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The Clark Hill Project, South Carolina

STATEMENTS

BY

GOV. J. STROM THURMOND

AND

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

PRINTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1947, AT THE REQUEST OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hold in my hand copies of statements by two eminent and distinguished South Carolinians with relation to the appropriation for the Clark Hill project in my State. The first is a statement by Gov. J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, before the Civil Functions Appropriations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. The second is a statement by Hon. Butler B. Hare, a former Representative from South Carolina, before the same subcommittee.

I ask that both these statements be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF J. STROM THURMOND,
GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
BEFORE THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman MABON and Members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the construction of the Clark Hill project by the Federal Government is of vital importance to the States of South Carolina and Georgia, and we greatly appreciate the courtesy extended us of a hearing in this matter.

It is our firm conviction that the Federal Government should continue with the construction of the Clark Hill project and for two reasons should not accept the offer of the Savannah River Electric Co. to build it.

1. There is no assurance the power company will construct the project.

We doubt the good faith of the power company in its request to build this project. The past history of this company, or its affiliates, indicates that it would not. A license was granted to this company in 1928, and it held this license until 1932 and did not build the dam as it rendered the license. The company changed its mind.

About 1929 or 1930 the company, the Georgia Power Co., started the Furman Shoals project on Oconee River, near Milledgeville, and after spending several million dollars upon it, discovered the company decided to build steam plants instead of hydroelectric plants, and the Furman Shoals project has been abandoned. With regard to continuing with that project, the company changed its mind.

In 1935 the Georgia Power Co. promised to cooperate with the Federal Government in the construction of the Clark Hill project and the Government was promised a license. It expressed no desire to be the liciter and offered to assist Georgia and South Carolina in furthering the project. In July or August 1940 the company again changed its mind.

At the Federal Power Commission hearing in Atlanta, Ga., during October 1946, when the power company attempted to obtain another license to build this project, Mr. Arkwright, former president of the company, stated conditions had changed, that money rates were too low, coal high, and it was their desire now to build the project. But, what will occur if money rates go up, coal down, or a depression occurs? We are fearful that the company will again change its mind.

If a license should be granted to the power company to construct the project, about 1 year would be required to design plans and specifications. This time would be required because a private concern, Charles T. Main & Co., of Boston, which designed the project, resigned the agreement, required about this time to design the present plans.

The power company would require a similar length of time or approximately that, in our judgment, especially since it says it will furnish its own plans, and especially since under some proposal the powerhouse would be placed on the Georgia side instead of on the Carolina side, necessitating considerable change from the present Government plans.

On the other hand, the past history of the Federal Government in projects of this nature leads us to believe that it will complete the project. We do not know of any Government project of this nature that has been abandoned by the Government. We know of many such projects that have been constructed by the Government and carried to speedy conclusion.

On the Tennessee River there are approximately 50 dams known as the TVA project. There were all completed. On the Colorado River there is the Boulder Dam, which was carried to completion. On the Columbia River there are Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, which were carried to completion. On the White River in Arkansas there is the Norfolk Dam, which was carried to completion. And there is now being constructed a project on the Allstonia River, which we are informed is going forth without delay.

There is further assurance that this project will be completed by the Federal Government. The Government has shown a steady and continuous interest in this project. Pursuant to the resolution of 1927, the Clark Hill project was included among the navigable streams of the Nation as worthy of development.

In 1936 Congress acted favorably in the Flood Control Act by embracing therein a proviso authorizing this project again to be investigated. In 1938 an appropriation was included to begin work on this project, but the Comptroller of the United States ruled that the appropriation had not been authorized, therefore the appropriation could not be used, and it was not used, but it showed the interest of Congress in the project of 1928.

In 1944 the Flood Control Act actually authorized the contraction of the project. In 1945 the first Deficiency Appropriation Act included an appropriation of $1,000,000 to begin construction of the project. In 1946 there was appropriated an additional $4,500,000 to continue construction of the project. This makes a total of $8,500,000, which is actually appropriated for construction, and of this amount $4,500,000 has been spent or committed.

2. FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Public development of this project has been recommended by every public agency that has investigated it. In 1935 the Army engineers submitted a report to Congress and recommended it, known as Report 306. In 1936 a special board appointed by President Roosevelt investigated this project and submitted a favorable report to him. In 1939 the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission recomended it to Congress in House Document 657 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee, all of which reports recommended the construction of this project.

