*Quick, Thomas J.
Rappuhn, Aifred A., Jr.
Riggan, James M., Jr.
Riordan, Gilbert A.
Roberts, William K.
Rodgers, Donald L.
Ryder, Donald F.
*Sar, Raymond V.
Schmucker, Stanley K.
Schniedwind, Robert F.
Schwartz, Mathew J.
Serrie, John A., Jr.
Sholes, Charles W.
Simons, Joseph T.
Sisterhenm, William H.
*Slattery, Francis L.
Smelz, Jervis L.
Smerdon, John E., Jr.
Smith, George E.
Smith, James J.
Smith, James V.
Smith, John E.
Smith, Wendell K.
Spruit, Robert E.
Stair, Robert N.
Stassevitch, Paul S.
Stewart, Richard C.
Stout, Harry R.
Sup, George C.
Swanstrom, Willis E.
Sweeder, Stanley E.
Taylor, Huling F., Jr.
*Torrey, Julian A.
Tribble, Gordon B. B.
Valentine, Earnest
Vehorn, Charles M.
Vrolyk, Raymond F.
Walery, Kenneth F.
Waring, Everett D.
Warren, Burtis "W"
West, Gordon R.
Whitely, Joseph M.
Whitney, William J.
Whittaker, Gordon S.
Williams, Elmer R.
Williams, James E.
Wilson, James G.
*Windley, William D.
*Wooldridge, Arthur R., Jr.
Caskey, James C.

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Chace, John F.
Moorman, Elmer R.
Watkins, George S.

To be assistant paymaster with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

McCreary, Arthur D.

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign

Babler, Richard F.
Bach, Charles F., Jr.
Beamon, Charles W.
Benz, Norman E.
Carothers, Rodney P.
Comfort, John R.
Curtis, Ralph E.
Day, Robert D.
De Pourtales, Louis J. E.
Fairfield, George W.
Fargason, James E.
Farnham, Benjamin L.
Goodreau, George H.
Harris, Melvin W.
Hart, Billy W.
Holland, Donald E.
Jongeward, Keith W.
Kees, John D.
Keidel, Charles J.
McAdams, Robert J.
McKenna, James E.
Mulvee, Paul L.
O'Leary, Joseph J.
Pooler, Richard P.
Pope, George S., Jr.
Primm, Jules R.
Robinson, James A.
Ronayne, William D.
Sampson, William J.
Schmidt, Maurice L.
Schmitt, Joseph D.
Senulis, Alexander D.
Sherrell, David P.
Simpson, Harvey
Slater, Thornton L.
Smith, William C., Jr.
Smith, William C.
Starbody, John L.
Taylor, William L.
Williams, George W.
Bauer, Allen F.
Hill, William H.
Odell, Jack G.
Parfitt, Arthur R.
Scott, Joseph E.
Meyer, Milton, Jr.
Smith, Frank W., Jr.
Crowell, Julian E., Jr.
Jordan, Robert L.

To be assistant civil engineers with the rank of ensign

Burch, Bobby F.
Chadwick, Dean O.
Daub, Leland A.
Ellis, Darl A.
Hoskins, Dalton
Malvin, David W.
Marron, James P.
Michael, Edwin M.
Mulder, William H.
Ross, Willard A.
White, Richard D.
Young, Robert "C"
Scanlan, Melvin E.

To be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Brimer, Eugene L., Jr.
Carney, Bruce H.
Crossmire, George B.
Fowler, James M.
Kraske, Leonard M.
Nystul, Oliver G.
Sancier, Henry J.
Scrivener, Charles A.
Shearn, Raymond S.

To be chief torpedoman

Van Gorder, Keith R.

To be chief pharmacist

Baker, Lewis G.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS

Richard J. Sullivan to be second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps from November 16, 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Thou God of the human heart, teach us the gladness of life which is responsive to Thy message through Nature. We thank Thee for the promise of returning springtime, for radiant sunlight and blue sky; for leaf, flower, and fruit which are beginning to clothe dale and hillside. All about us Thy beautiful world is thrilling with new life. Surely the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork.

Today, our Father, awaken in us a like renewal, lest cold doubt cause it to die out. O Spirit of God, direct us and rule us, and broaden our spiritual vision. Clothe us, we pray, with that wisdom that never fails to bear fruits of happiness and good will. Bless our Speaker and be very near to every Member of the Congress. In the name of our Saviour we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the minority views on House Joint Resolution 153.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter and statement by Mr. Chester T. Lane, Lend-Lease Administrator.

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

There was no objection.

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

MILDRED HICKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 182) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mildred Hicks, widow of R. C. Hicks, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said R. C. Hicks.

The resolution was agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 191) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee authorized by House Resolution 18 of the Eightieth Congress, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

RETIREMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. COLE of Kansas. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which, for the first time, fixes a definite policy for an orderly retirement of the national debt.

The debt can be reduced, but unless we act immediately the huge burden will be frozen into a permanent debt and never paid.

My proposal is simple: The establishment of a sinking fund of $10,000,000,000 each year to pay upon the interest and principal of the public debt.

Perhaps an unusual feature of the proposal, however, is the direction given the Secretary of the Treasury to take money from a definite source of revenue—the estate tax—and place it in the sinking fund.

The interest on the public debt always has been considered a fixed charge, which must be paid each year. My proposal would place in the same category a payment on the principal of the debt. Thereafter, neither the Executive nor Congress could ignore the policy of debt reduction.

Unless the bill I have introduced, or some similar plan, is adopted, the future generations of America will be saddled with this permanent burden and the economy of our country placed in grave danger.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUSK (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain telegrams and other data.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill he introduced today.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with respect to St. Ann's Church in Bronx County.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon notwithstanding the fact that the House may be in session.

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

There was no objection.

RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Mr. MURDOCK. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 last year, I took the floor for 1 minute to protest the Interior Department appropriation bill brought up that day. Today we have an Interior appropriations bill coming before us which is far worse than the one of last year. I feel that the bill as proposed today deals a stunning blow to the progress of the West, and I, for one, shall have plenty of protest about some of its recommendations.

Among many other bad features, I am especially concerned about the reclamation program. Not to go now into detail, I note that existing reclamation, although hit hard, has suffered less than future reclamation under terms of this bill and under its philosophy. It is one thing to destroy a farmer's crops, but it is even worse to destroy his seed corn so that he can have no future crops. The great reclamation program for western farm land suffers in this bill a sterilizing action which aims to prevent future reclamation even more than it checks existing reclamation.

It remains to be seen how the progressive forward-looking citizens of the 17 Western States will regard the wisdom of the committee that brings such a bill as this before Congress. Of all the phony economy that I have ever heard proposed on the floor of this chamber, in my considered judgment this is the worst.

CASH PAYMENT OF TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN

Mr. BRYSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly which is now in session requesting the Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of terminal leave for enlisted personnel who have been discharged from our armed services.

My own bill, H. R. 219, would permit applicants for terminal-leave pay to elect payment in cash in lieu of bonds and provide that bonds already issued for that purpose should be redeemable at any time. That bill was introduced on January 3, the opening day of this session of Congress. Some 25 similar bills have been introduced, and, indeed, there is now on the Speaker's desk a petition for motion for discharge of one of those bills, H. R. 3, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

I have received a great many letters and I want to read one paragraph from a letter from a veteran:

> I am in a spot and really need $150. I have my leave bond but it won't do me any good. I will even tell you why. My house will be finished in just a few weeks and if I haven't the $150 for the closing fees such as taxes and insurance the house will have to go to someone else. So please try and get me a special permit to cash my bond. Please, if you ever do anything for our sake.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter that was sent to President Harry S. Truman by the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Federal aid to education and include therewith a letter.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of April 21, in another an editorial from the Washington Post of April 23, and in the third a letter to the editor of the New York Times.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram received by him.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld delivered over radio station WMAL.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the spy ring recently uncovered in this country and Canada. It exceeds the limit and I have a statement from the Printing Office which says that the cost will be $443.75. Of course, it will cost nothing actually except the paper and ink, but it is of such vital importance that I think it should go in the RECORD at this time.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. KLEIN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is in the housing shortage that the only valid grounds for rent control can be found. The majority leadership knows that the American people do not want decontrol of rentals. Furthermore, a limited extension will obviously keep the rent control problem in a state of turmoil. At the height of next winter's coal and housing shortage, the problem would again be renewed with obvious further inroads into any competent administration. If rent control is kept in a continual state of turmoil, it will in practice be crippled and discredited.

In refusing to face the issue, the majority leadership is behaving in this respect exactly as it is with reference to the veterans' housing program. Veterans' housing is crippled in answer to selfish real-estate interests who are seeking to make fantastic profits at the cost of the veterans' urgent and really tragic need. That same real-estate lobby is organized in a demand for the complete elimination of rent control.

We have seen a tremendously rich and powerful lobby sweep down upon Congress. With cries of ghoulish glee they mutilated and murdered the OPA and now they are concentrating their efforts on rent control. Restraints and restrictions were called off. "Free enterprise" was to have its chance and the people were to be relieved of onerous government controls. Business was to get out from under Government interference and be allowed to surge freely ahead.

We are seeing where soaring prices are taking us. Let us stop the flood. Keep effective rent control.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1948, and for other purposes, the appropriation and language contained in the bill on page 50, lines 13 to 21, inclusive, and on page 81, lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, less than 7 weeks after the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] took his seat in Congress in 1939 he pioneered legislation to help the anthracite industry and the men, women, and children dependent upon it for a livelihood by introducing a bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite industry by providing for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite region.

The bill provided for investigation of the mining, preparation and utilization of anthracite, for the development of new uses and markets, for improvement of health and safety in mining, and for a comprehensive study of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems.

The authorization act passed both Houses in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and was signed by the President on December 18, 1942.

Funds to construct the laboratory were not requested until the last session of Congress and the appropriation of $450,000 passed both Houses, and was signed into law on July 1 past.

Although the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] was the father of this legislation, and despite repeated written and verbal requests to the Secretary of the Interior's office and to the Bureau of Mines the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] was unable to secure any real information until he became a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Such discourteous and disrespectful treatment of Members of Congress by any department or agency of the Federal Government should be terminated once and for all.

From the evidence that has developed in the hearings on this item it is clear to even disinterested observers that politics of the worst kind entered into the selection of Hazleton, Pa., as the site for the laboratory. Demands have been made from the public and the press for a thorough investigation.

That the public welfare continues to rate second to political considerations on the part of some officials in Washington was never more clearly demonstrated than in the petty jockeying which has marked the tedious progress of a project, which is one of the most practical and constructive yet conceived to solve the sorry plight of the coal fields.

It will interest this Congress to know that before the November election of last year, the War Assets Administration at the request of the United States Bureau of Mines and former Congressman Flood, froze a building in Hanover Township, near Wilkes-Barre, Pa., to be considered for the site of the laboratory.

