

I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for its willingness to protect the respective States from interference by the Commission in the administration of their water rights; also for its willingness to guard against damage to the people of Yuma; and for the other reservations, such as the one which I have discussed, making it clear that Mexico cannot receive a right to more than 1,500,000 acre-feet of water.

Mr. President, I said in the beginning that the amount of water to be delivered to Mexico is the important part of the treaty. For the reasons I have stated, I feel that we should accept the treaty, and we should thus prevent the possibility of having Mexico establish an equitable right to a larger amount of water. I am not interested in the arguments made for the acceptance of this treaty on account of the good-neighbor policy. This treaty is by far too important to our Nation for the United States Senate to base its decision upon that kind of an argument. We cannot afford to give important resources for good will. No nation should expect it; and such an argument has the opposite effect upon me.

I want the United States Senate to know and I want the people of my State to know that I have arrived at my conclusions after careful and deliberate consideration of the facts alone.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I have asked the Senator to yield because he has referred to the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association. I happen to have a copy of the statement by that association on the subject of the pending treaty. I hold the statement in my hand. I wish to inquire whether the Senator agrees with item No. 4, on page 1, which I should like to read at this time. It is entitled "The Preservation of Existing Rights":

The treaty shall not be deemed to amend the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, or any contractual obligation of the United States thereunder, nor to impose upon the waters of the Gila River and its tributaries any burden in respect to Mexico, except return flow originating below Gillespie Dam.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I urged the committee to adopt as much of that reservation as it could. In place of that reservation, the committee

adopted the reservation I have just read. If the Senator from New Jersey refers to what California claims to be a contract to build a power dam at Pilot Knob, I do not agree to that. I do not believe the then Secretary of the Interior ever had a right to make such a contract, and California was bound by the notice of the wording of the Boulder Canyon Act. That is my interpretation.

If the Senator inquires whether there would be an interference with the laws and with the Colorado River compact, I say I do not think the treaty would do so. Again let me repeat that I do not believe California had any right to make that kind of contract. I am not going to be bound by any such contract. I will admit that perhaps California is entitled to something for the use of the All-American Canal to take the water to Mexico; but if that is what the Senator has in mind in his reservation, I am against it.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me ask the Senator a question. The question whether this is a good contract is one which can be determined under our judicial system in the United States; is it not? Is the Senator opposed to protecting a contract or a compact which has been made, if it is a good one, according to the American system of jurisprudence?

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that I am in favor of making a treaty which will give us every possible drop of water. I do not blame the senior Senator from California for fighting for California. As I said at the beginning of my statement, I have the greatest admiration for the Senator. But I believe we should make a treaty which will give the greatest benefits to us in the United States. If we take all the water through the All-American Canal, we will not receive credit for the return flow, which is very important.

As I said before, I do not believe the then Secretary of the Interior had any right to make such a contract; and if the purpose of the Senator from New Jersey in proposing the reservation is to establish the rights of California under that contract, I say to the Senator that I will vote against the reservation.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator certainly believes, I am sure, from my knowledge of him, that a contract in California is just as sacred as a contract in Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator take the position that if an official—or a bureaucrat, as those on the other side of the aisle like to call them—makes a contract that is not authorized under law, we in the Senate should recognize it?

Mr. HAWKES. I have not said that.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is what I am saying.

Mr. HAWKES. I understand. I am endeavoring to ascertain whether the Senator would agree with what I have said. Let us pay no attention to references to bureaucrats, or other references to administrative bodies. If the contract is a good one, would the Senator from Arizona be in favor of having the Government of the United States keep faith with the States and public agencies in connection with it?

Mr. MCFARLAND. It may even be necessary to condemn certain rights. Someone may have a right to a piece of land; he may own it. His right to that land is a good right; but sometimes the Government of the United States has to condemn land and take it over. But I am not willing to defeat the treaty in order to satisfy the people of the Imperial irrigation district.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator tell me whether I am correctly informed that the American Federation of Labor has gone on record in the Senator's State as being opposed to the treaty in its present form? I should like to know.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I have received telegrams from some representatives of labor who stated they favor the treaty; and I have received from other representatives of labor telegrams stating that they were opposed to the treaty. Our people in the State of Arizona are divided on this question.

I have spent months studying the question. I have given it careful consideration. I think I have studied it as much as has the Senator from New Jersey. I know that my State is more vitally affected than the Senator's State is.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me interrupt sufficiently long to say that my State is not affected at all, except as it is a part of the United States. As such, the people of my State are interested in seeing that the United States keeps faith with its citizens and with the various States.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the interest the Senator from New Jersey has taken in the pending question. I am glad to see Senators from other States take an interest in this very important matter, because it is important to us in the West. Water is our very lifeblood. We are dependent on it. It is only because I feel that the treaty is best for my State and is best for the Nation that I am willing to vote for ratification of the treaty with the reservations I have mentioned.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, as I said before, I wish to have the Senate know and I wish to have the people of my State know that I have arrived at my conclusions after careful and deliberate consideration of the facts alone. To be frank, I would prefer to have a treaty giving less water to Mexico because of the value of water to the future of my State and to our Nation. But I have decided that this treaty is the best we can expect to get; and if we do not accept and ratify this treaty, Mexico may establish rights to more water, and some day we may be forced to give more water, or to refuse to do so, after a decision of arbitrators. Under those circumstances, we could maintain such a position solely because we are a powerful nation. I do not believe we would do that.

So, Mr. President, if the reservations which we have requested and which are recommended by the committee, are accepted, I shall cast my vote for ratification of the treaty.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

During the delivery of Mr. MCFARLAND'S speech,

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have an engagement to make an address tomorrow evening at Louisville, Ky. I ask unanimous consent to be absent until Monday if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSALL in the chair). Is their objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator remain on the floor during the remainder of the day?

Mr. HILL. If the distinguished Senator from Arizona continues to speak it will not require any request on his part to insure my presence. [Laughter.]

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

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. WILEY. For what purpose?

Mr. MURDOCK. For a brief statement before the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] leaves the Chamber.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In examining the biographies of our colleagues I find that today is the anniversary of the birth of the very genial and able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I take this opportunity to extend to him the congratulations of his colleagues on this very happy occasion.

Mr. President, in sizing up the Senator a moment ago I decided that he might wish to leave the Chamber in order, perhaps, to celebrate the anniversary of his birth and eat a birthday cake.

Mr. WILEY. Am I to understand that the anniversary is that of the Senator's birth or his marriage?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is the anniversary of his birth.

Mr. WILEY. Very well.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is now growing late, and if he desires to be excused I think it would be a mark of respect for the Senate to excuse the distinguished Senator from Washington for the remainder of the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be excused for the remainder of the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the privilege being forced upon the Senator from Washington against his wish?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Apparently it is. [Laughter.]

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the treaty (Executive A, 78th Cong.,

2d sess.), between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers, and (Executive H, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol supplementary to the treaty.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President; I feel somewhat hesitant to speak on the subject of the treaty now before the Senate. I was a member of the committee which for more than 4 weeks considered the treaty. I saw partisans of Texas, of California, and perhaps one or two other States take charge of the sessions by main force. They conducted the hearings and the remaining members of the committee injected questions now and then.

We are at a period in our own history when international politics engage the attention and the thought of our people. The thinkers and statesmen of all nations are likewise engaged. International politics cannot be separated from what we might call international economics. The prosperity of every nation depends upon the economic set-up of that nation. Economics, of course, is dependent upon consumption, production, and distribution.

Because the nations of the world have grown closer together, we are constantly thinking about what will satisfy the desires and the human wants of our own and other like-minded peoples.

The recent Chapultepec Conference indicates quite clearly—and I have particular reference to the attitude of the conferees—that the nations of the Western Hemisphere are tied together by economic and political bonds as strong as the law of gravity that pulls the waters of the Rio Grande into the Gulf of Mexico, and the waters of the Colorado River into the Gulf of Lower California.

For over half a century Mexico and the United States have been seeking a solution of the problem arising out of international waters—international rivers. Water is a great material resource. Heretofore there has been a failure successfully to manage the economics of the waters of these two rivers. I believe that out of the awakened conscience arising from this global war has come this treaty. We know that no matter how we seek to equalize material values, differences will arise as to the distribution thereof, unless accompanied by understanding and a desire for fraternity.

I believe this treaty is a step in the right direction. In discussing the matter, I shall rigidly refrain from any personal criticism. I do not think that such a course lends itself to lucidity of thinking.

After over 4 weeks of listening in committee to testimony on the subject of the Mexican Water Treaty, and all that time seeking to preserve a judicial attitude toward the whole subject, I find myself in a position where, with the adoption of certain reservations, I can support the treaty. Someone has said that if one were to support only those measures which coincide 100 percent with his own views, he would never support any measure. What we have to do in voting on legislation or treaties is to

consider the whole picture and take that course which is most nearly right.

In this assembly of 96 men, no 2 of whom have the same background—religiously, economically, politically, racially, or geographically—we see in operation the system of checks and balances which has made America great and maintained her type of democratic republic.

Now I believe that this treaty, if it becomes the law of the land, equitably settles the water rights of the two nations in relation to three international rivers—the Tijuana, Rio Grande, and Colorado Rivers.

I listened for more than 4 weeks to the testimony. There was a great deal of repetition. It was only after the testimony was closed and after going through the arguments presented by very distinguished people that I reached my conclusion. One must rise above personal conflicts and fears, and view this whole matter as an American. I realize that I am fortunate in that respect. While I have countless friends in California and Texas, I feel that this is an American undertaking. I realize that in such undertakings we in America have an obligation to look out for our own. If I had any prejudice it was at the start, as I felt that we might not have looked out for our citizens of California. But I have had too many lawsuits to know that until the facts are all in, it is inadvisable for a jurist to decide the case in his own mind. So I kept my mind open throughout the "trial" period.

Having reached my conclusions, I should like to present my specific thoughts on them. First, let us review the matter specifically with relation to the States involved. There is no question that the treaty is a very good treaty so far as Texas is concerned. There is no dispute about that fact. The system of dams will not only equate the flow of the Rio Grande, but will give Texas 50 percent of the Rio Grande flow while about 70 percent of the flow is contributed from Mexican streams. It will make possible the development of thousands of more acres in Texas and insure water supply for the thirsty ground already cultivated. It will harness the Rio Grande and stop floods.

The situation on the Colorado is not as clear. That is evident by the fact that people in the same State disagree on the facts and conclusions. Engineers for the Government and for California cannot agree on the facts and lawyers do not agree on the law. There are some facts, however, in relation to the Colorado which we can set down as reasonably certain:

(a) At present the Colorado, with the Boulder Dam, has more than sufficient water in it to take care of the present needs of the seven States.

(b) Prior to the building of the Boulder Dam, Mexico did not put to use more than 600,000 to 700,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado. Since the building of the dam, she has put to use approximately 1,100,000 acre-feet.

(c) At present there flow into the Gulf of Mexico something like 10,000,000 acre-feet, wasted.

(d) The Reclamation Department of the Government in 1922 had set up figures, which I shall quote later, showing future demands in the Colorado Valley under Government contracts and an estimate of available water supply. This would show some 2,000,000 feet shortage during dry cycles. This estimate was revamped by a witness who calculated the discrepancy at approximately 800,000 feet.

(e) The construction of the Boulder Dam and the construction of other dams in the upper and lower basins will make it possible to equate the flow of water and, as civilization grows in the basin, to distribute the water in accordance with the Colorado compact.

I might say that it was not contradicted that if this treaty shall become the law of the land, it will facilitate this work in the Colorado River Basin, making thousands of acres available for new settlement and the utilization of the waters of the Colorado.

(f) The main issue or difference between the contention of the Government and California centered around the amount of water to be guaranteed to Mexico.

California was ready to guarantee 750,000 acre-feet of pure water or usable water but not 1,500,000 acre-feet. California contended also that the language in the treaty meant that 1,500,000 acre-feet of the water of the Colorado River might well mean guaranteed usable water and that it might be necessary, because of the saline content of water 30 or 40 years from now, to contribute a lot more water to make it usable. The contention of the State Department is that the treaty speaks for itself and that whatever the condition of the water of the Colorado, due to the use of the same in the upper stretches, Mexico would have to accept the water in the condition it is in.

After studying the text of the treaty, after realizing that Mexican engineers knew what they were about, and realizing also that if the time should come in the years ahead when the water was so saline that it was unusable for agricultural purposes, this very treaty itself would be the greatest protection that the last users in the United States could have.

On the subject of salinity, I am satisfied—which shows that I am an optimist—that if this matter became very important, the ingenuity of man would find the answer. Already in a small way we know that hundreds of our boys whose ships have been torpedoed at sea or whose airplanes have ceased to function above the ocean, who have been obliged to take to the rafts, have by a very simple device made use of the ocean water so they would have water to drink.

I am not selling America short on the saline question. We will have that answered if it ever becomes an issue, but the best evidence obtainable indicates it will not be an issue for 40 or 50 years to come.

As I recall, under the compact California was entitled to some 4,400,000 acre-feet. Today she is using about 2,200,000.

We have said that the treaty was a good one as far as Texas is concerned, and in arriving at the conclusion we did, we think it is a good treaty as far as America is concerned.

So, now, let us review the treaty from the point of view of the United States as a whole, while making further references to particular States.

THE MERITS OF THE TREATY

(a) The treaty definitely settles a troublesome question between the two nations. In the hearings and on the floor of the Senate, much has been said about this question of arbitration. I can add nothing to that subject. I do know that this Nation, which has been the leader in the field of international arbitration and standing for the validity of international law, could not in good conscience refuse to arbitrate in the future the question of what quantity of water Mexico would be entitled to have released to her. Of course, that issue could not arise for many years to come because now, as I have said, some 10,000,000 acre-feet flow into Mexico. But under this treaty, Mexico would be estopped in claiming more than what was agreed to. As I view the future, that is a very important consideration.

(b) The treaty results in harnessing the Rio Grande, doing away with floods, creating electric power, creating wealth on both sides thereof.

(c) In the Colorado River Basin, it definitely settles the meaning of the language in the Colorado compact, relating to a future treaty with Mexico. It endangers no one's water rights or possible rights for many years to come.

(d) It will bring about quicker consummation of planned projects in the United States and that means development in certain arid sections.

Mr. President, that is extremely important when we think of the growth of population in this country, and when we think of 10,000,000 of our boys returning from the war. There will be land available for them; and if the treaty shall be ratified and become the law, the land will be used. If we continue to leave this matter up in the air, it will interfere with the consummation of the plans which are already laid.

It will not in the slightest degree threaten any of the investments made by California. That is an important consideration. I have reached that conclusion after having gone into the matter. In fact, it will definitely let everyone know just where they are at. California today is only using about 2,000,000 acre-feet. Under the compact, she has a right to 4,400,000 acre-feet. There are outstanding contracts for 5,400,000 acre-feet, and I feel that under the equated flow of the river these contracts will be taken care of when and if they are needed and the water is needed. There will be water to spare—at least, for many years to come.

(f) Something has been said to the effect that the negotiators of the compact estimated a greater water supply in the Colorado River than present records indicate exist. At that time; that is, when Mr. Hoover was in the picture, the nego-

tiators estimated the supply to be 20,000,000 acre-feet—yes; up to 22,000,000 acre-feet. It is my understanding that estimates of the United States Bureau of Reclamation ending in the year 1920 and estimates made by the Bureau at the present time do not revise downward the Bureau's estimate of the water supply of the Colorado River since the compact was negotiated.

The distinguished senior Senator from California presented a report of February 23, 1922, by the United States Bureau of Reclamation. In table 9, on page 37 of that report, the flow of the Colorado River at Yuma is estimated at an average of 17,550,000 acre-feet per annum for the period of record ending 1920. The flow at Boulder Dam is estimated at 16,407,000 acre-feet. The Bureau at present estimates the mean annual virgin flow of the river at Yuma at 17,751,000 acre-feet per annum, which is about 200,000 acre-feet more than it estimated this flow to be at the time the 1922 report was prepared. The virgin flow at Boulder Dam, as estimated now by the Bureau of Reclamation, is 17,331,000 acre-feet. This is 861,000 acre-feet more per year than the estimate which appeared in the 1922 report. Engineers for the Bureau of Reclamation and other engineers estimate that sufficient storage will be provided on the river under ultimate conditions fully to equate the flow of the stream to the long-time average. Therefore, the results of the records of run-off for the period 1931-40, inclusive, have not justified any reduction in the figure of safe water supply.

(g) Something has been said about there being an excess of demand over supply in the upper basin. It will be remembered that in 1922 the allocation was for 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum to the upper basin. While at that time there was no thought of transmountain diversion, there is thought of that now. However, to offset that, it has now been found that there is a lesser amount of acreage susceptible of irrigation within the natural basin of the Colorado River than was estimated in 1922.

(h) Under the Colorado River compact, there is the obligation of the upper basin to deliver to the lower basin not less than 75,000,000 acre-feet in any 10-year period. As the upper basin develops and storage dams are created, the United States Bureau of Reclamation estimates that there will be constructed in the upper basin some 38,000,000 acre-feet of storage in order to increase irrigation development in that basin, and to generate hydroelectric energy. To generate the electricity, the water must be released, just as something over 10,000,000 acre-feet are released at Boulder now to generate the electricity which California buys. The operation of such reservoirs for the generation of electricity will so equate the flow of the stream that the upper basin delivery at Lee Ferry will always be made. This should banish any doubt as to the ability of the upper basin in the years to come to fulfill its obligation under the Colorado River compact.

(i) We have no disagreement with those who, looking into the future, say that the Colorado River is a natural resource of the United States and will be-

come of greater and greater importance and value as time goes on. It is for that very reason that a treaty should be consummated at this time. I call the Senator's attention to a table found in the Reclamation report, *Problems of Imperial Valley and Vicinity*, Senate Document No. 142, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, 1922. A table which appears on page 38 of this Senate document shows the estimate made by the Bureau of the ultimate acreage that would be irrigated below Boulder Canyon:

TABLE 12.—*Estimated ultimate demand (All lands below Boulder Canyon)*

	Acres
United States.....	1,220,000
Mexico.....	800,000
Total.....	2,020,000

A break-down of the Mexican acreage is given in table 3 on page 32 of the Senate document, as follows:

	Total ultimate acreage
Mexico:	
Under Imperial Canal.....	255,000
Under All-American Canal.....	30,000
Delta south of Volcano Lake and Bee River.....	250,000
Sonora.....	265,000
Total.....	800,000

On page 75 of the report, the following statement appears:

Storage required: It is expected that some storage will be required for full development of the lands under the Imperial Canal in California and Mexico. The question of water supply and storage requirements of this project must be considered in conjunction with the subject as a whole on the Colorado River, and it is being so considered in the general water-supply report being prepared on the lower Colorado River in connection with the investigations required under the Kinkaid Act.

It may be noted that the report of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Problems of Imperial Valley and vicinity considered that 800,000 acres ultimately would be irrigated in Mexico, and that some storage would be required for this purpose. Under the present duty of water in the Mexican area, the 800,000 acres of land would require a diversion from the river of 4,800,000 acre-feet of water. The aggregate acreage under the two items to which the footnote in the above table applies is 285,000 acres. Under the present diversion duty in Mexico this acreage would require a diversion from the river of 1,510,000 acre feet.

It must be remembered that the Colorado River is an international stream and that the United States cannot do with it entirely as she sees fit. The effect of the treaty will be to confine Mexican development to a much smaller acreage than that which the Bureau report of 1922 estimated would ultimately be irrigated, and to permit a material increase in the acreage and the use of water in the United States over the estimate made in that report. The Bureau report of 1922 estimated that the water demand for the ultimate acreage in the entire basin in both countries would be 12,531,000 acre-feet. Under the treaty, the use of Colorado River water by the

United States alone can be in excess of 16,000,000 acre-feet per annum.

(j) It has been contended also that the language in the compact which referred to a treaty to be made with Mexico was indefinite and therefore the amount should not be over 750,000 acre-feet. That is based on the suggestion that Mexico was at that time using only some 500,000 to 600,000 acre-feet per year. The distinguished Senator from Colorado has shown how Mexico was using more than that—that this amount was delivered to the laterals of the Alamo Canal and did not include canal losses, desilting water, and carriage water. We must bear in mind that the acreage irrigated in Mexico by the Alamo Canal in 1943 and 1944 was 191,700 acres and 197,900 acres, respectively, and that the diversion through the Alamo Canal for 1943 and 1944 was 1,100,000 acre-feet.

Each Senator, of course, will give these facts just such importance as he thinks they merit, in determining the justice and the equity of the treaty. As to whether or not the negotiators of the compact considered possible such a treaty as the present one, all we have to consider is that the total water supply of the basin was assumed to be 20,000,000 acre-feet to 22,000,000 acre-feet. The negotiators of the compact allotted to the two basins an aggregate of 16,000,000 acre-feet and provided that in the event of a treaty with Mexico, the Mexican water should come first out of the surplus over and above the 16,000,000 acre-feet, and if that were not sufficient each basin would make up the deficiency equally out of the 16,000,000 acre-feet allocation. I actually believe that the terms of the present treaty are such that there will be no encroachment on the use by the United States of the 16,000,000 acre-feet. The water that goes to Mexico will be in the surplus above the 16,000,000 acre-feet. Of course, what the various States had in mind at the time of the compact as to the amount of water that was to be allocated to Mexico when the treaty was made is not controlling. We are simply asking ourselves, as representatives of the Federal Government, what is the equitable, fair apportionment. I believe the negotiators arrived at that. You and I know that, as the Colorado is developed with reservoir dams, with power projects, and these projects will be paid for, I hope, like Boulder Dam was by the consumers of electric energy. We know that the water will have to leave those reservoirs and flow down the stream just as the 10,000,000 acre-feet have to leave Boulder every year to generate California's demand for electric juice.

(k) We now come to an important matter which has raised a doubt in the minds of some Senators. I refer to the escape clause. I believe that it is not uncertain, and in view of all the facts—and by facts I mean the proof relating to the water supply of the Colorado—I do not believe that it jeopardizes the rights of any of our nationals. The escape clause is as follows:

In the event of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the United States, thereby making it difficult

for the United States to deliver the guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet a year, the water allotted to Mexico under subsection (a) will be reduced in the same proportion as consumptive uses in the United States are reduced.

(l) The whole argument against this treaty seems to center around the general allegation that we are not playing fair with California, and that we are impairing existing American rights. This is a serious indictment. First, we have to remember the quantity of water that was allotted under the compact to the lower basin—7,500,000 acre-feet. Of this amount, California received 4,200,000 acre-feet. Second, we have to remember that with that 4,200,000 acre-feet, California establishes the priority. No one else has any right in that process. Third, that from the generation of electricity alone at Boulder Dam, over 10,000,000 acre-feet flow down the Colorado. Fourth, we know that the entire cost of Boulder Dam will be repaid by the users of hydroelectric energy, and that the generation of such energy will not be impaired by the terms of the treaty. Fifth, now let us take the example of the Los Angeles aqueduct. We know the population of southern California reached an all-time peak due to many Army camps and war industries located in that area, and yet during 1943 only 35,000 acre-feet of water was diverted through this aqueduct. But if conflict should arise between the various interests in California as to the use of California's share of the water of the Colorado River, then that is a matter which California must settle. But it is apparent that with California only using some 2,000,000 acre-feet, and having the right to use 4,400,000 acre-feet, it will be a long time before she has any need for her allotted share, and, of course, there will be no objection to her using any of the surplus water as long as the use thereof does not interfere with the rights of the other States and Mexico.

(m) If it should be developed that after the lapse of decades the treaty operated so as to endanger what we might call equitable rights of investors, then I would be one who would feel that there was a claim against the Government. But all this is highly conjectural. Take, for instance, the Imperial irrigation district bonds. No one would say that they were sold on the basis of speculative returns from the sale of water to Mexico or the generation of energy at Pilot Knob power plant.

(n) It is always difficult to mete out exact justice, and yet we have to consider, in arriving at a figure relating to acre-feet, the present conditions of development in Mexico. She is using now approximately 1,800,000 acre-feet, and, with 10,000,000 acre-feet going down into Mexico, I am informed she could make use of a great deal more. She could build diversion dams; she could increase her pumping facilities. If this went on for any length of time she might increase her acreage, and I do not think that the argument could properly be made that because we built Boulder Dam and thus made possible an equated flow for her utilization she could not obtain any equitable right.

We are not talking now about the law between States. We are talking about human factors, human relations, equitable considerations. I believe there is a great difference between that situation which might arise and one where she agreed by a solemn treaty that her rights should be limited to 1,500,000 acre-feet. Engineers have said that under present conditions absolutely no drawn-down of Boulder Dam storage would be necessary to meet Mexico's demand during a decade such as 1931 to 1940, inclusive; that Davis Dam and Bullhead Reservoir will be entirely adequate to supply water to Mexico in accordance with the terms of the treaty under present conditions on the river. Less than one-half of the capacity of the reservoir would be required in the lowest year of record—1934—for this purpose.

(o) When the treaty says that the allocation of water from the Colorado River to Mexico is from any and all sources, and that Mexico shall acquire no right for the use of waters of the Colorado River system for any purpose whatsoever in excess of 1,500,000 acre-feet annually—that is pretty clear Anglo-Saxon, and it makes sure that those who negotiated the treaty—Mexicans and Americans alike—fully understood the situation.

(p) Let us bear in mind that Davis Dam is already authorized for construction, and one of its purposes is to meter water to Mexico in the event that this treaty becomes the law of both nations. The treaty does not authorize Mexico to use American power for pumping from the Colorado River and it does not give Mexico a part of the power proceeds from Pilot Knob power plant. The treaty does provide that if this plant is built and if revenues therefrom become available to pay a part of the cost of Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal down to and including Pilot Knob, then the Mexican payments toward the All-American Canal shall be reduced in proportion to the reduction in the total cost. Congress can enact legislation to dispose of the revenues from Pilot Knob power plant in any way it sees fit.

(q) The treaty obligates Mexico to construct a diversion structure at some place below the upper boundary. It may be partly on American soil or it may be wholly on Mexican soil. There is no provision that obligates Mexico to construct a diversion dam wholly or partly on American soil.

(r) The treaty also provides that at the time Mexico does build a diversion structure, regardless of where it is constructed, simultaneously there shall be constructed whatever works are necessary to prevent the flooding and seeping of American lands. Without this treaty, Mexico is under no inhibition with respect to a dam wholly in her own territory.

(s) Now as to the administrative provisions. I believe that Congress, through its control of appropriations, retains complete control over the actions of the American Commissioner which involve the expenditure of money. However, in order that that matter may be cleared up, I understand that all the parties of this controversy have agreed that by

amendment or reservation, article 19 shall be changed so as to make clear that it provides for hydroelectric power at hydrointernational plants, and that the reservation suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] shall be adopted.

(t) We have said very little about the Rio Grande. This treaty is imperatively necessary to make sure that Mexico does not materially increase her uses of the Colorado River water and the water of the Rio Grande, to the detriment of our own nationals. She can divert the waters of the Rio Grande very easily, because the terrain slopes that way, and she is already doing it to a considerable extent. We cannot stop the 10,000,000 acre-feet that now go into the Gulf of Mexico from the Colorado, because we have no available use for the same. It just makes common sense that we get together. I believe that the negotiators of this treaty—Mexican and American alike—did a good job.

Mr. President, I do not believe it ever strengthens one's case to bring in personalities. In many a lawsuit when I noticed that my opponent was not arguing the case, but was referring to one of my witnesses or to myself, I referred to the statement Lincoln once made, that he had noticed that when a man damned his opponent it was clear evidence of the fact that he had a damned poor case of his own.

I am convinced that these men, who are water men, whose lives are tied up with this subject, who have lived in this work, are statesmen of the first water.

Perhaps the treaty is not written the way I would write it. This international Commission has been in existence, as we have said, for over 50 years. It is not a part of the bureaucratic machinery of the last decade. It is an essential part of the Government. Its functions, as provided by law heretofore passed and extended by this treaty, relate to the development of resources, valuable water resources in this country and in the boundary between our country and Mexico. Its personnel is made up of honorable men who understand the law of water and who have lived, some of them for decades, with this problem which now can be happily solved.

I believe that the technique of fear has been utilized to a great extent, and that many fine people have the impression that we are again being a Santa Claus. In my humble opinion, there is no question of Santa Claus in the picture. We are receiving quid pro quo. We are receiving value for value, but what is more, we are establishing something we have tried to establish for 50 years. Three rivers are involved.

No, Mr. President; I cannot see that we are being a Santa Claus. As I see it, we are getting rid of the grounds for controversy. We are adjusting matters in relation to three international streams. A glance at the map should alone settle the need for this international agreement. I have said nothing about the Tijuana, but on looking at the map, I found that in this case we were the last user.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I have heard the Senator more than once say that we are disposing of a question which affects three streams.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. As a matter of fact, we are doing nothing whatever, are we, with reference to the Tijuana River except delegating the authority of the Commission to make a treaty?

Mr. WILEY. I can agree with the fact, but I cannot agree with the conclusion. We are setting up the mechanism which will handle the future problems on the Tijuana, and in the treaty we are providing that it cannot be handled without an appropriation from Congress. We are putting into existence a mechanism whereby the Tijuana will receive international treatment by a competent water commission created under law by both governments.

If we were to apply the rule that some would have applied in relation to the Colorado, it might result in the application of the same rule to our detriment on the Tijuana. To infer that the American Commissioner would in the administration of his duty, sell America short, of course, is no argument whatever. Anyone knows that any public official, especially a technician in his own field, who would do that sort of thing, could be removed overnight. But this work relating to rivers is the life job of men who live the science. For 4 weeks I sat and listened to those men testify. They stood up under a severe grilling. Those men live that science. That does not mean that this treaty is perfect. As I have already stated, I was instrumental in obtaining two reservations. No human being is perfect.