In May 1944 the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission recommended it to the Chief Engineers of the United States Army. In June 1944 the Secretary of War recommended it to Congress in House Document 657 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Not a single public agency that has investigated this project, so far as we are informed, has recommended private construction. On the other hand, the numerous boards and agencies that I enumerated have all recommended that this project be developed by the Federal Government.

If the Federal Government develops this project, the natural resources of the Savannah River Basin will be more fully utilized and the potential values of the entire Savannah River Valley will be developed to the maximum, whereas, we are very much concerned if it is developed by the power company.

The proposed development is a multiple-purpose project. It has three primary benefits: Power, navigation, and flood control. We think it is better for the Federal Government to develop this project from the stand-
point of the primary benefits. A more complete job will be done and the benefits will inure more to the people than if it is developed by the power company.

This project also has numerous secondary benefits:

- Malaria control: This would be handled by the Federal Government, which will give adequate malaria control and not be a mere stab at the matter.
- Restoration: This will be handled by another branch of the Government, and will be a great asset to the Nation in the development of this comprehensive project.
- Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin. It will be a great asset to the Nation in the development of this comprehensive project.

This means a great deal to the country and to the people of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin. It will be a great asset to the Nation in the development of this comprehensive project.

Wildlife conservation: It is felt that under Federal construction, wildlife will be conserved to a much greater extent and more pains will be taken to preserve it than under private development.

Recreation: This is one of the most important benefits of the project, although many benefits will be denied unless the proposal. The Savannah River Basin would be used for recreational purposes. If the power company should develop this project, as I understand it, the land would be available for recreational purposes, but someone else might have to do more important work on the project in order for the people to reap the biggest benefits from the standpoint of efficiency. If the Federal Government develops the project the plans call for beautiful parks, roads, and trails. Water is an ideal recreating agent. Facilities will be available for fishing, boating, swimming, and picnicking. This means not only more enjoyment, but more health to the community. All of these things mean a great deal to our people of the Savannah River Basin. We feel that the working people, the farmers, textile workers, barbers, mechanics, people on the street, the people we frequently refer to as the common man, will have an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of this basin from a recreational standpoint. Recreation is being given attention throughout the country than ever before. We feel that this reason alone is sufficient to deal with courts and crime, and know the importance of proper recreational facilities in preventing court and crime. People who reside in the Savannah River Basin, do not want these benefits I just enumerated positively if we do not want them aggressively accomplished. We do not feel that any private company will aggressively accomplish them to the extent that the Federal Government will.

We also feel that since there are 10 other dams to be constructed in this Savannah River Basin, the Keystone Dam should not be allotted to any private company to develop, as it might then be probable that the Federal Government would not do so and develop the other dams. Or, if it did develop the other dams, we are very much opposed to the proper conservation in regard to all these benefits that I have just enumerated would not be had, and that best results from all people would not be accomplished. There can be no doubt that the power company would not develop the other dams.

The Constitution and laws of the United States provide that the waters of navigable streams belong to the people. We want the greatest benefits from these waters, and under the proposed plan of the Federal Government for construction, and under that plan, we do feel these benefits will be derived.

The power company is in the business to make money. It was organized for that purpose. Monetary considerations govern its actions. The profit motive will undoubtedly determine the course it will pursue in every major action. If the Federal Government develops this project, there are many considerations, other than making money or deriving a profit, that are of great advantage to the people of the Savannah River Basin; and we feel these benefits deserve the utmost consideration.

If the Federal Government develops this project, the first consideration will be the public good. If the power company develops this project, the first consideration will be the company's good. A great majority of the people of South Carolina, one of the States with the biggest project, feels that the Federal Government developing this project the plans call for a more reasonable result, and the people of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin; and with the great area of the Savannah River Basin. It will be a great asset to the Nation in the development of this comprehensive project.
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The Army engineers did not act hastily in preparing its report and making its recommendations. Their study and surveys covered a period of years. The Federal Power Commission did not act hastily. The Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Flood Control and Navigation Committee were in preparing and submitting their report to Congress. The Congress did not act hastily in passing the act authorizing the development of the project. The time consumed by these several agencies of Government covered the period from 1921 to 1927. At no time was there any pronounced opposition recorded. Then 2 years elapsed before Congress made the first appropriation of $1,300,000 and the second appropriation of $1,500,000 was made in May 1928 and up to that time nothing but cooperation had come from the power companies or otherwise at any time.