However, when Congressman Flood was defeated in the last election some other individuals got active, and the report of the Bureau of Mines' engineers shows that it was as late as December 16, 1946, that the Secretary of the Interior sent letters out which resulted in his selecting two individuals from Luzerne County, Pa., to serve on a site-selection committee. Another letter was sent out on December 23, to another individual from Philadelphia, which is outside of the coal regions, who became the third member of this site committee.

Despite countless inquiries to the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines, Mr. FENTON was unable to get any information as to what action the Secretary was taking, and he was amazed and astounded on January 8 last when he read a newspaper article which stated that the Secretary of the Interior had selected a committee of three and the laboratory site would be selected on January 9, the following day.

In desperation and to protect the future interests of the anthracite industry and the people dependent upon it for a livelihood, Mr. FENTON immediately protested to the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Bureau of Mines, but was unable to secure any further information and did not know that Hazleton had been selected as the laboratory site until a correspondent from one of the national press associations dashed into his office about 12 o'clock on January 10 last and broke the news that the Secretary of the Interior had made the announcement.

Public Law 812, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorizing the establishment of an Anthracite Research Laboratory, section 2, provides that—

> For the purpose of this act the Secretary, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is authorized to acquire land and interests therein.

Despite the specific provisions of the act, the Secretary of the Interior named the site selection committee of three members, none of whom were officials or employees of the Bureau of Mines, and approved the recommendation of this site committee that the Anthracite Research Laboratory be established at Hazleton, Pa., the home community of one of the three members of the site committee.

It also developed at the hearing that the only member of the site committee who actually saw the site was the member of the committee from Hazleton. This same committee member, the day after he helped pick the site in his home community, wrote to a Member of Congress under date of January 10 last and stated:

> Entering the meeting my preference was Summit Hill for reasons which later could not stand up under the qualifications outlined by the Bureau of Mines in their analysis of locations, for instance, accessibility was one of the requirements and housing was another.

In other words, gentlemen, this member of the site committee admits that he went into the meeting with a fixed opinion, although this is questionable, in view of the fact that he was the only member of the committee that saw the site that was selected in his home community of Hazleton.

With reference to section 2 of the enabling act, which provides that the Secretary shall acquire the land and interests therein by acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, the Director of the Bureau of Mines recognized this provision of the law when he sent out a letter dated July 10, 1946, and enclosed a questionnaire to secure certain information which would be useful in selecting a site for the Anthracite Research Laboratory by stating:

> The Bureau's engineers will correlate the data obtained from the questionnaires, examine likely sites, and recommend a location to the Secretary of the Interior.

It was established during the hearings that although the Bureau of Mines engineers examined the 35 sites available, they were not permitted by the Secretary of the Interior to recommend a specific location to the Secretary of the Interior, as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of the laboratory.

Examination of the report of the Bureau of Mines' engineers indicated they favored locating the laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.

Despite the preponderance of evidence presented at the hearings showing that the Secretary of the Interior had completely ignored the provision of the act in appointing a site committee, and subsequent written and verbal protests to the Secretary, the Secretary insisted that he "found no adequate reason for overruling the recommendation of the committee."

Members of the Appropriations Committee held a conference with the Director of the Bureau of Mines, and it was agreed that the Bureau of Mines' engineers who made the actual survey would be made available for interrogation, and this meeting was held.

One of the two Bureau of Mines' engineers who made the survey, and who was authorized to speak for the other engineer, informed the members of the Appropriations Committee that of all the available 35 sites surveyed they selected Schuylkill Haven, Pa., as the best site for the laboratory. This information definitely confirmed the evidence presented during the hearings that the Secretary of the Interior disregarded both the letter and spirit of the act.

It is the intent of Congress that the laboratory be established where it will best serve the purposes for which it is intended, and that the taxpayers' money be well and wisely spent. From the factual evidence presented, the Appropriations Committee concluded that this purpose can best be achieved by establishing the laboratory in the immediate area where the largest anthracite reserves are located, and which, of course, means where the future problems of the anthracite industry will develop.

In view of the attitude of the Secretary of the Interior, the Appropriations Committee has had no other alternative but to recommend cancellation of all funds now available, and reappropriate funds for the construction of the laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., as recommended by the Bureau of Mines' engineers who made the survey, in order to carry out both the letter and spirit of the authorization act.

The Members of the House, in the face of the evidence that has been presented, and the specific provisions of the authorization act, would be derelict in their duty if they did not support the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee in this matter.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, all this resolution does is to waive points of order and make in order consideration of the legislation contained in the appropriation bill. The legislation has been explained by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], and I believe it is up to the membership of the House to vote on this as on any other proposition, as to whether the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee changing the site from that which has been recommended by a special committee designated by the Secretary of the Interior, should be adopted or not. I may say that notwithstanding the reading of the report by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Secretary of the Interior has acted in good faith. He selected three men, one a labor man, one representing industry, and one who was not interested in any site and represented the public. These three men have recommended a site—1 of 7 that had been recommended out of 35 previously considered. I feel, therefore, the Secretary of the Interior acted in good faith; but, nevertheless, the evidence presented before the Rules Committee is such that, in my opinion, and in the opinion of members of the Rules Committee, points of order should be waived and the provision should be permitted to be taken up and considered. It provides for $450,000 for what I understand is a laboratory that may bring about greater efficiency and safety in the coal fields and may bring about a reduction in the cost of mining coal.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. This is the laboratory that was provided last year under the Democratic administration?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. We pursued the ordinary method of having a commission appointed or authorizing the appointment of a commission to select a site; is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that commission was constituted of Mr. Thomas Kennedy, who is a very prominent labor leader in the coal-miners organization, also the dean of the University of Pennsylvania, also the president of the Anthracite Operators Association. Is my information correct?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is always correct from my point of view.

Mr. McCORMACK. They selected a site?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Appropriations Committee, exercizing a rare jurisdiction or responsibility—I have never seen it done before in my 19 years as a Member—selects a definite site rather than letting the agency of government select a site through a commission appointed or through a board, is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is really a fight between two Republican Members from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SABATH. That I do not know. Of course, that is not the only thing I do not know about this matter. This, however, I do not know about.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is most unfortunate that this important thing from the Republican angle should deteriorate into a matter of congressional-district patronage.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Massachusetts should know by this time that it has always been my policy to leave any matters of that kind to the membership of the House.

LABORATORY MAY BRING REDUCED PRICES

From the evidence that was presented before the committee, I could not do anything else but act favorably upon the rule, and that was also the position of my colleagues on that committee. I believe that the original authorization was in the right direction, and the laboratory should be erected as speedily as possible because, as I say, it may bring about a reduction in the cost of production of coal, and perhaps an equal reduction in price to the coal users.

I may say that I read only a few days ago that there has been a reduction of 50 cents per ton here in the District of Columbia. I hope to God that similar reductions will be made throughout the United States, and that we will have not only a reduction in the cost of coal but in the prices of all products that enter into the cost of living.

GRATIFIED BY PRESIDENT'S MOVE TO BRING LOWER PRICES

I have been pleased and gratified, Mr. Speaker, as can be readily understood by those who have heard me for three long years as I pointed out the rapidly rising spiral of living costs, by the firm stand which has been taken by the President in regard to price increases, and by his demands that prices to consumers be reduced.

I have been equally gratified by the action taken by some industrialists, retailers, and wholesalers to actually reduce prices. Recently we have seen advertisements in the Washington newspapers announcing price cuts, not only in coal, which I have mentioned, but in clothing and foods.

I believe that all members received yesterday a telegram from one big wire and cable manufacturing company announcing reductions of prices on their products and the agreement with unions for increased wages. Today all of us received another similar wire from Charles Luckman, of Lever Bros., announcing reductions in the price of soaps and cooking oils at the same time the workers' wages have been lifted without benefit of the Republican union-wrecking bill. I have many similar telegrams and letters.

OPA SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN KILLED

The present situation, when we find that prices have increased as much in the last 10 months as in the preceding 7 years, is a direct result of the tremendous pressures exerted by selfish, profit-hungry forces first to break through the OPA price ceilings and then ultimately to kill price control entirely. The Congress and the people of this great Nation were fed a heavy forced diet of false and misleading propaganda. Businessmen were painted as desperate in the face of rising costs and rising wages.

Mine was one of the few voices raised then to point out that the average profits for all businesses had broken all records in 1945, and bid fair to outstrip even those high levels in 1946.

Under leave, I desire to insert at this point a short table based on figures furnished by the Department of Labor, as the figures were given in the Chicago Sun, April 14, 1947:

Percentage change in retail food prices

1941 AVERAGE IS 100 PERCENT

September 1945:	
All foods	132
Cereals and bakery products	111
Meats	122
Dairy products	119
February 1947:	
All foods	173
Cereals and bakery products	147
Meats	183
Dairy products	164

That table, Mr. Speaker, represents what is happening to people who cannot fall back on swollen profits and bonus payments to counteract the loss of income created when prices go up and dollar income stays level or falls.

That is what has happened to working people who, because of the end of overtime payments, find themselves drawing a smaller pay check than in 1943, or who perhaps have been laid off in the process of reconversion.

That is what happened to people living on retirement pay, or on insurance, or on pensions, or on the income from the bonds of these very companies which have forced prices up and up.

INDUSTRIAL PROFITS UP

Against that reduction in real income we have undreamed-of industrial profits on every hand. Let me take a single industry group, Mr. Speaker, one which exercises a vast influence over the cost of living. Here are the profit figures for the last 3 years in the meat-packing and meat processing industries:

Net income of industry groups

MEAT PACKING AND PROCESSING

1944	$46,236,000
1945	34,307,000
1946	67,857,000

LABOR HAS BEEN PATIENT UNDER ADVERSITY

In spite of the harsh, punitive laws which the Republican Party has proposed, and has passed in this House, and in spite of the deluge of abuse heaped on American workingmen and their spokesmen by some, American labor has been infinitely patient under this unfair division of the unequaled national income.

The Monthly Labor Review of the Department of Labor shows that out of a total population over the age of 14 of 106,940,000, we have a total labor force

of 58,430,000, a figure never before surpassed in peacetime.

In spite of all abuse, of prices rising above the limit of incomes to reach them, and of unfounded charges, idleness arising from labor-management controversies in January 1947 reached a postwar low and was less than for any month since March 1945.

In December 1946, which is the last month for which full figures are available, only 180 such disputes were begun, involving only 95,000 workers, while in the whole month only 400 disputes were in progress involving 525,000 workers and a loss of 3,065,000 man-hours.

In other words, in December 1946 about four-tenths of 1 percent of all workers were, during the month, either out on strike or locked out by management some time during the month.

This does not sound like the labor-management war of which we heard so much the other day.