Mr. President, we are now approaching the Conference at San Francisco. I do not expect that out of San Francisco will come any magic formula for the salvation of the world. However, if we can take one step forward, and pass this treaty, we shall go to San Francisco with realism in our hearts; and, what is more, we will have demonstrated a willingness to cooperate with our nearest neighbor in solving a problem which is full of dynamite.

Only a few years ago Maine objected when we settled the boundary line and took what she thought was a little of her own land. But the Federal Government, seeing the Federal question, did what was necessary. I ask the Senator from Maine if I am not correct in that statement.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is approaching the facts. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Maine for that concession.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have always understood that it was thought that we put something over when we took as much land

as was put into Maine. Was not Lord Ashburton accused by the British Government of being unduly generous?

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish to become involved in details; but the truth is that we sent such troops as Maine could muster to the eastern boundary, and we held on to what we thought was our own. The Webster-Ashburton Treaty did not do so badly by us, but I have always felt that the presence of our troops on the border and the determination of our people to hang on to our own made a real contribution to the ultimate result.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is not the main subject.

Mr. WHITE. To Maine it is an important matter.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have always understood that it was not so much a question of the amount of land that was conceded to Maine, but the kind of land which Maine obtained.

Mr. WHITE. A portion of the land involved is in the county which produces about 70,000,000 bushels of potatoes a year, which makes every other county in the United States look like pikers when it comes to raising potatoes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think I should have the appreciation of the Senator from Maine for giving him the opportunity at this time to boost Maine potatoes. The rest of us do not know much about the subject, we just eat them.

Getting away from facetiousness, the treaty before the Senate is not something which has just been born. It is the result of years of negotiation and effort. Two great peoples have come together. I do not believe that the Senate of the United States will separate them. As I previously stated, we are approaching the conference at San Francisco. I believe that it is important that the treaty be approved before our colleagues, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], arrive at San Francisco—approved on its merits. It has not been hurried. The deliberations in committee lasted almost 5 weeks.

Mr. President, with the reservations which have been proposed, I have no mental reservations in voting for the treaty.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have an engagement which will require my absence from the Senate to go to the House Office Building. Time is slipping by and my engagement begins at 4:30 this afternoon. There will probably be another quorum call today. I therefore request unanimous consent that I may absent myself from the Chamber in order to go to the House Office Building and keep a previous engagement which I have made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from New Mexico will be complied with.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REVERCOME. Mr. President, I understand two quorum calls have been had today, and I was not present to answer to my name at either of them. I wish to explain that, as a member of the

Military Affairs Committee, I, together with other members of the Military Affairs Committee, have been at Army headquarters in the Pentagon Building and at Fort Myer on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked and obtained permission for the Senator from West Virginia and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs to be absent from the Senate on official business.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the treaty (Executive A, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers, and (Executive H, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) a protocol supplementary to the treaty.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the treaty between Mexico and the United States was entered into by the Governments of the two countries more than a year ago, but, in my judgment, the time for consideration of the treaty by the Senate has not been sufficient to give Senators who are interested in it ample information with reference to its merits.

The impending Conference at San Francisco is advanced as a sufficient reason for hurrying consideration of the treaty. I am not prepared to discuss that question; but, to me, that reason is not entirely persuasive. It seems to me that the importance of the treaty is such that there is no special reason why there should be so much hurry about it. Very frankly, I have been impressed with the importance of the treaty. I have tried to understand it. I have given a good deal of thought to it. I have read the conflicting statements and briefs of the various contending parties. Still, I should like to have more time to consider the treaty, so that when I cast my vote on it I may feel that I am doing what is right.

The treaty is the result of negotiations which have been in progress for many years. It deals with two rivers—not three rivers—namely, the Rio Grande, which is a boundary river, and the Colorado River, which is entirely within the United States, except for a short distance. It empties into the Gulf of California on the Mexican side of the border.

Mexico has shown no interest in a treaty for the division of the waters of the Rio Grande, and has refused to consider the matter seriously unless we, at the same time, were willing to negotiate with respect to the Colorado River.

I believe the evidence shows that the waters of the Rio Grande are made up from drainage, about 40 percent from the United States and 60 percent from Mexico. Mexico has exercised its right to utilize the waters from the streams on the Mexican side flowing into the Rio Grande. It is said that Mexico has utilized the waters to such an extent that a shortage of water on the American side has been caused, and that this shortage of water has worked a great hardship on those whose efforts and industry have developed a great farming area, known

as the Rio Grande Valley in the State of Texas. The shortage of water for this area of Texas is a sizable disaster to this magic valley. I believe that by developments damming up the water and the use of the water on the Mexican side, the water customarily used on the Texas side has been decidedly reduced to the great detriment, as I say, of the people living in that Texas valley.

On the Colorado River large sums of money furnished by our own people have been employed to control the floods and impound the waters of that wild river. By the employment of those facilities we have minimized the damage of the floods to the Imperial Valley of California and to the land adjacent to the mouth of the Colorado River in Mexico. We have not only minimized the damage of the floods, but we have conserved the water of the floods, so that it may be regularly and beneficially utilized, both by the valleys of Mexico and California.

Prior to the building of the Boulder Dam and other facilities, the country of Mexico used what water it could obtain from the Colorado River when it was an unregulated river, as likewise did the people on the American side. I think the testimony shows that the greatest amount of water ever used beneficially by Mexico prior to the damming of the stream was 750,000 acre-feet a year. The average amount used did not exceed 600,000 acre-feet a year. The proponents of this treaty, both on the part of Mexico and the United States, have agreed that Mexico would have under it 1,500,000 acre-feet; and in consideration of that, Mexico and the United States would agree to build dams and facilities on the Rio Grande River to so regulate the river that the amount of water would be substantially enhanced for beneficial use on both sides of the stream; the water from the stream would be equally divided; and by such division, the magic valley of Texas could be sustained in a very valuable production to our own country and our own people. That would be gratifying to the people living in the valley and gratifying to the rest of our own country. It is a consummation devoutly desired.

There are no better or more deserving people than the people who inhabit the Rio Grande Valley of Texas, and there are no better or more deserving people than those who live in the Imperial Valley and the southern portion of the great State of California. Without the application of water other than the usual rainfall, both those areas are what we call desert countries. By the application of water, both have a valuable production not exceeded on the face of the earth. The American people must feel a deep concern for both areas.

The industry and genius of the American people living in California and in other basin States of the great Colorado River have long visualized the great blessing that would accrue by the regulation of that Colorado stream and the conservation of its waters. To that end, in 1928 the Congress passed an act vitalizing a compact between the Colorado River States. It provided for the possibility of the full utilization of the very valuable water resources of that stream; and that act also provided that the im-

pounded waters were to be for the exclusive use of the States which could so utilize them, and that Mexico should never acquire any rights to the waters so impounded by our dams. I think the evidence clearly shows that by the unregulated flow of the river Mexico could never utilize more water than is proposed by the opponents of the treaty, to wit, 750,000 acre-feet. Mexico had full notice that it would never be the intention of our country to provide her with water, by the use of our facilities, in excess of the average amount of water she could have utilized from the unregulated flow of the stream. The improvements on the Colorado River by our own country and our own people were of such a character that they not only enabled the people living along the river and adjacent to it to use the water for farming purposes and domestic uses, but they could also use it for the development of power. So valuable was that power resource that State agencies contracted to reimburse our Government for every dollar it had expended for the improvements, and thus gave to our country a great resource free of expenditures by the taxpayers.

The people of California have committed themselves to the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, relying upon the good faith of our country. They expect our Government to keep its solemn agreement with them. Now to give to the country of Mexico an additional 750,000 acre-feet of water would deprive the people on the American side of a resource which they had a right to depend upon, by reason of the agreement with their Government. I believe that to breach that confidence now would convict our Government of a breach of faith and a breach of the integrity in regard to its contract.

The proponents of the treaty now contend that ratification of the treaty would stabilize the use of the disputed waters from the Colorado and would stabilize the use of the waters along the Rio Grande, so that each country would know what to depend upon. It is claimed by the proponents that since the building of the dam on the Colorado, the beneficial use which the people on the Mexican side have been able to make of the water constitutes a right, and that by arbitration their right to a very much larger amount of water than that provided for in the treaty might be sustained. I do not believe there is any justification for that apprehension. I think neither equity nor comity of nations would justify such a finding. I doubt whether the matter could legally be made a subject of arbitration. I believe that a gratuity of this water to Mexico, at the expense of the rights of our own people, would contribute nothing to a neighborly feeling between the countries. I believe that the country of Mexico would have more respect for our country if we would insist upon our own equitable rights. To go beyond that would, I believe, condemn us for stupidity, and would detract from the respect Mexico would have for us. I think hard feelings would be engendered between the two countries, and that neighborly friendliness would be impaired, rather than improved.

The issue then becomes a controversy between the people on the Colorado River and our own people on the American side of the Rio Grande. In other words, it becomes a controversy between Texas and California. Not more than 8 States are directly concerned with the utilization of the waters of both of those rivers. It seems to me that the Senators from 40 of our States are called upon to ratify a treaty with a foreign country that will benefit Texas and will injure California. The decision is not an easy one to make; but by reason of the contract made between our Government and the States on the Colorado, I consider that they have vested rights that would now be disturbed by such a treaty; and I cannot understand how this body, actuated by the justice which it desires to accord, can agree to ratify the treaty.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the reservations offered by the Senator from Texas, as amended.

MR. TAFT. Mr. President, if we are not going to adjourn or take a recess at this time, but are to continue, I wish to ask the Senator from Texas about some of the reservations.

MR. CONNALLY. Very well.

MR. TAFT. I am concerned about the control or the statutory powers or whatever other powers would be given to the International Commission, particularly to the American Commissioner. In reservation (b) the Senator has proposed that—

Nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed as rendering inapplicable statutory or constitutional controls and processes, insofar as they affect persons and property in the territorial limits of the United States, to the administrative powers and functions of the Secretary of State of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, the United States Section of said Commission, or any other officer or employee of the United States.

What bothers me is whether there are any statutory or constitutional controls or processes to which any powers conferred by a treaty can be subjected. In other words, if it is possible to have the reservation drafted in such a way, I should like to have it provide that we shall have the same statutory and constitutional control over these functions as if they were created by statute, rather than by treaty.

What I am concerned about is the apparently established rule that a treaty is at least on a level with the Constitution, so that if something is put in a treaty, we cannot raise the constitutional questions which we can raise with regard to something provided in a statute. Merely to provide that "Nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed as rendering inapplicable statutory or constitutional controls and processes" would not seem to me to meet the objections I have to those powers, if no such processes or controls apply to treaties.

MR. CONNALLY. This reservation was drawn for the purpose of satisfying certain Senators who were fearful of a possible exercise of control by the Boundary Commission and other functionaries in

connection with the execution of the treaty. We have provided that they shall not have such powers, and that they shall be subject to the statutes, constitutional controls, and processes of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. If what the Senator has stated were made a part of the resolution of ratification, I should have no objection to it. The form of the language seems to me not to subject the members of the Boundary Commission to such processes.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are subject to them now. All we are saying is that nothing in the treaty shall change that status. The testimony on the part of the Boundary Commissioners and other functionaries before the committee was to the effect that they never had assumed such authority, and they do not assume it now. They do not try to exercise any control of international works except on the border. However, because of an extreme desire to satisfy objections of Senators, this language was inserted. It applies only to our side of the border. Mexico is not concerned. We inserted language to the effect that nothing contained in the treaty shall render inapplicable any of the controls that we may now possess.

It is further provided in the treaty that the works in the United States, as well as their maintenance, shall not be under the control of the Boundary Commission but under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation. The building of Davis Dam and other works wholly within the United States will be under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation. This reservation is intended to continue, regardless of anything which may be contained in the treaty, the same constitutional and statutory provisions which now exist. For example, appropriations and other processes of government will continue in effect.

I should like to ask the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who participated in drafting these reservations, to explain how he views their effect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the preliminary history leading to this particular reservation was a criticism which the American Bar Association had made. The American Bar Association took the position that the treaty was profligate in its grant of administrative and judicial powers to the Boundary Commission. Therefore, those who drafted the reservation were endeavoring to meet the criticism and make very clear the fact that nothing contained in the treaty or protocol should destroy constitutional or statutory controls within the territorial limits of the United States.

I am trying to learn the exact point which the Senator from Ohio has in mind. If the reservation did not exist, under the theory of the American Bar Association, and those who have echoed such theory in the hearings and before the Senate, if they are correct in their interpretation of the treaty, statutory and constitutional controls would be advisable.

The language of the reservation meets the claim head-on by stating that statutory controls and constitutional proce-

esses in the domestic field shall not be deemed to be inapplicable. That is the intent of the reservation.

Mr. TAFT. The question is whether the intent is carried out by the language of the reservation. I agree with the intent.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have before me a letter from Mr. William L. Ransom, former president of the American Bar Association, with regard to this matter. I think it would be well to read a paragraph from the letter. I shall not take time to read the entire letter. It states in part as follows:

The American Bar Association has not opposed the treaty or asked that it be amended. The American Bar Association has not concerned itself with the merits of the treaty. The association's point is a very simple and proper one, which can be dealt with, I think. It is also important, as I see it.

The American Bar Association's point is this: Insofar as the American Commissioner acts alone, as to internal matters in the United States, he should be and remain subject to the laws of the United States, to the powers of the Congress, and to judicial review as to his quasi-judicial determination.

We were trying to meet through the reservation the views expressed in the letter from which I have read. The writer of the letter was not concerned with the Mexican section of the Commission, but with the United States section, and wants the Commission to be made subject to the laws and Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think perhaps I should restate my objection to the amendment, and my contention that it does not carry out the purpose of the American Bar Association, or the purpose of the Senator from Texas. Paragraph 2 of article VI of the Constitution reads as follows:

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

And so forth. Therefore, treaties are placed on a level with the Constitution itself; and, as I view it, treaties, as well as obligations under them, are not subject to constitutional limitations. I further believe that they do not necessarily reserve any rights given by the Constitution to individuals, to Congress, or to courts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe a treaty could abrogate a statute, but, in my opinion, the very fact that treaty-making powers stem from the Constitution certainly places the Constitution above treaties, statutes, or anything else. If the power to make treaties stems from the Constitution, then certainly a treaty cannot abrogate the Constitution, which gives it life.

Mr. TAFT. That argument might have been made in the case of the State of Missouri against Holland, a migratory-

bird case. The decision in that case held that the treaty on migratory birds conferred on Congress power which it could exercise within the State of Missouri but which it could not exercise without the treaty, in spite of the language of the tenth amendment of the Constitution reserving to the States all powers not universally given to the Federal Government. In that case Mr. Justice Holmes, in effect, held that treaties are superior to, or at least on a level with, the Constitution. That doctrine has never clearly worked out, but there is still the possibility that it will.

The treaty provides:

The Commission shall determine the cases in which it shall become necessary to locate works for the conveyance of water or electrical energy and for the servicing of any such works, for the benefit of either of the two countries, in the territory of the other country, in order that such works can be built pursuant to agreement between the two Governments. Such works shall be subject to the jurisdiction and supervision of the section of the Commission within whose country they are located.

So, if we build a power plant in this country, we confer by treaty on the American Section of the Commission, one man, it seems to me, the power to supervise and regulate the power works and to dispense power.

My difficulty arises when we come to reservation (b), providing that "Nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed as rendering inapplicable statutory or constitutional controls and processes." That is not the question. The question is whether the fact that it is in a treaty does not eliminate any constitutional or statutory controls and processes, and set the Commission up as an independent body created by treaty, and no longer subject to regulation by the legislature.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest to the Senator that the effect of the reservation is, not to put it in the treaty, and not to give the body those powers. How would this suit the Senator?

Nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed to interfere with the statutory controls and processes so far as they affect the persons—

And so forth.

Mr. TAFT. I have not worked out the exact language, but I suggest that there should be added something of this sort:

And the same constitutional or statutory controls and processes shall apply to such administrative powers and functions as if they were created by statute.

That is what I think should be added, so that we will not have a negative statement, but a direct, positive statement.

I think something can be worked out. I do not desire to object to the reservation, I think it is all right as it is, but I think it should go a little further than it does.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is always difficulty in transposing language of a reservation, but it seems to me that everyone agrees with the objective, and if the objective can be accomplished by transposing the language so as

to have it begin with the word "insofar", in line 3, it could be made to read, "So far as they affect persons", and so forth, "the treaty and protocol shall be held subject to statutory or constitutional controls and processes within the United States."

Mr. TAFT. I think perhaps that would be a simpler way of stating it. I suggest we can work out something before tomorrow which will be satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the reservation proposed by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TAFT. There is one other reservation about which I should like to raise a question, and I should be glad to do it now, if it is desired, but I think it might be worked out without debate.

Mr. DOWNEY. What was the announcement by the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the reservation presented by the Senator from Texas yesterday.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why can we not agree on some of the reservations which are not objected to?

Mr. DOWNEY. The reservations have not been printed in final form. We may agree to a large majority of them, but I may wish to discuss some of them tomorrow morning when they are printed in final form.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are printed in final form up to now.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not believe they include the changes made by the subcommittee.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; they will be printed in the RECORD tonight.

Mr. BARKLEY. New copies should be printed of the amended reservations. I ask unanimous consent that all reservations be printed carrying the language of the modifications submitted by the subcommittee and by the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the full Committee on Foreign Relations, which have not yet been printed, and are not now in full upon our desks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Kentucky, as the Chair understands it, is that the reservations be reprinted as modified in the committee, and by the Senator from Texas, and on the floor of the Senate today, for appearance on the table tomorrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kentucky will be complied with.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I renew my request for a unanimous-consent agreement that the Senate vote at 3 o'clock, Monday, on the reservations and the treaty.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked me to make objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator make objection?

Mr. DOWNEY. I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Kentucky at what time the Senate is to meet tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had hoped that the Senate could meet at 11 o'clock, but the Senator from California has suggested that other conferences—I do not know with whom—are in progress which may result in saving some time, and I am willing to save an hour tomorrow if by so doing we can save a day or two, so I am going to yield to the Senator's usually persuasive and seductive importunities by moving that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow; but I shall expect results when we return tomorrow.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very grateful to the Senator.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(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:

James G. Smyth, of San Francisco, Calif., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of California, in place of Harold A. Berliner.

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Alfred Schindler, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Brig. Gen. Claude A. Larkin to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 1st day of April 1945;

Brig. Gen. William P. T. Hill to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 1st day of April 1945; and

Col. Ivan W. Miller to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 21st day of January 1945.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Stella Creekmore, to be postmaster at Rockholt, Ky.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 12 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

James J. Caffrey, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1945; vice Robert H. O'Brien.

IN THE NAVY

Commodore Edmund W. Burrough, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of April 1943.

Capt. Harold B. Miller, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Director of Public Relations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Sovereign God of the universe, we pray that our minds and hearts may have a clear and confident realization of the eternal truth that Thou art man's unfailing friend and counselor.

Grant that in our thoughts and toils during this day we may aspire and endeavor to do Thy will more perfectly. When the evening hour comes may we receive that benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the faithful.

Bless our President, our Speaker, and all who are now carrying such heavy burdens and responsibilities. Sustain them by Thy grace and the companionship of Thy presence.

We pray that this bleeding and wartorn world may soon be forever delivered from the forces of evil and destruction. Inspire us to dedicate ourselves humbly and heroically to the building of a social order in which the spirit of the Prince of Peace shall prevail.

In the name of the Christ we offer our prayers and our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 9, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed joint resolutions and bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 29, 1945:

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution providing for the employment of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets, House of Representatives.

On March 31, 1945:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in lieu of certain appropriations contained in H. R. 2374, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors;

H. R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2745. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921.

On April 3, 1945:

H. R. 2404. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 201. An act for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation;

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau;

H. R. 206. An act for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss;

H. R. 268. An act for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.;

H. R. 510. An act granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.;

H. R. 685. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Murray B. Latimer;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate;

H. R. 807. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Louise Townsend;

H. R. 914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Margaret G. Potts;

H. R. 934. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 945. An act for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse;

H. R. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring;

H. R. 950. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Ray L. Smith;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.;

H. R. 1135. An act for the relief of Gus A. Vance;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello;

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of George Webb;

H. R. 1353. An act for the relief of J. P. Harris;

H. R. 1396. An act for the relief of Anne Loacker;

H. R. 1483. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers;

H. R. 1534. An act to amend the Fact Finders' Act;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.;

H. R. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased;

H. R. 2013. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 2055. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 209. An act for the relief of David B. Smith;

H. R. 1307. An act for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.;

H. R. 1325. An act for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer;

H. R. 1527. An act to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes;

H. R. 1567. An act for the relief of Katherine Smith;

H. R. 1669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell;

H. R. 1707. An act for the relief of Murray W. Moran;

H. R. 1983. An act for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis; and

H. R. 2122. An act to extend to 6 months after the termination of hostilities the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day, or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. National Archives.
6. Office of Defense Transportation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 27. An act to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war;

S. 37. An act to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes.

S. 69. An act for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.;

S. 78. An act for the relief of the estate of William Edward Oates;

S. 90. An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara;

S. 105. An act to extend the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation;

S. 122. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets, of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended;

S. 123. An act to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments, to maintenance in, and discharge from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended;

S. 124. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,'" approved June 20, 1906, as

amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924;

S. 125. An act to provide for the disposition of funds collected by District of Columbia examining, licensing, and other boards and commissions, and for other purposes;

S. 174. An act for the relief of Mary Martha Withers, as trustee; Mary Martha Withers, as administratrix of the estate of Beatrice Withers, deceased; and Mary Martha Withers, individually;

S. 176. An act for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and Memphis Park Commission;

S. 328. An act for the relief of James A. Kelly;

S. 359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack;

S. 392. An act for the relief of Nebraska Wesleyan University and Herman Platt;

S. 427. An act to repeal section 3 of the act approved April 13, 1938, as amended, relating to hops;

S. 428. An act for the relief of the Forest Lumber Co., Lamm Lumber Co., and Algoma Lumber Co.;

S. 498. An act for the relief of W. C. Wornhoff and Josephine Wornhoff;

S. 567. An act for the relief of Mrs. Freda Gullikson;

S. 638. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia by adding a new section 548a and providing for the recording of veterans' discharge certificates;

S. 701. An act to provide a method for the wartime reduction of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States; and

S. 804. An act to authorize certain additional appointments in the Officers' Corps of the Regular Army in initial grades not above the grade of captain.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Federal Works Agency.
4. National Archives.
5. Petroleum Administration for War.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT POLICY

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

MR. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 417) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 176) authorizing that the report from the Attorney General of the United States dated February 28, 1945, on International Air Transport Policy, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Attorney General of the United States transmitted to the House of Representatives on February 28, 1945, including a report by the Attorney General on International Air Transport Policy, pursuant to the provisions of section 205 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document, and that 1,000 additional

copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This is a unanimous report from the Committee on Printing, is it?

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] agrees to it?

Mr. JARMAN. I understand he does. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes on Tuesday next after the disposition of the business of the day and other special orders.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: SECOND QUARTERLY REPORT OF U. N. R. R. A. EXPENDITURES AND OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second quarterly report on U. N. R. R. A. expenditures and operations under the act of March 28, 1944, authorizing United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

In the course of their victories United Nations armies have liberated millions of people and have done their best to provide them with a minimum amount of essential civilian supplies. But the needs of the liberated people cannot be met by the armed forces alone. Their chief task is to fight and to defeat the enemy.

During the course of the war U. N. R. R. A. can help the liberated people only to the extent that military considerations of operations, supply, shipping, and distribution make it possible. The requirements of the armed forces for accelerated military operations have had the first call on our supplies, our shipping, and the unloading and transportation facilities in the liberated areas.

Notwithstanding the exigencies of the war U. N. R. R. A. has shipped some supplies to the liberated areas and U. N. R. R. A. personnel has begun to aid in the distribution of these supplies. It has begun, too, to assist in the immense task of repatriating the millions of displaced United Nations nationals and to assist in preventing and controlling the spread of disease among the victims of war. As rapidly as circumstances permit, U. N. R. R. A. is furnishing emergency and essential aid to the heroic people who

fought the Nazis before the invaders overran their lands, who fought them later during the period of occupation, and who are now fighting side by side with the forces of the other United Nations.

We in America, who have been so fortunate as to have the battle for the world waged beyond our shores, propose as participants in U. N. R. R. A. to do all in our power to help these victims of war begin to regain their strength so that they can help themselves and assume their rightful places as partners in achieving victory and in building a lasting peace.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 11, 1945.

MESSAGE FROM GENERAL BRADLEY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

From Twelfth Army group, T. A. C., signed Bradley. To United States House of Representatives. A. G. W. A. R., please pass.

"Troops of the First, Third, Ninth, and Fifteenth United States Armies gratefully welcome your good wishes, with the knowledge their victories largely reflect the great strength of the Nation."

MESSAGE FROM GENERAL DEVERS

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

The Speaker, House of Representatives:
The following message has been received from General Devers for delivery to you:

"General Patch and I wish to express our appreciation and the appreciation of the officers and men of our commands for the motion of congratulations adopted by the United States House of Representatives."

MESSAGE FROM GENERAL SPAATZ

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

The Speaker, House of Representatives:
Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz has asked the War Department to express to you, on behalf of himself and the members of his command, their sincere thanks and appreciation for your message of congratulations, which was delivered to him by General Eisenhower.

General Spaatz asks that you be assured that the appreciation of the efforts of his command expressed by the House of Representatives is a source of inspiration to him and his men.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Saturday next.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that this carries out the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] to have the House meet at that time for the celebration of Pan-American Day.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the reading of the Journal and before the legislative business, the Commissioner from the Philippines, General Romulo, be permitted to address the House for one-half hour.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, can the majority leader advise us as to next week's program?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am hopeful that I will be able to do that within a very short time.

I am looking into that now and am hopeful that I may be able to confer with my friend in a few minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and in connection with the question of the program for the week, the statement was made in the House when it last met that the Appropriations Committee was not ready to report an appropriation bill and in view of the situation there would be no legislative program for the week. While it may not have been so intended, the implication was that the committee had in some way been derelict in its duty in the matter of having business ready for the consideration of the House. The only conclusion to be drawn from the statement is that the House had expected to take up business this week and would have taken up business this week but for the failure of the committee to report expected business.

As a matter of fact the committee was prepared to report, and would have reported, bills had it not been directed to withhold them. It was announced by the majority leader that no business of a controversial nature would be taken up before April 16. But for that announcement, the committee could have had two bills ready.

In addition, there were conference reports which could have been ready for consideration this week. The Senate was insistent on having a conference on the first deficiency bill and disposing of it before the recess. I took up the matter with the leadership of the House, but it was not considered advisable to dispose of it before the recess. I then suggested that conference be held during the recess and the conference report be taken up last Monday, but the leadership thought best not to bring up any controversial business this week. The implication that the failure of the House to get down to business this week is due to any failure on the part of the Appropriations Committee to have business ready is wholly unwarranted.

The SPEAKER. What two bills is the gentleman speaking of that the Committee on Appropriations could have brought in this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad the gentleman from Missouri has made that statement. The gentleman from Missouri can now help the gentleman from Massachusetts and answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan. We would like to put an appropriation bill on the legislative program for Tuesday of next week. Will it be satisfactory to the gentleman to consider the naval appropriation bill at that time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That would be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman be ready on Wednesday with the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly. We will have it ready the week following the disposition of the naval bill. We

could have had either bill ready this week.

The SPEAKER. The occupant of the chair had a conference with the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] on last Monday and sought his knowledge of when he could bring up the bill making appropriations for the Navy Department. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] conferred with his committee, and notified the Chair that he could not possibly be ready before next Tuesday.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was due, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that we were notified that there would be no business until the 18th. We could have had it ready and we could have had a conference report ready on Monday if we had not been advised no business would be taken up.

The SPEAKER. That is not what the Chair was advised. The gentleman from California was sitting in the House. What the Chair has stated was the fact.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from California's subcommittee is not the only subcommittee and his bill is not the only bill reported out by the Committee on Appropriations. The Interior Department appropriation bill was also ready for disposal and had originally been scheduled to precede the bill of the gentleman from California. It was only at the earnest request of the gentleman from California that I sidetracked the Interior Department bill in order to give him right-of-way. We could have had either bill ready had we not been told that there would be no business this week. Furthermore, I am certain the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, will bear me out in the statement that we were ready to bring in a conference report on last Monday if the House leadership had requested it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not talking about that. The Chair is talking about a bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have just explained that we could have had not only one bill but two bills had we not been directed by the House leadership not to bring in any business this week.

The holiday has been an embarrassment to the Committee on Appropriations. We have three bills on which the Senate has requested conference: First deficiency; independent offices; Treasury-Post Office.

The holiday has delayed these conferences. It has also delayed the consideration of the Federal Security bill, and will delay the commencement of the hearings on the legislative bill and the national war agencies bill. The committee has not delayed the House. On the contrary, the House has delayed the committee.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I

may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered in New York City last Friday.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. POAGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon delivered by Dr. A. J. McCartney, pastor of the Covenant First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, THE IMMORTAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson's niche as one of the four immortals among the founders of the American Republic becomes more and more secure as the years roll by, and his title to that place in American history more and more assured.

It is well for us, Mr. Speaker, to take time out these hectic days to observe the anniversary of the birth of this man and to recall that in the first 49 years of his life, among other things which he had accomplished, he had taken part in the agitation against the Crown policy in Virginia; served with conspicuous ability in the Continental Congress; drafted the Declaration of Independence; won the fight for religious freedom, for the abolition of primogeniture and entail; served as Governor of Virginia at a time of great danger and disorder; designed our system of coinage; expedited the future westward expansion of the Nation; represented his country with outstanding success at the most important court in Europe; designed and built Monticello; planned the University of Virginia.