SAVANNAH RIVER ELECTRIC CO. OBJECTS

Although the Savannah River Electric Co., owned by the Commonwealth & Southern Power Co. of New York, was one of the outstanding sponsors of this project for a period of years, it later decided not to develop the project and voluntarily returned the license to the Federal Power Commission in 1932, simply because the site near Clark Hill was exceptionally well suited for storing waters to be used when needed for navigation purposes. To use the exact language, the report read:

“...This reservoir is located well down the main stream of the river so that a large volume of water for navigation purposes is there practically assured. The reservoir could be operated in such a manner as to reduce the stage of the river at Augusta and allow the depth of the river without detriment to either navigation or power, and thus increase the margin of safety at Augusta against possible inundation...”

This report not only showed that the construction of the dam would prove to be an insurance against floods for a distance of over 200 miles, but the entire upper portion of the main stream of the river so that a large volume of water for navigation purposes is there practically assured. The reservoir could be operated in such a manner as to reduce the stage of the river at Augusta and allow the depth of the river without detriment to either navigation or power, and thus increase the margin of safety at Augusta against possible inundation...

“The Clark’s Hill site is one of the best undeveloped power sites on any of the streams entering the Atlantic Ocean from the South Atlantic States.”

The following year this report was submitted to the National Resources Committee and to the Federal Power Commission for a further study and report on the necessity and inducements for the construction of a navigation reservoir and flood control along the Savannah River Valley and adjacent territory. These two agencies submitted their report in due time and stated that there would be ample and suitable markets for all the electric power to be generated at this plant when completed. The proposal was then considered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to attend the hearing and I did not hear of any objection to the proposal from any source whatsoever. The recommendations for this project were approved, reported by the committee and included in the Rivers and Harbors bill and later in the Flood Control bill, both of which were passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and the latter became a law on December 22, 1944. That is now over 2 years. Appropriations for use on the project have been approved by your committee and the Congress. Several contracts have been let and it is on the project is now well under way. Entering highways have been constructed and railroads for delivering materials and equipment to the dam site completed. Two contracts for the construction of the upper portion of the dam, have been let and contractors have now been at work for several months. Other contracts for performing specific parts of the construction have been let and others are now being processed.

In 1927 the river and harbor bill provided that the Board of Engineers should make a thorough survey of the Savannah River with the idea of determining whether there would be justification for additional Federal aid in providing facilities for increased navigation and flood control. A great deal of work was required in this survey and the engineers did not report until July 1934, when a rather full and complete report was submitted. It was recommended that a dam be located near Augusta and Savannah, which was submitted.
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to why the license was voluntarily returned. According to written statements, the president of the Savannah River Electric Co. said in 1953, "This company would never build another hydroelectric dam." Giving as the reason for this decision, "too much Government red tape." The Congress of the United States consummated the contract by formally enacting a law providing for the development of the plant. The company has had the river taken from the assessment books. In this connection, it should be noted that there is a significant difference between the interests of this company and the people who have been clamoring for the construction and operation of the plant when completed."

The offer was accepted in good faith by every agency of the Government to which it was submitted. The Congress of the United States consummated the contract by formally enacting a law providing for the development of the plant. The company has had the river taken from the assessment books.

In view of later developments, it would appear that the company was given the reason for the abandonment of the project, as the one which governed their action. If they had really wanted to develop this project, they would have filed an application to protect 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, or 1944, when there was an increasing demand from day to day for electric power, but they did not. In fact, if they had had an intention in the back part of their heads to develop this project, they certainly could have obtained the license in either one of the years mentioned and the Government would have furnished whatever financial assistance that might have been necessary, for it did finance quite a number of power plants in order to secure electric power for use in making aluminum and other materials for manufacturing necessary and highly essential war implements.