PRICE CONTROL SHOULD HAVE BEEN KEPT

Last fall, Mr. Speaker, I urged the President to maintain the full force of price control and not to yield to the money-hungry profiteers; but, as you will recall, the packers went on strike against the people of the United States, and conditions arose which brought about the virtual suspension of price controls, followed by the last election, when the Republican Party gained what will be, I am certain, a short-lived majority, and the last pretenses of price control and orderly reconversion to peacetime were abandoned.

Now we are faced with the reality which I predicted time after time. I dare say there is not a Member of this House of any party who does not regret the abandonment of the administration program for slow and careful reconversion.

I hope that the vigorous action of the President in calling for a reduction of consumers' and wholesale prices, and the prompt response of some of the more responsible segments of industry, will provide a pattern for all of business.

Lest there be any thought that I may be exaggerating, or merely attempting to make business a scapegoat, I here insert a table showing the net profits of seven major meat-packing plants. Bear in mind that the consumer must provide these profits—the consumer and the worker.

Net sales and net profit of 7 major meat-packing plants, 1945 and 1946

Company	Year ending—	Operating revenue and sales	Net profit
Armour & Co.	Nov. 2, 1946[1]	$1,183,537,561	$20,791,128
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945[2]	1,212,961,355	9,172,538
Cudahy Packing Co.	Nov. 2, 1946	349,901,504	6,720,585
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945	344,909,594	2,505,097
Geo. A. Hormel & Co.	Oct. 26, 1946	126,082,009	2,541,138
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945	114,213,587	1,273,639
Hygrade Food Products Corp.	Nov. 2, 1946[2]	154,949,972	4,585,995
Do.	Nov. 3, 1945[1]	110,986,858	702,887
Rath Packing Co.	Nov. 2, 1946[2]	100,300,102	2,065,885
Do.	Nov. 3, 1945[1]	100,155,207	1,347,575
Swift & Co.	Oct. 26, 1946	1,308,364,155	16,394,739
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945	1,307,631,681	12,303,807
Wilson & Co., Inc.	Oct. 26, 1946	440,572,155	8,311,560
Do.	Oct. 27, 1945	468,638,536	5,036,602

[1] 53 weeks.
[2] 52 weeks.
Source: Standard & Poor's Corporation Records. Daily news section.

PLEASED NAM OPPOSES CARTELS

I am most pleased, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in many years I can join in spirit with the National Association of Manufacturers in their statement deprecating cartels and monopolies.

The only trouble is that this fine talk does not quite jibe with their continuous and frivolous statements that they want "free private enterprise." Free for what? Free to deprive smaller businesses of their freedom? Free to exploit the worker? Free to gouge the consumer?

These statements would have come with better grace from those who can come into court with clean hands, so to speak—or with free hands. The record of all-time record profits do not support the plaints of governmental interference. The record of absorption, despite our antitrust laws, of small concerns by big concerns does not sound like a truly "free" enterprise system. There is reason for believing that trade associations continue to act with considerable unanimity, though perhaps technical violation of the law is avoided.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I fee impelled to show how this "restricted" enterprise has "suffered" in recent months, though I know much of this has appeared before.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me draw attention to the fact that Bethlehem Steel Co. has just today reported the greatest earnings for a first quarter in all history, though in the same breath Eugene Grace finds it possible to say that a wage increase would be "inflationary."

A compilation covering 15 industries shows that the weighted average price increase necessary to cover increased labor costs would have been 2.5 percent; but the actual weighted average price increase was 17.9 percent.

The percentage increase in 1946 over profits in 1945 was, for the Atlantic Refining Co., 760.5 percent; for the Long-Bell Lumber Co., 407.6 percent; for the Food Fair Stores, 293.3 percent.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, for a long time, showing the weird disparity between the claims of business prostration made on this floor and the factual reports of business guormandizing from the financial pages; but I shall desist.

I hope that business and industrial leaders will realize that no one wins through inflation, or through sudden deflation—that is, through the "boom and bust" cycle—and everybody loses.

I certainly would not wish for any such sharp or sudden price cuts as would actually hurt our American business concerns. Let me say, as a figure of speech, that I should like to see them sweat off some of the fat; and then I should like to see our workers, our white-collar people, our annuitants, and other low-income groups, get some of that fat for their own needs.

The action of United States Steel and of other enlightened employers in settling their wage disputes before they get started is most gratifying; it proves what I have long contended, that with proper opportunity and with good will on both sides, labor disputes can be settled at the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from some of the telegrams and letters I have received.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the applicants for the pending rule on the bill in question did not make out a very strong case. They are asking for a rule that will provide opportunity to invalidate the decision of an agency set up to determine where this laboratory should be located. In spite of the fact that a poor case was made, I think the action of the Appropriations Committee was wise. I believe in the liberal use of the purse strings on the part of the Appropriations Committee to influence legislation and public behavior. I am confident that the criticism directed at the agency that first determined this question is well supported and that the Appropriations Committee acted wisely in suggesting that the House be given an opportunity to correct the error made. Certainly the preponderance of the testimony as to the proper location is on the side of those who asked for this rule and for the invalidation of the decision made by the agency. It was not a wise decision, and although it was made regularly and under authority granted by the Congress, I think it ought to be reversed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule now before the House and in particular to the provision in it waiving any points of order that might be made to the items of the present appropriation bill. In thus opposing the rule I do so with reluctance, but under the circumstances, I have no other course. Yesterday, before the rule was placed on the Clerk's desk, I attempted to have the Rules Committee change the rule but was unable to do so. I am particularly concerned with the item appearing on page 50, lines 13 to 31 inclusive and with title II of the bill, which deal with the appropriation of $450,000 for the construction and equipment of an anthracite research laboratory. We have here, in this rule before us, a situation which, while not unknown,

is, I am told by those older and more experienced in the ways of the House than I am, rather uncommon. The rule was not asked for, however, without a reason, which I shall endeavor to point out to you.

For that purpose I should like briefly to review the history of that legislation. Under Public Law No. 812, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, approved December 18, 1942, the Secretary of the Interior was authorized and directed to establish a research laboratory in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. Nowhere in the act is there any designation as to where in the region it should be located, the choice of the site being left to the discretion and judgment of the Secretary within that general limitation. The erection of this institution and the appropriation of the funds for its construction were postponed by reason of the war. The Seventy-ninth Congress, the war being then over, appropriated the required funds and the Secretary of the Interior promptly took steps to comply with the direction of the Congress.

In the latter part of 1946, the Secretary, in furtherance of that direction, appointed a committee as he was empowered to do under section 4 of the act, to advise with him and make recommendations as to the location of the laboratory. This committee consisted of Dr. Frank Ernst, head of the Anthracite Institute, representing the operators, Mr. Thomas Kennedy, of the United Mine Workers, representing the employees, and Dr. J. A. Goff, dean of the Towne Scientific School of the University of Pennsylvania, representing the general public, all three of them men of standing and ability in the anthracite industry. In appointing that committee, the Secretary endeavored to comply and thought he was complying with the provisions of the act which directed that those three elements should appear on any advisory committee he should select. That committee, after careful consideration of the various possible sites in the region, coupled with the personal knowledge of its members of the problems involved, and having before it the report of the engineers of the Bureau, decided, for reasons set forth in its report to the Secretary, that the laboratory should be situated in the city of Hazleton, which is located in my district, and unanimously recommended to the Secretary that this be done.

Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior approved that recommendation and made a public announcement, in the latter part of January of this year, of his decision to locate the laboratory at that point. Full publicity was given to the Secretary's decision, and his press release announcing it appeared in all the newspapers in my district and was given wide distribution. It is, and has been, a matter of common knowledge throughout the district. Thereupon the gentleman from Pennsylvania representing the Twelfth Congressional District, comprising the counties of Northumberland and Schuylkill, in the latter of which is the little town of Schuylkill Haven mentioned in this present appropriation bill, on page 50, line 15, who had been desirous of having this laboratory located in his district, raised a great outcry, shouting that he had been robbed by this exercise of the Secretary's judgment, an exercise specifically committed to him under the act, robbed of what was rightfully his, that someone, while he was in swimming, had stolen his clothes, and that, far from exercising his sound discretion, the Secretary had been guided by other considerations. A glance at the character of the members of the advisory committee shows the ridiculousness of this assertion and makes patent the lack of bona fides behind such a statement.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which prepared the bill now under consideration making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, representing the Twelfth Congressional District, made no violent protest, I assume, at the insertion therein of title II, revoking the previous appropriation made by the Seventy-ninth Congress, and the provision on page 50, appropriating an exactly similar amount for the laboratory, but coupled with the proviso that the laboratory be constructed in Schuylkill Haven, which just happens to be in his district. Such a proviso would normally have been subject to a point of order, a fact well known to everyone. In order to bar such a point, the present rule was sought and granted. In making that assertion I am only quoting the chairman of the subcommittee who categorically stated that the only purpose in seeking the present rule was to prevent, specifically, the elimination of the designation of the place at which the laboratory was to be erected, to insure that it should be constructed at Schuylkill Haven in the Twelfth District, and, inferentially, that what was thus obtained, should be made secure and safe from legitimate attack.

Earlier I said that the gentleman had cried out to all the world that he had been robbed, robbed of what he had never had but what he assumed he was going to have. I wonder how he would characterize the proceedings which have resulted in the present rule, were the situation reversed. I think there is no necessity to paint any picture to the Members of this body of the reactions of the people of my district to what they will consider a gross injustice. On the merits, both they and I are quite prepared to justify the soundness of the Secretary's judgment, notwithstanding the statement in the committee's report.

What really gripes an anthracite sympathizer is to mention Schuylkill Haven for the laboratory. Surely the Schuylkill County Congressman must know that of all the towns in his territory, Schuylkill Haven is the one town with not only oil-burning homes and oil-burning factories, but actually a center for the distribution of oil burners and the introduction of oil burners into areas on the fringe of the anthracite coal fields. Certainly the miners of Tamaqua, Coaldale, Mahonoy City, Shenandoah, Mount Carmel, Ashland, Shamokin, etc., will al' look askance at awarding a community bent on stabbing the anthracite industry by shrinking its market with the anthracite industries' most potent agency for its future existence, the proposed laboratory.

An anthracite laboratory in Schuylkill Haven, the community with oil-burning intents, should be scorned in the anthracite coal fields with the same repercussion as Henry Wallace's speeches in Europe.

The writer of this letter himself prefers a different location than either of the ones involved here. It illustrates, however, the difference of opinion among those conversant with the area, and the wisdom of the provision leaving the decision to the Secretary, assisted by experts upon whose advice he can rely. At the moment, that is beside the point. They will feel, and I assure you that they are fully cognizant of the situation, for the local newspapers have been full of it and I concur in the feeling that they should not, under the circumstances, be made the victims of someone's spleen and disappointment and of a feud with the Secretary of the Interior. They will feel, and justly so, that a committee of this great House, which prides itself on its sense of justice and fair play, should not lend itself to the furtherance of such an end at their expense, and that, if it does, the House itself from which it derives its authority should rebuke it by refusing to countenance its action. They look to this House to protect them.