What a record of achievement crowded into so short a time as the life of any man.

On the 13th of April, the anniversary of Jefferson's birth, we shall honor ourselves when we honor the memory of one of America's great men, great both as a private citizen and public servant. We should never fail to observe and to emphasize with pride and gratitude the magnitude of the debt we owe to him.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today the gentleman from

South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

INSPECTION OF VETERANS' FACILITY AT PERRY POINT, MD.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my distinguished colleague the Congressman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Legislation, I visited the veterans' facility at Perry Point, Cecil County, Md., on April 3 last.

This institution contains at the present time 1,646 inmates, about 400 of whom are from the Second World War. Practically all of them are mental cases. The hospital is in charge of Col. H. G. Clark, who showed me every courtesy and consideration, and who went with me on my tour of the institution. I was also accompanied by Dr. Davis, whom I have known for many years, he and I both being graduates of Washington College at Chestertown, and being members of the board of visitors and governors of that institution.

When I arrived at the hospital about 10 a. m., quite a group of boys were indulging in a game of softball. I went into the recreation building where they were planning for moving pictures that evening, and where they play basketball, handball, and bowl. I visited the swimming pool and then went to ward 12, where the most violent cases are located. I saw these men go into dinner. I visited the main dining hall, went all through the storehouses, went into the kitchen and saw the noon meal being prepared. All the food seemed to be most wholesome. About 900 men ate in this dining room. They were served cafeteria style. Every man had ample food and hot food.

I visited the library, the librarian being a young lady who lives only 6 miles from my home, and whom I knew for some years. About 20 of the inmates were in the library reading when I was there. I went to the operating room and the medical supply room and met several of the physicians, had dinner in the nurses' dining room, and had a fine report of the cadet nurses who had only recently been assigned to the hospital.

I was impressed throughout my trip with Colonel Clark, with the fine feeling existing towards him by the inmates. He seemed to know them all personally, and they seemed to know him.

I examined briefly the work being done to enlarge the institution. The new work is just a little beyond the completion of the foundation stage. I was advised that the institution has teams for bowling, softball, baseball, and so forth, and that they have regular athletic contests with each other.

The institution is beautifully located at the head of Chesapeake Bay, the Susquehanna River on the right and the Northeast River on the left.

I found everything in neat, clean, wholesome condition, with efficiency and competency plainly evident on every hand. I saw nothing that I thought merited or justified any criticism of any kind.

WORLD'S FAIR FOR VICTORY, PEACE, AND PROGRESS, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the millions of people of Los Angeles County, in my native State of California, announce that they invite the world to Los Angeles County to participate in a World's Fair of Victory, Peace, and Progress, during the years 1948, 1949, and 1950.

Yesterday, I received copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on March 27, 1945. The resolution relates that on July 27, 1943, the board of supervisors adopted resolution signifying intention to sponsor a county of Los Angeles World's Fair of Victory, Peace, and Progress. Since that date, it has, of course, not taken such steps as would interfere or limit its fullest function to help win the war at the earliest possible date. Every official board of public servants in Los Angeles County, as well as the people generally, are tirelessly at work in the labor of love, sacrifice, and patriotism for the earliest winning of the war. But, by taking a minute here and a minute there and making use of it, when otherwise that minute, or leisure-time hour, might have otherwise been used, a group of community leaders, county-wide in their representation, have been studying and planning together. The tangible result is now announced in the resolution to which I refer, and which I include as the conclusion of my remarks.

The preliminary study and thinking for this world's fair grew out of a world's fair commission which was created by the Los Angeles County Supervisors to study the feasibility of a post-war world's fair. The following citizens composed that commission: William H. Evans, Dr. Rufus von Kleinsmid, Mrs. Leiland Atherton Irish, Thomas Gregory, John B. Kingsley, Eldred L. Meyer, Ray Myers, C. D. Russell, Dr. Russell W. Starr, and Theodore Rosequist.

Upon receipt of report which sponsored and set in motion plans for this World's Fair of Victory, Peace, and Progress, supplementary thinking and planning of other groups was invited.

As Congressman from the Eighteenth District of California, I am happy to now learn that my home city of Long Beach is recognized as the logical geographical situation during the fair, which will be countywide. I have received word that the following citizens of Long Beach are designated as an executive committee: Messrs. Clarence Wagner, Ernest A. Webb, Thomas Greg-

ory, Frosty Martin, William S. Grant, Cal Demarest, Gus Walker, Werner Hartman, Glen Gerkin, Douglas Newcomb, Captain Coffman, and Colonel Evans. This group of active, successful citizens of my home city generally are representative of the official city family of management, labor, manufacture, industry, finance, chamber of commerce, and of the interest of the Army and Navy.

So, Mr. Speaker and Members, I am proud to take this brief time to cordially invite you to an occasion and place in 1948, 1949, and 1950, which will be most hospitable and from which you will never want to return to your own home State or community. California is a way of living. I invite you to plan to go there personally and see how it is done. You will thereupon be captivated by it.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in their meeting of March 27, 1945:

"Whereas on July 27, 1943, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution which signified its intention 'to sponsor a County of Los Angeles World's Fair of Victory, Peace, and Progress' for many logical reasons; and

"Whereas the commission appointed to make the preliminary study has presented its conclusions resulting from almost 2 years of activity; and

"Whereas the commissioners are unanimous in the opinion that a fair in Los Angeles County is both feasible and desired by the public; and

"Whereas they have presented to this board a plan for county-wide action which will culminate in unifying the community in the achievement of post-war civic improvements; and

"Whereas we daily draw nearer to the post-war era wherein activities of this nature will be all important; and

"Whereas it is generally conceded that there is need for, especially during the post-war era, greater and more effective cooperation between the various communities and political subdivisions within Los Angeles County; and

"Whereas the years 1948-49-50 will be celebrated Statewide as centennial years (see S. Con. Res. 19, Weybret; and A. B. 163, Middough and others), and because the Los Angeles County area will play a major role in said celebration; and

"Whereas Long Beach is forming a corporation known as the Los Angeles County California Centennial, 1949-50, and has presented evidence to the Commission of its ability and willingness to provide a site and finances for a post-war 'World's Fair of Victory, Peace, and Progress'; and

"Whereas a Hollywood group likewise is planning participation in the centennial celebration; and

"Whereas many other communities in the county have plans under way for participation, or will have; and

"Whereas there is a recognized need for an unbiased central authority to correlate, sponsor, help plan, exploit, and participate in the various centennial connected plans: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That, in order to carry on and accomplish the above-described objectives, we do hereby reconstitute the World's Fair Commission to be the Los Angeles County California Centennial Authority with all those powers and duties conferred upon it which will enable it to perform its above-described functions, chiefly, that of sponsoring, helping to plan and promote, as well as to participate in a Los Angeles County Centennial Fair Celebration (Los Angeles County

World's Fair of Victory, Peace, and Progress); and be it further

"Resolved, That all powers and duties resting in the World's Fair Commission (under our July 27, 1943, resolution) be transferred to this authority; and that organization of the authority follow the pattern outlined in the World's Fair Commission's March 21, 1945, report to the board of supervisors; and be it further

"Resolved, That the board of supervisors hereby commends the World's Fair Commission members for their unselfish and untiring effort in behalf of the welfare of this community."

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the meeting of the House on Saturday, to which the distinguished majority leader has already referred.

As you will recall, it results from a resolution passed by the House several weeks ago, setting aside that date, April 14, which was long ago designated as Pan-American Day, for the celebration by this body of the occasion.

I realize fully that a meeting of the House on Saturday is quite unusual. I am also well aware of the fact that since the House has transacted no business for the past few weeks, many Members are at home and will then still be at home. Therefore I know that the number of Members of the House who will be here on Saturday will be small. Consequently I request that all of those who are in town, and can conveniently do so, attend that meeting of the House, and again I extend the invitation to all of you who wish to do so, to indulge in remarks germane to that occasion, either by making them or extending them in the RECORD.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution sent to him.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article quoting Attorney General Biddle on the evils of international cartels.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with legislation I have introduced relating to international cartels—H. R. 2612—I desire to call to the attention of House Members a statement made by Attorney General Biddle, as reported by the Associated Press from Philadelphia, under date of April 7.

I am asking permission to have this statement printed in today's RECORD, and I hope it will be the pleasure of the several Members to read this grave warning

of the evils sure to result if this insidious cartel system is not destroyed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may make the extension indicated.

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

CARTEL PLANS WILL FADE IF UNITED STATES STANDS FIRM, ATTORNEY GENERAL SAYS

PHILADELPHIA, April 7, 1945.—Attorney General Biddle predicted today that world cartels will disappear if United States retains a firm stand against the private trade agreement.

Mr. Biddle asserted in an address at a luncheon meeting of Philadelphia's Foreign Policy Association that "today there is a well-recognized movement to get this country to adopt the cartel system," which, he said, would curtail necessary post-war industrial expansion.

Minimizing suggestions that cartels may become entrenched in other nations and place restrictions against trade with this country unless business firms here join up, the Attorney General said the United States was too vast a producer and consumer for that to happen.

"The problem, for a while at least, will not be that Europe will be excluding our goods, but whether we will be ready to accept hers," Mr. Biddle said. "The talk of Europe excluding American trade, unless we agree to cartel restrictions, just doesn't make sense." For some years to come, he declared, European nations will be clamoring for our goods.

"I sometimes doubt if the cartel advocates are doing Europe justice," he said. "Why should a continent which was held in the grip of a giant monopolistic system be assumed to be an advocate of that system in the years to come?"

"Of course, some of the monopolists have not changed their minds. But we have not yet heard from the people, from the ordinary businessmen, from the men of vision, who will reconstruct Europe with hope in new opportunities."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests to extend my remarks: In the first extension, to include an editorial from the National Grange Monthly; and in the second, to include a resolution adopted in the General Assembly of Iowa pertaining to the centennial celebration of the statehood of Iowa.

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

There was no objection.

CREATION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as part of my remarks a bill I am introducing to create a Department of Veterans' Affairs, its administrator to be a member of the President's Cabinet.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that in order to secure adequate care and services for the veterans there must be created a Department of Veterans' Affairs with a Secretary with Cabinet rank. In the G. I. bill of rights we provided that the Veterans' Administration should have priorities second only to the Army and the Navy. These priorities have not been secured and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs states that he has not been

able to secure doctors, nurses, and other personnel as well as equipment necessary to give adequate care and assistance to the veterans. There should be a Cabinet member sitting at the Cabinet meetings to fight for the rights of the veterans. They surely deserve the best we can give them.

I am introducing a bill which would establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs, and I ask for its early consideration.

SHIRLEY TEMPLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, we may rest assured that democracy is vigorously alive, not decadent or dying, as charged by our Nazi opponents, when we read the announcement recently made by Shirley Temple, this sweetheart of the world, that she is engaged to marry an ordinary American soldier, G. I. John George Agar, of Beverly Hills, Calif.

This is democracy in action. Shirley Temple was made great by democracy plus her brilliant talent. Next to Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, Shirley Temple is one of the best known individuals in the world, and, unlike the Big Three, she is the most beloved and has no opposition or enemies.

All Members of the House of Representatives rejoice in her democratic decision to marry an ordinary G. I. Joe when it was hers to choose from the world's great. All Members of the House wish her long and blessed happiness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Admiral King before the Academy of Political Science of New York City on April 4.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein part of a letter from a constituent of mine, a very prominent cattle feeder, on the subject of meat prices.

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

There was no objection.

ITALY AND THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, Italian regulars and Italian guerrillas have been fighting and bleeding and dying for the Allied cause for more than 18 months. Italy grasped its earliest opportunity to repudiate fascism and dictatorship. Italy today is a democratic country. Italy is on our side in the war. Italy is entitled to a place at the San Francisco Conference.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on the subject of the United Nations Conference on International Organizations.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter from a constituent.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Greenville News of April 8.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Francisco News.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Oscar Johnson.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copies of three letters to the President of the United States.

VETERANS PARTICIPATE AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the month of June, 1944, at a meeting of the Costello Post, the American Legion, in Washington, D. C., this ex-service men's organization went on record to support the proposal to send a G. I. delegate to the forthcoming peace conference, and this was the original proposal of this character insofar as it is now known. Following this action by this post many letters were sent to both political and veteran leaders throughout the country urging the adoption of this proposal.

In the month of September, 1944, the national convention of the American Legion, held in Chicago, Ill., took up this same proposal, and this idea spread very rapidly throughout the country, and to the far corners of the world. The veterans of this war, and the people generally, want a real G. I. representative to sit

at the peace table. They are entitled to a voice in the discussions of our peace for the future; they have waged the war, they have made the greatest sacrifices, and their voice should be heard in the peace conference. They want a representative present at the conference, and I hope their pleas will be heard, and heeded. They are entitled to have their G. I. present in the conference when peace is discussed.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several newspaper articles upon this same subject, which follow:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 2, 1945]

G. I. REPRESENTATIVE

(By Daniel M. Kidney)

Commander Harold Stassen will be the G. I. Joe representative at the San Francisco Conference, according to a letter written by Joseph C. Grew, as Acting Secretary of State.

The letter was made public today by Vice Commander Joseph Leib, of the Costello American Legion Post here.

Mr. Leib had written Secretary of State Stettinius suggesting that some combat soldier be given a seat on the American delegation to the United Nations peace meeting April 25.

Under Secretary of State Grew replied, March 30:

"As you may be aware, Commander Harold Stassen has been appointed a member of the United States delegation. It is felt that he will fully represent the point of view of men who have been serving overseas."

Three times elected Republican Governor of Minnesota and prominently mentioned as a G. O. P. Presidential possibility, Commander Stassen has been flag officer to Admiral Halsey in the Pacific.

He resigned as governor to take the Navy commission.

The Army Times, published here, urged editorially this week that cartoonist Sgt. Bill Mauldin be sent to the Conference to represent the Foxhole Fraternity.

The Washington Daily News suggested Sgt. Joe McCarthy, editor of *Yank*, the G. I.'s magazine, referring to his long experience in dealing with the G. I. point of view, and acting as his spokesman.

Both are long-time, front-line fighters against the Nazis.

The Army Times pointed out that the plea for a combat soldier to sit at the peace table had been approved in polls by 8 of 10 civilians. It was presented to his post last June by Mr. Leib and adopted by the national convention of the American Legion in September of 1944.

[The Washington Post of April 3, 1945]
ONLY SERVICE VOICE AT PARLEY TO BE STASSEN'S

Apparently implying that no other serviceman or veteran will be added to the American delegation to the United Nations Security Conference at San Francisco, Undersecretary of State Joseph C. Grew has declared that Commander Harold Stassen "will fully represent the point of view of men who have been serving overseas."

Grew's announcement came in a letter to Joseph Leib, vice commander of the Costello American Legion Post here, who had written Secretary of State Stettinius urging that a combat soldier be given a place at the peace table. Leib presented the proposal to his post last June and the national convention of the Legion adopted it in September. His letter from the Undersecretary, dated March 30, apparently gave Commander Stassen official designation as the conference spokesman for the men in uniform.

Commander Stassen, who resigned as Governor of Minnesota to take a Navy commis-

sion, has been flag officer to Admiral William F. Halsey and recently returned to the Pacific for a few weeks additional duty before attending the San Francisco parley, which is scheduled to open April 25.

[From the Army Times of October 28, 1944]

FOX-HOLE PEACE PLANS

Fox-hole occupants have their own peace plans. Based on first-hand experience they reflect the attitudes of those who have met the enemy and fought alongside the Allies.

Although every fox-hole peace plan has its own ideas for reaching the goal, every goal is the same—No World War No. 3.

Although few of these fox-hole occupants are trained in the diplomatic niceties that have become a mark of the Foreign Service, the fox-hole diplomats have become America's best salesmen. In every land where they have lived and trained they have left a mark and, in turn, have absorbed the wisdom of those nations from the man in the street.

Although the armchair strategists and diplomats might scoff, it is not ill-advised to recommend that Joe have his representatives at the peace table. A muddy, war-weary veteran isn't very likely to lose sight of his goal in the hocus-pocus of diplomatic jockeying.

[From the Army Times of March 31, 1945]

A JOE AT THE PEACE TABLE

Some months ago we proposed that a combat veteran be seated at the peace table. Since then the idea has swept the Nation on a wave of popularity with polls indicating that 8 out of 10 civilians favor the proposal.

When we suggested a peace-conference representative we had in mind a man from the ranks, a true representative of fox-hole fraternity. We believe that although stars and bars might well represent the combat forces, it is G. I. Joe who has the greatest appreciation for the ideals for which he fights. He has met and defeated the enemy, fought beside our allies and has been ambassador of good will in liberated nations. He knows the cost of victory.

Just that sort of a Joe is Sgt. Bill Mauldin. Although he has parlayed an observant eye and a talented pen into big money he is still the buddy of every tired, unshaven fighting man in our armed forces. He is their friend and champion—because he, too, is a member of fox-hole fraternity.

We believe Bill first should be invited to the San Francisco Conference. With his intimate knowledge of the mud, pain, death, and realities of war he would contribute stability and reality to the conference as the representatives jockey for power and prestige. Sergeant Mauldin would keep his eye on the ball.

We have no doubts as to the young cartoonist's ability to stay in there and pitch for his convictions. When he locked horns with General Patton recently, Bill got at least a draw—which makes him big league in our books. And if the representatives decide to doll up with their many medals, Bill has one to wear—one which all fighting men are proud to wear, the Purple Heart.

Yes, Sergeant Mauldin has many qualifications for the job. He is young and married. He has hopes and ambitions for his son, whom he has not yet seen. He has been in service long enough to rate a service stripe and a number of overseas stripes. He is ambitious and talented. He is representative of the American young men and women wearing khaki and blue. We think he would be in there working for a better nation and a better world. We think he would do a good job.

And besides, if he ever faltered or weakened Joe and Willie would be right there to remind him that he was speaking for the ration-eating doughboys.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1945]

A G. I. DELEGATE?

There has been a lot of talk about having a G. I. Joe present at the San Francisco Conference. The idea is peculiarly American; it suits our romantic ideas about democracy and so on.

Well, is there anything to it?

Sometimes we make such gestures—and they remain gestures. Some inarticulate hero, heavy with medals, is dragged into some situation as a sort of symbol, and the myth of democracy may be preserved, but its substance may be absent. He is feted, he meets all the topside people; he even sits in at meetings; and then he is wafted back to obscurity and the play goes on as before. If there is to be a G. I. delegate, let's have him functional—not decorative.

One function a G. I. could perform—besides being the G. I.'s voice—would be to tell the soldiers in their own terms what went on. To do so would not only take a G. I. but a qualified observer of tact and stability. Nobody has suggested anyone specifically, yet. So here's an idea: If there is to be a G. I. delegate, why not someone like Sgt. Joe McCarthy, editor of *Yank*, the G. I.'s magazine? Neither officer nor civilian has anything to do with *Yank*, published by soldiers in 16 editions at 12 points all over the world, with a circulation of 2,000,000. Sergeant McCarthy chauffeured an Army mule in a pack artillery outfit for a year. As *Yank* editor, he has been in the African, Caribbean, Mediterranean theaters, in England, Italy, on the western front, and so on. We don't know him personally, but perusal of his paper indicates he knows his G. I.'s. *Yank* has been publishing a world-wide page called *The Soldier Speaks*, in which G. I.'s discuss such post-war questions as compulsory military training, women in industry, what shall we do with our enemies, and so on. That, and *Yank*'s mail page, where the G. I. has his say, have given the American soldier more freedom of expression than any other soldier in any other army of the world, past or present.

So very probably a G. I. like Sergeant McCarthy could not only interpret for the American soldier what went on at the conference, but, what is more important, could interpret for the conferees the hopes and dreams of the men all over the world who are shedding their blood to make the San Francisco Conference possible.

THE O. P. A. IN ACTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, more than 2 months ago, I wrote the O. P. A. here in Washington asking that Office to consider an increase in the sugar allotment in Sauk County, Wis., in my district, citing facts to indicate an increase of population in that county of 30 percent to 100 percent due to the influx of workers at the Badger Ordnance Works near Baraboo, Wis. The O. P. A. replied after 2 weeks, admitting that there had been a 15-percent increase in population in Sauk County for the period January 1943 to August 1943, and a 10-percent increase for the period September 1943 to March 1944. But I was informed by the O. P. A. that because the tabulation of the issuance of war ration book 4 disclosed an increase of 3.2 percent in the number of ration

books issued, there would not be any possibility of giving the relief requested by the people of Sauk County.

At the time of the issuance of ration book No. 4 the Badger Ordnance Works had the smallest number of employees at any time since it started operations, due to a temporary shut-down of powder lines. I informed the O. P. A. of this fact, which they should have known, and submitted figures verified by the Department of Labor statistics that the number of milk customers in that community had increased 99 percent and milk consumption had nearly trebled; that all buildings and dwellings in Baraboo, Prairie du Sac, and Sauk City were filled to overflowing and the Government had authorized the construction of 650 new dwelling units at the Badger Ordnance Works site to take care of the increased population; and also that the sewage disposal in those cities had increased 36 percent in the city of Baraboo and 102 percent in Prairie du Sac and Sauk City.

After waiting almost 6 weeks for a reply from the O. P. A. I received a letter from them on April 10 containing this lucid and enlightening observation:

You submit as evidence in contrast to our method tabulating issuance of war ration book No. 4, statistics showing the increased consumption of milk, water, gas, electricity, and increased use of banking, postal, and telephone service. While this data is of interest, nevertheless the figures probably reflect an increase in business due to the higher earning capacity of the community rather than a substantial increase in population.

I have written to Chester Bowles, head of the O. P. A., telling him I could not follow the line of reasoning of his office when they conclude that an increase of the sewage disposal of 36 percent in one city and 102 percent in two other cities in Sauk County reflected an increase in business due to the higher earning capacity of the community rather than a substantial increase in population. Is it any wonder that the people all over the country are becoming more and more disgusted with the obstinacy of the O. P. A.?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the Bretton Woods agreement.

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

There was no objection.

NEED FOR AN ALUMINUM ADMINISTRATOR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Small Business Committee in the past 2 days has gone thoroughly into the matter of aluminum production and procurement, including the recent 250,000,000 pound contract with the Aluminum Co. of Canada, whose stock is controlled by the same group which controls Alcoa in this country.

I was privileged to participate in the Senate committee proceedings, and to my utter amazement I found that nobody in the entire Government has any centralized control over aluminum production, procurement, and eventual disposal to private industry of our \$700,000,000 investment in aluminum.

The W. P. B., the R. F. C., the Metals Reserve Corporation, the Defense Plant Corporation, and the Surplus Property Board form a five-ring aluminum circus, and there isn't even a ringmaster. This is what makes possible an amazing paradox, that Alcoa's sister Canadian company, grown through Government aid to the largest aluminum producer in the world, cannot only destroy independent American aluminum producers and by sheer weight of production almost compel the closing and junking of our cheaply operating Government-owned facilities, but could run Alcoa itself out of the aluminum business.

What makes this statement not utterly fantastic is the simple fact that the same people who own the Aluminum Co. of America own the Aluminum Co. of Canada. Their \$300,000,000 plant in Canada has less than \$15,000,000 of their own money invested. Through post-war cartel arrangements, which the Canadian company has already illegally engaged in according to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, that company may easily hope to dominate the world market and through the necessity of having to earn for so vast a plant a return on only the small amount of their own capital actually invested, they are in a profit position superior to any actual or potential American company including Alcoa, their American operation.

The War Production Board has worked miracles in the procurement of war materials of all kinds. What we need now, in order to prevent the same chaos which retarded our war effort during conversion days of 1940 and 1941 from destroying our post-war capacity to dispose of Government-owned aluminum facilities, is a single aluminum administrator, with the powers and duties proposed in the resolution I am introducing today.

Had we been possessed of a light metals administrator, to coordinate our entire aluminum program, we would not now be faced with the possibility of closing some of the most profitable Government-owned aluminum plants, endangering their post-war disposal to private investors, while we purchase aluminum at higher cost from Canada.

Here is the kind of an aluminum circus we are running:

In one ring of our aluminum circus, W. P. B. juggles procurement of light metals, and shouts across to the per-

forming Metals Reserve actors to get so much metal from such-and-such a place.

Meanwhile, Defense Plant Corporation is dancing on the tightwire of keeping \$271,000,000 worth of American-owned aluminum facilities operating. But W. P. B. may well be shooting the props out from under that tightwire with its order to Metals Reserve.

R. F. C. swings from the trapeze of Government loans to American aluminum producers, and hopes that some of the other actors have not removed the net below by orders to cut back aluminum production and make R. F. C.'s investment so much confetti.

Surplus Property Board stands in the entrance, hoping that before its time for its act in selling the properties, the entire tent does not come roaring down around its ears.

Here we have the greatest show on earth from the standpoint of our post-war future and we are running it not much better than the kids who put on their one-pin admission shows in garages and woodsheds.

It is not too late to correct this situation. Passage of the resolution which I am offering today will bring a solution to the problem, will assure our post-war future, and will save this Government millions of its already invested capital. This we can do. We would be derelict as legislators if we did anything less.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Polish-American Congress adopted March 9, 1945.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short poem.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the president of the University of Oklahoma.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. E. L. Kohler.

Mr. TOLAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Antonio Express entitled "Keep Political Hands Off the Army Engineers."

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a serviceman's prayer.

AUTOMOBILE AND BOAT USE TAX

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a House resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the first bills I introduced when I came to this Congress was the bill to

repeal the nuisance automobile and boat use tax. The House of Representatives of the State of Florida has taken cognizance of that bill and has passed a memorial, known as House Resolution 7, calling upon this Congress to repeal that nuisance tax. I think it is time that Congress thinks more about repealing some taxes rather than trying to tax everything we can find.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following which was passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida on the 10th day of April 1945, and known as House Resolution 7:

"House Resolution 7

"Whereas there was enacted by Congress, section 557 of the Revenue Act of 1941, which became section 3540 of the Internal Revenue Code, a law which placed a tax of \$5 annually on all automobiles; and

"Whereas it appears that such a tax is an unsuitable method of raising Federal revenue, because it does not take into account the value of the vehicle, it duplicates automobile license taxes imposed by the States, and because it is difficult to collect under the system now used; and

"Whereas a distinguished former member of this house, Hon. Dwight L. Rogers, Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Florida, has introduced in the Congress H. R. 1926, which would repeal this unfair and discriminatory tax: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, That the Representatives in Congress from Florida be urged to support said H. R. 1926 or some other pending legislation which would repeal the automobile-use tax now in force and being collected by the Federal Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the clerk of this house to each Representative in Congress from the State of Florida."

The foregoing resolution was duly introduced by Messrs. Ray and Fuqua, of Manatee, and Burwell and Stirling, of Broward, on the 10th day of April 1945, and duly passed by the house of representatives on the 10th day of April 1945.

The proceedings thereof appear upon the pages of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Florida State Legislature of the 10th day of April 1945.

EVANS CRARY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LAMAR BLEDSOE,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include some excerpts and articles dealing with prisoners of war.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that some time ago I had occasion to call the attention of the Members of the House to the surprisingly excellent manner in which we were treating the German prisoners of war in the war prisoners' camps in this country.

I pointed out that we were going out of our way in coddling these men who have killed so many of our American boys, and included, as an example, a menu at one particular camp which is typical of the food they receive.

Some of our colleagues object to any criticism of treatment of war prisoners because, as they point out, we are obliged to honor the Geneva Convention prescribing the treatment of war prisoners, and, above all, they feel it is necessary for us to act in such manner as to prevent retaliation by the Nazis against American prisoners of war held in German camps.

I have always had serious doubts as to the Nazis' living up to the provisions of the Geneva Convention, no matter what we may do, and to the kindness shown by the Germans to our boys because the Nazi ideology and Nazi manner of warfare do not include decent treatment of anyone.

In the last few days the American Army has liberated a number of prison camps where the Germans had been mistreating their prisoners of war, and, although we feared the worst from Germany's gangster Government, the details that have come to light surely have surpassed all our fears.

The New York Times of April 5 contained an article which I would now like to read to the House:

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1945]

WHOLE WORLD APART

It is not solely, nor even chiefly, in the geographical sense that certain dispatches in this newspaper yesterday were as far apart as the poles. They illustrate two ideologies so sharply contrasted that there is not room for both of them in the same world. One could only swallow the lump in his throat when he read Meyer Berger's account of amputation cases from two landed at Johnston Island by huge Navy C-54's and borne to hospital wards at the neap-tide hour of 3 a. m., and of these same sorely wounded fighting men relaxed and refreshed by frank tears after U. S. O. girls, roused from their sleep, sang softly, with wet eyes, the song of their choice, You'd Be So Nice to Come Home To. This is a saga of heroism not afraid of emotion; the kind of heroism that knows fear and compassion and the love of simple, kindly, human things; the heroism that has carried the fighters of a supposedly soft democracy to their triumphs.

On the reverse side of the shield are the dispatches of Richard Johnston and John MacCormac from Germany about Stalag 9-B, Wegscheide, where for 4 months 6,500 Allied soldiers have been starving to death in the foulest degradation, and the prison camp at Eselheide, where 9,500 Russian prisoners were found so near starvation that they fought savagely for a loaf of bread and a scoop of raw flour from the ground. These stark and grim accounts pile another stone on the edifice of evidence which the whole war has built as to the true nature of the German enemy. After Poland, Rotterdam, Lidice, Warsaw, and the whole bleak litany of horror which has been written, we and our allies should need

no further proof of the character of the gangsters whom we fight. But if living skeletons of Wegscheide and Eselheide serve to stiffen our resolve for unconditional victory and unmitigated punishment for the war criminals, they will have rendered a final pitiful service to their country.