The failure of this company to take advantage of this opportunity to prove that they were telling the truth in 1938 when they declared they had no intention of doing so now, even if you should fail to make a statement and the Government should give them a license to the full extent of our ability, it is the responsibility of the Company to preserve, and promote the interest of the public, and it knows further that as long as our present system of Government stands and undertakes to discharge its full responsibilities there will be some Government red tape, Government supervision, and Government control in any kind of way of development in streams like the Savannah River. Therefore, if the reason assigned for abandoning the project in 1938 was an honest reason, that reason still exists and will continue to exist until there is some change in the form of Government. We have every reason to believe that the power people will never develop this project. If you were to give them a license today they could change their minds tomorrow and, in light of the past, they would change them, and the people who have been clamoring for this service for 25 or 30 years or longer would be absolutely helpless. This committee nor any agency of the Government could in this event require or compel this company to complete the job or even reimburse the Government. It has already spent $1,300 in taxes per annum. If you were to give them a license to develop the project, they would probably be restored under an efficient flood-control program.

TAXES

The power companies have propagated the idea that the counties which would be affected when this project is completed by the lands acquired by the company will not be subject to taxation, whereas if the project is completed by the power company the taxes of the company and its property will be eliminated. The Congress of the United States consummated the contract the project the taxes of the company and its property will be eliminated. The Congress of the United States consummated the contract the project the taxes of the company and its property will be eliminated. If you wish us to absorb it, it would be reasonable to allow a load-building period here. Now that means that until that time is expired, the project will not be in operation or be subject to taxation.

While discussing how the electric power would be disposed of following the construction of the plant, Mr. Arkwright said: "I assume that some of the land would be allocated to South Carolina and perhaps some to Savannah, but whatever remains, or if you cannot get it absorbed in South Carolina or Savannah, I believe the Georgia Power Co. would be willing to absorb it. Not all at once. There was a load-building time allowed at Boulder Dam and it would be reasonable to allow a load-building period here. Now that means that until that time is expired, the project will not be in operation or be subject to taxation. But whatever remains, or if you cannot get it absorbed in South Carolina or Savannah, I believe the Georgia Power Co. would be willing to absorb it. Not all at once. There was a load-building time allowed at Boulder Dam and it would be reasonable to allow a load-building period here. Now that means that until that time is expired, the project will not be in operation or be subject to taxation.

"If you wish us to absorb it, it would be reasonable to allow a load-building period here. Now that means that until that time is expired, the project will not be in operation or be subject to taxation. But whatever remains, or if you cannot get it absorbed in South Carolina or Savannah, I believe the Georgia Power Co. would be willing to absorb it. Not all at once. There was a load-building time allowed at Boulder Dam and it would be reasonable to allow a load-building period here. Now that means that until that time is expired, the project will not be in operation or be subject to taxation. But whatever remains, or if you cannot get it absorbed in South Carolina or Savannah, I believe the Georgia Power Co. would be willing to absorb it. Not all at once. There was a load-building time allowed at Boulder Dam and it would be reasonable to allow a load-building period here. Now that means that until that time is expired, the project will not be in operation or be subject to taxation. But whatever remains, or if you cannot get it absorbed in South Carolina or Savannah, I believe the Georgia Power Co. would be willing to absorb it. Not all at once. There was a load-building time allowed at Boulder Dam and it would be reasonable to allow a load-building period here. Now that means that until that time is expired, the project will not be in operation or be subject to taxation.
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PROJECT DOES NOT COMPETE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

If the company is offering to complete this project in order to secure additional power, I do not feel that it is in the interest of the State, the people, or the Government as a whole. They do not want the development. They certainly do not want the power people, by their actions, are saying, "this is not the primary reason," and they are propagandizing the public opinion, the public mind, the public talk, the public print. They are claiming and magnifying the idea that this is primarily a power project where the Government is entering in competition with private enterprise. I note from press reports that a considerable number of people of the State of Georgia over its extensive operation and the use of the power. I do not feel that a dam for flood control is sufficient just to put the Government in competition with private enterprise.