Both my constituents and I are opposed to this attempt to legislate indirectly, are opposed to any change in the basic legislation which alters the intent of Congress that the site of this laboratory should be determined by the Secretary, with the advice of a committee of experts, which was the method adopted.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have stated I am opposed to the present rule. I realize that this appropriation bill must be considered, and I have no desire to be an obstructionist even though the rule is directly aimed at me and at my district. On the basis of the larger issues involved, I shall vote to have this legislation proceed, but I feel it is unfair and unjust, and at the proper time, if the rule be approved by the House, I propose to present an amendment for the consideration of the House, striking out title II of the bill and also on page 50, lines 13 to 21, thus eliminating this attempt to amend the original act by subterfuge, and restoring to the Secretary of the Interior the discretion conferred on him by the basic legislation as it existed before this ill-starred plan was concocted.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand it, what you are saying is that by this bill they are canceling out an appropriation that was made last year for a laboratory which was to be in your district.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Which was left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to decide where it would be located.

Mr. SMATHERS. And now they are putting it back, but putting it in some other district?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

In view of what has been stated, I want to make it clear that I have at all times insisted that a minority opposed to any proposition should be given an opportunity to explain their position before the Rules Committee before we acted upon any application for a rule. In this instance, when the rule was requested, there was no opposition on the part of anybody. Whether the minority is on the Democratic side or on the Republican side, the minority should have the right to appear and present their views or their opposition to any matter. In this instance, I believe it is up to the House to decide, since it is a disagreement between two sections or localities in the same State, after the evidence is presented more fully than it has been presented before the Rules Committee, whether the provision provided for in the appropriation bill should be sustained or not.

As to the bill itself I have not said anything. You will hear more about it later. I did not criticize the committee notwithstanding the fact that I feel the committee has been penny-wise and pound-foolish in eliminating appropriations for deserving projects, and I think it is purely a political maneuver on the part of the committee. The cuts in some of these appropriations are unfair and unjust and will deprive many sections of the country of improvements and betterments to which they are entitled.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman, of course, is referring to the majority of the committee, not the minority.

Mr. SABATH. Why, of course; I know that the minority did not have much to say and will not have much to say. It is not like it was under Democratic control when the minority always was heard and received that consideration which I myself have always advocated. I know the majority has the vote on this committee, in fact we know the majority is in the saddle. Unfortunately they seem to be drunk with temporary power but whether it will help them I doubt very much because I do not believe the American people will approve the course that is being pursued by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I want to preface my remarks by stating to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS] that never have I at any time suggested any specific location for the new Anthracite Research Laboratory.

I want the Members to know that my only contention has been that the laboratory be established in the immediate region where the largest anthracite reserves are located, and which, of course, means where the future problems of the anthracite industry will develop.

The statistics of the United States Bureau of Mines, introduced in the evidence during the hearings on the appropriation bill, and which I will present later, show where these reserves are located and more than justifies the recommendation of the Bureau of Mines' engineers that the laboratory be established at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.

As our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has already explained to the House the history of the legislation authorizing a laboratory for research on anthracite coal, I will not go into detail or repeat that which he told you.

However, I do want to summarize for you the various steps taken up to this point in the hope that you as Members of the Congress and future Members, will be accorded all the courtesies and respect, as such, by the various bureaus and departments of our Federal Government.

First of all, the enabling legislation or authorization act which I sponsored became law on December 18, 1942. Then the war prevented securing funds to build the laboratory.

The Interior appropriation bill for 1947 included the $450,000 for the erection of the laboratory to be placed on a site to be named by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines. This is in accordance with section 2 of the enabling act.

That this was the interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director of the Bureau of Mines is indicated in the letter that was sent out by the Director of the Bureau of Mines on July 10, 1946, and which had a questionnaire enclosed to secure certain information which would be useful in selecting a site for the anthracite research laboratory. This letter stated:

> The Bureau's engineers will correlate the data obtained from the questionnaires, examine likely sites, and recommend a location to the Secretary of the Interior.

Well, as a matter of fact, 35 sites were offered to the Government from the anthracite area, and the Bureau of Mines sent engineers to examine the likely sites. These engineers spent days and days examining all the sites. They were the only ones qualified to determine which was the most suitable site. They were neutral in their position and had a job to do. They did that job and made their report; I have a copy of it. The best they could do in the matter of Hazleton was to give it 13 points to Schuylkill Haven's 15.

As far as the matter of accessibility to nonregional areas was concerned, Schuylkill Haven was in a class by itself. That is to say, and I quote from the engineer's report:

> The nonfunctional points of Washington, D. C., Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and New York as a whole are more accessible from Pottsville (Schuylkill Haven area) than from any other population center within the coal-producing area.

This accessibility to the great metropolitan areas was one of the most basic factors to consider in establishing the laboratory site, and was so stated to me by the Director of the Bureau of Mines in a conversation I had with him about what the cardinal factors should be.

Yes, my colleagues; they even had in their report on Schuylkill Haven that the western and southern anthracite field contained 83 percent of the anthracite reserves.

Yes; the engineer's report or summary of each of the suggested most favorable sites—8 sites out of the 35 visited and surveyed—shows very plainly to any unbiased mind which site, the one site, that these professional engineers of the Bureau of Mines preferred. There was no doubt that they thought Schuylkill Haven the best site.

This was verified by the engineers themselves in an interview with members of the Appropriations Committee. Dr. L. C. McCabe, one of the two engineers who visited all the sites and who was authorized to speak for Mr. Buch, the other engineer who could not attend the conference on account of the serious illness of his mother, having been called to his mother's bedside, informed the members of the Appropriations Committee the engineers selected Schuylkill Haven, Pa.

The Bureau of Mines made Dr. McCabe available for interrogation at the request of our committee, and I am happy to state that Dr. McCabe did no pussyfooting, and gave us his honest and candid opinion that Schuylkill Haven was the best site for the laboratory out of the 35 sites they surveyed.

Now let us see how this Hazleton decision came about. Well, Mr. RICH did touch on a little of it. He told you that such discourteous and disrespectful treatment of Members of Congress by any department or agency of the Federal Government should be terminated once and for all. He was referring to the lack of cooperation and my inability to get any information from the Director of the Bureau of Mines or the Secretary of the Interior. Surely as a Member of Congress, to say nothing of the fact that I was the author of the legislation, should demand at least a reply to mail asking for information. It should not have taken the Secretary of the Interior 177 days to answer a letter and, incidentally, the letter that I wrote was in reply to a request from the Secretary to send him names of people that he might consider in appointing a "consultative committee." Note well, now, he said "consultative committee" and not a selection committee. I sent him the names of people for his consideration on August 7, 1946. He never acknowledged that letter until I brought it to his attention when he was before our committee on January 21, 1947. The reply came to me on Saturday, January 25, 1947, in a letter dated January 24, 1947, and was delivered in person by the Director of the Bureau of Mines.

Well, a lot happened between August 7, 1946, and January 25, 1947. Already, mention has been made of November 5, 1946, on which day my colleague, Mr. JENKINS' predecessor, was retired.

They certainly went a long way in the Department of the Interior to try and

establish the laboratory in Luzerne County, Pa. As has already been stated they had a certain building in Hanover Township, near Wilkes-Barre, Pa., frozen by the War Assets Administration in the hope that they could place it in Luzerne County. But after the election they unfroze it. Why? Because it was unsuitable for the laboratory and they knew it when they had it frozen.

Then the Secretary of the Interior, in direct violation of section 2 of the enabling act, named a site selection committee which picked Hazleton. That this committee was a site-selection committee is attested to by a press release from the Department of the Interior dated January 10, 1947, which states:

In selecting Hazleton on the basis of its central location in the anthracite region, the committee also considered accessibility, housing, community facilities, utilities, and local manufacturers.

Pikes Peak might be the center of a given area, but you certainly would not build something there if accessibility is one of the main factors to be considered.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has already informed you, the site committee was composed of three members who were not picked until long after the November election. Two of the members were from Luzerne County, Pa., and the third was from Philadelphia, outside of the coal regions. Of course one of the members from Luzerne was from Hazleton, the home community of one of the three members of the site committee. It developed at the hearings that he was the only one who saw the site at Hazleton, which he picked in his home community. This man forgot, and he should know, that we have miners and their families in the western and southern field in which lies 86 percent of the coal reserves. He should also know that many of the coal operators in the Hazleton area have already migrated to the fields where they could get coal for the next 150 to 500 years.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this time, as was introduced in the hearings a statement of the estimated anthracite reserves by fields as of January 1, 1943, on pages 85 and 86 from the report entitled "Pennsylvania Mineral Heritage," published by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, department of internal affairs, William P. Livengood, Jr., secretary, Harrisburg, Pa., in 1944, and based on reports of the Pennsylvania Geological Survey, the School of Mineral Industries of the Pennsylvania State College, the United States Geological Survey, and the United States Bureau of Mines.

Northern field: Luzerne and Lackawanna—Wilkes-Barre and Scranton—16 percent.

Eastern middle field: Luzerne and little part of Carbon—Hazleton area—less than 1 percent.

Western middle field: Northumberland and Schuylkill—Shamokin area—about 22 percent.

Southern field: Schuylkill, Dauphin, and a little of Carbon—Pottsville area, largely Schuylkill County where the Schuylkill Haven site is located—62 percent.

The Pottsville area and the Shamokin area combined have 13,490,000,000 tons of coal out of a total of 16,188,00,000 tons for the whole region, which is approximately 84 percent of the total anthracite reserves.

At the present rate of mining the northern field, Wilkes-Barre and Scranton, will be mined out in 50 years; the eastern middle field, Hazleton, in about 11 years; the western middle field, Shamokin in about 150 years; and the southern field, Pottsville, will last over 500 years.

The estimated reserves by counties is as follows:

County	Tonnage	Percent
Carbon	244,000,000	2.2
Columbia	543,000,000	3.5
Dauphin and Lebanon	76,000,000	.5
Lackawanna	637,000,000	4.2
Luzerne	2,023,000,000	12.9
Northumberland	1,967,000,000	12.6
Schuylkill	10,007,000,000	64.0
Sullivan	7,000,000	.05
Susquehanna and Wayne	10,000,000	.05+
Total	15,614,000,000	100.0

Inasmuch as my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS] has already read into the RECORD a letter which was addressed to him, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WALTER, and me, 2 days ago, April 22, 1947, by Mr. E. V. McCullian, executive secretary, Panther Valley Industrial Association, Inc., Lansford, Pa., I shall now read into the RECORD a letter which Mr. McCullian addressed, under date of January 15, 1947, to the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, attention Mr. R. B. Sayres, Chief. This letter, which was introduced in the evidence of the hearings, is as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1947.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. R. R. Sayers, Chief.)