The story itself upon which the editorial is based appears in two dispatches from the front by correspondents of the New York Times. They are as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1945]

AMERICANS SAVED IN PRISON OF DEATH
(By Richard J. H. Johnston)

BAD ORE, GERMANY, April 3.—Atop a wooded hill 3 miles southeast of this pleasant village stands Stalag 9-B Wegscheide, a Nazi war prisoner camp. For the last 4 months 6,500 Allied soldiers, including 3,200 Americans, have been slowly starving to death there amid scenes of foulest degradation, which are virtually impossible to describe.

A few days ago I wrote an account of the capture of a prisoner hospital on this front in which conditions were described as appalling. The word does not define the living-death scene I witnessed today.

Into a barbed-wire enclosure 400 feet square these 6,500 men were driven like cattle by German troops to spend 4 months awaiting slow death or liberation. For all but some 100 liberation came at 6:30 a. m. yesterday, when a One Hundred and Sixth United States Cavalry group captured this town and the camp. Among those who died before rescue from this hell were 36 Americans.

MEN'S STORIES DEFY BELIEF

I spent 4 hours today talking with the living skeletons who survived. They were divided into nationality groups—Americans, British, French, Serbs, and Russians. There were, in addition to the Americans, 2,200 British, including scores of "red devil" paratroop survivors of Arnhem and hundreds who had been in German prison camps since Dunkerque; 450 French, 450 Russians, and 200 Serbs.

Dirty for want of soap and towels, these caricatures of men had stories to tell that defied belief. Most of the Americans had been taken in the Ardennes offensive in January on the Belgian and Luxembourg fronts.

British veterans of Dunkerque, Tobruk, Greece, Crete, and the western front reached this place from two camps in Silesia, at Lamsdorf and Sagan, from which they were marched 500 miles in 8 weeks after the Russian advance on the German defenses on the eastern front. That march, a prelude to their treatment here, itself was a fierce indictment of the Nazis.

Four or five weeks ago the British arrived here, joining the Americans and others. The United States prisoners had been serving with the One Hundred and Sixth, Twenty-eighth, and One Hundred and First Airborne Divisions in the Ardennes when taken. It took most of them 2 to 4 weeks to reach this place. They were hauled in boxcars attached to slow trains, and spent days on sidings without heat or food.

Unmarked and undistinguishable from cars carrying German war materials, they were subjected to Allied bombing and strafing. The Nazi guards threatened to shoot any man who tried to leave the cars. En route these men were forced to labor repairing railroad bomb damage under slave conditions in numbing cold.

BITTER MEMORIES STAND OUT

Many died of wounds, illnesses, or exhaustion. Some were shot to death by the guards when they were unable to perform heavy labor. But all that was dimmed in the mem-

ories of the men I talked with. Bitter in their memories, though, are recollections of a 32-mile march through snow from the Ardennes without food or water; of being crowded 60 men in a boxcar without heat; of having to use helmets in lieu of toilet facilities; of singing carols amid the stench and crush in the cars on Christmas Eve; of trying to lie down in the filth on the car floors to sleep, and of trying to divide 1 loaf of bread among 10 men on Christmas morning.

From all this these young, once robust Americans came here. They were billeted in 18 flimsy, rotting wooden buildings, one of which housed 160 men. This was possible because the building, 60 by 40 feet, was utterly bare of furniture. There were no beds, no chairs, not even blankets.

The stench of this building was overpowering and these once healthy and vigorous youths kept apologizing to me for their appearance and for the danger of my catching lice from them. On legs devoid of muscle or tissue—mere skin-encased bones—they stood tottering around me, each trying to tell his bit of this story.

They whipped off their dirty shirts to show me their skinny, blotched bodies. "I lost 60 pounds, I guess," said one veteran of the December offensive. Another tried to give me an idea of how husky he once was by displaying a faded picture of himself and mother. It was hard to believe it was the same man.

A LOSING FIGHT FOR LIFE

One of two United States doctors, officer prisoners, who were permitted to stay with the men, said the daily diet was less than 1,400 calories in this prison. Soup without substance, ersatz bread, indigestible cheese, and a vile coffee substitute were handed out in microscopic portions to these men, who fought to maintain life. Their rescue was fortunate because they were losing the fight.

The sanitation facilities for this building housing 160 consisted of one water tap, from which a feeble dribble splashed in a crusted, tiny bowl. The toilet was a hole in the floor. These had to serve the 160, who had no soap, no towels; only cold water.

They slept on the bare floor, close-huddled, crowding every inch. Not all could lie down at the same time because of insufficient floor space. They had to take turns standing up.

On February 6 Allied planes strafed this unmarked camp. Three Americans and unrevealed numbers of others were killed. Between December 26 and February 20, 80 cases of pneumonia were treated. Only one of these, all Americans, died. The sole drug the doctors had was a few sulfa pills, which the men contributed from their combat first-aid packs when they arrived. With this meager store of drugs the two American doctors treated a dozen different diseases.

"A pair of clean hands, one needle-holder, one pair of forceps, one pair of scissors, and a spool of black cotton thread was our surgical equipment," a medic, one of eight assisting doctors, told me. He took me to the "pharmacy." On two 1½-foot shelves rested the sparse assortment of things that anyone can buy for a couple of dollars in a drug store without a prescription.

RED CROSS PACKAGES STOLEN

The Americans received one shipment of Red Cross prisoner-of-war packages.

"There were 2,199 packages," a sergeant told me. "One hundred and one packages of the shipment were missing. They were stolen by the German guards. We had borrowed 705 packages from the Serbs some time before and paid them back out of the shipment. What was left had to be divided among 3,200 men."

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1945]
YANKS BARE PRISON HORROR—"GHOSTS" FIGHT
OVER FOOD

(By John MacCormac)

WITH UNITED STATES SECOND ARMORED DIVISION, IN GERMANY, April 3.—A war correspondent sees some grim sights. Not often among them, however, is that of men fighting one another frantically for a loaf of bread or scooping up raw flour from the ground and wolfing it down in handfuls. Men, particularly if they are soldiers in the same army, must be mad with hunger to do that.

The 9,500 Russian prisoners of war whom this correspondent saw today in a German prison camp at Eselheide, some 11 miles southeast of Bielefeld, were as near starvation as it seemed possible for men to be and survive. For weeks before some 12 to 15 had been dying daily, and of those who continued to hold body and soul together there were some who obviously were doing so only by an effort of will. They looked like ghosts.

There are said to be some 20,000,000 displaced persons in Germany and, after what this correspondent saw today, that term should go down in history as one of the most colossal euphemisms of all time. Among them are many millions of Allied war prisoners. The location of the camps in which they were confined is well known to the Allied bombing commands and presumably to supreme headquarters. The replacement of displaced persons is a problem to which the allied governments have given much thought and is acknowledged to be the most immediate task of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

CAMP HORRIFIES AMERICANS

But when a tank company of the Eighty-second Reconnaissance Battalion liberated at 4 p. m. yesterday what was known to the Germans as Prisoner of War Camp 326, it came as a total surprise. When the conditions of the camp were investigated, surprise changed to horror and, when its needs were ascertained, to perplexity. The Eighty-second was operating as a mopping-up force for the American Second Armored Division, which had broken through the enemy lines three days earlier and was racing eastward. The job of the Eighty-second was to fight Germans, not to feed Russians.

But when the Russians in camp 326 saw American tanks approaching they had only one thought—that deliverance was at hand—and deliverance for them, after some three years of semistarvation, had come to mean only one thing, food. Still above them in 12 towers that watched and warded the camp were 200 German guards with machine guns, but the prisoners cared no more for them.

What they cared for, after subsisting for months on 9 ounces of bread a day, plus soup faintly reminiscent of vegetables, was food, food in the camp warehouses. So they stormed the warehouses. Their own camp committee tried to restrain them with rifles, which the German guards had given to them on this last day of durance. But it was useless. By mere body pressure they broke in the walls of two warehouses.

Said First Lt. Donald P. Chase, of Lexington, Mass., liaison officer with the Eighty-second:

"I never saw such a sight. One man would grab a loaf of bread and try to wolf it down. Others would fight him for it until finally there would be nothing but crumbs on the ground. The German guards in their towers were afraid to come down. They wouldn't budge even when we fired machine guns over their heads. Our men had to go up and haul them down."

"I don't blame them. When you see a man eating raw cabbages whole, as if they were

watermelons—a man who looks like death warmed over—I guess you don't feel very comfortable if you're the guy responsible for his condition."

MEN SCAVENGE FOR FOOD

Finally Capt. George Karl, of Ellenville, N. Y., commander of the tank company, posted his tanks around the camp, armed five Russians who seemed more responsible than the rest and allowed the German camp commandant to surrender his guards and the camp, which he did in a formal letter written in bad English.

When this correspondent arrived at the camp 3 hours later he saw its occupants still searching the ground for flour, bread crumbs, and raw macaroni, which had been spilled there as a result of the rush on the warehouses. What they found they ate just as it was.

There were Ukrainians among them, and Cossacks, slant-eyed Tartars, men from the Urals and the steppes. But they had two things in common—their uniform and their hunger. One kissed the hand of a correspondent who gave him a cigarette. Another, to whom I gave a K ration, trembled and became speechless. But these men, emaciated as they were, were the strong ones. They had enough energy left to fight one another for food.

They seemed hale and hearty compared with some of those in the prison hospital with its 3,000 inhabitants. A Russian Medical Corps colonel who showed me around could speak German. He showed me one hut containing men who had nothing more or less wrong with them than sheer starvation. He lifted the shirt of one poor fellow to show how his spine almost cleaved to his breastbone. Hunger had wrought so mightily on this soldier that against a strong light his body would have been semitransparent.

He was a mere shadow of a man who had to hold on to his cot for support. He wept when he told how he had been marched with two other haggard survivors of the same ordeal for a month and a half from the eastern front to the camp. During all that time, he swore, his guards gave him no food. He had lived only because of the charity of peasants, Russian, Polish, and German, in the lands through which he had passed. He had been unable to regain weight on the starvation fare in this camp.

HOSPITALS WITHOUT SUPPLIES

The Russian doctor—a calm, forthright man who seemed to have the situation as well in hand as could any man—took me into another hut that contained 400 survivors of abdominal operations. They needed a special diet, but there had been none for them. He had almost no medicine, antiseptics, or bandages. Only two of the dozen huts for lying cases had sheets or blankets. None had had heat until 3 days ago, when the prisoners, growing bold as word of the war's progress reached them, seized stoves from the camp commissary and installed them themselves. But as the prisoners grew bolder their German guards became more nervous and in one hospital hut were a number of Russians who had been shot by the guards for approaching too near the barbed wire that surrounded the camp or calling too urgently for food.

In his letter of surrender, which was interlarded with references to the Geneva Convention, the German camp commandant said there were a fortnight's provisions in stock. He supplemented this with some crocodile tears over the condition of his prisoners. I saw thousands of loaves of bread stacked up. But when we left the still intact warehouses the problem of distributing them without provoking another riot had not been worked out.

Mr. President, other newspapers have also given the story to the world, but I believe Congress should be given these details, since it may induce some of our Members to take a different view as to how far the German "supermen" really may be trusted to live up to any agreements or treaties. All the gruesome details of the tortures of American prisoners of war in Germany should be kept in mind when the time comes to write a treaty of peace with the world's greatest gangsters.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] now on leave of absence, I ask unanimous consent that because of pressing and important official business he be granted additional leave to and including April 18.

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

There was no objection.

BRETON WOODS

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon be called upon to vote on the so-called Bretton Woods agreement and on several amendments which will undoubtedly be proposed. Probably no more complex and important subject will be considered at the present session.

On a recent morning, at my request, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] devoted an hour and a half of his time to a discussion of the principal features of the agreement and of the proposed amendments with some of the newly elected Republican Members of Congress.

He did this with complete impartiality and everyone of us came away with a much clearer understanding of the issues involved than we had before.

I want to pay public tribute to the gentleman from Michigan for his helpful discussion and I hope that when the gentleman from Michigan is allotted time in connection with the debate on the bill there will be a full attendance of Members of this House.

I am sure that those who do listen will be as much assisted in a comprehension of the issues involved as we were.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem written by Lt. Mitchell T. Ancker.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and

include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter by Dr. J. S. Davis.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 passed by the Iowa Assembly in opposition to a Missouri Valley Authority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include house concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of Iowa.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech that he recently made.

PAYMENTS OF OLD-AGE SECURITY BENEFITS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a recent resolution passed by the State Legislature of New York memorializing the Congress to pass legislation to give an appropriate credit for the purposes of old-age and survivorship insurance to those who are fighting in the armed forces of the United States, for their service in such forces.

I think it is time the House began considering such a proposal. I am for the idea. I am going to introduce legislation to take care of it.

Under the Railroad Retirement Act and the civil-service retirement law, servicemen who come under these categories are provided for in this manner. But that does not help the millions in this war who are on the outside. Adequate provision should be made for them, too.

It seems to me that any man fighting for his country should have credit for time spent in service applied to insurance for his old age. It should not stop with just one group or two groups. The credit given should be universal whether the man be a Government employee, a railroad worker, or one of the millions working for private enterprise.

Regardless of where they worked before the war or what they worked at, they should all be treated alike and in a fair manner. After all, they are all soldiers. I ask the sympathetic consideration of the Members of the House, so

that all veterans will be given a chance to have these benefits paid.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FOOD SHORTAGES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter to the War Food Administrator and also a release from the department.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENNER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday will be the Consent Calendar; Tuesday the Private Calendar; Wednesday the naval appropriation bill. I assume that will be finished in 1 day. If not, that will continue. Thereafter the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. That will continue until disposed of. That is the program for next week.

Mr. MICHENNER. And there will probably be some conference reports?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. If any conference reports come in, of course, they will be taken up.

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

THE PORK SHORTAGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, if the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration, whose conflicting rules and orders have been partially responsible for the acute hog and pork shortage, will heed the advice of the St. Louis Live Stock Exchange and act quickly on two suggestions this organization makes, the pork shortage can be halted to some extent until production can catch up with consumption.

This organization, the second largest in the nation, operated by men who know the livestock business, processing and marketing, suggest, first, that the War Food Administration immediately increase the floor price guaranty for

barrows and gilts 180 pounds up, to \$13.75 Chicago basis, same as a year ago with this price structure continued to March 31, 1946. They claim that this move will stimulate hog production and that it will be much cheaper for the Government if a surplus is created to make good on the price than with packer subsidies now being paid.

Second, that the O. P. A. immediately attempt to stop the diversion of hogs away from regular market channels by establishing larger ceiling differentials for the market. This will channel hogs into the Federal inspected packing house markets and will lessen the supply that is now going to the black markets.

The livestock exchange points out that there were 44 percent less hogs being slaughtered through Federal inspected terminal markets during the first 2 months of this year than reached these regular markets 1 year ago. They point out further that a check on 12 principal markets of the United States for the first 2 months of this year shows a drop from the first 2 months of last year of 58 percent. In other words, less than half the hogs are going into the regular markets of the Nation than were just 1 year ago, while the black market is booming.

It is to be hoped that the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration, who have the power to make these changes, will, at the same time, exercise good common sense and make them.

The St. Louis Livestock Exchange says:

If the situation is to be relieved, action must be taken immediately by the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration.

It is high time these two organizations, who have this power, use it before the market for the farmers of this country is destroyed, the distribution meat service organizations of this country are driven out of business, and a real meat famine proceeds to the point where we cannot properly feed our own people and our military forces, to say nothing of our commitments by the administration to help feed the other nations and the liberated countries where food is becoming the most important matter to those people all over the world.

O. P. A. FAILURES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, frequently in the past 2 years I and other members of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee have stood on this floor and vigorously protested the fallacious food policies of the New Deal. Its policies have been unsound and its administration has been arrogant and inefficient. In spite of these and other protestations, the New Deal has defiantly pursued its course until today the Na-

tion is aroused as it probably has not been aroused before over a purely economic situation. Rather than acknowledge its inefficiency the O. P. A. defiantly attempts to defend itself when there is no defense. The messy situation that has been developed in the Senate investigation in the last few days with reference to meat had previously been partially developed by our Food Study Committee.

The muddling methods of the Food Department of the O. P. A. have been destructive in many other respects.

The policies adopted in the handling of sugar are indefensible.

Failure to make preparation for the production of future crops will bring serious consequences.

For many reasons farmers and producers everywhere have announced a curtailment of production.

Nothing has been done to supply the urgent need for farm implements. On the contrary, a further reduction is probable.

Lack of cooperation between the food authorities of the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration carries destructive consequences.

The only solution of this serious problem is a complete cleaning out of the Office of Price Administration as it applies to food. This should apply both to personnel and to policies.

All food activities should be placed under one head with full authority and full responsibility. The President should appoint a good man and then leave him alone to operate without Presidential or political interference.

The producer is the most important factor in the food problem and he should be encouraged and not threatened.

Processors and distributors are important factors and if they had been given proper consideration, the widely prevalent black market might have been prevented. Many thousands of honest retail grocers and butchers have been put out of business by the punitive methods employed by the New Deal.

Nobody objects to rationing when it is necessary. A complete abandonment of price control is not advisable now, but the American housewife has every reason to complain of the innumerable senseless regulations to which she has been subjected in her efforts to provide food for her family. The situation is serious and will become more serious. Everybody is dissatisfied. It is now right up to the President. It is an executive matter which the President cannot avoid.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] may have indefinite leave of absence due to a death in his family.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter on the food situation from B. E. Cunningham, secretary of the Sioux City, Iowa, Livestock Exchange.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Helena, Mont., Independent Record of April 8, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some brief excerpts from a report.

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

There was no objection.

AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the indulgence of the House so that I may bring to the attention of the House and to the country the fascinating and gripping story of Pvt. (1st cl.) Wilburn Ross, route 2, Strunk, McCreary County, Ky. It is one of, if not the most remarkable story that I have ever read in the naval and military annals of our country. It is the story of a 22-year old American soldier who, having killed and wounded single-handed more than 58 German soldiers in a contest not unlike the battle between David and Goliath, at Mount St. Jacques, France, last October, was recently awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor—the highest award that this Government bestows upon either enlisted man or officer in our Army.

Private Ross served heroically in 1943 in the Italian campaign. He was slightly wounded in one fight and seriously wounded in another, for which he received the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, and he was also awarded the combat infantryman's badge.

His company was ordered to take a hill, if possible, at Mount St. Jacques, France, which was defended by strongly entrenched German troops. The Germans were too strong for our boys, as they were in a sheltered position, with superior equipment. All of Private Ross's company was killed except 32. Because of

the heavy German fire they were forced to dig in within 200 yards of the German position under heavy gunfire from the Germans occupying the hill. Under the protection of heavy gunfire the company of Germans marched down the hill. Private Ross had the only machine gun. He insisted on taking his machine gun and placing it in front of the other 32 survivors of his company, and between the Germans and his comrades. These survivors had rifles, but only a small amount of ammunition. The survivors remained in the background.

Here I desire to let First Sgt. Gerald T. Heckman, of Gloucester, N. J., who led the riflemen of the infantry, describe what happened:

Protected by heavy fire the Germans rushed down the hill. They were shouting and yelling. Private Ross waited until they were a dozen yards from his position before he opened up. His machine gun cut them down like a combine going through a wheat field. They withdrew, and the second attack was concentrated on Ross. The enemy automatic fire caused bits of the ground to jump up all around Ross, and it did not seem possible he could live in that fire and fire back at them.

BULLETS BOUNCED OFF TRIPOD

All during this attack Private Ross was the object of attack of a deadly concentration of enemy rifles. I saw bullets bounce off his tripod and other bullets caused sparks from stones on the ground around him. The enemy soldiers crawled to within 12 or 15 feet of Ross and all had grenades in their hands. They were at such close range that he frequently had to jump up and pick up his one gun to change direction of the fire. Our company was desperately low on ammunition.

Before the eighth attack the Germans reorganized. Almost all our riflemen were out of ammunition. They abandoned the fox-hole and took up a new position behind Private Ross. While he fired on the advancing enemy, some of our riflemen crawled on their hands to the machine gun, took several rounds from the belt, and crawled back to their position. Private Ross had protected the entire company with his life. He again broke the assault. Just as the Germans were breaking away his gun ceased firing. He had used eight boxes of ammunition and that was all he had. None of the eight surviving riflemen had any ammunition left and they withdrew 20 yards to the rear, where the mortar squad was located; but Private Ross decided to sweat it out in his firing position. He was alone when the ninth and last counterattack got under way. This time the Germans were determined to knock him out. They opened up on him with a hail of automatic weapons and grenades all around him. When the Germans saw that he was not replying to this fire, riflemen and those with grenades rushed in to finish him off. We were sweating it out with bayonets fixed when two of our men brought up six more boxes of ammunition, and we rushed them to Private Ross just as the Germans closed in. Loading rapidly he squeezed off burst after burst into the enemy. He killed over 40 Germans. The Germans were charging up in mass formation and within seconds Ross had killed over 40 and wounded many others. The surviving Germans ran back to the line of departure and the counterattacks were over.

When he ran out of ammunition Private Ross sat there as if he had plenty. But another minute and the Germans would have swarmed over his empty gun.

Private Ross's lieutenant, William T. Wardell, of Beardstown, Ill., gives a graphic description of the battle of Private Ross with the Germans. Lieutenant Wardell said in part:

I pointed out to him that he had already done his duty and I told him that it was needless to stay out there 40 yards in front of the rest of the company on the chance that more ammunition might arrive. He merely shook his head. When the enemy turned and ran, German corpses were piled high around the gun.

For sheer courage, for masterful judgment, cool and calculated action, I am sure there is no instance in the history of our country that will surpass that of Private Ross.

AWARDED CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

When the report of the heroic action of Private Ross reached the War Department a short time ago, they awarded him the Congressional Medal of Honor with a citation in the following language:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at risk of life above and beyond the call of duty. After experiencing his last raid Private Ross was advised to withdraw to the company command post together with 8 surviving riflemen; but as more ammunition was expected, he declined to do so. After having killed and wounded more than 58 Germans in more than 5 hours of combat and saved the remnants of his company from destruction, Private Ross remained at his post the following day for a total of 36 hours. His actions throughout this engagement were an inspiration to his comrades and maintained the high traditions of the military service.

THE ONLY KENTUCKIAN

Approximately 9,000,000 men have been inducted into the United States Army during this war, and they have fought heroically and courageously on every battle front of the world. But only 28 enlisted men have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, and only 12 of these 28 were privates, first class; and the War Department advises me that Private Ross is the only enlisted man from Kentucky who has received this distinction in the present World War.

I want it clearly understood that nothing I say here is intended to detract from the patriotic and courageous services that have been rendered by millions of other men in our armed services in all parts of the world. Many an enlisted man has rendered services "at risk of life and beyond the call of duty" and no doubt their acts have not been brought to the attention of the War Department and they have not received any citations.

I have always believed and still believe that we have the finest men and officers in the world in our Army, and the same goes for our Navy. American fighting men have not been defeated on land or sea or in the air. They have added imperishable glory to our country. And the heroic action of this hill country boy from Kentucky has helped to contribute to the very highest and best traditions of American fighting men from Lexington in 1775 to this very day.

HONORABLE, HUMBLE, PATRIOTIC FAMILY

The father of this fine soldier is Mr. Ned Ross, his mother is Mrs. Maude Ross. They have a little hillside farm in McCrae County, Ky., and have brought into the world a number of fine children. They could not make a livelihood from the sterile soil of that little mountain farm alone. The father has worked getting out timber and in the mines for the Stearns Coal & Lumber Co. Pvt. Wilburn Ross has a second brother, Osborne Ross, 21 years of age. He joined the Army early in the war and on January 3, 1945, was severely wounded in the battle of Leyte, P. I., and he is now at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., recovering from these severe wounds. And there is a third brother, Conrad Glen Ross, who is a little over 18 years of age, and he is in the Army in the foreign service. These boys worked on the farm in the timber woods and in the coal mines.

What a wonderful contribution this father and mother and these three patriotic sons have made in their sacrifices to our country! This great republic can never fully repay its debt of gratitude to this father and mother and these sons and to the millions of other fathers and mothers and sons who have given so much to our country in this emergency.

A GREAT INSPIRATION

The Rosses are a patriotic, God-fearing, liberty-loving family. In fact they are a part of that great section of our country where the people know but one allegiance and that is to the United States, and where they follow but one flag and that is the Stars and Stripes. There is no spot large enough in my congressional district to put up a staff carrying a flag of a country or people disloyal to this Nation. I have never heard of a single person in all the 17 counties in my district accused of disloyalty to our country in this war.

The lives of this family should be an inspiration to all of us. If we had the spirit of Private Ross, would there be any stoppage in our munitions plants, or any let-down on the farms or on the railroads, or other activities essential to our war effort, to produce all the ships, munitions, food, and clothing necessary, and more, to enable our defenders to win an early and conclusive victory over our enemies?

Private Ross did not quibble about hours or pay. He remained on duty, according to the records of his superiors, after having spent 5 hours in this terrible ordeal, and he remained on duty that night and the following day—36 hours in all. Would not some of us have thought we had done a very good day's work when we had killed and wounded 58 Germans, under the terrific strain that this private soldier was under? But this fine American boy remained on duty in the tense atmosphere of impending attack on the western front for 36 hours after this remarkable achievement.

Let us all do all we can to emulate the fine example of this father and mother and these three fine sons, and put forth every effort within our power to bring

victory at the earliest moment possible so that all the sons and daughters, husbands, brothers, and others may return to their homes and loved ones, and that we may again enjoy the blessing of peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record with reference to the citation awarded to my constituent Fred E. Gross and include certain data.

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

There was no objection.

THE MEAT SUPPLY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the bungling of the administration on the meat supply of America is a most serious problem. Many alibis for this failure have been advanced, including a statement a few days ago indicating that supplies of feed were not large enough to justify additional cattle feeding.

I have just returned from the Middle West cattle-feeding section. I found there tremendous supplies of feed, so large that there are areas where corn and alfalfa, which together form an almost perfect cattle-feeding ration, are in such oversupply that they are unsalable at prices 25 to 40 percent below O. P. A. prices.

I found corn and alfalfa that farmers had been trying to sell for months deteriorating in the fields. The reasons are twofold. First, livestock feeding has declined, due both to the price structure and the draft raid on farm help. Secondly, the boxcar situation has made it impossible to sell these feeds at most elevators.

The reason for the meat shortage is not a shortage of feed. That alibi is a fake.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations, before the Academy of Political Science of New York City on April 4 of this year.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. PITTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a radio address delivered by D. D. Monroe, grand sire of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of Clayton, N. Mex., and in the other to extend his remarks in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and to include editorials and excerpts from articles.

HYMAN L. SCHIFFER

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1325) for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Hyman L. Schiffer" and insert "Mrs. Rose Schiffer."

Amend the title so as to read "An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Schiffer."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DOROTHY STOWELL

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1669) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Ralph A. Stowell."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MURRAY W. MORAN

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1707) for the relief of Murray W. Moran, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "W." insert "and Elsie P."

Page 1, line 8, after "W." insert "and Elsie P."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "his" and insert "their."

Amend the title so to read: "An act for the relief of Murray W. and Elsie P. Moran."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENJAMIN D. LEWIS

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1983) for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis, with a

Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after "who" insert "is alleged to have."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Journal of Commerce on the subject Great Britain Seen in Strong Post-War Shipping Position.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in an official proclamation Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, has set aside this week in April—April 8 to 14, inclusive—as teacher appreciation week in South Dakota. It is well, Mr. Speaker, that we should give thought, even in the midst of this awful war, to the sacrifice and service given by the teachers of youth, and I wish that teacher appreciation week were being commemorated this week throughout the entire United States. A nation which appreciates and adequately rewards its teachers, sir, is a nation which is building wisely for the future.

In calling upon the citizens of South Dakota to set aside this week in April to express their appreciation for the public-spirited service rendered by the teachers of our State, Governor Sharpe issued the following proclamation:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION

Whereas those who teach the oncoming generations of our citizens are performing an indispensable and important work for the public benefit; and

Whereas we can improve and strengthen the influence of our teachers for the general good by giving some public recognition and appreciation of their important and useful functions in promoting the general welfare and aiding in the grand objective of individual and racial development: Now, therefore,

I, M. Q. Sharpe, Governor of South Dakota, do hereby proclaim and declare the period of April 8 to April 14, 1945, as teacher appreciation week in South Dakota and suggest that our people commence to give careful consideration of the position and needs of our teachers as individuals and as public servants doing an important work for the benefit of all; and I do urge all of our citizens during that time to consider and practice appropriate ways and means of expressing our appreciation to our teachers in all schools for their public-spirited work, and to give them our encouragement by visiting their

schools and classes and cooperating with them always for the production of the best grade of citizenship for our country. I would recommend to all student bodies and organizations, including the Young Citizens' League, that they put on some kind of appropriate school program or exercises during teacher appreciation week.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, this 15th day of February 1945.

M. Q. SHARPE,

Governor of South Dakota.

Attest:

Mrs. L. M. LARSEN,

Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, South Dakota is one of the States of the Union which throughout its short but brilliant history has always placed great emphasis upon the importance of education. We have preserved our public-school lands. We have established a group of growing and important State institutions of higher learning. The session of the legislature which has recently adjourned passed an appropriation measure implementing an earlier adopted teacher-retirement law so that for the first time our educators have access to an operating retirement plan which will minimize the insecurity of illness and old age. South Dakota's sole contribution to famed Statuary Hall in this Capitol Building is a statue to a great educator, Gen. W. H. Beadle, whose likeness in bronze was fashioned as a result of funds made possible by contributions from the school children and teachers of South Dakota.