The statements quoted were made about the Army Engineer Corps after they had devoted 5 or 6 years to a study of plans for promoting navigation and assuring flood control in the Savannah River. They concluded that the only effective plan would be to construct a dam of such magnitude that it would impound the waters in such volume that they would prevent floods and when released in an orderly way facilitate navigation. The estimated cost of the dam was about $2,000,000. This is quite a sum of money and, in order that there could be some way of reimbursing itself for these expenditures, the added power facility was recommended. Mr. Arkwright, Mr. Clark and the late Mr. Middlebrooke, in recommending the authorization of this project, explicitly stated that the Government is not interested in making and selling electricity. They are interested in navigation and flood control. They make and sell electric power as an incident of the control of the river for navigation purposes. This coincides exactly with the conclusion reached by the Army Engineer Corps after they had devoted 5 or 6 years to a study of plans for promoting navigation and assuring flood control in the Savannah River. It is designed to put the Government in business in competition with private enterprise. The Government has no intention of going into business in competition with private enterprise and never intended to build or construct another hydroelectric plant.

Mr. Chairman, if the Savannah River Electric Co. or any of its officers made any reservations in 1932, their actions from 1932 to 1945 and subsequent thereto show conclusively they never intended to file a request for another license and their tactics in this procedure are not calculated to inspire any confidence whatever in the representations of the company in this case and in any other case that may be under consideration by your committee to help them enforce such right.

All these commitments confirm the statement that the power company had no intention of developing this project. The situation is further confirmed by an admitted fact that the power companies have, in the meantime, had plenty of money to construct, or now have under construction at least six or seven additional steam electric plants to assist in taking care of the increased demand for electric power. If the power company had any intention to develop this project when they buy and pay for the electric power furnished. However, this question seems to have been brought up again when the project was authorized, unless it was definitely settled years ago when the project was authorized.
such activity and found it was inspired by the interest expressed by you. I suggested that the Clark Hill Authority of South Carolina make an effort to ascertain the true sentiment of the people from which reports came, we have a good cross section of the public. It is true that the company had already secured a license, but if the power company could build it, it will do it. If the power company had been building it for the past 11 years, it has committed a crime. The tabulation of these questionnaires was as follows: Banker, sawmill operator, city clerk, county auditor, judge, city clerk, county agent, cotton ginner, ferryboat operator, mill superintendent, housewife, college professor, constable, land surveyor, county supervisor, policeman, police officer, cattle and livestock dealer, pulpwood dealer, clerk of court, radio operator, minister, teacher, vocational instructor, live stock dealer, physician, oil mill operator, editor, HFD carrier, machinist, Soil Conservation Service, Linotype operator, furniture dealer, dealer in farm machinery, county treasurer, State board of health, State labor department, bank cashier, construction contractor, filling station operator, carpenter, textile operator, miller, skilled laborer, member of the legislature, cotton buyer, gas and oil distributor, horticulturist, boarding-house keeper, civil engineer, re taunt, veterinarian, county agent, county auditor, implement dealer, lumberman, electrician.

I note further from the newspapers that some of the letters sent to Members of Congress urging them to reverse their previous action and to oppose the development of this project, have been very persistent in having the Congress reverse its action and give the Savannah River Electric Co. the market they desire. These waters belong to the Savannah River Electric Co., and the Government should not own a gallon, not even a drop of water. If the power company had been building it for the past 11 years, it has committed a crime.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

1. The Savannah River Electric Co. was given a license in 1928 by the United States Government to develop the Savannah River for power, flood-control, the navigation, and power project now under construction on the Savannah River near Clark's Hill, S. C., and was given a new license in 1932, after a lapse of 15 years, which was 2 years after the Congress had provided that the project should be developed by the Army engineers, and after appropriating $5,500,000 for this purpose, and after work on the project has been in progress for approximately 1 year, the company now comes and urges that no further appropriations be made for the project and that it be given a new license, notwithstanding that for the past 11 years the company has insisted that the work be done by the Government.

2. The excuse the power company gives for not developing the project when it had a license was because of the stringent money market. Now, further than a mere statement, that this was the real reason, but there is a transcribed record showing that the president of the company stated the license was returned because they did not want to be bothered with red tape and Government supervision. It is true there was a stringent money market in 182, but if that had been the reason, the company had submitted no reason why the application for a new license was not renewed in 1890, 1890, 1911, 1913, 1914, but it is possible that there is an excellent and intelligent reason why the application was not renewed.