DEAR SIR: Your letter and your copy of the release assigning the anthracite laboratory to the section designated in Hazleton, Pa., is supporting evidence to our contention that the Department of the Interior, and its subcommittee, paid little attention to either its own Department's technical knowledge or to that of the subcommittee that inspected sites proposed in the anthracite area.

To state that Hazleton is the geographical center of the former anthracite coal fields triangle with Scranton, Mauch Chunk, and Tremont as the vertices is nearly correct.

But our understanding was the laboratory is being built for the anthracite of the future. Accordingly, your own statistics would eliminate any anthracite problems in the territory from Scranton to Hazleton, inclusive, as anthracite of this area will, by your Department's statistics, soon be but happy memories. Perhaps by the time the new laboratory is completed and functioning in Hazleton, the latter city will be purchasing anthracite from the Panther Valley or using oil as a substitute. That is how exhausted the anthracite operators and the anthracite miners of the vicinity of Hazleton figure their future coal reserves happen to be.

The district No. 7 office of the United Mine Workers, located in Hazelton, through its district provisional president, Mr. Martin Brennan, proposed as a site one of those offered your Department by our commission, namely, the one at Summit Hill, Pa. Perhaps if you check your recommendation, you may alter your statement that Hazleton had the support of the United Mine Workers of America. It would better be said the personal support of Mr. Kennedy, who happened to be a resident of Hazleton and a Mine Workers' official.

Anyone that ever traveled to or from Hazleton would not write about its accessibility for travel. Hazleton is a branch-line city. We are 12 miles from Hazleton and can reach New York City as quickly as we can get to Hazleton by public conveyance.

Insofar as air travel is concerned, there is not an airport of worth-while size nearer to Hazleton than the Allentown-Bethlehem port which is considerably closer to the Panther Valley. Traveling by train, the people of Hazleton must make their way by branch train or bus to the Panther Valley towns of Tamaqua or Mauch Chunk.

If university support was a criterion, Lehigh and Lafayette as we oft stated were at Panther Valley's back door.

As a summary, therefore, your subcommittee recommendation looked at a beclouded map when it located the geographical center of the future anthracite coal fields; the laboratory is being built to serve in Hazleton.

With your statement that Hazleton is a city of 40,000 people, and the type of city that will be satisfactory to laboratory engineers, we have no quarrel. We only know that people as well equipped as laboratory engineers find living in our midst no inconvenience. The housing problem will be just as difficult to solve in Hazleton as elsewhere.

We have filed our protest as we cannot accept the findings on the reasons given. Living in the anthracite coal fields of the future, knowing the voluminous statistics bureau of government love to play with, it is just plain stupidity and an insult to our intelligence to recommend Hazleton as the center of the anthracite fields the laboratory is being built to serve.

We congratulate the city of Hazleton for its success in acquiring that which it will have no need for, and we also congratulate its outstanding citizen (Mr. Kennedy) for feeding Hazleton as a compromise city to a gullible Government department.

Very truly yours,
E. V. MCCULLIAN,
Executive Secretary,
Panther Valley Industrial Commission.

(Copies to Hon. F. E. WALTER, Hon. I. D. FENTON.)

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has stated, Congress intends to see that the taxpayers' money is well and wisely spent.

From the facts and evidence presented in the hearings, as well as the subsequent evidence which developed, and has been presented here, the Appropriations Committee in order to carry out the letter and spirit of the authorization act had no other alternative but to recommend cancelation of the funds now available, and to reappropriate funds for the construction of the Anthracite Research Laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., as recommended by the Bureau of Mines' engineers who surveyed all the 35 sites that were made available.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate run throughout the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and myself; and that the first paragraph be read before the Committee rises.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3123, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, Tuesday of this week in the city of Newburyport, Mass., the Newburyport plan to reduce prices of consumer goods went into effect and already, this experiment has taken on national significance with the eyes of the Nation focused on this drive to stabilize our economy in accordance with the President's plea recently that prices be reduced.

I am proud to state that I have the honor of representing the district in which Newburyport is located, and I hasten to congratulate its business leaders and people in being the first city of the Nation to undertake a program calling for a roll-back of 10 percent in the prices embracing all goods and services.

Designed to halt the postwar inflation spiral, stimulate buying, increase purchasing power, the plan is moving along with great speed and success and should pave the way for the parade of cities and towns throughout the country in this remarkable movement.

Enthusiasm is needed on the part of all for the success of such a plan and enthusiasm is running high in Newburyport and spreading to surrounding cities and towns. The following editorial by the Newburyport Daily News speaks for itself:

THE NEWBURYPORT PLAN—LET'S ALL SUPPORT IT

Primarily, the Newburyport plan for a 10-percent price reduction on all permissible goods and services, effective here tomorrow, has been devised to help you, the consumer, to buy some things you want, at figures below the unprecedentedly high level which have been reached in the postwar inflation spiral.

It is also geared to help your neighbor, the merchant, who has begun to suffer through public resistance to high prices and mounting inventories.

In a larger, more idealized sense, the plan may be regarded as the spearhead of a national movement to adjust an economic machine, seriously out of balance. Widespread recognition of the Newburyport plan will make our city famous as the place where a great idea was originated and developed. Who knows how far-reaching, how momentous the results may be?

The public has a serious responsibility in helping make the plan work. If the public fails to respond the Newburyport plan will go down in history as a flop and a folly. We can't let that happen! It won't happen!

It would be asking you too much to enjoin you to go out tomorrow and buy something you don't want or need. But if there are things you need, services you desire, join the eager trade in Newburyport parade we expect to form tomorrow and continue for the duration of the price-cutting experiment.

Remember that old song, Let's Have Another Cup of Coffee and Let's Have Another Piece of Pie? This is not a depression, but it is an economic crisis the businessmen of your city have decided to become pioneers in meeting. Get into the spirit of the song!

Get behind the Newburyport plan. Think it, talk it, act on it! Get out and make Newburyport cash registers tinkle, in a symphony whose echoes shall be heard from coast to coast!

This is big. Be a part of it!

Mr. Chairman, as its representative in Congress, I am pleased to re-echo this symphony of action toward stabilization and to the representatives of the people of this Nation, urge support of this drive in order that our economy can be more evenly balanced in the quickest possible time, and that prosperity be retained in this country of ours.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am opening general debate on the bill H. R. 3123, which, in my opinion, is the soundest Interior Department appropriation bill that has been before the House in many a year. This subcommittee has labored hard and diligently to get the facts upon which it could base sound judgment, and it has come forth with a bill that represents sound judgment. None less than the President of the United States slapped this subcommittee on the wrist last year when it appropriated and made available in the fiscal year 1947, the present fiscal year, $465,500,000 in appropriations and contract authorizations. The following table, furnished me by the Budget Bureau, shows the $465,000,000 that was available in appropriations and contract authorizations for obligation during the fiscal year 1947:

Statement of appropriations and contract authorizations available for obligation during the fiscal year 1947

PART 1. AGENCIES COVERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION ACT

Description	1947 appropriations and contract authorizations [1]	Unexpended balances of prior-year appropriations and contract authorizations as of June 30, 1946 [2]			Total appropriations and contract authorizations available for obligation during the fiscal year 1947
		Unliquidated obligations	Unobligated balances		
			Available for obligation after June 30, 1946	Not available for obligation after June 30, 1946	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)+(3)
Department of the Interior:					
Office of the Secretary	$4,247,294	$909,000	$13,000	$934,000	$4,260,294
Commission of Fine Arts	10,000			1,000	10,000
High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands		25,000	77,000		77,000
Bonneville Power Administration	12,470,000	12,840,000	2,934,000		15,404,000
Office of Fishery Coordination		4,000		18,000	
Solid Fuels Administration for War	2,950,000	48,000		572,000	2,950,000
Southwestern Power Administration	7,600,000	491,000	200,000	67,000	7,800,000
Grazing Service	1,327,500	104,000	630,000	43,000	1,957,500
General Land Office	8,756,726	837,000	6,146,000	200,000	14,902,726
Bureau of Indian Affairs	40,705,879	5,905,000	4,554,000	2,400,000	45,259,879
Bureau of Reclamation	115,795,543	8,025,000	142,555,000	23,000	258,350,543
Geological Survey	9,709,072	2,334,000	230,000	[3] −1,095,000	9,939,072
Bureau of Mines	10,845,515	4,179,000	23,109,000	831,000	33,954,515
Gas and Oil Division		1,000		16,000	
National Park Service	25,285,455	1,823,000	14,831,000	145,000	40,116,455
Fish and Wildlife Service	10,708,502	3,892,000	486,000	2,851,000	11,194,502
Government in the Territories	9,372,590	4,893,000	9,993,000	2,000	19,365,590
War Relocation Authority		1,293,000	29,000	4,976,000	29,000
Claims and judgments		275,000			
Private relief acts		1,000			
Total, covered by the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act	259,784,076	47,879,000	205,787,000	11,984,000	465,571,076

[1] Includes appropriations in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946. Excludes appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations.
[2] Excludes balances which lapsed and reverted to the surplus funds on June 30, 1946.
[3] Repayment will take care of overobligation.

How did the Department of the Interior arrive at that situation? Let us see. You remember that last year the appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the regular annual supply bill was $252,300,000, in round figures. This is considerably less than they had available for expenditure and for obligation. That is the difference between the $465,500,000 they actually had available according to

the Budget Bureau and the annual supply bill. Where did they get the $465,000,000 then to spend? They got it because the Interior Department had practiced the habit of getting more money than they could spend in any fiscal year. The construction items were made available until expended and carried over from year to year when the Department could not spend them. Instead of trying to keep a safe kitty of funds behind them to cover emergencies, they just piled up as much as they could. In my opinion, the bureaucrats in the Department were certainly trying to pile up funds that they knew they could not spend in the year's time for which they were asking money in each annual appropriation bill.

The President has liberalized his original special antiinflation treatment of the Bureau of Reclamation twice. He slapped this subcommittee, and he slapped the Congress, and he slapped the members of his own party with a freeze order. In other words, his freeze order said that amount of money appropriated last year, if expended and obligated, would be inflationary not only n the fiscal year 1947, but he also had his eye on the future. He said the appropriations for construction should not be expended at a higher rate in the fiscal year 1948.

On October 26, on the eve of election, he liberalized his freeze order with reference to the Bureau of Reclamation. In the first instance, on August 2, they had available in the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditure some $209,000,000 which had been piled up from the 1947 annual supply bill and previous years. The President in effect said, "If the Bureau of Reclamation spends that much money, that is inflationary. More than that, next year it will be inflationary. So I limit you for each of the fiscal years." This is the President talking now, just as we were adjourning the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress. His own party had appropriated the money and had followed through the recommendations of his budget estimates. He said, "$85,000,000 is all you can spend this fiscal year for the Bureau of Reclamation, and $85,000,000 the next fiscal year."