Even so, the teachers of South Dakota like the teachers of other States of the Union, are not paid salaries which are anywhere nearly commensurate with the time they have devoted to their own preparation or the talents which they display as the tutors of tomorrow's citizens. Most of them could earn considerably more were they to give up their classrooms and devote their efforts to the marts of trade, to our great production industries, or to the practice of other professions. The fact that so many teachers have stayed by their jobs throughout this long war is indeed a great tribute to the unselfish devotion which they have to the cause of education. It is a fact which the rest of us should never fail to appreciate, and it is something which we should keep in mind as provisions are made in the post-war era for the expansion and improvement of educational opportunities in this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the following figures are for the Nation as a whole and not for South Dakota and while I am glad to say teachers' salaries in South Dakota are above the median they are still so low that they compare unfavorably with other professions in our State. However, the average salary of all teachers, principals, and supervisors in the public schools of this country in 1942 was \$1,500. For rural teachers throughout America, the average was only about \$900. These figures are much lower than comparable figures for the salaries of Federal Gov-

ernment employees doing civilian work which for the same period was \$1,926 and which on the average represent workers with less collegiate training than the teachers in our schools. For employees in manufacturing industries who work shorter hours and in positions of less responsibility the average salary for the same year was \$2,043. So long as a nation pays higher rewards to those who work with material things than it pays to those who train our children, Mr. Speaker, that nation still has much to learn about the relative values of life.

When Thomas Jefferson founded the great University of Virginia he chose as the motto for that school, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." How tragically we are all seeing the veracity of that saying being written across the face of the world in the blood of our best young men during this global war. If children around the world could have been taught the truth during the past quarter of a century, the great, silent force of education might well have prevented a war which force of arms and show of might entirely failed to stop.

Even today, with victory near, the crying need of the hour is for high-minded, intelligent, freedom-loving teachers in every country of the world to teach oncoming generations the virtues of peace and the vicious follies of the hatreds, the greeds, the disregard for the rights of others, the selfishness, and the vanities which always lead to war. Here in America, let us resolve to better reward our teachers and better equip our schools so that in peace as in war we can show the rest of the world how to develop and display the effective forces which are needed to secure results.

Fully as much as the great productive capacities of our farms and our factories and the unbending courage of our men and women in uniform, Mr. Speaker, our American schools have contributed to our victories in this war. Last September in France while I was having lunch with General Eisenhower in his headquarters, he told me and a number of my colleagues who were with me on a mission that one of the great superiorities which the American soldier displayed over his Nazi adversary was the ability to think for himself and to exercise his own initiative in a tight spot. General Eisenhower rightfully attributed that mental alertness and agility to the training which American soldiers received in the classrooms of the schools of this Republic. But let us remember that without the inspirational leadership of a teacher, the bare walls of a classroom or the bookcases of a library could do little to quicken the imagination or train the mind of the average American student who is today distinguishing himself with valor in battle areas all over the world.

Following this war the demands upon our educational system will exceed anything in all our previous history. Not only will hundreds of thousands of young men and women discharged from the

armed services be crowding our school-rooms in search of more learning but to their ranks will be added almost equal numbers of boys and girls of school age who have disrupted their schooling to work in the defense industries. The realization of the dreams and hopes of all these eager youngsters will depend primarily upon the ability of this Republic to have available a gigantic corps of well-trained, professional-minded, and adequately paid teachers.

A dissatisfied or a dispirited teacher in a classroom, sir, can do more to dampen the ardor and discourage the ambition of a student than anything else which all the ills of ignorance can conceive to hold a nation in intellectual darkness. Conversely, books cannot grow so old nor classrooms become so bleak that education can be withheld from the student who is fortunate enough to face each day a teacher who loves the profession which he or she has selected as a lifetime career.

Statistics gathered by the United States Department of Labor indicate that between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 young people, 18 years and less of age, are now employed in industry and on our farms, in contrast with a peacetime average of 900,000. Education faces the challenge of drawing these boys and girls out of the labor market and back into our institutions of learning. This country, Mr. Speaker, faces the challenge of making schools and teachers available to this great group in addition to the great numbers who will come home from the war eager to avail themselves of the provisions in the G. I. bill of rights which make it possible for them to go to school or college.

So much confidence have I in the tremendous force of education that I have introduced two bills in the present session of Congress designed to utilize the influences of education in the promotion and preservation of a just and permanent peace. One of them is H. R. 1740, which would provide for exchange scholarships among the student teachers of the teacher-training institutions of the pan-American republics. The other is House Resolution 215, which would place this House on record favoring the establishment of an international office of education to serve as a great clearing house of educational ideals and to encourage the right type of training in proper principles of peaceful behavior among students throughout the world.

Twelve of the happiest—and perhaps the most fruitful—years of my life were spent as a high-school or college teacher. I know from experience that if we Americans will give education a real opportunity to demonstrate its great effectiveness that it can go far toward equipping this Republic to meet the great challenge which it confronts and that it can render trojan service wherever in the world it is utilized as a force for peace and as a device for implementing and expanding freedom by the simple process of teaching eternal truths to people everywhere.

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 1 hour.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—OVER-CHARGES FOR ELECTRICITY, 1944

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables and other data I have compiled on the power question.

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

There was no objection.

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country certain interests are attacking the Tennessee Valley Authority, with two objects in view, to discredit the work of that great organization and to prevent the creation of additional authorities throughout the country to develop and distribute the water power of this Nation.

While that is going on we see a great flood sweeping down the Ohio River destroying millions of dollars' worth of property and wiping out human lives. We see the same deplorable conditions on the Missouri River and other large streams throughout the Nation. Far down the Mississippi, as a result of the failure to develop regional authorities on these various tributaries, we see the Mississippi breaking over its levees and destroying untold millions of dollars' worth of property as well as destroying human lives and depriving the people of a great fertile area of this country of the opportunity to make a crop during the year 1945.

All of this could have been prevented by the development of authorities such as the T. V. A. on these great tributaries.

There seems to be in progress an organized campaign of abuse and misrepresentation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, its costs, its functions, its operations, and its benefits to mankind.

Twelve years ago on this floor I led the fight for the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, while my distinguished friend, who has now passed to the great beyond, George W. Norris, of Nebraska, led the fight at the other end of the Capitol.

We had the support of the administration. The bill was passed after a hard fight, and President Roosevelt signed it, creating the Tennessee Valley Authority as it stands today.

The T. V. A. has proved to be the greatest development of ancient or modern times. It has done more for the American people than any other project that has ever been instituted, and it is doing more now for you and the people you represent than any other development yet undertaken, as I will show you before I leave the floor this afternoon.

You see no destructive floods on the Tennessee. They are all under control.

We have a splendid navigation channel on the Tennessee all the way up to Knoxville.

The T. V. A. is generating about 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity each year that was formerly going to

waste. It is now being used to light the homes and business establishments, operate the appliances, turn the wheels of industry, and produce the materials of war for our men on the various fighting fronts.

By the coordination of those dams we were able to cut the flood crest on the Ohio and save the city of Cairo a few years ago.

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. RANKIN. I yield.

MR. GROSS. Is it true that the Tennessee River is the only river that flows through seven States and drains the Federal Government?

MR. RANKIN. That is the brightest thing the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said since he advocated "licking the platter clean."

I hope the gentleman remains in the Chamber. I am going to discuss the power rates in Pennsylvania in a moment, and I want to ask why he piddles around with such matters while the people of Pennsylvania are overcharged \$104,000,000 a year for their own electricity.

Now, if anybody else wants to get in on this discussion the door is open, because this issue reaches into every home.

But let me go back to the floods on the Tennessee. A few years ago the people of Cairo were all sitting on the anxious seat, expecting that the water would sweep over the levee and destroy that city. Had it not been for the dams on the Tennessee that would have occurred. But those dams held back the flood waters of the Tennessee and saved Cairo. We have spent almost a billion dollars trying to control floods on the Mississippi River. But the Tennessee Valley Authority is the only thing that ever held back the flood crest to such an extent as to save the lower Mississippi Valley from destructive overflows.

In 1927, if we had had the T. V. A. in operation we could have held these flood crests down to where they would never have broken over, and all that devastation would have been prevented.

In addition to that, we have built a navigation channel all the way from Paducah, Ky., to Knoxville, Tenn., and opened up one of the finest sections of this world to navigation. This can be done on every other large stream in America.

But that is not all, the T. V. A. is generating 12,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year, that is being used not only by domestic and commercial and industrial consumers in the area, but it is also going into war production. Had it not been for the power generated on the Tennessee River, and on the Columbia River, I do not know what we would have done in this great war emergency.

But throughout the country we find various and sundry charges being made to the effect that the Tennessee Valley Authority is a burden on the Treasury of the United States. I see that the mayor of Kansas City, Mo., of all places, stated that "The United States Treasury has advanced capital to the extent of \$700,-

000,000 for the T. V. A." and that "actual interest charges are buried in the vast general expenses of the Treasury."

Then he goes on and attempts to show that the T. V. A. is a burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation. But listen to his statement:

During the year T. V. A. made payments in lieu of taxes amounting to \$2,000,000, which was 6 percent of gross revenue. At the same time the privately owned and operated power companies paid approximately 24 percent of their revenues in taxes, or four times the T. V. A. figure.

In 1936 and 1937 the Federal Power Commission issued a report on the taxes of the various power companies of the entire Nation. I have that report before me. It shows that the gross percentage of taxes to gross revenue of private power companies were not 24 percent, but 13.2 percent.

If they are paying any more taxes now than they did then, it is excess profits taxes, based on the overcharges for electricity throughout the country. But the mayor of Kansas City used this figure \$700,000,000 as investment in the T. V. A. to which he attempted to relate power earnings after deductions of expenses and other programs.

The United States Chamber of Commerce was more lavish in attributing capital funds to the assorted programs of T. V. A. I believe they called it a billion dollars. In discussion of the T. V. A. in connection with the Nation-wide referendum on national water resources policies among local chambers of commerce last year, the United States Chamber of Commerce declared that the T. V. A. public-utilities business represents a billion-dollar investment, of which it says that a hundred million was attributed to the municipal and cooperative distributors of T. V. A. power.

The Edison Electric Institute, in its appraisal of the Tennessee Valley Authority, was less liberal in its claim, but it included part of the facilities for flood control and navigation to run the power investment up to \$555,000,000, including the investment of the distributors.

So we find this \$450,000,000 difference between these various critics, all of whom represent the viewpoint of those selfish interests that were literally plundering the American people on power rates when the T. V. A. was created, and are plundering them yet in some sections of the country, including Kansas City, and the whole State of Missouri, as I will show before I close.

Let us now see what these investments amount to. The facts which these propagandists seek to obscure are simple. As to investments the T. V. A. on June 30, 1944, had total fixed assets of \$757,500,000. Included in the gross investment was the investment in multi-purpose dams providing navigation and flood control as well as power, and other dams and steam generating stations, and a chemical plant of more than \$9,000,000. General plants of nearly \$13,000,000; and construction in progress totaled more than \$188,000,000. These are the items which propagandists would charge

against the electric rate payers in the Tennessee Valley area.

The total investment in power facilities on June 30, 1944, amounted to \$403,000,000 instead of a billion, as contended by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, for which depreciation reserves of nearly \$44,000,000 had been provided, leaving a net investment of \$359,300,000. The power consumers are not supposed to pay for flood control and navigation any more than power consumers along the Mississippi, the Ohio, or the Missouri are supposed to pay for flood control on those streams or the power consumers in Massachusetts are to pay for the construction or improvement of the Cape Cod Canal.

In the fiscal year 1944 the T. V. A. power operations provided nearly \$35,500,000 in gross revenue.

Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross] still present?

After provisions for all expenses including \$2,169,000 in payments in lieu of taxes to States and counties the power operations provided a net income of \$14,116,000, or about 40 percent of the gross revenue. Not even the frantic walls of the assorted propagandists of the Nation can change the fact of this net income or surplus, nor can they obscure the plain fact that T. V. A. power operations are on a self-supporting and paying basis. Nor can they support their claim that T. V. A. should pay 22 or 23 or 24 percent of its gross revenue in taxes. Again the facts are simple. T. V. A. under section 13 of the T. V. A. Act makes payment to the States and counties in which it operates to safeguard these subdivisions against loss of ad valorem taxes resulting from the purchase of reservoir lands and power properties by the Federal Government through T. V. A. The propagandists failed to point out that the \$2,169,000 paid in lieu of taxes by T. V. A. last year exceeded by \$800,000 the taxes formerly paid to the States, counties, and municipalities under private ownership of these reservoir lands and utility properties which had been purchased by the T. V. A.

The municipal and cooperative electric power systems distributing T. V. A. power also paid taxes, or made payments in lieu thereof. The combined total is \$4,137,000, which exceeded by more than \$1,200,000 the property taxes formerly paid on all reservoir lands and power properties purchased by the T. V. A. and the distributors.

Again the charge is made that the T. V. A. pays no taxes. Here again they fail to point out that whereas the Federal taxes of utilities consist chiefly of a proportion of the net income, the entire net income of T. V. A. is the property of the Federal Government.

They talk about private companies paying 24.5 percent of their gross revenues, which is almost twice what the record shows they did pay in 1936, but even then they fail to point out that 6.8 percent even of that is paid as taxes on excess profits. Where do they get those excess profits? By wringing them from

the power consumers of this country in overcharges.

Now, as the T. V. A. progresses through its twelfth year, I submit, as I pointed out a few minutes ago, that it has proved to be the greatest development of its kind the world has ever known. And I am going to tell you why. In the first place, it has not only controlled floods and provided for navigation channels, but it has saved 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year that was absolutely going to waste. Do you know what that means? We all hear so much about manpower these days. Electricity is the greatest servant mankind has ever known, and the only one the man and woman of ordinary means can afford; and they can afford it only when the rates are such that they can afford to pay them.

The power generated at Muscle Shoals alone, one dam on the Tennessee River, exceeds the combined physical strength of all the slaves freed by the Civil War. Now, bear that figure in mind.

The power generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority today exceeds the combined physical strength of every man in the United States living east of the Mississippi River.

The power generated at Boulder Dam on the Colorado River exceeds the combined physical strength of every man in the United States living west of the Mississippi River.

The power generated at Grand Coulee in 24 hours exceeds the combined physical strength of the entire manhood of the Nation working 8 hours a day.

But what is this power worth if we do not get it out to the people at rates they can afford to pay?

I want to go back and call your attention to some of the rates we were paying before the T. V. A. was created.

When we created the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933, the power interests were buying power at Muscle Shoals under a contract with the Hoover administration at about 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and selling it to us at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour. The average rate paid in Florence, Ala., just across the river, was the same as that paid in Tupelo, Miss., my home town 100 miles away, and here it is. I am going to read you those rates, and then I am going to read the present rates.

RESIDENTIAL RATES 1933

First 30 kilowatt-hours a month, 10 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Next 170 kilowatt-hours a month, 8 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Next 300 kilowatt-hours a month, 7 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Next 350 kilowatt-hours a month, 6 cents a kilowatt-hour.

All over 850 kilowatt-hours a month, 5 cents a kilowatt-hour.

RESIDENTIAL RATES 1945

First 100 kilowatt-hours a month, 2 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Next 250 kilowatt-hours a month, 1 cent a kilowatt-hour.

Next 700 kilowatt-hours a month, 4 mills a kilowatt-hour.

All over 1,050 kilowatt-hours a month, 7 mills a kilowatt-hour.

The domestic consumers in that area were using an average of only about 30 kilowatt-hours a month at that time. I believe by 1933 they got up to 35 kilowatt-hours a month in Florence, Ala. I will show you in less than a minute what they are using in Florence now. They used 291 kilowatts a month in January 1945 instead of 35, as in 1933.

What do you suppose they pay for it now? An average of 1.12 cents a kilowatt-hour. What do you suppose they paid wholesale to get that power? Let us look at that. Instead of paying 2 mills a kilowatt-hour as the power interests did in 1933, they pay 3.88 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale. Where the power company was paying 2 mills and selling it at a top rate of 10 cents, they buy it for 3.88 mills and sell it at a top rate of 2 cents a kilowatt-hour—or an average of 1.12 cents a kilowatt-hour.

In 1933 in my town 19 percent of the domestic customers were using electric refrigerators. Today between 95 and 100 percent of the power consumers in my town have electric refrigerators.

Let us turn to these rates and see what we are paying now. Let us just read this domestic schedule again. The residential rates that are paid, and let us just compare them as we go along, and I will show you where all this griping is coming from. Here is their schedule for 1933. The first 30 kilowatt-hours per month, 10 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Here is our present schedule: The first 100 kilowatt-hours a month, 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Their next block was 170 kilowatt-hours, 8 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Our next block is 250 kilowatt-hours, 1 cent per kilowatt.

Their next block was the next 300 kilowatts, 7 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Ours is the next 700 kilowatt-hours, 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. These rates prevail in Corinth, Tupelo, and Columbus in Mississippi; Decatur, Ala., and many other towns and cities throughout the T. V. A. area.

Where they paid 5 cents for all over 850 kilowatt-hours in 1933, we now pay 7 mills per kilowatt-hour for all above 1,050 kilowatt-hours per month, because up to that amount the average is 7 mills, and we extend that on to maintain that level. Yet we pay interest on investment, 6 percent. Our power systems are separate from the other city properties. We pay interest on the bonds and pay all overhead charges. Then the only thing we can do with the surplus is to reduce the rates or extend the service. We cannot extend the service in those towns and cities because everybody has electricity. So we began to reduce the rates. That increased consumption to where the T. V. A. asked us not to reduce the rates any more because they needed this power for war purposes. Therefore in Tupelo, and other cities, we paid back to the consumers in the

form of dividends in Government bonds enough to reduce the domestic rate to an average 1 cent per kilowatt-hour, whereas 12 years ago we were using 42 kilowatt-hours a month in that town and were paying on an average of 9.4 cents a kilowatt-hour for it.

The average rate paid for domestic electricity throughout the T. V. A. area now is 1.79 cents per kilowatt-hour, as against an average of about 3.65 cents a kilowatt-hour for the rest of the country.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. How wide is the area of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because I am one of the men who settled that question when Senator Norris and I introduced the bill creating the T. V. A. We provided that this power is to be distributed throughout the distribution radius. The Army engineers in 1930, in their report stated that this power could be transmitted economically a distance of 350 miles.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. On either side?

Mr. RANKIN. In any direction, from any dam, which they said would reach St. Louis and New Orleans. We are carrying it now, as far as 250 miles. That is about as far as we have gone. That is down through the district I have the honor to represent.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DE LACY. Does not the gentleman believe these remarkable figures he is citing of reduction in rates are a great encouragement to industrialization of the country by free enterprise?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. Now, understand me, I am as anti-Communist, anti-Fascist, anti-Nazi, antitotalitarian as any man in Congress, or out of it; but I want to draw this distinction: The power business is not a private business. It is a public business. Why? Because electricity today is one of the necessities of our modern life. That is one reason. Another reason is it must be handled by a monopoly. You cannot have a half dozen concerns distributing power to a town or a community. The overhead would eat them up, worse than it is doing some of you now.

Again, the waterpower of this country already belongs to the people, to the Federal Government. That was decided in the Ashwander case. Chief Justice Hughes delivered the opinion in that case. I was there and heard it. He simply followed the philosophy of John Marshall and all of the other great judges who had preceded him on that august tribunal.

Again, in the Appalachian power case, it was decided that the power in the tributaries also belonged to the Federal Government. We are therefore dealing with power that already belongs to the American people, already belongs to the Government. It must be handled by a monopoly and it is a necessity in every

modern life. Therefore it is a public and not a private business.

Mr. DE LACY. I agree with the gentleman but I am afraid he misunderstood the purport of my question. I was trying to bring out that the reduction of these excessive rates in every area, including our own Northwest, has resulted in the vast upspringing of industry under private enterprise.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes, and the areas that do not have cheap electricity are going to suffer after this war is over. That is one reason it is so necessary to develop our water power now, as provided in my bill, H. R. 1824.

The T. V. A. does not sell power at retail—it is selling some probably at the present time to war plants—but the T. V. A. program is to sell the power wholesale to the municipal systems or to cooperative power systems or to private power companies, but to fix a retail rate, at least the maximum rates at which it is to be sold to the ultimate consumers. In 1930 the Army engineers said this—I want you to get this because this is on that subject of transmission. They said to pay 4 percent on the investment, which is a good return for a Government investment, this power should be sold wholesale at the following rates:

At the switchboard at 1.352 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Transmitted 100 miles, 1.993 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Transmitted 200 miles, 2.310 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Transmitted 250 miles, 2.467 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Transmitted 300 miles, 2.625 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Transmitted 350 miles, 2.775 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Since you have asked so much about my own district, I will show you what we pay for this power.

At the end of a hundred-mile line, instead of paying 1.993 mills a kilowatt-hour Tupelo pays 4.94, or almost 5 mills a kilowatt-hour. Instead of selling it at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour maximum and 9.4 cents average, Tupelo is selling it at a maximum rate of 2 cents a kilowatt-hour and an average of 1.15 cents a kilowatt-hour, to residential consumers.

There is the rub, there is the difference. We are taking the greatest resource America has outside of the soil from which we live and making it available to the American people at rates they can afford to pay.

At 200 miles away the Army engineers said it should be sold at 2.31 mills a kilowatt-hour. At 250 miles it should be sold at 2.467 mills a kilowatt-hour. At 300 miles it should be sold at 2.625 mills a kilowatt-hour; and at 350 miles away, which the Army engineers point out would reach both New Orleans and St. Louis, it should be sold wholesale in order to pay 4 percent on the investment at 2.775 mills per kilowatt-hour.

We had the Army engineers and we had the private engineers on the stand in the St. Lawrence case, and every single one of them on both sides testified that power could be transmitted at around

four-tenths of a mill a kilowatt-hour for each hundred miles. I said: "Well, in order that we may keep it in our minds easily we will just say half a mill." They said: "That is ample."

You can transmit power from Muscle Shoals or any of the rest of these dams, 300 miles at a mill and a half a kilowatt-hour. That is the transmission costs, and includes line losses, as well as all other costs.

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

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

Mr. MURDOCK. In order to develop all the waterpower in this country we would need just about as much money as we are spending in one month's time in this war.

Mr. RANKIN. Why certainly. In 30 years every dollar that is now charged to power will be paid back to the Government with interest and in 50 years it will pay for all the developments for flood control and navigation, reforestation, fertilizer, and every other investment.

Let us see what this means to you. When I came to Congress the record shows that we were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. That figure was published by the private power companies, and you will find it in the electric institute reports as well as in the World Almanac. My opinion is that the private concerns that were making their own electricity, in order to get it more cheaply, probably were producing 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. We will say that raised the amount 50,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Let me take the year 1944 and I will give you some figures. Last year there was generated and sold in the United States 196,425,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. There was 49,211,000,000 manufactured by the people who used it, manufacturing concerns that make their own electricity. That amounted to a total of 245,363,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Then in addition to that we imported 2,585,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. Of course, that came from a short distance. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Grossl] should have remained here. That came from just across the river in Ontario, Canada. That raised the amount of electricity used in this country last year to 248,221,912,000 kilowatt-hours. I have said time and time again that in 10 years after this war closes we will be using half a trillion kilowatt-hours a year and long before the turn of the next century the American people will use 1,000,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. In other words, we are entering the electric age.

There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year now going to waste down our navigable streams and their tributaries, including the Ohio, the Missouri, the Arkansas, the Delaware, the Savannah, the St. Lawrence, and other streams throughout the country.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman mentioned the Missouri River Valley a moment ago. There is quite a difference. There is quite a bit of difference in the lay of the land in the Missouri River Valley and that of the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman has available the extent of land that was sacrificed in order to build these dams in each instance? The reason I ask that question is this: Along the Missouri River, particularly in northwest Missouri, that land is very fertile. It will grow most anything. I believe that that is one of the principal objections by those who oppose the M. V. A. in my district.

Mr. RANKIN. The private power interests and others who are manifesting local interest at long distance made the same complaints against the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I am not sure that they did not make the same complaint against the building of Boulder Dam. I remember when they had Boulder Dam up here in the House, I heard some of the cries that I heard the other day against this proposed Potomac Valley development—the Potomac River right here in the Nation's Capital, with power running to waste right down through the city. They said, "Why, if you build that dam up the stream, sometime we will get into a war and somebody will blow it up and drown everybody in Washington." I said, "Oh, how familiar that sounds. I hear the echo of the Power Trust in California, Utah, Arizona, and Nevada in 1928." They said, "If you build Boulder Dam, there will come an earthquake and drown everybody from there to Mexico."

By the way, I want to say to you Members that if you have never been through Boulder Dam, it is worth walking from here to Nevada to go through that great enterprise. I know some people who know nothing, and care nothing, about the power question, or about what these great developments mean, will say that is an exaggeration, but I consider the trips I made to go through those great dams worth more to me than anything else I have ever done. There is no other structure on earth like Boulder Dam. And the same thing can be said of Grand Coulee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I know that the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has urged that the committee visit all of these dams, the Tennessee Valley dams and all the other projects throughout the Nation. I, for one, as a member of that committee, am very eager to do that.

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

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the splendid interest he has shown in the development of power throughout the country and on the results he has accomplished. May I ask him if he is in position to weigh the possibilities involved in the so-called

Mexican Water Treaty, as to what the result might be as it would affect the gentleman's program, and if he has any comments to make upon that issue.

Mr. RANKIN. I have not gone into that question thoroughly. My prejudice, if I have any, is in favor of the water users and the people who use the power that is generated by that water; but I have not gone into it carefully and am not so sure about it. However, I certainly would not want to see any of the water taken away from behind Boulder Dam or those other great dams that are supplying electricity to that section of the country, or supplying the water to water the land that those people are going to have to depend upon for a living in the years to come. That is my feeling on the proposition, but as I said, I have not gone into the merits of the proposition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman and compliment him on the attitude he has just expressed. We in California appreciate that attitude very much.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to get back to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], because he asked a very intelligent question, as did the gentleman from California, and I want to give him an intelligent answer as I can.

Let me say in passing that the bill I introduced, H. R. 1824, provides for the creation of an authority in the Central Valley. By firming up the power in the Central Valley, by the use of a stand-by plant, we can give the people of the entire State of California the same power rates they are now getting in Los Angeles through the use of Boulder Dam power.

Now let me get back to my distinguished friend from Missouri. I want to say to him that the high dams would not be built in the flat country where these rich lands are situated. The high dams where this power would be generated would be farther up the stream. But they would hold back the flood waters. In flood time they would be high enough so that by a proper coordination they could be made to hold back the flood waters and prevent those disastrous floods that the people in the Kansas City area and throughout Missouri, and that whole section of the country in fact, have been subjected to this year and in the years that have passed and gone.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. We recently passed a bill authorizing the building of dams under what is known as the Pick plan on the Missouri River. Would that be workable?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think so. I think you are going to have to have an authority with a coordinated program from one end of the river to the other. If that is done we do not propose to take a single drop of water from the people on the upper stretches of the Missouri where it is needed for irrigation, not a single drop. It will not be necessary.

But by building these dams we can provide a channel as far up as Sioux City, or as far as is necessary for navi-

gation. We can control these destructive floods that now sweep down the Missouri every year and at the same time generate possibly ten or twelve billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year that is now going to waste.

Do you realize what that means? Let me give you an idea of what this power going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries amounts to. The reason I am telling you this is that our place in the post-war world is going to depend, to a large extent, upon how well America is electrified. Let me repeat that. You talk about exports; you talk about commerce. When this war is over America's place in the world is going to depend largely upon how well our country is electrified for every single purpose.

Let us get back to these dams on the Tennessee. They told me then, "Why, you are going to flood some lands that are rich." What did we do? We bought those lands and paid what they were worth. "Oh," they said, "you are going to flood a cemetery." The T. V. A. went there and removed the remains in those cemeteries in order not to shock the sensibilities of the relatives of the ones who were buried there. Today, Tennessee, north Mississippi, north Alabama, and north Georgia, the area affected, are producing just as much, if not more, crops than they ever did and are living on a standard they never enjoyed before; and for the first time in all history the farmers in that area enjoy the use of electricity in their homes.

Look at the floods sweeping across the State of Louisiana now. They may not produce a bale of cotton on that flooded land this year. If it breaks over the levee on the Mississippi side you will see thousands of acres flooded. It is true the T. V. A. does flood some land, but that land was all purchased, and those people who owned it were paid for it. Today they are living, as I said, especially the people in the rural sections, on a standard they never enjoyed before in all the history of the country.

When this program went into effect and these rates were cut, people began to use electricity for the purpose for which it was intended. We started then a program of rural electrification. That program started in the courthouse in my home county. We organized the first cooperative power association. Then I went into every other county in the district and did the same thing. Then when they got organized and made ready, the T. V. A. asked us to incorporate, and we went to the legislature and had a law passed to have those power associations incorporated, nonprofit, cooperative power associations. Today we have throughout this whole country a system of rural electrification that is moving on toward what I hope in a few years will be 100 percent electrification of the farms of this Nation.

In 1936 the International Power Conference was held here in Washington. Their report shows that in this country we had 10.9 percent of our farms electrified at that time. As a rule, they were the homes of what we call town farmers—men who lived close enough to town to send their children to the city

schools and far enough out of town to avoid city taxes. They had electricity, but the average farmer had none. At that time, according to that report, Austria had 95 percent of her farms electrified. Germany had 90 percent. Japan, 90 percent. Italy, 94 percent. France, 98 percent. Holland and Switzerland, 94 to 98 percent. Even far-off New Zealand, that new, sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified; and we only had 10.9 percent of our farms electrified—here in the richest farming country in the world.

Every time I got to talking about rural electrification in those days, men would

rise on both sides of the aisle and ask: "How far are you going with this movement to electrify farm homes? The first thing the farmer will do will be to buy a radio."

I said, "Why not? Then he will not have to go to town to get misinformed; he can get it at home; he will not even have to read the newspaper. Of course, he should have a radio if he wants one."