3. The company insists that the license was returned with reservations, consented to by the Federal Power Commission, but no record has been found in evidence to this effect, and if true, there should certainly be a written record of some kind in the office of both the company and the Federal Power Commission. In the absence of such a record, the logical assumption is that the president of the company was either not honest or not intelligent when he said his company never intended to construct another hydroelectric plant, and this company now is not developing the project. If the company had a license, it will still be sufficient reason for changing its mind again and delaying the company 15 years, or indefinitely if possible, for this appears to be its only purpose.

4. The company complains about the Government depriving it of the right to develop its own property; in fact, it has no property rights at Clark's Hill, except land and forests; and it is water in the Savannah River in which the Government is interested in protecting and controlling. The power company has no water; it does not own a gallon, not even a drop of water in the Savannah River. These waters belong to the public, and it is a responsibility of the Government to control them for the benefit of the public.

5. The power company is endeavoring to lead the public to believe this is primarily a power project, but it knows this is not true, for its president, testifying under oath before the Government less than a year ago, denies and refutes the idea when he said, "The Government is not anxious to secure the unbiased and unprejudiced opinion of the people..."

6. This company is trying to convince you and the public that the people of Georgia and South Carolina are now opposed to having the power company complete the project. You did not hear of the people objecting in 1914 when the Government took and held its undying support to the proposal, saying the project should be developed and operated by the Government unless they were sufficient to reimburse the Government for expenditures, then to be turned over to some municipality, county, or any corporation, or any private individual to complete it. If you allow the public to become involved in all the questionnaires and the tabulations, they will be in the same for the public. It is true that this company owns about 40,000 acres of land adjoining the Clark Hill site, which, according to reports when the license was issued in 1928 and 1929, at ridiculously low prices by promising the owners that the company would use their land and right of way for an hydroelectric power plant, and at the same time control the floods and promote navigation on the Savannah, a facility which the Savannah River Electric Co. had already secured a license from the Government to develop the project.
to that if the United States Government would agree to construct, maintain, and operate the Clark Hill project the company would convey approximately 40,000 acres of land to the Government at a price not exceeding the cost, turn over its files and records to the Government to be used in any way it may see fit, furnish any information it may have that might prove to be of service, and cooperate in every possible way in the development and operation of the project, it was an offer with no reservations attached, for his concluding words were: "Regardless of what plan you may finally recommend, we stand ready to cooperate to the fullest extent," and when Congress passed the flood control bill in December, 1944, providing for the development and operation of this project it accepted that offer, and both parties then became honor-bound to the fulfillment of the agreement. I shall let the Congress be the judge as to what constitutes honor. Our Government has always been very jealous of its honor, and I am glad to bear witness that the Congress, irrespective of political parties, has ever guarded with jealous care its honor and integrity. "That nation is worthless that will not venture all for its honor."

When the State of South Carolina, through its legislature in 1933, authorized and directed the governor and secretary of state to issue to the United States a grant of such lands, flowage rights or easements, that may be required in the development of the navigation project or projects on the Savannah River, it was a conditional offer to the United States Government and when Congress on December 23, 1944, passed the flood control bill, the offer, in effect, was accepted by the United States Government and both are now honor-bound to carry out their agreement. When South Carolina, through its legislature in the early part of 1947, unanimously adopted a resolution favoring and urging the completion of the project by the United States Government, it reaffirmed the action of the State legislature of 1933 and declared, in effect, that the State is still willing, ready, and able to discharge its part of the agreement. I understand that similar action was taken by the State Legislature of Georgia, and to turn turtle now, after the action of the Congress in providing for the authorization without any objections on the part of anyone, coupled with the persistent support and cooperation of the Savannah River Electric Co., for 10 years, and with the construction of the project well underway, it would be a breach of good faith with the State of South Carolina, the State of Georgia, with the people of the United States, and it would create much criticism, raise a justified suspicion, and tend to destroy the confidence of the people in the integrity of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the development of this project has been one of the dreams of my political life, and, in view of the preceding actions of the Congress, I would regret to learn that the interest of the people I represented for 16 years has been subjected to an unprecedented action of the Congress simply to promote the unwarranted selfish interest of a small group of individuals after having broken their faith with the Congress. The establishment of such a precedent would be extremely dangerous. I shall look with confidence for your decision in the matter.