On the basis of the President's freeze order we would not have to appropriate for the Bureau of Reclamation for two and one-half fiscal years. It is just as simple as dividing $209,000,000 by the rate of expenditure of the President, $85,000,000 a year. On October 22 he liberalized the order and allowed the Bureau of Reclamation to spend $25,000,000 more, or $110,000,000, leaving $99,000,000 still frozen.

As late as January 10, 1947, 40 days before the Bureau of Reclamation hearings were started before our subcommittee, he had only released $130,000,000 for expenditure in this fiscal year out of $209,000,000 available for construction to this one agency. The rest of this amount is tied up as indicated in the report. It is tied up today, and all of the hue and cry about the action of this subcommittee does not explain why members of his own party from August 2, 1946, to this very day have not sponsored a bill to unfreeze these funds which have already been appropriated by the Congress.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I introduced a resolution a few days ago to try to unfreeze these funds because it seems to me that when the Chief Executive can freeze moneys appropriated by the Congress, whether it be the Department of Interior or for national defense, he therefore controls the pursestrings and certainly such an act by the Chief Executive should not be permitted by the Congress, particularly in this case where he signed the bill with a half a dozen pens and gave people the pens as souvenirs and said, "This is a fine bill; please step forward and get your pen."

On August 2 the House adjourned. On August 3, in a letter dated August 2, the freeze order was in effect. I have a resolution in now. I hope the committee will see fit to act on it to see that not only these funds but future funds appropriated by the Congress cannot be frozen or made inactive by the Chief Executive.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit me to make a correction, I did not say that the present majority party had not introduced a resolution to unfreeze these funds. I said none of the President's party had introduced a bill to unfreeze these funds.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Was the committee able to ascertain whether or not the authority under which the President proceeded to freeze these funds still exists?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The committee did not inquire into that because this is a committee to appropriate. We assumed since the President froze the funds they would be available in the next fiscal year and we made our appropriation on that basis. But I would like to discuss that a little further as we go along.

There has been a lot of loose talk about this bill discontinuing many worth-while projects. I call your attention to the committee report on pages 3, 4, 5, and 6, to the amount available at the beginning of the fiscal year 1947, which is July 1, 1946, calendar year. The amount that the President froze is in the second column and the net available allowed for expenditure by the President at the end of the fiscal year 1947. You will note that in the first place there had been voted for construction $287,908,605. The President reserved of this and froze so that it could not be spent $125,193,605. That $125,193,605 is there. It is in the President's hands. It is available to him. He can freeze it or he can unfreeze it. People who have been circulating this information about the committee's action, that we are discontinuing worthwhile projects, need just to look at these first few pages of the committee report to understand fairly and squarely that the committee has not been penny pinching in the appropriation of these 1948 fiscal year funds. It is quite obvious that the people have been circulating this information for political purposes or in a downright misrepresentation of the facts. It is quite obvious that a smear campaign is under way, but this Congress will not be deterred in its efforts to restore efficiency in the Department of the Interior.

If we did not appropriate a cent for the Bonneville Power Administration, for instance, it would have to expend, in the fiscal year 1948, $500,000 more than the President let them spend this fiscal year.

Let us take a look at the table on page 3. You will see they had available $23,000,000. How much did the President freeze? Eleven million seven hundred fifty-five thousand dollars. How much did that leave them to spend? Eleven million three hundred ten thousand dollars. So if we did not appropriate a cent they would have $500,000 more. The committee was very liberal with the Bonneville Power Administration. What did we allow them? Six million nine hundred seven thousand eight hundred dollars. Is this committee against the sound use of hydroelectric power in the West and Southwest with that kind of a record?

Let us look at another item. You will remember that last year on the floor of the House there was voted for the Southwest Power Administration $7,500,000, for the transmission and sale of electric energy from two dams, Norfork and Denison Dams, in Arkansas and Texas, respectively. That was appropriated by the Congress, signed and sealed by the President, and the money became available to the Southwest Power Administration. How did the President treat those funds that Congress had so liberally voted? Well, he froze $3,700,000 of it, and that is still frozen. If we did not appropriate 1 cent for the Southwest Power Administration they would have only $100,000 less than the President let them spend this year. How much did this pinch-penny committee, as it has labeled, appropriate for the Southwest Power Administration? We have been very liberal in what we think is a sound program to get a return for the Government on the investment it has already made in those dams. If we provide the additional money, money in addition to the $7,500,000 that was voted last year, we can tie the two dams together. What is the situation in the Southwest? You have a negligible amount of water sometimes in a year, and you have flash floods. These dams were built for the purpose of storing the water that comes down the rivers during these flash floods. The firm power generated at any hydroelectric dam is power that is sure during all seasons of the year, all hours of the day. It is power generated from water at the low-water mark of the river. If you consider firm energy from these two dams separately you have a smaller amount of firm power to sell, but when you connect them together you can make the low water in one river, going through its dam generators complement the low water passing through the other dam generators in the other river, and get more firm power to sell. The Ad-

ministrator of the Southwest Power Administration estimates that from 10 to 30 percent more firm power would be generated at Southwest Power Administration if we provided the money to tie the two dams together. So it may look figure-wise, and the demagog may say we have cut the life out of the Southwest Power Administration, but on the basis of sound facts and return on Government investment to build up more firm power that can be marketed successfully, we provided the necessary amount, $1,246,000. That is the necessary amount.

One dime more cannot be defended at this time.

Now, let us look at the Indian Service. I am just covering construction items now because that is where the heat of criticism has been. We are labeled as destroying these great construction projects. The Indian Service has some construction items for irrigation, and buildings, and utilities, and roads.

On the first day of the present fiscal year, July 1, 1946, the Indian Service has $11,173,000. How much did the President freeze? He froze $6,289,838, and left them to spend this year $4,883,000.

If we do not appropriate one red cent for the Indian Service construction items for the fiscal year 1948, and if the President would just unfreeze the funds he has frozen they would have a million more to spend. What did the committee do? It considered the pleas of the Indian Service and the Indian population and the committee has looked upon the needs of the Indians and said: You need this much more money appropriated for your buildings and for your utilities to carry on an orderly program of construction; so we appropriated liberally for the Indian Service, and with the freezing order funds they will have $11,736,838 for construction of irrigation systems, buildings, utilities, and roads.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. A few minutes ago the gentleman was discussing the question of the reduction of funds for the power section of the Department of the Interior. Control of power was given to the Department of the Interior under section 5 of the Flood Control Act.

I wish to advise the gentleman and the House that I have introduced a bill to repeal that section and to place the power authority back in the Federal Power Commission and under the Army engineers where it was in the first place.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his observation. We had to appropriate according to the law as it stands today and we have taken care of our responsibilities thereunder.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Michigan has referred to a bill which he introduced. I noted with a great deal of interest the provisions of the bill; I have read it. I am just a little bothered to know whether it may not establish two or three different sales agencies to deal with power and whether or not it may not mean that we may have two or three different yardsticks to determine the proper price of Federal power.

Mr. DONDERO. If I may answer the gentleman——

Mr. JONES of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman to wait until we get to the theories and formulas of the basic legislation just a little later?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio regarding his comment about being liberal with the Indian Service? Does the gentleman refer only to construction funds?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I am referring to construction funds at this point; yes. I am taking up all the construction items because that is where the heat and criticism is being turned on the Committee and I want to challenge those who say we have ripped the West up the back.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What I am wondering about is whether enough funds have been provided to operate the education facilities which your Indian Service already has.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I will get to that later.

Mr. CURTIS. Just one further question with reference to the freeze order on funds for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I have not come to that item. Wait until I get to that.

Mr. CURTIS. I thought the gentleman had passed it.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. No, no.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well; I will wait.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. With the amounts allowed in the bill for the Bureau of Reclamation for the fiscal year 1948 we have provided $11,000,000 more for the fiscal year 1948 than the President allowed them to spend this year.

Bear in mind we have also allowed with the frozen funds and the amount of new money, $11,000,000 more for expenditure in the fiscal year 1948 than the President allowed to be spent in the fiscal year 1947.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intent of the Committee that they want the President to unfreeze these funds and make available for construction the money that the Congress has already appropriated?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Let me continue and I will answer the gentleman categorically in a moment. I do not want to break up the continuity of my statement.

These facts effectively answer the campaign of misinformation that has been spread across the country and especially among the Western States.

We have some construction items in the National Park Service. Last year they had available $25,622,000. How much did the President freeze? Seventeen million dollars. He only let them spend $8,000,000.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee recognizes that there will be a large customer population in all the parks this year. We know they have been on a stand-by, caretaker basis during the war. We want to fulfill our obligations and provide the necessary roads, buildings, and facilities to take care of the public so that they may fully enjoy the great national resources in these parks. So the committee was very liberal and, although the Park Service would have twice as much money to spend on roads and trails and on buildings and physical improvements as it had last year if we did not appropriate another cent, the committee has fulfilled its obligation to the public and has provided some $2,650,000 more for this purpose.

Turning next to government in the Territories, we have a little different consideration there. The General Staff has emphasized the importance of rebuilding the Alaska Railroad; it has emphasized the importance of building roads, so that in case of a national emergency the great Territory of Alaska may be protected by the Army. So the President's freeze order did not apply last year to the funds appropriated for construction of roads and trails, as well as other buildings and utilities in Alaska. We have allowed the full amount of the budget estimate so that there will be no question but that any spot in the Territory of Alaska may be protected by our armed services.

Mr. Chairman, that winds up all of the construction items in the bill.

The people of the West are just as eager as are the people of the remainder of the country to see that the people's money is wisely spent. Westerners can see better than anyone else the carelessness and lack of sound planning that has marred some of the worth-while projects in their parts of the country. They welcome the effort of this Republican Congress to see that an orderly program for helping the West in developing its natural resources shall be put into effect, and they want that done now.

Now, the President's freeze orders did not affect only 1947 funds. The President had his eye on 1948 funds. In every letter to the Interior Department, he indicates that construction programs for public works in the whole Government should be cut in half. And he indicated that the other half would be used in the fiscal year 1948. Bear in mind, he cut the Bureau of Reclamation 60 percent.

Apparently the President thought it was more offensive to inflationary pressures than any other item in his public-works program, because you will note on page 44 of the hearings a statement by the President dated October 24 where he is only cutting all public works from $1,600,000,000 to $900,000,000. He is only cutting other public works across the board for every executive agency 43 percent at this rate.

Now, we certainly are taking the President at his word. We are not assuming that he is hypocritical by cutting the over-all public works appropriations 43 percent and singling out reclamation in the first instance for a 60-percent cut.

We are glad to have President Truman cooperate with us in this antiinflation program. The subcommittee, too, believes that inflation is deadly in its economic effect to the whole Nation. The subcommittee agrees with the President that public works expenditures are inflationary, when the Government bids in the market price for critically short materials and runs the price up on them to increase the cost of living across the board for the common man.