When the bill creating the Rural Electrification Administration was passed it limited to \$40,000,000 a year the amount that could be allowed for R. E. A. in any one year. In 1938 all points of order were waived against the relief bill. I offered an amendment for an extra \$100,-

000,000 for rural electrification and got it adopted by only seven votes. But we got our hundred million, and that added to the \$40,000,000 gave us \$140,000,000. The next year we got another hundred million and the next year another hundred million, including the forty million provided for under the general law. That really started rural electrification on its way, and today we have 42.2 percent of our farms electrified, as will appear from the following table, which tells one of the greatest stories of material progress ever made by the farmers of any country. I hope every Member will study it carefully, especially with reference to the R. E. A. progress in his own State:

Comparison of rank, percentage, and number of farms electrified with central-station service, 1935, 1940, and 1944, by States and for the United States

Area	Farms, Jan. 1, 1945 ¹	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1934			Farms, Apr. 1, 1940 ¹	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Apr. 1, 1940			Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1944 ²	Increase in electrified farms, from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1944				
	Number	Number ²	Percent	Rank	Number	Number ¹	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
United States	6,812,350	743,954	10.9	-----	6,006,799	1,853,249	30.4	-----	2,572,960	42.2	-----	1,829,006	245.8	-----
Alabama	273,455	11,053	4.0	33	231,746	33,807	14.6	41	60,500	26.1	37	49,447	447.4	15
Arizona	18,824	5,577	29.6	12	18,468	5,607	30.4	24	8,100	43.9	25	2,523	45.2	46
Arkansas	253,013	2,943	1.2	47	216,674	21,303	9.8	45	37,900	17.5	44	34,957	1,187.8	3
California	150,360	81,003	53.9	1	132,658	107,904	81.3	4	118,600	89.4	3	37,507	46.3	45
Colorado	63,644	7,145	11.2	25	51,436	14,823	28.8	25	24,200	47.0	24	17,055	238.7	27
Connecticut	32,157	10,138	31.5	10	21,163	16,995	80.3	5	18,800	88.9	4	8,662	85.4	40
Delaware	10,381	1,791	17.3	20	8,994	3,545	39.4	21	5,100	56.7	20	3,309	184.8	31
Florida	72,857	5,700	7.8	26	62,248	15,476	24.9	28	20,500	32.9	33	14,800	259.6	26
Georgia	250,544	6,956	2.8	41	216,033	42,469	19.6	33	72,100	33.4	30	65,144	936.5	5
Idaho	45,113	13,433	29.8	11	43,663	25,439	58.3	13	33,200	76.0	13	19,767	147.2	35
Illinois	231,312	28,379	12.3	23	213,489	80,627	37.5	22	115,500	54.1	22	87,121	307.0	17
Indiana	200,835	23,476	11.7	24	184,549	91,127	49.4	21	129,500	70.2	14	106,024	451.6	14
Iowa	221,986	32,047	14.4	22	213,318	73,308	34.4	23	116,200	54.5	21	84,153	262.6	23
Kansas	174,589	13,224	7.6	28	156,327	27,960	17.9	37	41,200	26.4	36	27,976	211.6	28
Kentucky	278,298	8,480	3.0	39	252,884	38,607	15.3	40	61,500	24.3	41	53,020	625.2	10
Louisiana	170,216	2,826	1.7	46	150,007	16,058	10.7	44	25,200	17.5	44	23,374	827.1	8
Maine	41,907	13,959	33.3	8	38,980	20,221	51.9	15	23,500	60.3	19	9,541	68.4	41
Maryland	44,501	6,791	15.3	21	42,175	17,170	40.7	20	25,600	60.7	18	18,809	277.0	20
Massachusetts	35,094	14,494	41.3	7	31,897	26,220	82.2	2	27,300	85.6	5	12,806	88.4	38
Michigan	196,517	42,152	21.4	17	187,589	131,126	69.9	7	155,700	81.9	7	111,548	264.6	22
Minnesota	203,302	13,783	6.8	30	197,351	50,075	25.4	26	84,500	42.8	26	70,717	513.1	12
Mississippi	311,683	2,802	.9	48	291,092	26,078	9.0	46	47,800	16.4	46	44,998	1,605.9	1
Missouri	278,454	17,853	6.4	31	256,100	39,204	15.3	39	64,700	25.3	39	46,807	261.6	24
Montana	50,564	2,768	5.5	32	41,823	7,947	19.0	34	10,800	25.8	38	8,032	290.2	18
Nebraska	133,616	9,544	7.1	29	121,062	22,832	18.9	35	34,400	28.4	35	24,856	260.4	25
Nevada	3,696	946	25.6	15	3,573	1,555	43.5	19	1,760	49.3	23	814	86.0	39
New Hampshire	17,695	9,495	53.7	2	16,554	10,845	65.5	10	13,700	82.8	6	4,205	44.3	47
New Jersey	29,375	15,162	51.6	4	25,835	21,298	82.4	1	23,400	90.6	2	8,238	54.3	43
New Mexico	41,369	1,350	3.3	37	34,105	4,479	13.1	42	6,600	20.2	42	5,550	411.1	16
New York	177,025	57,825	32.7	9	153,238	102,283	66.7	9	118,200	77.1	11	60,375	104.4	36
North Carolina	300,967	9,672	3.2	38	278,276	67,627	24.3	29	98,500	35.4	28	88,828	918.4	6
North Dakota	84,606	1,968	2.3	43	73,662	3,218	4.4	48	5,800	7.8	48	3,832	194.7	29
Ohio	255,146	48,048	18.8	19	233,783	137,680	58.9	11	180,000	77.4	10	132,852	276.5	21
Oklahoma	213,325	5,648	2.6	42	179,687	20,149	11.2	43	33,800	18.8	43	28,152	408.4	13
Oregon	64,826	17,839	27.5	14	61,829	36,269	58.8	12	47,700	77.1	11	29,861	167.4	32
Pennsylvania	191,284	45,182	23.6	16	169,027	94,081	55.7	14	112,800	66.7	15	67,618	149.7	34
Rhode Island	4,327	1,975	45.6	6	3,014	2,457	81.5	3	2,900	96.2	1	925	46.8	44
South Carolina	165,504	3,796	2.3	44	137,558	27,568	20.0	32	52,300	38.0	27	48,504	1,277.8	2
South Dakota	83,303	2,039	3.5	36	72,454	3,681	5.5	47	7,800	10.8	47	4,861	165.4	33
Tennessee	273,783	9,727	3.6	34	247,617	38,884	15.7	38	61,700	24.9	40	51,973	534.3	11
Texas	501,017	11,466	2.3	45	418,002	79,127	18.9	36	130,200	31.1	34	118,724	1,035.5	4
Utah	30,695	16,130	52.5	3	25,411	17,411	68.5	8	19,700	77.5	9	3,570	22.1	48
Vermont	27,061	7,945	29.4	13	23,582	12,213	51.8	16	15,400	65.3	16	7,455	93.8	37
Virginia	197,632	14,954	7.6	27	174,885	42,144	24.1	30	58,000	33.2	32	43,046	287.9	19
Washington	84,381	40,060	47.5	5	81,686	58,283	71.4	6	66,700	81.7	8	26,040	66.5	42
West Virginia	104,747	3,647	3.5	35	99,282	25,199	25.4	27	33,100	33.3	31	29,453	807.6	9
Wisconsin	199,877	39,206	19.6	18	186,735	87,556	46.9	18	115,000	61.6	17	75,794	193.3	30
Wyoming	17,487	527	3.0	40	15,018	3,474	23.1	31	5,300	35.3	29	4,773	905.7	7

¹ U. S. Census Bureau.

² Edison Electric Institute.

³ Rural Electrification Administration survey, 1944.

be worth more to the people of central and northern California, including the Sacramento and the San Francisco areas—I know of nothing that would be worth more to them than the development of an authority in the Central Valley and the installation of steam plants to firm that power up to maintain an equal flow at the top level the year around.

Mr. OUTLAND. Did the gentleman also discuss the reasons for the opposition to the development out there?

Mr. RANKIN. I think that is apparent; yes. I have gone up against that opposition ever since John Raker was in

the House. I believe I was here when the first Raker bill was passed. We tried to get that Hetch-Hetchy power delivered directly to the people of San Francisco. This is not a new proposition. I have been in this fight a long time—even in California.

These fellows jump on me, they even send people down in my district to agitate the people against me by saying that JOHN RANKIN is in favor of developing water power in California or on the St. Lawrence.

There are twelve or thirteen billion kilowatt-hours of electricity going to waste in the St. Lawrence every year.

As for the overcharges, last year, according to the Ontario rates, the rates charged right across the river, the overcharge in New York State alone amounted to \$225,424,434.

One good live yardstick such as the St. Lawrence would provide would break those rates down by probably \$200,000,000 a year in the State of New York alone.

You know, the poorest people on earth are the poor in a great city. They seem to be more hopeless and more helpless than anybody else, and you have many of them in that area. The best thing you could do for them would be to give them cheap electricity, in order to enable them to enjoy some of the comforts and conveniences of the modern home.

In Maine the overcharges were \$10,000,000, according to the Ontario rates; in Massachusetts they were \$67,000,000; in New Hampshire, \$7,000,000; in Vermont, \$4,581,000; in Connecticut, \$30,460,000; and in Rhode Island, \$11,623,000. Add that up and it runs up to around \$350,000,000 a year of overcharges in that area, not including Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

As I said, there are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power a year

going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries. That is equal to 115,000,000 tons of the finest bituminous coal. Suppose that coal would float and it were floating down our rivers at the rate of 115,000,000 tons a year. Why, you could not get to the bank of one of those rivers for people there trying to recover it. Yet this power is flowing to waste, and the Members of the House and the Members of the other body are leaning back on any development at all. Suppose it were wheat. That 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity is equal in value to the entire wheat crop of the United States running to waste down our streams. Suppose the 900,000,000 bushels of wheat was floating down these streams every year, going to waste, and that you could recover it without injury to it. Why, you could not get to the bank of the average stream for the people there gathering it in. That merely illustrates the power end of the question. That merely shows the value of the electric power that is going to waste.

We hear men from the coal districts saying it is going to lower the price of coal; that it will interfere with our coal mines. At the rate we are going, 100

years from now we are not going to have any coal. It will be exhausted, or virtually so. In 100 years or so from now, all our gas and oil fields will probably be exhausted. Yet we find these very fellows opposing the saving of power that is going to waste that can be used now by building these dams and the development of these authorities.

Last year we sold in this country 196,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. I want to show you to whom we sold it, and I am going to insert these tables in the RECORD for you to read.

DOMESTIC CONSUMERS *

On the domestic side the 27,365,000 residential consumers of this country used 30,752,839,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid \$1,091,000,000. Under the Tennessee Valley rates it would have cost them \$614,524,000, or \$476,393,000 less, and it would have cost less under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates, as the following table, broken down by States, will show. If you want to see how much the residential consumers of your own State were overcharged for their electricity last year, just look at the following table:

TABLE 1.—Residential electric service, 1944

State	Estimated sales data for 1944			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Adminis-tration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	294,513	427,315,000	\$10,837,563	\$7,337,030	\$3,500,533	\$6,621,751	\$4,215,812	\$7,575,457	\$3,262,106	\$5,722,233	\$5,115,330
Arizona	100,640	145,577,000	5,079,024	2,250,008	2,829,006	2,031,610	3,047,414	2,321,114	2,757,910	1,757,342	3,321,682
Arkansas	168,024	172,855,000	7,258,861	3,469,736	3,789,125	3,135,828	4,123,033	3,585,877	3,672,984	2,707,555	4,551,306
California	1,913,779	2,089,580,000	65,635,756	43,647,778	21,987,978	39,447,089	26,188,667	45,091,764	20,543,992	34,064,957	31,570,799
Colorado	224,591	224,607,000	8,959,072	4,891,653	4,067,419	4,416,822	4,542,250	5,043,958	4,915,114	3,816,565	5,142,507
Connecticut	484,519	556,439,000	21,238,208	11,277,488	9,960,720	10,173,102	11,065,106	11,638,538	9,599,670	8,792,618	12,445,590
Delaware	62,773	70,001,000	3,028,202	1,453,537	1,574,665	1,311,211	1,716,991	1,498,960	1,529,242	1,135,576	1,892,626
District of Columbia	69,872	233,330,000	5,649,890	4,683,759	966,131	4,231,768	1,418,122	4,892,805	757,085	3,655,479	1,994,411
Florida	380,556	561,966,000	21,026,879	9,251,091	11,775,052	8,368,698	12,658,181	9,567,230	11,459,649	7,243,246	13,793,633
Georgia	396,832	575,684,000	16,748,091	10,132,595	6,615,496	9,161,206	7,586,885	10,467,557	6,280,534	7,921,847	8,826,244
Idaho	111,515	246,598,000	5,779,067	3,340,301	2,438,766	3,016,673	2,762,394	3,450,103	2,328,964	2,606,350	3,172,708
Illinois	1,897,282	2,025,512,000	75,506,228	42,223,882	32,342,346	39,067,740	36,498,488	44,544,075	30,982,153	33,702,538	41,863,690
Indiana	788,437	874,602,000	34,010,978	18,842,082	15,186,886	17,005,489	17,005,489	19,420,268	14,590,710	14,692,742	19,318,236
Iowa	485,237	462,621,000	19,017,632	9,965,239	9,052,393	8,995,340	10,022,292	10,288,539	8,729,093	7,778,211	11,239,421
Kansas	347,708	352,071,000	14,117,079	7,340,881	6,776,198	6,635,027	7,482,052	7,580,871	6,536,208	5,731,534	8,385,545
Kentucky	365,675	368,488,000	12,957,879	7,787,685	5,170,194	7,036,128	5,921,751	8,033,885	4,923,994	6,077,245	6,880,634
Louisiana	304,908	324,226,000	12,777,303	6,184,215	6,563,088	5,596,459	7,180,844	6,388,652	3,888,651	4,829,821	7,947,482
Maine	199,869	189,746,000	8,091,156	3,721,932	4,369,224	3,357,830	4,733,326	3,843,299	4,247,857	2,904,724	5,186,431
Maryland	484,668	400,720,000	14,600,610	8,541,357	6,059,253	7,709,122	6,891,488	8,188,768	7,581,842	6,672,479	7,928,131
Massachusetts	1,167,130	977,596,000	45,676,033	21,970,732	23,705,861	19,869,074	25,806,958	22,700,988	22,975,045	17,174,188	28,501,845
Michigan	1,384,291	1,881,292,000	56,810,779	35,961,223	20,849,556	32,438,955	24,371,824	30,077,439	19,713,340	28,064,525	28,746,254
Minnesota	563,359	656,866,000	22,847,402	13,320,035	9,527,367	12,017,733	10,829,669	13,754,136	9,093,266	10,395,568	12,451,834
Mississippi	156,742	177,016,000	5,542,631	3,801,703	2,460,923	2,782,401	2,760,230	3,175,928	3,266,703	2,405,502	3,137,129
Missouri	724,411	788,512,000	26,958,497	15,662,887	11,285,610	14,126,252	12,832,245	16,148,140	10,810,357	12,212,199	14,746,298
Montana	99,937	122,453,000	4,256,662	2,162,384	2,094,278	1,953,808	2,302,854	2,234,748	2,021,914	1,689,895	2,566,767
Nebraska	236,067	246,352,000	9,822,099	5,343,222	4,478,877	4,822,651	4,999,448	5,10,198	4,311,901	4,174,392	5,647,707
Nevada	26,541	41,348,000	1,497,406	693,299	804,107	625,916	871,490	715,760	781,646	540,564	956,842
New Hampshire	133,327	120,306,000	5,649,200	2,479,999	3,169,201	2,242,732	3,406,468	2,559,058	3,090,112	1,937,676	3,711,524
New Jersey	1,156,352	1,010,538,000	47,707,910	22,899,797	24,808,113	20,657,528	27,050,385	23,615,415	24,092,492	17,890,466	29,817,444
New Mexico	61,059	56,792,000	2,628,830	1,080,449	1,548,381	975,296	1,653,534	1,114,624	1,514,204	843,854	1,784,976
New York	3,544,544	3,111,409,000	136,961,050	68,891,408	68,669,642	62,317,278	74,643,772	71,082,785	65,878,265	53,825,693	83,135,357
North Carolina	425,958	553,193,000	17,619,496	10,272,166	7,347,330	9,267,855	7,351,641	10,606,937	7,012,559	8,016,871	9,602,625
North Dakota	75,808	83,961,000	3,549,028	1,707,082	1,841,946	1,543,827	2,005,201	1,763,867	1,785,161	1,334,435	2,214,593
Ohio	1,735,025	2,100,660,000	69,348,283	44,382,601	24,965,382	40,152,656	29,195,627	45,839,215	23,509,068	34,674,142	34,674,141
Oklahoma	314,025	298,942,000	13,151,379	6,246,905	6,904,474	5,641,942	7,509,437	6,457,327	6,649,052	4,870,162	8,272,217
Oregon	287,522	656,539,000	12,462,847	8,861,084	3,601,763	8,001,148	4,461,699	9,147,730	3,315,117	6,916,880	5,545,967
Pennsylvania	2,214,521	2,316,303,000	87,062,754	58,581,017	38,481,737	43,879,628	43,183,126	50,148,140	36,914,608	37,572,298	49,190,456
Rhode Island	191,120	146,517,000	7,373,879	3,384,610	3,989,269	3,052,786	4,321,093	3,487,844	3,886,034	2,639,849	4,734,030
South Carolina	206,322	266,352,000	8,027,514	4,880,729	3,146,785	4,407,105	3,620,409	5,033,251	2,994,263	3,813,069	4,214,445
South Dakota	78,319	78,867,000	3,402,673	1,609,464	1,793,209	1,452,941	1,949,732	1,660,704	1,742,169	1,255,586	2,147,087
Tennessee	395,115	671,356,000	13,465,803	10,866,903	2,568,900	9,816,570	9,816,570	3,649,233	11,217,014	2,248,789	8,483,456
Texas	953,764	941,176,000	38,283,594	10,639,484	18,644,110	17,763,588	20,520,066	20,290,305	17,993,289	15,351,721	22,931,873
Utah	145,674	191,579,000	5,641,469	3,215,637	2,425,832	2,905,357	2,736,112	3,317,184	2,324,285	2,510,454	3,131,015
Vermont	76,187	89,511,000	3,958,755	1,777,481	2,181,274	1,607,255	2,351,500	1,836,862	2,121,893	1,389,523	2,569,232
Virginia	428,815	536,777,000	19,647,879	10,649,150	8,998,729	9,627,461	10,020,418	10,983,164	8,664,715	8,311,058	11,336,826
Washington	514,170	1,254,959,000	21,298,250	16,420,951	4,877,299	14,844,880	6,453,370	16,953,407	4,344,843	12,821,547	8,476,703
West Virginia	279,114	253,523,000	10,035,987	5,499,721	4,536,266	4,967,814	5,068,173	5,670,333	4,365,654	4,295,402	5,740,585
Wisconsin	664,622	797,071,000	25,998,617	17,767,214	11,231,403	13,337,291	12,661,328	15,235,190	10,763,427	11,517,387	14,481,230
Wyoming	43,761	41,105,000	1,851,648	872,126	879,522	788,802	1,062,846	925,824	925,824	681,406	1,170,242
United States	27,365,000	30,752,839,000	1,090,917,832	614,524,188	476,393,644	555,207,420	535,710,412	634,375,074	456,542,758	479,721,835	611,195,997

COMMERCIAL CONSUMERS

There were 4,250,000 commercial consumers of electricity in this country last year. They used 30,740,000,000 kilowatt-hours for which they paid \$815,546,000. Under the T. V. A. rates it would have

cost \$396,876,000, or \$418,669,000 less. Under the Tacoma rates \$335,207,000 less; Bonneville rates, \$479,721,000 less; Ontario rates \$611,195,000 less. These are the merchants, the men who operate stores, warehouses, filling stations,

hotels, restaurants, and other small establishments who have to keep their books balanced. They are bearing this overcharge of \$418,669,000 a year, or more than 100 percent, as the following table will show:

TABLE 2.—Commercial electric service, 1944

State	Estimated sales data for 1944			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	38,796	227,724,000	\$5,902,124	\$3,399,623	\$2,502,701	\$2,779,900	\$3,122,224	\$3,671,121	\$2,231,003	\$3,210,755	\$2,691,369
Arizona	15,691	266,992,000	4,814,128	2,137,473	2,676,655	1,742,714	3,071,414	2,305,967	2,508,161	2,017,120	2,797,008
Arkansas	35,648	176,670,000	6,310,493	2,675,649	3,634,844	2,183,431	4,127,062	2,883,895	3,426,598	2,013,047	4,297,446
California	159,998	4,169,433,000	66,840,307	42,309,914	24,530,939	34,556,439	32,283,868	45,651,930	21,188,377	39,903,663	26,936,644
Colorado	38,361	267,056,000	7,394,929	3,549,566	3,845,363	2,891,417	4,503,512	3,823,178	3,571,751	3,342,508	4,052,421
Connecticut	62,331	445,311,000	13,915,894	5,816,844	8,099,050	4,745,320	9,170,574	6,276,068	7,639,826	5,482,862	8,433,032
Delaware	9,084	53,343,000	1,568,731	767,498	861,233	577,293	961,438	762,403	806,328	666,711	902,020
District of Columbia	11,178	252,230,000	4,863,255	3,832,245	1,031,010	1,311,936	1,731,319	4,075,408	787,847	3,623,125	1,240,130
Florida	71,549	592,211,000	17,779,828	6,685,251	11,094,613	5,440,627	12,339,201	2,700,830	10,578,998	6,294,059	11,485,769
Georgia	64,416	516,162,000	14,165,195	6,827,624	7,337,571	5,566,922	8,588,273	7,365,901	6,799,294	6,445,164	7,720,031
Idaho	20,562	140,536,000	3,348,753	1,660,581	1,687,772	1,349,547	1,999,206	1,784,885	1,563,888	1,560,519	1,788,234
Illinois	251,574	1,481,222,000	49,913,834	23,858,813	26,055,021	19,516,309	30,397,525	25,805,452	18,108,382	22,561,053	27,352,781
Indiana	108,606	710,082,000	19,605,725	9,998,920	9,606,805	8,155,982	11,449,743	10,783,149	8,822,576	9,430,354	10,175,371
Iowa	96,249	558,219,000	17,421,715	8,654,762	8,466,953	7,317,120	10,104,595	9,669,652	7,752,663	8,432,110	8,985,605
Kansas	59,097	508,011,000	11,479,477	5,774,177	5,705,300	4,706,586	6,772,891	6,221,877	5,257,600	5,452,752	6,026,725
Kentucky	48,604	224,213,000	6,981,478	3,688,229	3,295,255	3,009,017	3,972,461	3,972,461	3,009,017	3,476,776	3,504,702
Louisiana	49,868	372,163,000	11,340,881	4,547,693	6,793,188	3,697,127	7,643,754	4,899,261	6,441,620	4,286,853	7,054,028
Maine	30,350	119,601,000	3,745,217	1,726,555	2,018,672	1,404,456	2,340,761	1,853,882	1,891,335	1,621,679	2,123,538
Maryland	77,538	433,178,000	12,567,765	6,894,703	5,668,062	5,642,926	6,924,839	7,452,685	15,658,080	1,211,132	1,240,177
Massachusetts	169,483	739,581,000	27,610,686	10,740,557	16,870,129	8,752,587	18,858,099	11,568,877	16,041,809	10,133,122	17,477,564
Michigan	169,142	1,436,032,000	39,103,136	19,942,691	19,160,626	16,266,970	22,836,337	16,506,824	17,506,492	16,892,633	22,210,683
Minnesota	102,856	535,437,000	18,629,524	8,662,729	9,966,795	7,060,590	11,568,934	9,333,392	9,296,132	8,159,732	10,466,792
Mississippi	30,618	181,325,000	5,458,375	2,330,726	3,127,649	1,899,515	2,558,860	2,510,853	2,947,522	2,194,267	3,264,108
Missouri	125,706	715,883,000	20,490,449	10,634,543	9,855,906	8,687,950	11,802,499	11,474,651	9,015,798	10,040,320	10,450,129
Montana	21,607	105,492,000	3,141,113	1,492,029	1,649,084	1,212,470	1,928,643	1,601,968	1,539,145	1,400,936	1,740,177
Nebraska	41,826	250,966,000	6,932,168	3,638,388	3,292,780	2,966,968	3,965,200	3,923,607	3,008,561	3,431,423	3,500,745
Nevada	5,112	92,091,000	1,540,108	680,888	852,520	560,599	979,509	740,792	799,316	648,385	891,723
New Hampshire	17,642	61,619,000	2,344,160	1,036,119	1,308,041	846,242	1,497,918	1,118,164	1,225,996	977,515	1,366,645
New Jersey	187,591	839,706,000	33,784,889	12,669,333	21,115,556	10,338,176	23,446,713	13,682,880	20,102,009	11,959,851	21,828,038
New Mexico	12,501	111,588,000	3,798,298	1,431,958	2,366,340	1,166,077	2,632,221	1,545,907	2,252,391	1,352,104	2,446,104
New York	596,872	4,070,525,000	135,823,432	54,057,726	81,765,706	44,142,615	91,680,817	58,268,252	77,555,180	51,069,610	84,753,822
North Carolina	513,242,000	12,916,108	7,181,356	5,733,597	5,550,997	7,065,111	7,738,749	17,359,359	6,768,041	6,148,067	
North Dakota	22,050	81,421,000	3,313,327	1,881,866	1,931,861	1,123,387	2,190,440	1,487,908	1,525,919	1,299,020	2,014,807
Ohio	212,709	319,089,000	88,234,094	21,105,220	17,128,224	17,243,576	20,990,518	22,787,520	15,446,574	19,958,197	18,275,897
Oklahoma	54,827	248,710,000	8,519,765	3,233,832	4,685,794	3,118,183	5,401,443	4,123,499	4,396,127	3,603,802	4,915,824
Oregon	43,104	456,712,000	7,586,908	4,491,456	3,095,458	3,664,477	3,922,431	4,848,034	2,788,874	4,233,495	3,533,413
Pennsylvania	309,913	1,546,014,000	45,754,197	22,877,099	22,877,099	18,713,467	27,040,730	24,661,512	21,002,685	21,595,981	24,158,216
Rhode Island	24,572	93,303,000	4,055,442	1,650,565	2,404,877	1,342,351	2,713,091	1,772,228	2,283,214	1,549,179	2,506,263
South Carolina	34,618	247,116,000	5,884,631	3,160,047	2,724,584	2,577,468	3,307,163	3,407,201	2,477,430	2,977,623	2,907,008
South Dakota	21,713	84,527,000	3,184,852	1,350,377	1,834,475	1,101,959	2,082,893	1,458,662	1,726,190	1,273,941	1,910,911
Tennessee	55,751	368,979,000	7,231,368	5,887,269	1,843,899	4,396,672	2,834,696	5,806,789	1,424,579	5,083,652	5,972,785
Texas	159,258	1,422,486,000	33,045,635	16,033,224	16,652,411	13,119,117	19,926,518	17,348,958	16,696,677	15,167,946	17,877,689
Utah	17,498	1,043,633,000	10,515,466	4,826,599	5,686,887	3,932,784	6,582,682	5,184,125	5,331,341	4,542,681	5,972,785
Vermont	11,596	52,164,000	1,682,408	750,324	932,054	610,714	1,071,694	807,556	874,852	706,611	975,797
Virginia	64,374	619,917,000	14,200,312	6,688,086	7,572,226	5,461,699	8,798,613	7,215,718	7,044,594	6,317,318	7,942,994
Washington	63,719	1,019,912,000	14,243,857	9,842,505	4,401,352	8,033,535	6,210,322	10,640,161	3,603,696	9,286,955	4,956,862
West Virginia	37,902	160,962,000	5,467,536	2,772,041	2,695,495	2,263,560	3,203,476	2,996,210	2,471,326	2,618,920	2,848,586
Wisconsin	106,745	755,638,000	19,330,744	10,361,279	8,966,465	7,466,866	10,563,878	11,192,501	8,138,243	9,781,356	9,549,388
Wyoming	7,296	51,611,000	1,703,502	749,541	953,961	609,854	1,093,648	807,460	806,042	705,250	998,252
United States	4,250,000	30,740,238,000	815,546,760	396,876,962	418,669,798	323,246,503	491,600,257	428,018,363	387,528,397	372,073,806	443,472,954

We have 1,418,900 industrial consumers. Last year they used 134,932,159,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid \$1,347,689,000, or an overcharge of

\$440,089,000 according to the T. V. A. rates; \$742,240,000 according to the Tacoma rates; \$461,525,000 according to the Bonneville rates; and \$504,441,-

00 according to the Ontario rates. Examine the following table and you will see what these overcharges amounted to in your own State:

TABLE 3.—Industrial and other electric service, 1944

State	Estimated sales data for 1944			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	41,898	4,660,402,000	\$20,625,984	\$21,804,724	\$7,821,260	\$14,565,325	\$15,079,626	\$21,301,082	\$8,324,902	\$20,264,173	\$9,361,811
Arizona	1,855	556,392,000	5,015,945	2,528,036	2,487,909	1,685,358	3,330,587	2,467,845	2,548,100	2,347,462	2,688,483
Arkansas	23,492	971,883,000	10,584,301	6,922,133	3,662,168	4,614,755	5,969,546	6,763,368	3,820,933	6,435,255	4,149,046
California	325,296	9,936,512,000	113,800,563	106,403,531	7,397,037	71,011,554	42,789,014	103,899,919	9,900,649	98,892,694	14,907,574
Colorado											