Now, the only difficulty with the President's letter is that his departments are trying to double-cross him. I assume that the President is sincere. We are trying to uphold his hand. But his Interior budget estimates call for construction funds of $163,810,000. Add that to the amount which he has presently frozen, available now, and which will be available in the fiscal year 1948—the same as the new funds in this bill—and he would get an over-all expenditure in 1948 of $292,071,946, for Interior Department construction.

Now did the Department of Interior double-cross the President in presenting these inflated requests? Have they violated the President's ultimatum? Or have we been handed a watered budget?

Certainly the President does not want us to appropriate his full budget request so that he can slap on the wrist a Republican Congress committed to cutting the fat and oil from Government expenditures.

We are not going to let the Department of the Interior double-cross our antiinflation program, and we have brought in a bill that, in my opinion, is still too high on the yardstick of the rate of expenditure that the President has allowed this year for construction in the west, in Alaska and all over the United States.

The President allowed in 1947 for construction $162,715,000. This bill, with the frozen funds, allows 25 percent more. Can the New Deal propaganda agencies say that we have been parsimonious with the Department of Interior?

No; there is nothing wrong with this bill. There is nothing wrong except in the 1947 fiscal year the Department of the Interior has about $300,000 to propagandize their point of view. This committee has been lambasted from the afternoon it marked up this bill in executive session. This subcommittee has observed the rules of comity between the two Houses of Congress. This subcommittee has sat quietly by as statements were made in another body based upon a misapprehension of the facts, and while those statements have gone out all over the country and while they have been reechoed with this $300,000 propaganda machine, the committee has been defenseless, and this is the first day that we have had an opportunity to present our views in any forum before the American public. You will find in the paragraphs of the report of the committee describing these actions that a major portion of the cut in the Secretary's office from $1,600,000 to $1,000,000 is to be borne by the Personnel Administration, by the Division of Information and by the Power Division of the Department of the Interior.

I believe that if the great widespread activities of the Department of the Interior are sound, they will rise and stand upon the basis of their worth. If they are all good, if everything they are doing is beneficial to the public, then they do not need $300,000 to propagandize and misrepresent the facts to the public, misrepresent the subcommittee, and put us in a bad light with the country until we get an opportunity to speak our piece and make the facts known.

Now, are we in a fair fight with these propagandists? Are we? Well, I will say we are not. Only four members of this subcommittee of seven are trying to hold the position against this great Department's inflationary movement. We have only four members of the subcommittee trying to hold down inflation. What chance have four people, taking care of their constituents' business, taking care of all of the other jobs that come to a Congressman's desk, and trying to fight a great landed interest like that? I have faith that the American people will get to know the truth and that they will come forward with the right answers and will support the action of this committee. The Republican Party must face the issue with the President. Last year a New Deal majority voted new money for the 1947 fiscal year for the over-all expenditure of the Government. Thirty-three billion of new money was voted in the annual supply bills for all executive agencies for the fiscal year 1947.

The Republican Party cannot avoid the fact that there was available for all Government agencies, for expenditure in this 1947 fiscal year, not $33,000,000,000 of new money that we voted but $57,000,000,000. We talk about cutting back expenditures to $37,000,000,000. A great hue and cry has been raised that we are going to fail. I tell you that we can make good every tax cut, we can make good every promise that we made to the electorate, if we take cognizance of this great, vast, surplus of moneys which are held in a kitty by the executive branch of the Government. Nobody will challenge these figures.

New money appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 during the last calendar year was $33,019,328,535. I have a letter from the Budget Bureau, which I shall insert in the RECORD at this point, which shows that there is available for all departments and agencies of Government for this fiscal year $57,674,586,235.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., September 20, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: The information requested in your letters of July 3 and July 27 on the balances of appropriations and contract authorizations as of June 30, 1946, which are available for the fiscal year 1947, is contained in the enclosed tables, itemized by agencies and bureaus grouped and totaled according to the annual appropriation acts. For your convenience we have also shown on this table the 1947 appropriations and contract authorizations and the sum of the appropriations and balances available to each agency for obligation during the fiscal year 1947.

The amounts shown include all general and special fund appropriations but do not include trust fund appropriations. Column 1 includes the appropriations and contract authorizations made available for obligation during 1947 by the annual and supplemental appropriation acts, plus amounts becoming available under permanent appropriations. Appropriations made to liquidate contract authorizations are eliminated in combining the appropriations and contract authorizations in order to avoid the duplication which would otherwise occur. The total thus arrived at of appropriations and contract authorizations made available to all the agencies of the Government by the 1947 annual and supplemental appropriation acts amounts to $33,019,328,535.

The unexpended balances as of June 30, 1946, as shown in columns 2, 3, and 4 of the attached table exclude the balances of 1944 appropriations which lapsed and reverted to the surplus fund of the Treasury on June 30, 1946. The balances shown in these columns also exclude the amounts rescinded by title II of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, approved July 23, 1946. These unexpended balances as of June 30, 1946, are broken down between unliquidated obligations (column 2) and unobligated balances (columns 3 and 4). The unobligated balances are broken down in turn between those available (column 3) and those not available (column 4) for obligation in 1947. The unobligated balances not available for obligation after June 30, 1946 (column 4) are the balances of the 1945 and 1946 annual appropriations which expired on June 30, 1945 and 1946, respectively, and are no longer available for obligation. The amounts available for obligation after June 30, 1946 (column 3) are the balances of continuing appropriations, which remain available indefinitely.

The total appropriations and contract authorizations available to the various agencies for obligation during the fiscal year 1947 of $36,864,622,235 (column 5) are the sum of the 1947 appropriations and contract authorizations (column 1) and the unobligated balances available for obligation after June 30, 1946 (column 3). The unliquidated obligations of $20,809,964,000 (column 2) may be added to the total amount available for obligation (column 5) to arrive at the total available for expenditure (disbursement) during 1947, or subsequently. This total amount available for expenditure is $57,674,586,235.

Very truly yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Administrative Assistant.

What does that mean? Twenty-four billion dollars has been cached away, $24,000,000,000 the executive branch of the Government wants to hold onto from year to year, and a part of that is $465,500,000 in the Department of the Interior. This appropriation bill for the Interior Department is a fight to drag out of the sack some of that $24,000,000,000. It should not be there. Congress, if it does its duty, and this Republican Congress will, will start dragging out of the sock funds that are not in use but which are available for expenditure the same as if we voted them anew last year.

Now I want to analyze this $465,500,000 that was available at the beginning of the present fiscal year—one of the reasons why the President had to present the freeze order in order to stop

inflation. How does it work out? According to the Budget Bureau, $195,952,130 is available for administration, operation, and research, available for obligation during the fiscal year 1947. The next table is the same "in the sock" money represented by construction, and I shall insert it in the RECORD at this point.

Department of the Interior—Statement of unexpended balances as of June 30, 1946, and appropriations for fiscal year 1947, for construction accounts

Organization unit and appropriation title	Unexpended balances, June 30, 1946		Appropriations, 1947	Total available for expenditures, 1947
	Unliquidated obligations	Unobligated balances		
Bonneville Power Administration: Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system	$12,839,923	$2,433,604	[1] $12,470,000	$27,743,527
War Relocation Authority, transferred from: Community facilities, defense public works, Office of Administrator, Federal Works Agency	253	4,216		4,469
Southwestern Power Administration:				
Construction			7,500,000	5,500,000
Public Works Administration, act of 1938	416,460			416,460
General Land Office:				
Working fund (access roads)	17,082	37,518		54,600
Working fund (public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks)	2,292	16,608		18,900
Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
Construction:				
Irrigation systems (reimbursable)	99,090	631,702	[1] 924,038	1,654,830
Buildings and utilities, Indian Service	9,033	1,861,582	3,023,800	4,894,415
Roads, Indian reservations	357,545	371,587	[1] 3,700,000	4,429,132
Bureau of Reclamation:				
Reclamation fund, special fund, construction:				
Altus	17	1,991,225	2,664,610	4,655,852
Belle Fourche		28,547		28,547
Boise-Anderson ranch	100,615	288,166	2,040,735	2,429,516
Boise drainage		143,523		143,523
Boise-Payette	28,746	3,389,827	2,782,659	6,201,232
Carlsbad	12,887	34,747		47,634
Colorado-Big Thompson	48,717	109,383		158,100
Deschutes	135,905	1,380,597	1,716,837	3,233,339
Gila	35,605	36,510		72,115
Grand Valley		122,132		122,132
Humboldt		3,568		3,568
Hungry Horse	7,892	21,937		29,829
Hyrum		1,289		1,289
Kendrick	12,378	753,359	1,895,000	2,660,737
Klamath	84,086	1,282,805	1,281,605	2,648,496
Minidoka	11,231	646,912	1,000,000	1,658,143
Ogden River	6	40,007	62,000	102,013
Orland		35,000		35,000
Owyhee	1,704	209,557	125,000	336,261
Palisades	49,018	1,400,850	650,410	2,100,278
Paonia		848,471		848,471
Pine River		11,912		11,912
Provo River	65,585	1,534,877	2,223,520	3,823,982
Rio Grande—East Butte	28,132	893,731	360,675	1,282,534
Riverton	10,502	1,695,232	3,520,550	5,226,288
Salt River		394,261		394,261
San Luis Valley		1,000,000	650,410	1,650,410
Shoshone-Heart Mountain	13,735	1,316,170	1,917,672	3,247,577
Shoshone-Power	1,475	1,140,279		1,141,754
Shoshone-Willwood	356	70,439	196,895	267,690
Sun River	11,980	65,809	41,625	119,414
Tucumcari	15,763	1,985,116	1,738,000	3,738,879
Uncompahgre		5,182		5,182
Upper Snake River		25		25
Vale	51	139		190
Yakima		100,000		100,000
Yakima-Roza Division	101	1,637,822	2,597,100	4,235,023
Yuma		100,000		100,000
Total, reclamation fund, construction	676,487	24,719,406	27,465,303	52,861,196
Reclamation projects, payable from general fund:				
Gila project, Arizona (reimbursable)	83,190	1,500,036	2,000,000	3,583,226
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada (reimbursable)	157,614	7,844,270	7,500,000	15,501,884
Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California (reimbursable)	156,555	164,295		320,850
Central Valley project, California (reimbursable)	3,281,779	28,298,460	12,685,622	44,265,861
Kings River project, California			100,000	100,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado (reimbursable)	280,659	3,858,790	7,504,075	11,643,524
Pine River project, Colorado (reimbursable)	296	13,454		13,750
San Luis Valley project, Colorado (reimbursable)	273	385,172		385,445
Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch (reimbursable)	192,984	316,128		509,112
Hungry Horse project, Montana (reimbursable)		1,491,256	867,210	2,358,466
Tucumcari project, New Mexico (reimbursable)	84,672	756,349		841,021
Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma (reimbursable)	31,338	433,650		464,988
Colorado River project, Texas (reimbursable)	3,873	46,346	68,400	118,619
Provo River project, Utah (reimbursable)	19,610	162		19,772
Columbia Basin project, Washington (reimbursable)	335,616	12,866,084	18,000,000	31,201,700
Yakima project, Washington, Roza division (reimbursable)	19,948	109,889		129,837
Water conservation and utility projects (reimbursable)	144,856	4,122,136	3,340,000	7,606,992
Fort Peck project, Montana (reimbursable)	18,029	992,602	932,893	1,943,524
Missouri River Basin (reimbursable) (no year)	140,083	8,960,273	17,500,000	26,600,356
Missouri River Basin (reimbursable)	36,663	749,084		785,747
Advances to Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project		1,175,382	433,605	1,608,987
Advances to Colorado River dam fund, All-American Canal		3,250,025	5,000,000	8,250,025
Colorado River front work and levee system	2,682	83,382	600,000	686,064
Valley gravity canal and storage project, Texas	5,037	1,716,023		1,721,060
Transferred from:				
Community facilities, defense public works, Office of Administrator, Federal Works Agency	34,896	286,702		321,598
Flood control, general, War Department	32	34,139		34,171
Geological Survey:				
Transferred from:				
Flood control, general, War Department	132,612	169,579		302,191
Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works, War Department	24,431	42,962		67,393

[1] Includes maintenance and operation.