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1944—Continued*

State	Estimated sales data for 1944			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Adminis-tration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Missouri.....	20,508	2,593,243,000	\$32,850,107	\$23,027,925	\$9,822,182	\$15,341,000	\$17,509,107	\$22,469,473	\$10,380,634	\$21,385,420	\$11,464,687
Montana.....	2,246	1,624,923,000	8,825,514	7,404,606	1,420,908	4,933,462	3,892,052	7,228,096	1,597,418	6,875,075	1,950,439
Nebraska.....	11,920	428,036,000	5,636,469	3,849,708	1,766,761	2,570,230	3,066,239	3,759,525	1,876,944	3,573,521	2,062,948
Nevada.....	124	35,336,000	487,897	369,588	88,309	266,332	221,505	389,830	98,067	371,290	116,607
New Hampshire.....	2,928	334,190,000	5,271,626	3,579,434	1,692,192	2,388,047	2,883,579	3,495,088	1,776,538	3,326,396	1,945,230
New Jersey.....	4,826	4,386,901,000	49,604,620	29,217,121	20,387,490	19,494,616	20,110,004	28,522,657	21,081,663	27,133,727	22,470,593
New Mexico.....	2,360	45,571,000	828,987	396,256	432,731	264,447	504,540	387,137	441,850	368,070	460,917
New York.....	22,451	14,394,021,000	125,414,500	72,991,239	52,423,261	48,660,826	76,753,674	71,235,436	54,179,064	67,849,245	57,565,255
North Carolina.....	26,241	2,498,049,000	24,787,222	18,937,438	5,849,784	12,641,482	12,145,739	18,491,265	6,295,654	17,598,626	7,188,294
North Dakota.....	1,162	34,340,000	781,758	427,623	354,136	285,342	496,416	417,459	364,291	397,133	384,625
Ohio.....	99,067	11,513,353,000	113,997,732	72,958,548	41,039,184	48,677,032	65,320,700	71,248,582	42,749,150	67,828,651	46,169,081
Oklahoma.....	23,397	1,162,763,000	13,422,445	8,952,771	4,469,674	5,972,988	7,449,457	8,751,434	4,671,011	8,321,916	5,100,529
Oregon.....	13,424	2,154,986,000	10,931,217	9,706,921	1,224,296	6,471,280	4,459,637	9,477,365	1,453,852	9,018,254	1,912,963
Pennsylvania.....	98,131	14,230,165,000	144,683,103	101,712,221	42,970,882	67,856,375	76,826,728	99,252,609	45,430,494	94,478,066	50,205,037
Rhode Island.....	1,527	640,165,000	10,193,582	6,248,666	3,944,781	4,169,175	6,024,407	10,655,856	4,087,626	5,810,342	4,383,240
South Carolina.....	12,635	1,202,764,000	11,293,595	8,639,267	2,653,892	5,759,511	5,533,648	8,435,990	2,857,169	8,029,436	3,263,723
South Dakota.....	2,118	88,690,000	1,830,661	970,250	860,411	648,054	1,182,607	946,452	848,209	900,685	929,976
Tennessee.....	15,005	4,751,471,000	23,567,237	21,045,543	2,521,694	14,046,073	9,521,164	20,550,331	3,016,606	19,560,807	4,006,430
Texas.....	81,102	3,934,211,000	41,755,146	27,516,641	14,238,505	18,372,264	23,382,882	26,890,314	14,864,832	25,554,149	16,200,997
Utah.....	543	35,584,000	693,628	495,250	198,378	330,167	363,461	485,459	210,169	459,875	233,753
Vermont.....	6,474	179,481,000	3,198,892	2,325,594	878,293	1,551,463	1,647,429	2,217,213	927,679	2,162,451	1,036,441
Virginia.....	13,870	1,533,918,000	16,822,196	11,809,182	5,013,014	7,889,610	8,932,586	11,540,026	5,282,170	10,968,072	5,854,124
Washington.....	28,290	6,435,530,000	26,425,871	22,065,602	4,360,269	14,719,210	11,706,661	21,537,085	4,888,786	20,506,476	5,919,395
West Virginia.....	25,498	2,940,688,000	27,970,933	18,796,467	9,174,466	12,530,978	15,439,955	18,348,932	9,622,061	17,453,862	10,517,071
Wisconsin.....	83,878	2,627,081,000	34,469,021	20,819,289	13,649,732	13,891,015	20,578,006	20,336,722	14,132,299	19,337,121	15,131,900
Wyoming.....	1,483	64,386,000	1,019,796	570,066	449,730	380,384	639,412	556,809	462,987	529,274	460,522
United States.....	1,418,900	134,932,159,000	1,347,689,718	907,600,581	440,089,137	605,449,226	742,240,492	886,164,206	461,525,512	843,248,553	504,441,165

Last year we had 33,033,900 consumers of all classes. They purchased and used 196,425,236,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid \$3,254,000,000. Under the T. V. A. rates they would have cost them \$1,919,000,000, or \$1,335,000,000 less; un-

der the Tacoma, Wash., rates they would have saved \$1,769,000,000; under the Bonneville rates they would have saved \$1,305,000,000; and under the Ontario rates they would have saved \$1,559,000,-

More than a billion dollars in overcharge are paid by the electric consumers of this country every year.

Here is the table showing those overcharges by States:

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1944*

State	Estimated sales data for 1944			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Adminis-tration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama.....	375,207	5,315,441,000	\$46,365,671	\$32,541,377	\$13,824,294	\$23,948,009	\$22,417,662	\$32,547,660	\$13,818,011	\$29,197,161	\$17,168,510
Arizona.....	118,186	968,961,000	14,909,097	6,915,517	7,993,580	5,459,682	9,449,415	7,094,926	7,814,171	6,121,924	8,787,173
Arkansas.....	227,164	1,321,408,000	24,153,655	13,067,518	11,086,137	9,924,014	14,219,641	13,233,140	10,920,515	11,155,857	12,997,798
California.....	2,599,073	16,195,525,000	246,276,631	192,361,223	53,915,408	145,015,082	101,261,549	194,643,613	51,633,018	172,861,314	73,415,317
Colorado.....	283,443	940,080,000	23,496,348	12,740,912	10,755,436	10,172,320	13,324,028	10,639,694	10,436,654	11,151,645	12,344,703
Connecticut.....	555,658	2,664,939,000	8,298,676	31,698,558	26,600,118	24,662,288	33,636,388	32,171,664	26,127,012	27,888,200	30,460,476
Delaware.....	73,567	426,135,000	8,059,658	4,456,822	3,602,886	3,419,028	4,640,630	4,501,746	3,557,912	3,935,326	4,124,332
District of Columbia.....	81,818	1,658,185,000	19,676,225	15,076,769	4,595,446	11,743,656	7,932,569	15,373,206	4,303,019	13,372,052	6,304,173
Florida.....	456,340	1,822,715,000	49,516,447	21,773,850	27,742,597	17,696,961	31,819,486	22,465,642	27,050,805	18,946,433	30,570,014
Georgia.....	462,606	3,034,214,000	48,013,676	29,186,998	18,526,678	22,885,014	25,128,662	29,769,530	18,244,146	25,721,670	2,292,006
Idaho.....	137,507	970,573,000	12,933,726	7,897,615	5,036,161	5,299,646	6,634,130	8,062,813	4,870,963	6,857,689	6,076,087
Illinois.....	2,288,427	12,716,274,000	229,569,577	126,934,166	102,635,411	98,554,423	131,015,154	128,887,834	100,681,743	111,847,392	117,722,185
Indiana.....	979,986	6,645,694,000	101,004,600	58,693,383	42,309,226	45,064,392	55,940,217	59,346,979	41,657,630	51,845,021	49,159,588
Iowa.....	625,757	2,149,422,000	50,219,659	27,765,961	22,452,098	22,210,434	28,009,225	25,597,847	21,621,812	24,437,167	25,782,492
Kansas.....	435,190	1,613,156,000	35,815,823	19,951,748	15,864,674	15,899,406	19,916,417	20,475,792	15,339,894	17,530,451	18,285,372
Kentucky.....	433,874	2,381,185,000	38,698,587	23,836,238	18,862,349	18,280,447	20,418,140	24,068,531	14,630,056	21,034,670	17,663,917
Louisiana.....	359,442	6,182,082,000	39,713,870	20,915,891	18,797,979	16,093,305	30,973,698	38,155,202	24,137,861	18,475,909	18,583,255
Maine.....	237,597	1,026,124,000	19,339,220	10,059,159	5,164,276	8,071,019	11,268,151	10,536,485	8,802,685	9,133,121	10,206,049
Maryland.....	592,334	8,487,755,000	50,847,874	29,767,157	21,080,717	22,884,886	27,952,988	30,242,357	26,605,517	26,503,027	24,344,847
Massachusetts.....	1,344,391	4,818,118,000	122,063,156	61,683,933	60,379,223	47,937,130	74,126,026	62,560,988	59,502,958	54,231,903	67,831,233
Michigan.....	1,574,066	9,031,646,000	159,670,543	91,097,473	65,573,070	72,168,307	87,502,236	92,968,988	66,701,555	77,664,216	82,006,327
Minnesota.....	689,053	2,413,081,000	58,979,218	32,689,199	26,040,010	26,394,281	32,584,937	33,781,428	25,197,790	28,724,132	30,255,086
Mississippi.....	202,125	865,264,000	17,322,406	9,426,518	7,895,888	9,356,868	9,966,049	7,716,357	8,323,074	8,989,332	8,989,332
Missouri.....	880,625	4,097,635,000	80,259,053	49,325,355	30,973,698	38,155,202	42,143,851	50,092,264	30,206,789	43,637,939	36,661,114
Montana.....	123,790	1,852,663,000	16,223,289	11,283,841	10,339,062	8,564,312	13,058,591	11,366,029	10,256,874	9,999,370	10,385,176
Nebraska.....	289,813	2,954,354,000	22,390,736	12,832,318	9,588,511	4,488,095	3,202,954	5,215,232	4,065,618	4,352,568	3,430,212
Nevada.....	31,777	168,775,000	3,525,411	1,779,775	1,745,636	1,452,907	2,072,054	1,864,382	1,679,029	1,560,239	1,965,172
New Hampshire.....	153,897	516,121,000	13,264,986	7,095							

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. Earlier in the gentleman's interesting speech he referred to the fact that in excess of 90 percent of all the farms in the countries of central and southern Europe had electric services prior to the war, and I believe only about 10 percent of the farms of this country had electric service.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. HAVENNER. Can the gentleman tell me to what cause he attributes that great disparity in electric service as between Europe and the United States?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know how they got such a start on us, but I do know why we were held back. We were held back by the same kind of propaganda I have referred to here.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. The gentleman mentioned the great State of Missouri and asserted, I believe, that the people of the Missouri Valley were perhaps foolish if they did not have a valley authority.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not say "foolish"; the gentleman misunderstood me if he thought I said "foolish."

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I think it is true that the people of the Missouri Valley are just as anxious to have the benefits to be derived from the development of their waterways and natural resources as anybody can be. They are interested in flood control and cheap electricity just as are the people of any other section, and they are going to insist upon the development of these natural resources, irrespective of the name by which the system may be called. It is a question as to whether we are doing to follow what has been done in the Tennessee Valley and by the valley authorities.

We have certain existing legislation that provides for these things, for the control of power, and so forth. We have preached the benefits; but I should like for the gentleman to touch upon how we could benefit by setting up this valley authority over existing legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say this: That they have not controlled the floods on the Missouri, and I fear they never will at the rate they are going.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. But how could that be helped by setting up a valley authority over existing legislation?

Mr. RANKIN. Because they would place dams at the right places; and when they know there is a flood crest on its way, they can let the water out from behind those dams if necessary, close them at the right time, and keep the flood crest from synchronizing with the flood crest on the various tributaries, or the Ohio, or the upper Mississippi, and in that way they can protect the people of the Missouri Valley as well as the people along the lower Mississippi. You are not protecting the people in that area. I understand your floods are worse this year than they have ever been, or as bad.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I think the gentleman is mistaken. They were

worse last year than they have been in 100 years. This year has not passed as yet.

Mr. RANKIN. The last 2 years your floods have been worse than they have ever been. We do not have flood damage on the Tennessee. That stream is completely controlled.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. My people are more interested in flood control in central Missouri than in the development of power, although they appreciate cheaper electricity. Will the gentleman tell me what the chances would be of our deriving any more flood-control benefits by setting up a power authority?

Mr. RANKIN. Simply because you would have a coordinated system that would close the dams at the right times and places just as they do on the Tennessee. Suppose there is a wet spell throughout the whole country and the Tennessee Valley Authority knows there is a flood crest coming down the Mississippi River, the Missouri, or the Ohio. That flood crest will reach there at a given time. They let the water out from behind their dams, lowering them, in order that it may pass that point before that flood crest arrives. They then close the dams and hold back the water until the flood crest passes. It is the only way you are going to control the floods on the stream. They have not done it on the Mississippi. I repeat what I have said before, you have spent all this money on the Mississippi River, but today they are suffering the same disasters they suffered 20 years ago, probably not to quite as great an extent, but the same kind.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. On the Tennessee, how does the area that was subject to floods before the setting up of the Tennessee Valley Authority compare with the area that is normally flooded now under the existing program?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know the percentage.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I have heard that there is almost as much land flooded now normally as was subject to floods prior to the building of these dams.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a good deal of land flooded, that is true, but all that land was paid for.

If you want to see real crops in this country, go down in the Tennessee Valley. If you want to see real corn and cotton and cattle produced, I know of no place that you could get a better picture than down in the Tennessee Valley.

Did it ever occur to you that that kind of criticism never comes from the people down there? Had it ever occurred to the gentleman from Missouri that all this protest about their flooding some land in Tennessee did not come from the people in that area? We have had all this protest about what they have done to the Tennessee River, but not a word of it comes from the people who are affected and who are getting the benefits of not only the flood control and navigation but of the cheap electricity it provides.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. What control do the people of the Tennessee Valley have or what control does Congress have over the administrative structure of the T. V. A.?

Mr. RANKIN. Congress has it all. It is a governmental agency. We can do just what we please with it.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Could the Congress destroy the Tennessee Valley Authority if it wished to do so?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it certainly could.

The gentleman asked what control the people have down there. They have had more control than they had before, because heretofore their local power systems were controlled, I believe, from headquarters in New York. Today every city or every county has its own system. It buys the power from T. V. A. at wholesale. It knows what it is going to buy for and it knows what the maximum rate at which it is to be sold. That maximum rate is sufficient to pay all overhead expenses and to pay interest on their investment, and at the same time lay up a surplus. So they are enjoying more privileges, more freedom, as far as their power systems are concerned, than they have ever enjoyed before.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to compliment the gentleman for this splendid statement. The most significant thing I have heard today on this floor is this, that we have been developing these rivers piecemeal. The most significant thing we ought to do in the future is to develop them in a coordinated way.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe we have built our structures and channelled the waters to the sea, making the rivers rise right up above certain valleys, instead of catching the water up at the headwaters and retaining it and thus preventing the disastrous floods.

Mr. RANKIN. Use these waters for all purposes. Where water falls, it should first be used to water the people. Next it should be used to water the stock, and next to water the land. Then it should be used for the development of hydroelectric power, for the benefit of the people in that area. Then for navigation purposes.

Now, flood control is not a use, but all this coordinated program means also control of the floods, holding the flood waters back at the right time, and preventing them from devastating your country. I cannot see where anybody from Missouri can kick on that.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. The people of Missouri object to having a lot of their valuable lands, valley lands, inundated that are not now inundated the year round. If we have just as much flood control under the proposed M. V. A. system, we will have to have as much storage space for that purpose in the dams as we would have under existing legislation. If we have in addition the production of power, then those dams would have to be high. If the dams are high, it means more reservoirs and more land inundated.

Mr. RANKIN. The truth of the business is the high dams would be beyond you, where the banks are higher, and not down in the lowlands. You would not go

down here in the lowlands of the Mississippi to build a high dam, because if you did the water would break over above it.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. How far above?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know the exact engineering figures, but some of the largest ones would be at least up as far as Omaha or Sioux City.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. That would be 300 miles above where we want to use the power.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, you can transmit this power 300 miles and get it cheaper than you people are getting your power in Missouri now by at least \$30,000,000 a year.

Now, let us take Windsor, Canada. Windsor, Canada, is 258 miles from Niagara Falls. They transmit this power over power lines to Windsor, Canada, and sell it at the Ontario rates. If Michigan had those rates the people of that State would have saved \$68,573,000 last year. That is according to the T. V. A. rates, but according to the Ontario rates they would have saved \$82,006,000.

This is one of the greatest economic issues that has ever confronted this Nation, involving flood control, navigation, and power development as well as employment for our returned servicemen when this war is over.

In order that you may fully realize what these overcharges mean to the people you represent, I will give them again, broken down by States:

ALABAMA

During the year 1944 the people of Alabama used 5,315,441,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$46,365,671.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$32,541,377, a difference of \$13,824,294.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$23,948,009, a difference of \$22,417,662.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$32,547,660, a difference of \$13,818,011.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$29,197,161, a difference of \$17,168,510.

ARIZONA

During the year 1944 the people of Arizona used 968,961,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$14,909,097.

Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$6,915,517, a difference of \$7,993,580.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$5,459,682, a difference of \$9,449,415.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$7,094,926, a difference of \$7,814,171.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$6,121,924, a difference of \$8,787,173.

ARKANSAS

During the year 1944 the people of Arkansas used 1,321,408,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$24,153,655.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$13,067,518, a difference of \$11,086,137.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$9,934,014, a difference of \$14,219,641.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$13,233,140, a difference of \$10,920,515.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$11,155,857, a difference of \$12,997,798.

CALIFORNIA

During the year 1944 the people of California used 16,195,525,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$246,276,631.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$192,361,223, a difference of \$53,915,408.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$145,015,032, a difference of \$101,261,549.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$194,643,613, a difference of \$51,633,018.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$172,861,314, a difference of \$73,415,317.

COLORADO

During the year 1944 the people of Colorado used 940,080,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$23,496,348.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$12,740,912, a difference of \$10,755,436.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$10,172,320, a difference of \$13,324,028.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$13,059,694, a difference of \$10,436,654.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$11,151,645, a difference of \$12,344,703.

CONNECTICUT

During the year 1944 the people of Connecticut used 2,664,939,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$58,298,676.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$31,698,558, a difference of \$26,600,118.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$24,662,288, a difference of \$33,636,388.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$32,171,664, a difference of \$26,127,012.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$27,838,200, a difference of \$30,460,476.

DELAWARE

During the year 1944 the people of Delaware used 426,135,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$8,059,658.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$4,456,822, a difference of \$3,602,836.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$3,419,028, a difference of \$4,640,630.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$4,501,746, a difference of \$3,557,912.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$3,935,326, a difference of \$4,124,332.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

During the year 1944 the people of the District of Columbia used 1,658,185,000

kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$19,676,225.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$15,076,769, a difference of \$4,599,456.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$11,743,656, a difference of \$7,932,569.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$15,373,206, a difference of \$4,303,019.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$13,372,052, a difference of \$6,304,173.

FLORIDA

During the year 1944 the people of Florida used 1,822,715,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$49,516,447.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$21,773,850, a difference of \$27,742,597.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$17,696,961, a difference of \$31,819,486.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$22,465,642, a difference of \$27,050,805.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$18,946,433, a difference of \$30,570,014.

GEORGIA

During the year 1944 the people of Georgia used 3,034,214,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$48,013,676.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$29,186,998, a difference of \$18,826,678.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$22,885,014, a difference of \$25,128,662.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$29,769,530, a difference of \$18,244,146.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$25,721,670, a difference of \$22,292,006.

IDAHO

During the year 1944 the people of Idaho used 970,573,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$12,933,776.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$7,897,615, a difference of \$5,036,161.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$6,229,646, a difference of \$6,634,130.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$8,062,813, a difference of \$4,870,963.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$6,857,689, a difference of \$6,076,087.

ILLINOIS

During the year 1944 the people of Illinois used 12,716,274,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$229,569,577.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$126,934,166, a difference of \$102,635,411.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$98,554,423, a difference of \$131,015,154.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$128,887,834, a difference of \$100,681,743.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$111,847,392, a difference of \$117,722,185.

INDIANA

During the year 1944 the people of Indiana used 5,645,694,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$101,004,609.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$58,695,383, a difference of \$42,309,226.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$45,064,392, a difference of \$55,940,217.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$59,346,979, a difference of \$41,657,630.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$51,845,021, a difference of \$49,159,588.

IOWA

During the year 1944 the people of Iowa used 2,149,422,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$50,219,659.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$27,766,961, a difference of \$22,452,098.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$22,210,434, a difference of \$28,009,225.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$28,597,847, a difference of \$21,621,812.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$24,437,167, a difference of \$25,782,492.

KANSAS

During the year 1944 the people of Kansas used 1,613,156,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$35,815,823.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$19,951,748, a difference of \$15,864,675.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$15,899,406, a difference of \$19,916,417.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$20,475,929, a difference of \$15,339,894.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$17,530,451, a difference of \$18,285,372.

KENTUCKY

During the year 1944 the people of Kentucky used 2,381,185,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$38,698,587.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$23,836,238, a difference of \$14,862,349.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$18,280,447, a difference of \$20,418,140.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$24,068,531, a difference of \$14,630,056.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$21,034,670, a difference of \$17,663,917.

LOUISIANA

During the year 1944 the people of Louisiana used 2,618,082,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$39,713,870.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$20,915,891, a difference of \$18,797,979.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$16,093,305, a difference of \$23,620,565.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$21,237,961, a difference of \$18,475,909.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$18,583,255, a difference of \$21,130,615.

MAINE

During the year 1944 the people of Maine used 1,026,124,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$19,339,170.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$10,407,826, a difference of \$8,931,344.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$8,071,019, a difference of \$11,268,151.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$10,536,485, a difference of \$8,802,685.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$9,133,121, a difference of \$10,206,049.

MARYLAND

During the year 1944 the people of Maryland used 2,847,755,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$50,847,874.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$29,767,157, a difference of \$21,080,717.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$22,894,886, a difference of \$27,952,988.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$30,242,357, a difference of \$20,605,517.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$26,503,027, a difference of \$24,344,847.

MASSACHUSETTS

During the year 1944 the people of Massachusetts used 4,818,118,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$122,063,156.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$61,683,933, a difference of \$60,379,223.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$47,937,130, a difference of \$74,126,026.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$62,560,198, a difference of \$59,502,958.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$54,231,903, a difference of \$67,831,253.

MICHIGAN

During the year 1944 the people of Michigan used 9,031,646,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$159,670,543.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$91,097,473, a difference of \$68,573,070.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$72,168,307, a difference of \$87,502,236.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$92,968,988, a difference of \$66,701,555.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$77,664,216, a difference of \$82,006,327.

MINNESOTA

During the year 1944 the people of Minnesota used 2,413,081,000 kilowatt-

hours of electricity, for which they paid \$58,979,218.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$32,939,199, a difference of \$26,040,019.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$26,394,281, a difference of \$32,584,937.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$33,781,428, a difference of \$25,197,790.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$28,724,132, a difference of \$30,355,086.

MISSISSIPPI

During the year 1944 the people of Mississippi used 865,264,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$17,322,406.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$9,426,518, a difference of \$7,895,888.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$7,355,868, a difference of \$9,966,538.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$9,606,049, a difference of \$7,716,357.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$8,323,074, a difference of \$3,999,332.

MISSOURI

During the year 1944 the people of Missouri used 4,097,638,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$80,299,053.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$49,325,355, a difference of \$30,973,698.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$38,155,202, a difference of \$42,143,851.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$50,092,264, a difference of \$30,206,789.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$43,637,939, a difference of \$36,661,114.

MONTANA

During the year 1944 the people of Montana used 1,852,868,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$16,223,289.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$11,059,019, a difference of \$5,164,270.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$8,099,740, a difference of \$8,123,549.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$11,064,812, a difference of \$5,158,477.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$9,965,906, a difference of \$6,257,383.

NEBRASKA

During the year 1944 the people of Nebraska used 925,354,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$22,390,736.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$12,932,318, a difference of \$9,558,418.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$10,359,849, a difference of \$12,030,887.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$13,193,330, a difference of \$9,197,406.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$11,179,336, a difference of \$11,211,400.

NEVADA

During the year 1944 the people of Nevada used 168,775,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$3,525,411.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$1,779,775, a difference of \$1,745,636.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$1,452,907, a difference of \$2,072,504.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$1,846,382, a difference of \$1,679,029.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$1,560,239, a difference of \$1,965,172.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

During the year 1944 the people of New Hampshire used 516,121,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$13,264,986.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$7,095,552, a difference of \$6,189,434.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$5,477,021, a difference of \$7,787,965.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$7,172,340, a difference of \$6,092,646.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$6,241,587, a difference of \$7,023,399.

NEW JERSEY

During the year 1944 the people of New Jersey used 6,237,140,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$131,097,419.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$64,786,251, a difference of \$66,311,168.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$50,490,317, a difference of \$80,607,102.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$65,820,902, a difference of \$65,276,467.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$56,984,044, a difference of \$74,113,375.

NEW MEXICO

During the year 1944 the people of New Mexico used 213,951,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$7,256,115.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$2,908,663, a difference of \$4,347,452.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$2,405,820, a difference of \$4,850,295.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$3,047,668, a difference of \$4,208,447.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$2,564,118, a difference of \$4,691,997.

NEW YORK

During the year 1944 the people of New York used 21,575,955,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$398,-198,982.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$195,940,373, a difference of \$202,258,609.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$155,120,719, a difference of \$243,078,263.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$200,586,473, a difference of \$197,612,509.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$172,744,548, a difference of \$225,454,434.

NORTH CAROLINA

During the year 1944 the people of North Carolina used 3,564,484,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$55,322,826.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$36,390,960, a difference of \$18,931,863.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$27,760,335, a difference of \$27,562,491.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$36,834,954, a difference of \$18,487,872.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$32,383,840, a difference of \$22,938,986.

NORTH DAKOTA

During the year 1944 the people of North Dakota used 199,722,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$7,644,613.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$3,516,570, a difference of \$4,128,043.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$2,952,556, a difference of \$4,692,057.

Under the Bonneville rates, the most would have been \$3,669,234, a difference of \$3,975,379.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$3,030,588, a difference of \$4,614,025.

OHIO

During the year 1944 the people of Ohio used 14,933,102,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$221,580,109.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$138,446,669, a difference of \$83,133,440.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$106,073,264, a difference of \$115,506,845.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$139,875,317, a difference of \$81,704,792.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$122,460,900, a difference of \$99,119,119.

OKLAHOMA

During the year 1944 the people of Oklahoma used 1,710,415,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid \$35,093,450.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$19,033,508, a difference of \$16,059,942.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$14,733,113, a difference of \$20,360,337.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$19,332,260, a difference of \$15,761,190.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$16,804,880, a difference of \$18,288,570.

OREGON

During the year 1944 the people of Oregon used 3,268,237,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$30,-980,972.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$23,059,455, a difference of \$7,921,517.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$18,136,905, a difference of \$12,844,067.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$23,473,129, a difference of \$7,507,843.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$20,168,629, a difference of \$10,812,343.

PENNSYLVANIA

During the year 1944 the people of Pennsylvania used 18,092,482,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$277,500,054.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$173,170,337, a difference of \$104,329,717.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$130,449,470, a difference of \$147,050,584.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$174,062,267, a difference of \$103,437,787.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$153,946,345, a difference of \$123,553,709.

RHODE ISLAND

During the year 1944 the people of Rhode Island used 879,985,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$21,622,903.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$11,283,841, a difference of \$10,339,062.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$8,564,312, a difference of \$13,058,591.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$11,366,029, a difference of \$10,256,874.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$9,999,370, a difference of \$11,623,533.

SOUTH CAROLINA

During the year 1944 the people of South Carolina used 1,716,232,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$25,205,304.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$16,680,043, a difference of \$8,525,261.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$12,744,084, a difference of \$12,461,220.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$16,876,442, a difference of \$8,328,862.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$14,820,128, a difference of \$10,385,176.

SOUTH DAKOTA

During the year 1944 the people of South Dakota used 252,084,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$8,418,186.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$3,930,091, a difference of \$4,-488,095.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$3,202,954, a difference of \$5,215,232.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$4,065,618, a difference of \$4,352,568.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$3,430,212, a difference of \$4,987,974.

TENNESSEE

During the year 1944 the people of Tennessee used 5,791,806,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$44,264,408.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$37,299,815, a difference of \$6,964,593.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$28,259,315, a difference of \$16,005,093.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$37,574,434, a difference of \$6,689,974.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$33,127,915, a difference of \$11,136,493.

TEXAS

During the year 1944 the people of Texas used 6,297,873,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$113,084,375.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$63,249,349, a difference of \$49,835,026.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$49,254,969, a difference of \$63,829,406.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$64,529,577, a difference of \$48,554,798.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$56,073,816, a difference of \$57,010,559.

UTAH

During the year 1944 the people of Utah used 1,270,796,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$16,850,563.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$8,537,486, a difference of \$8,313,077.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$7,168,308, a difference of \$9,682,255.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$8,984,768, a difference of \$7,865,795.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$7,513,010, a difference of \$9,337,553.

VERMONT

During the year 1944 the people of Vermont used 321,156,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$8,840,055.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$4,853,429, a difference of \$3,986,626.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$3,769,432, a difference of \$5,070,623.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$4,915,631, a difference of \$3,924,424.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$4,258,585, a difference of \$4,581,470.

VIRGINIA

During the year 1944 the people of Virginia used 2,690,612,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$50,730,387.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$29,146,418, a difference of \$21,483,969.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$22,978,770, a difference of \$27,751,617.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$29,738,908, a difference of \$20,991,479.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$25,596,443, a difference of \$25,133,944.

WASHINGTON

During the year 1944 the people of Washington used 8,712,401,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$61,967,978.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$48,329,058, a difference of \$13,638,920.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$37,597,625, a difference of \$24,370,353.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$49,130,653, a difference of \$12,837,325.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$42,615,018, a difference of \$19,352,960.

WEST VIRGINIA

During the year 1944 the people of West Virginia used 3,355,173 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$43,474,456.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$27,068,229, a difference of \$16,406,227.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been \$19,762,352, a difference of \$23,712,104.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$27,015,475, a difference of \$16,458,981.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$24,368,214, a difference of \$19,106,242.

WISCONSIN

During the year 1944, the people of Wisconsin used 4,179,790,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$79,798,382.

Under T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been \$45,947,782, a difference of \$33,850,600.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates the cost would have been \$35,695,172, a difference of \$44,103,210.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$46,764,413, a difference of \$33,033,969.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$40,635,864, a difference of \$39,162,518.

WYOMING

During the year 1944, the people of Wyoming used 157,102,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid \$4,574,946.

Under T. V. A. rates the cost would have been \$2,191,733, a difference of \$2,383,213.

Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates the cost would have been \$1,779,040, a difference of \$2,795,906.

Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been \$2,290,093, a difference of \$2,284,853.

Under the Ontario rates, the cost would have been \$1,915,930, a difference of \$2,659,016.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 35 minutes.

AN ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2232, A BILL TO CREATE A PERMANENT FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss the contents of H. R. 2232, a proposal to create a permanent so-called Fair Employment Practices Commission, now pending before the Rules Committee.

In my judgment, the bill cannot stand the glare of the midday sun. It cannot withstand a searching examination and a fair analysis. The measure is most dangerous and contains provisions which when disclosed in their true meaning will both amaze and astound the membership of this House, and the whole country, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported favorably by a majority of the members of the Committee on Labor. Those who signed the committee report and thereby endorsed the measure as it is now written are: Chairman NORTON, of New Jersey; RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; KELLEY, of Pennsylvania; HOOK, of Michigan; PATTERSON, of California; GEELAN, of New Jersey; GREEN, of Pennsylvania; POWELL of New York; WELCH, of California; BALDWIN, of New York; McCONNELL, of Pennsylvania, and ADAMS, of New Hampshire. Being unable to agree with the majority, I filed and there is printed in the report my minority views. The bill is now before the Rules Committee and I am informed that a discharge petition may be filed. It would seem, therefore, that at this stage in the history of the measure its contents should be publicized and the fullest possible discussion had of the implications that would follow its passage.

The bill would set up a 5-man Commission, with 5-year overlapping terms, each to draw a salary of \$10,000 a year. It is provided that the Congress shall delegate to this bureau tremendous legislative, judicial, and administrative powers and functions. The Commission would have the power to "establish such regional offices as it deems necessary," and could appoint "such officers and employees as it deems necessary." The agency could also utilize voluntary and uncompensated services. Thus no limit is placed on the number of regions that could be created or employees who could be hired, under the terms of this measure.

POWER OF F. E. P. C. AGENTS

Now, Mr. Speaker, how would this bureau operate and what would be its powers? Section 6 (g) of the bill provides that the Commission may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any place, and may "by one or more of its members or by such agent, or agencies as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States."

It is further provided that any agent, agency, or referee could be designated to

take complaints charging discrimination, and require the defendant therein to appear before the agent at a certain time and place for a hearing or trial. Witnesses could be summoned from "any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing." Such witnesses would get the same witness and mileage fees as are paid in United States courts. The agent could conduct the hearing, administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

It can be readily seen, Mr. Speaker, that this so-called agent would be a big man in this America of ours. He would be clothed with unprecedented judicial powers. He would be a roving one-man court. In most respects his authority would exceed that now enjoyed by ordinary Federal judges. It is interesting to consider some of those powers and how they could operate in relation to issues affecting valuable property rights of millions of our citizens.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, these F. E. P. C. judges who would hear and try cases could be appointed without restraint as to any particular qualifications. A voluntary social-service worker could be appointed to conduct a trial anywhere in the land. That is not true in the case of ordinary Federal judges, whose basic qualifications are defined by law.

JUDGE AND PROSECUTOR

It is well to point out that these F. E. P. C. judges would be unlimited in number and could go anywhere in the country, take complaints and conduct trials. They would occupy unique roles. Each would be at the same time the judge, the prosecuting attorney and the investigator in the case. The prosecutor after hearing the disgruntled job seeker could file the complaint and would then naturally set about to obtain evidence to sustain his judgment in taking the case. Why, it is even provided that this judge may enter a victim's place of business and examine or copy any evidence desired that related to the investigation. According to this bill he would not need to bother about securing a search warrant or showing probable cause for the search. If the victim should willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with the search, it is provided that he would subject himself to a \$5,000 fine or a year in prison, or both.

There, Mr. Speaker, we have a proposal to have a prosecutor out collecting evidence to be used against a man whose rights are later to be judged by this same prosecutor. Can you imagine the gall of the thing? No ordinary Federal judge has comparable powers. But this is not an ordinary judge that it is proposed to create. Proponents of the measure have said it is the purpose of the bill to promote democracy and freedom in this country. Perhaps that explains many features of this proposal. Perhaps there are some who desire to create a new brand of democracy and a novel type of freedom in America.

Let us go a little further. At the hearing that would follow the collection of evidence, it is provided that the F. E. P. C. judge would call the witnesses,

question them, cross examine the opposition, pass on the admissibility of testimony and otherwise handle the development of the case. It would be hard to imagine a more typical kangaroo court. It would indeed be a travesty on the word "justice." No ordinary Federal judge could do what this F. E. P. C. judge would be empowered to do.

In the conduct of the hearing, ordinary rules of evidence that must be observed and respected in ordinary courts in meting out justice would not be binding. The judge would be free to admit hearsay evidence, ex parte statements, conclusions of witnesses, nonexpert testimony on expert subjects, legal conclusions of witnesses, and could ignore other well-established rules that are time tested and which have been found essential in our system of jurisprudence that has been a thousand years in the making.

NO JURY TRIAL ALLOWED

But suppose the victim should decide to try his case before a jury of his peers, what would happen? He would be told that the Congress of the United States had provided that he would not be allowed to try his case to a jury. Mr. Speaker, I fear there has been a tendency in recent times to treat the jury method of resolving contested issues in many types of cases as an outmoded practice of a passing era. Even in situations where rather severe penalties of the law may be invoked against a man for a violation, as is true in the bill I am now discussing, the victim is deprived of his last refuge of protection, that of a trial before a jury of his own peers. I predict that one of these days there will be a tidal wave of rebellion against just that sort of thing. This encroachment upon simple, fundamental rights will not escape the challenge of an aroused people once they become conscious of its growth and implications.

It may be contended the F. E. P. C. judge is really not the final arbiter in the case, that the Commission sitting in Washington makes the formal order. That is true, but everyone knows it would be absurd to think that the Commission could read and digest voluminous records of multiplied thousands of such cases. The Commission would of necessity have to rely upon the findings and conclusions of its agents who, acting as trial judges, saw the witnesses and heard the case. I do not think anyone would seriously make a contrary contention.

RIGHT TO APPEAL IS A FARCE

The proponents point with pride to the fact the victim has a right of judicial review by appeal to a United States Circuit Court of Appeals. Again, Mr. Speaker, that alleged right is a farce. There is in fact no real right of appeal except as a formality. That is because the bill provides the judicial review shall be in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same provisions of law as in the case of the National Labor Relations Board. Section 10 (e) of the law relating to the latter provides:

The findings of the Board as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive.

That means, of course, that if the prosecution made out a *prima facie* case,

the circuit court would have no choice but to affirm the action of the commission. If the F. E. P. C. judge was competent to run loose, he could surely establish a *prima facie* case in any prosecution he undertook.

But the bill goes further to make it more certain that the defendant in the case will not and cannot afford to appeal. That is the evident reason for the provision in section 7 of the bill giving the F. E. P. C. the power to require reinstatement or hiring an employee "with or without back pay." Therefore, a victim could hardly afford to appeal because if the judgment should be affirmed, as almost surely it would be, he could be required to pay the complainant regular wages throughout the period of the appeal. The victim who chose to appeal would thus subject himself to a severe penalty in the form of accumulated back wages, totaling perhaps \$2,000 or more before final motion would be taken on the appeal. Besides, if he won on appeal, he would probably have another case filed against him the next week and the whole thing would have to be done over again.

GIVES F. E. P. C. CONTROL OVER HIRING TEACHERS

Mr. Speaker, I now call attention to section 4 of the bill. It provides as follows:

The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State.

Now, what does that mean? It simply means that the bureau that that bill would create would assume jurisdiction over employment practices of every State, every State highway department, every city, county, school board, and of every other "instrumentality or creature" of the States.

It is a bold attempt to gain Federal control of an important phase of our educational system—that of the employment of teachers. Not only that: a private corporation is a "creature" of the State where it is incorporated. Therefore, an attempt is here made to give this Federal agency control over the employment practices of every private corporation in the land, regardless of the character of their business with respect to interstate commerce. Yes, Mr. Speaker, by section 4 an attempt is made to give this bureau control over the employment practices of every police department, of every fire department, and of every city government in the Nation. That is true because under the law each county, city, and political subdivision is, as a matter of law, a "creature" of the State.

A VOTE FOR BILL WOULD BE VOTE FOR SUBVERSIVE EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take time to discuss many of the provisions of H. R. 2232. In passing, I desire to refer briefly to section 6 (f), wherein it is provided that all employees of the present Fair Employment Practice Committee created by Executive Order No. 9346 shall be "transferred to and become employees of" the commission that would be cre-

ated. I am informed that provision is without precedent in legislative history. I recall very well that within the past 2 years there has been much said here on occasions about certain employees of the Government who had communistic or subversive records. Such employment practices were freely condemned, and, I thought, rightfully so. Yet here is an attempt to have this Congress put its stamp of approval and endorsement on each and every employee now on the pay roll of the F. E. P. C. by having the Congress itself rehire each of them. And it is a well-known fact that more than a dozen employees of the present F. E. P. C. have records that are of a subversive nature and that are at least questionable. There are at least three of such employees who have signed Communist Party petitions within the past 4 years. wants to endorse the records of those men? It is certain that any Member Is there any Member of this body who who votes for H. R. 2232, or who impliedly endorses it by signing a discharge petition in an attempt to force its passage, will thereby be putting his or her stamp of approval upon each and every employee of the present F. E. P. C. I am wondering how many Members of this House would care to defend that sort of a vote before the people of this country?

REPEALS JOB PREFERENCES FOR VETERANS

Mr. Speaker, there is another point that I should like to call to the attention of this House before I conclude my remarks. It will be recalled that when the Selective Service Act was originally enacted, provision was made whereby selectees would have the right to apply for their old jobs when they should be released from military service. In other words, they were given certain job preferences. Again, in the Starves Act of last year, certain preferences were set up in the employment of veterans. There have been other enactments along this same line, creating a policy of job preferences in many categories in behalf of war veterans. Most of us have supported and favored that type of legislation. Yet, if H. R. 2232 is enacted into law, it will probably have the effect of repealing many of those rights that have been established by law.

It may be said that the bill does not say that, and that is true. But every lawyer here knows that there are two ways in which to repeal existing laws: one is by a direct repeal, and the other is repeal by implication. In the latter case, the rule as I understand it is that where two or more laws are passed that are inconsistent with each other, the most recent enactment takes precedence over prior ones and repeals by implication all laws found to be inconsistent with the most recent law passed. What would be the situation with respect to this bill? Here is a measure which prohibits discrimination because of race, color, and so forth, in all employment coming within its jurisdiction. It provides that it shall be unfair employment practice "to refuse to hire any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry." In other words, no exceptions are made. All individuals, whether they be veterans or

otherwise, are included in the jurisdictional power of the proposed Commission. Therefore, does it not follow that if an employer should hire a veteran and in doing so discriminated against a nonveteran because of the latter's race, that the Commission would be able to say: "You must hire the non-veteran, because he belongs to a minority race and you have discriminated against him for that reason." If the employer answered by saying: "I discriminated all right, but I am protected by the veteran job-preference law," he might be told that the Congress had repealed the veteran preference laws inconsistent with H. R. 2232. I merely submit that possibility for consideration to the membership.

In any event, without regard to job-preference laws, there will be many who will prefer veterans in certain employment. There will be many veterans who go into business for themselves and who will want to employ friends and former buddies in the service. Moreover, there will be many businessmen who as fathers of veterans may have reason to prefer to employ a war veteran. If this bill is passed, all such natural preferences will be subject to the control and review of a bureau that would administer the law.

Not the judgment of the employer, but the whims and prejudices of the Commission would settle that issue.

BILL STEMS FROM MINORITY PRESSURE GROUP

Mr. Speaker, what is the rush about this legislation? Where is all the pressure coming from? Members on this floor and elsewhere have told of the pressing demand for early action. Two years ago there was no agitation for a permanent law. Five years ago it was an unheard-of thing. Yet now we are told that to save democracy and freedom the measure must be enacted at once.

It is more than evident that this proposal is the handiwork of organized minority pressure groups who see a chance to capitalize on wartime conditions to rush into law a measure which in normal times would be the object of almost universal ridicule. The world is now ablaze in war. The people are concerned with the progress of our armies. They are concerned about the safety of their sons who are out there in the breach of battle. Millions of anxious ears are pressed against radio sets listening for a clue or an intimation of what may have happened to a son or a friend. Millions who leave home for a few hours are today calling their Western Union to say: "If I should get a message from the War Department, you can reach me during the next 3 hours at so and so."

It is in this setting of mental anguish and fearful suspense that this bill to change the rules in the middle of the stream is being pushed. The great unorganized majority know but little about what the effect of this measure would be. Their attention is centered on other things at the moment. Few realize it would vitally affect the property rights and employment methods and practices of tens of millions of businessmen, merchants, and farmers. Only today I re-

ceived a letter from a man at Eugene, Oreg., relative to H. R. 2232, in which he said, "The public in general knows nothing about this bill being under consideration."

STRIKES BLOW AT PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Can it be, Mr. Speaker, that the pressure groups are rushing this thing in a desperate and frantic attempt to get it passed before the veterans of this war come marching home and exert their natural indignation toward it? It is but natural to suppose that such opposition would exist. This war is not being fought to destroy one of the basic attributes of competitive free enterprise in America. I refer to the right of an American citizen, when he borrows and invests a few dollars in a business and takes his risk on making it succeed, and thereby creates a few jobs, to then use his own good judgment in the selection of his employees. The degree of that man's success or failure depends in no small measure on his ability to select dependable, loyal, industrious men to assist him in the operation of that business, yet, if H. R. 2232 were enacted into law, that man's judgment would be subject to review by this bureau in Washington. He could be told, "You must hire this man; you must fire that man; you must promote the other man because he belongs to a minority race."

Is that the sort of new democracy and freedom the sponsors of this legislation want to set up in America? Does not efficiency count for anything any more? Under this proposed new order is a premium to be placed on the rights of the lazy and the disgruntled? Are people to be told by an independent bureau what their opinions must be and how their minds must operate in choosing employees?

Mr. Speaker, only in a totalitarian state where there is government control of the whole economy can there be true job equality for all. A well-operated penitentiary lends itself to that sort of thing. Inside its walls there is very little job discrimination; no difference in income. That is, of course, because of the control and regimentation that is practiced over all the people who live there. With sufficient powers of enforcement and with enough jails, it is conceivable the same general methods could be made to operate over a nation. Perhaps this is a step in that direction.

Indeed that sort of thing has operated in several countries during the past decade. The question is, Do we want to take a very definite step in that direction in free America?

ORDERLY PROGRESS VERSUS FORCE AND COERCION

Mr. Speaker, there are but few people who do not dislike unfounded discrimination and prejudice just for prejudice's sake. But how can those things be dealt with and reduced? Can it be done by force and coercion, by pitchforks and jails? Or can it best be done in the American way of education, promotion of mutual understanding, and orderly progress? Sponsors of this bill say use force and the jails, arbitrary control and regimentation. They say, "We must have a law with teeth in it." Opponents

say use the time-tested American method which has given us 300 years of phenomenal progress. We are now approaching the crossroads. Which way does this Congress propose to go?

Mr. Speaker, this proposal, if enacted, would be unenforceable. Laws cannot be sustained without the support of public opinion. The measure would have the natural effect of arousing racial feeling and would promote discrimination and prejudice. The result would naturally be strikes, riots, and industrial strife. The law would definitely set the clock of progress back for the Negro race, for whose alleged benefit it is designed. Its enactment would be manifestly unfair to them.

RULE BY BUREAUCRACY

Mr. Speaker, if someone should ask the question here, "How many Members of Congress favor a system whereby the people would be governed by bureaucracy rather than by responsible representatives of the people," how many hands would go up? Yet this proposal would make permanent and vastly increase the powers of a wartime, temporary bureau to control the employment practices of a major portion of the people of this Nation. What are you going to do about it? It is one thing to talk against that method of governing the people and another thing to vote against it.

Another result of the enactment of a measure of this kind would be the creation of a fertile field for the racketeers, blackmailers, and shysters. Merchants and farmers would be constantly subject to harassment by agitators, troublemakers, and disgruntled job seekers. The operator of a business could easily be kept in court half of his time answering complaints alleging discrimination by him with respect to the hiring, discharging, or promotion of some employee or applicant for a job. In addition, there would be that class of people who make their living by not working—those who live by their wits in making the thrifty and industrious support them. As I have said, the field would be most inviting. A trained, biased champion would be furnished any complainant, at Government expense. Complaints could be trumped up and filed. The employer would be tempted to settle out of court and avoid the expense of employing a lawyer, spending hours or days in court, and probably eventually losing out. Prejudice would become a commodity to be bootlegged.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that before any Member of this House votes for this bill or signs a discharge petition with respect to it, the measure will be very carefully studied. After all, I cannot believe the majority of the Members feel there is a need for a change from our present economic system. If not, then why take a radical step toward state socialism when our present plan admittedly is working. Why impose practices that would involve resentment and irritation and lead to racial bitterness, violence, slowdowns, and strikes? Why not let orderly, gradual progress continue and through that system provide more and better jobs for all the people, regardless of race, creed, or color?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. As for myself I want to thank the gentleman for his very informative discussion. I think he has done a splendid job in exposing the ignorance of the innocent and the hypocrisy of those who advocate the adoption of this bill. He has done a splendid job in exposing the viciousness of the measure.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the gentleman for his generous comments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include resolutions adopted by the Illinois General Assembly.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 27. An act to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

S. 69. An act for the relief of settlers on the international strip at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 78. An act for the relief of the estate of William Edward Oates; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 90. An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 122. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 123. An act to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 124. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 125. An act to provide for the disposition of funds collected by District of Columbia examining, licensing, and other boards and commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 174. An act for the relief of Mary Martha Withers, as trustee; Mary Martha Withers, as administratrix of the estate of Beatrice Withers, deceased; and Mary Martha Withers, individually; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 176. An act for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and Memphis Park Commission; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 328. An act for the relief of James A. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 392. An act for the relief of Nebraska Wesleyan University and Herman Platt; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 427. An act to repeal section 3 of the act approved April 13, 1938, as amended, relating to hops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 428. An act for the relief of the Forest Lumber Co., Lamm Lumber Co., and Algoma Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 498. An act for the relief of W. C. Wornhoff and Josephine Wornhoff; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 567. An act for the relief of Mrs. Freda Gullikson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 638. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia by adding a new section 548a, and providing for the recording of veterans' discharge certificates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 701. An act to provide a method for the wartime reduction of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 804. An act to authorize certain additional appointments in the Officers' Corps of the Regular Army in initial grades not above the grade of captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 201. An act for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation;

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau;

H. R. 206. An act for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss;

H. R. 266. An act for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.;

H. R. 510. An act granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.;

H. R. 685. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Murray B. Latimer;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate;

H. R. 807. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Louise Townsend;

H. R. 914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Margaret G. Potts;

H. R. 934. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 945. An act for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse;

H. R. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring;

H. R. 990. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property loss as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Ray L. Smith;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.;

H. R. 1135. An act for the relief of Gus A. Vance;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello;

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of George Webb;

H. R. 1353. An act for the relief of J. P. Harris;

H. R. 1396. An act for the relief of Anne Loacker;

H. R. 1483. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers;

H. R. 1534. An act to amend the Fact Finders' Act;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.;

H. R. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased;

H. R. 2013. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 2055. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 201. An act for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation;

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau;

H. R. 206. An act for the relief of Saint Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss;

H. R. 266. An act for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.;

H. R. 510. An act granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.;

H. R. 685. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest.

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Murray B. Latimer;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate;

H. R. 807. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wilma Louise Townsend;

H. R. 914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Margaret G. Potts;

H. R. 934. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 945. An act for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse;

H. R. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Milled Ring;

H. R. 990. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property loss as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Ray L. Smith;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.;

H. R. 1135. An act for the relief of Gus A. Vance;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello;

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of George Webb;

H. R. 1353. An act for the relief of J. P. Harris;

H. R. 1396. An act for the relief of Anne Loacker;

H. R. 1483. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice.

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers;

H. R. 1534. An act to amend the Fact Finders' Act;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.;

H. R. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased;

H. R. 2055. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein; and

H. R. 2013. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Saturday, April 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will meet on Wednesday, April 18, 1945, at 10:30 o'clock for the purposes of holding executive hearings.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will resume its hearings on the ship-sale bill, H. R. 1425, on Thursday, April 19, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

382. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for the disposal agencies under the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion in the form of an amendment to the budget for said agency for said fiscal year (H. Doc. 120, 79th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 140); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

383. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill, to authorize the payment of the sum of \$2,421 to Mrs. Ruby Doris Calvert, 31 Tower Street, West Hartlepool, Durham, England, as administratrix of the estate of Frederick Calvert, her deceased husband, for damages on account of the death of the decedent who lost his life when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle in Reykjavik, Iceland, on November 14, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

384. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules, covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

385. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission transmitting a report of the personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

386. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to declare that the United States holds certain lands in the State of Montana in trust for Indian use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

387. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in the States of North and South Dakota in trust for Indian use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

388. A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting recommendations from the Civil Aeronautics Board, with regard to multiple taxation of air commerce (H. Doc. No. 141); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

389. A letter from the Chairman of the American National Theatre and Academy, transmitting an annual report for 1944 of the American National Theatre and Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing House Resolution 176. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Attorney General of the United States dated February 28, 1945, on International Air Transport Policy, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document; and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 418. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCOWEN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to correct an error in section 342 (b) (9) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by the act of September 27, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARRETT: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 267. A bill for the relief of Jack Scarton or John Skar-ton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 270. A bill for the relief of John Damacus; with amendment (Rept. No. 421). 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. COLMER:

H. R. 2867. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2868. A bill to prohibit the eviction from their homes of the wives, children, and dependents of members of the armed forces for the purpose of permitting other persons to occupy the premises; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 2869. A bill to provide uniform allowances for the transportation of civilian officers and employees, their families and effects, upon permanent transfer from one official station to another or from one Federal agency to another; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2870. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1933, to permit allowances for transportation in excess of minimum first-class accommodations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 2871. A bill to create a commission to be known as the Alaskan International Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2872. A bill authorizing the city of Keokuk, Iowa, to purchase, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at Keokuk, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2873. A bill to authorize certain additional appointments in the Officers' Corps of the Regular Army in initial grades not above the grade of captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2874. A bill to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2875. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 2876. A bill to provide that compensation for service in the armed forces outside of the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska during the present war shall be excluded for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2877. A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a light metals administrator and defining his duties and powers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution conferring all powers permitted by the Constitution of the United States to the individual States with the consent of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election and term of office of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps to relieve the

butter shortage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention to consider an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing a limitation on taxes imposed by Congress on incomes, transfers of property and gifts, except in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to enable development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway immediately upon termination of the war; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States by requesting increase in the appropriation of the Office of Indian Affairs to an amount needed to support herding schools for natives at all reindeer herds, to remove all restrictions upon killing wolves and coyotes within national parks and monuments in the Territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that appropriate means be used to open Palestine to the free immigration and unrestricted colonization by the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 be represented at the World Peace Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that a welcome home celebration at the end of the war be held for Gen. George Smith Patton, with the President and the Governor of Pennsylvania attending, at the municipality of Patton, in the county of Cambria, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose Senate bill 555; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to institute a study of the interpretation of the Federal agencies and the Supreme Court of the "commerce clause" of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend its benefits to State, county, and city employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to confer with the Office of Price Administration with a view to quickly effect an adjustment in the egg price ceilings in the New England area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the construction and maintenance

of a veterans' hospital in the city of Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2878. A bill for the relief of J. C. Bateman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2879. A bill for the relief of Capt. John Earl Dwyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2881. A bill for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2882. A bill for the relief of Fritz Hallquist; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 2883. A bill for the relief of Robert Hinton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2884. A bill for the relief of B. H. Spann; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2885. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Mitchell and J. L. Price; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2886. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 2887. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mrak; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

340. By Mr. CLASON: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts for the payment by the Federal Government of one-half the expense of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

341. By Mr. CLEMENTS: Petition of the executive council of the Negro Citizens Improvement Association of Union County, Ky., urging the enactment of H. R. 5—the Community Recreation Services Act; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

342. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

343. By Mr. KEOUGH: Petition of the voters of the twenty-second and twenty-fourth assembly districts of Brooklyn, N. Y., with reference to the recognition of Italy as an ally of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

344. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Edward A. Kummell and 174 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

345. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank R. Wilson and 1,617 citizens of the State of Indiana, urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

346. Also, petition of Mrs. W. E. Shafer and 54 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

347. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary Lea Smith and 60 citizens of Birmingham, Ala., urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

348. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter G. Wilson and 139 citizens of Mooers, N. Y., urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

349. Also, petition of Mrs. Janie S. Thomas and 23 citizens of Winston-Salem, N. C., urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

350. Also, petition of G. G. Hunt and 370 citizens of the State of Michigan, urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

351. Also, petition of Mrs. G. W. Kees and 212 citizens of the State of Maryland, urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

352. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of the general court of Massachusetts, urging payment by the Federal Government of one-half of the cost of old age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

353. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts urging the Congress of the United States to provide for the payment by the Federal Government of one-half of the expense of old age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

354. Also, petition of City Council of Boston, Mass., urging favorable action on House Joint Resolution 43 asking that national recognition be given to the 19th day of April 1775; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

355. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts asking for the construction and maintenance of a veterans' hospital in the city of Lawrence, Mass., to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

356. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition signed by Miss Elizabeth E. Crook and other citizens of Bristol, Maine, deplored the shipping of malt beverages and other liquors with higher alcoholic content into our fighting areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

357. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Mabel Dearnley and members of the Methodist Church of Lisbon Falls, Maine, deplored the

shipping of malt beverages and other liquors with higher alcoholic content into our fighting areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

358. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Wisconsin State Legislature, requesting Congress to take steps to relieve the butter shortage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

359. Also, petition of Wisconsin State Legislature requesting Congress to call a convention to consider an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing a limitation on taxes imposed by Congress on incomes, transfers of property and gifts, except in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

360. Also, petition of Wisconsin State Legislature, urging development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway immediately upon termination of the war; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

361. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Post No. 4 of the American Legion Chapter of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to granting privileges to the veterans of both wars in the obtaining of jobs with all Federal and insular agencies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

362. Also, petition of the American Cancer Society, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appreciation for past support of Congress and hoping for continued enthusiastic moral support by that body in the future; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

363. Also, petition of the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition of Government operated corporations and farm and consumer cooperatives which enjoy freedom from Federal taxes under section 101 of the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

364. Also, petition of Louis and Nan Antonanti, Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition of independence bills for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

365. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Municipal Assembly of Mayaguez, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting every measure toward total eradication of colonial status in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

366. Also, petition of 250 Americans of Polish descent, residents of Johnstown, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to back the President in realizing the aims of the Crimean declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

367. Also, petition of the annual assembly of the Puerto Rico Teachers' Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the adoption of peaceful means to terminate the present political regime in Puerto Rico on a basis of mutual understanding and harmony with the People of the United States of America; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

368. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the California State Legislature, House Resolution No. 153, relative to the enactment by Congress of legislation amending the revenue laws to validate depletion allowances affecting the oil industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1945

(*Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945*)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., associate minister, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, Author of life and Lord of death: We bow our heads in silent grief that it hast pleased Thee to call unto Thyself the soul of Thy servant, Franklin, into whose hands Thou hadst placed the leadership of our Nation.

For his stainless character, the richness of his intellect, and his unremitting service to his country in time of sorest need, we yield Thee humble thanks, O Lord, beseeching Thee to help us to pray "Thy will be done." Lord, vouchsafe him light and rest, joy and consolation in Thy presence, in the ample folds of Thy great love.

Comfort, we beseech Thee, his loved ones in their sorrow. Remember them, O Lord, in mercy; endue their souls with patience, and give them grace to know that neither death nor life can separate them from loved ones who are with Thee.

O God of our salvation, in the midst of sudden perplexity, may we find Thy peace. Grant to the President of our Nation special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength. Dispel for us all the night of doubt and fear, and lighten our darkness as we go forward in Thy name, until at length we, too, may hear Thy voice, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1945.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LISTER HILL, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HILL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 12, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while the Senate has not yet received, according to custom, official notice of the death of the President of the United States, I am sure that all of us who assemble here this morning assemble with heavy hearts and with depressed spirits. We assemble, Mr. President, in the midst of grief, not only on the part of our official body, not only on the part of the Congress, not only on the part of the American people, but we assemble amid that grief and contrition of spirit that pervades the entire world at this hour.

It is given to few men to occupy the Chief Magistracy of this great Nation of ours, which was conceived in liberty and