Department of the Interior—Statement of unexpended balances as of June 30, 1946, and appropriations for fiscal year 1947, for construction accounts—Continued

Organization unit and appropriation title	Unexpended balances, June 30, 1946		Appropriations, 1947	Total available for expenditures, 1947
	Unliquidated obligations	Unobligated balances		
Bureau of Mines:				
Construction and equipment of anthracite research laboratory			$450,000	$450,000
Synthetic liquid fuels	$2,845,817	$19,509,784	[2] 5,250,000	27,605,601
Construction and equipment of helium plants (national defense)	1,307,689	673,474		1,981,163
Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. (national defense)	20,810	37,381		58,191
National Park Service:				
Roads and trails, national parks, emergency construction	691	5,926		6,617
Roads and trails	136,220	3,819,676	[1] 6,000,000	9,955,896
Parkways			[1] 11,000,000	11,000,000
Physical improvements, buildings and utilities	9,216	167,665	1,330,000	1,506,881
Blue Ridge, Natchez Trace, and George Washington Memorial Parkways	887,282	9,665,910		10,553,192
Fish and Wildlife Service: Construction of byproducts plant, Pribilof Islands, Alaska	14,937	41,283		56,220
Government in the Territories:				
Territory of Alaska:				
Wagon roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska (receipt limitation)	92,096		[1] 140,000	232,096
Construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska	821,363	50,000	[1] 2,600,000	3,471,363
Construction of Palmer-Richardson Road, Alaska (national defense)	83			83
Reconstruction and improvement of Richardson Highway, Alaska (national defense)	323,079		750,000	1,073,079
Government of the Virgin Islands:				
Transferred from: Community facilities, defense public works, Federal Works Agency	3,498			3,498
Puerto Rico: Emergency relief, revolving fund, act Feb. 11, 1936	116,400	2,927,096		3,043,496
Total, construction accounts, Department of the Interior	26,185,074	146,641,048	159,134,946	331,961,068

[1] Includes maintenance and operation.
[2] Includes research and operations.

The Budget Bureau says that, with trust funds and every other item, they have available for construction in the fiscal year 1947, $269,618,946. That gives you a sample of the problem. The subcommittee had to find out what was necessary to run the Department of the Interior on a more efficient basis in 1948. That shows you why there was a 10-pound record. I am not ashamed for one minute that we probably struck a new high in the number of pages and in the number of exhibits in conducting this hearing. We have had in the past a bunch of slipshod statements presented to the committee that are not backed up by the facts. This subcommittee intends to get the facts and it intends to be able to be in a position to prove those facts, one table against another. If you find two or three tables on the same subject you will know we are approaching it from different angles so that we can audit their books for them.

The Republican Party cannot avoid the issue that the President instead of having an over-all appropriation in 1947 of $33,000,000,000 has had $24,000,000,000 extra available to spend.

The Republican Party should either rescind that $24,000,000,000 or we ought to do in all the appropriation bills like this subcommittee did—count the $24,000,000,000 in, a part of which is frozen, because says the President, it is inflationary. In our approach to the appropriations for the 1948 fiscal year, that is exactly what we did. I think it is unsound to do otherwise. I think it would be indefensible when we have been committed to cut appropriations to the bone. If we take cognizance of this $24,000,000,000 kitty in the executive branch of the Government in our appropriation of funds for the 1948 fiscal year, I say again, we can make every promise of a tax cut to the Nation come true and we can substantially reduce the Federal debt. If we do as Mr. Krug would like to have us do, we would appropriate new money for the President and let him keep the $24,000,000,000 kitty in a frozen or inactive fund to release it in the campaign year of 1948 in an effort to whip every Republican Congressman. I am one subcommittee chairman that he could not whip with frozen funds or embarrass by freezing the money next August.

We come out on the floor and say to the House, "This is the kind of a bill we promised the electorate in 1946. This bill is an honest bill. It is an honest cut and consistent with our anti-inflation program for the fiscal year 1948."

Some folks have tried to make this a fight between the East and the West. As a matter of fact, that is a Krug political pipe dream. The New Deal bureaucrats are trying to create a rift in the Republican Party. But they will fail. The Republican Party is united for sound, economic appropriations, whether they be for something in the East, the West, the North, or the South.

The Department of the Interior has not cooperated with the subcommittee and will not cooperate with the Congress and reemphasize the most important parts of their program so that we can separate the wheat from the chaff. There are items in the bill not supported by the public for work provided in the budget estimates, so they go from one executive agency of the Government to the other drumming up business. In other words, if they cannot get the public to ask for it, then they get other Government agencies to ask for the services so they can keep the pay roll loaded. One such item appears in the Bureau of Mines. The committee very conscientiously is giving every taxpayer a fair break. Most of us when we pay our taxes only expect the blessings of liberty guaranteed by the Constitution and the protection of the Army and Navy. That is all we ask. Many people do not even own a suit of clothes, a pair of pants and vest, and coat to match. Well, then, why should the great corporations and why should individuals be able to get services from the Government and not pay for them?

There have been large items providing for special services to private enterprises with which they can make a profit. The committee eliminated such services to the oil and gas industry. One reason is that there is no basic authority for the activity. The other reason is if the Government is going to render these special services and gather statistics for the oil and gas industry, basic legislation ought to be adopted which would underwrite the cost of the special services, and private industry using them for profit should pay for them.

The Bureau of Mines proposed to give special free statistical services to the coal industry. When the Bituminous Coal Act was in force before the war, the industry underwrote the cost of this statistical service by a percentage of the coal produced. The Bituminous Coal Act has been liquidated, and during the war the Solid Fuels Administration took over the job as a war function. Now, the war is over. The Solid Fuels Administration is liquidated. What happens to the service? The Bureau of Mines proposes to do the same old job for free which the Government used to get paid for under the Bituminous Coal Act. The committee eliminated that fund. If industry wants it all well and good, but let them pay for it like they used to. So, the Bureau of Mines' estimate to continue a peacetime job for nothing so that private industry can make a profit is discontinued.

The committee says this special service without basic legislation should not be performed.

Commercial fisheries have gotten free service in past years. The committee did not cut them out altogether, because this approach has not come up before, but we have rolled them back to before-the-war and early war years. We think in the next 2 months basic legislation

can be adopted for this great industry to underwrite the cost of this commercial service, the same as we propose for the oil, gas, and coal industries. Wherever we could find the Government contributing to or underwriting completely programs that should be carried on by the States, the committee has eliminated or curtailed their operation. Several States have provisions in their laws that all children of their citizens should be educated. The committee cut the budget estimate for Indian education to $8,000,000, to give the States an opportunity to assume some of that responsibility under their respective State laws.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. May I please go on for a little bit? I will yield later.

We will look at this item very closely next year. The Indian Service has increased from $19,000,000 in 1933 to a request for $44,500,000 in 1948. We have rolled them back to $33,122,000. Remember when the Indian Reorganization Act was passed in 1934? The Indian Service Commissioner at that time stated that this act would mean economic freedom for the Indians. Since that time the miseries of the Indians have increased in proportion to the increase in appropriation. We have not cut the health and welfare items of the Indians, but we have cut the administrative expenses to the point of digging into the fat. This committee has appropriated funds for the Department of the Interior with an objective point of view, consistent with the mandate of the people given to us in November 1946. The main attack on the committee's action has been with reference to construction items and we repeat again that it is not wise management for the Government to plan to go forward with millions of dollars in construction at a time when private business is anxiously seeking in the market places the same commodities for which the Government will be priority buyer.

If construction projects requested by the Department of the Interior are allowed in full, the reclamation appropriations in this bill are difficult to handle, because the reclamation law is a hodgepodge of legislative bills and legislation on appropriation bills from 1902 to date. As a matter of fact, the legislative situation is so bad that the Bureau of Reclamation gets separate authorizations for projects, and then picks out the most favorable portions of every law enacted to date, to abuse the spirit and intent of the framers of the separate several laws. They try to pick out one sentence or one paragraph in the law instead of considering the entire law. They use one part of an act as a crutch in order to take advantage of the nonreimbursability features, and boldly proclaim the other sections of the law do not apply. There should be a complete recodification of the entire law in order to bring down consistent, sound policy to date, so that the committee can act intelligently on the requests. This situation has made appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation most difficult. There have been so many exceptions, divisions, and special provisions that we have a hard time making ourselves experts on the subject of considering these appropriations for reclamation. When the Appropriations Committee confronts the bureaus with their separate authorization, they run to cover under the 1939 act. At one point in the hearings Commissioner Straus quoted the directives of the flood-control law for the formula for the disposition of power from a reclamation project. That points up with the fact that we have no national power policy. It is not denied by the Bureau of Reclamation. It is simple and obvious that flood-control dams are only required to return investment allocated to power. No interest; nothing else. Reclamation projects are required to return investment in power, plus interest at 3 percent, and irrigation investment without interest beyond the water user's ability to pay.

The Interior Department is charged with the responsibility of selling power at the cheapest possible rate to encourage the most widespread use of the power generated at flood-control dams. It is charged with the responsibility of making reclamation dams feasible and the only way they can be made feasible is for power to pay some of the irrigation freight. It is obvious that the two policies are inconsistent, incompatible, and that there ought to be a complete review of the whole power law to see if we are not running into a set of facts that means disaster for the West, for the South, for the East, and for the North.

Obviously, reclamation dams must charge more for electricity than flood-control dams. We are approaching a time now when flood-control dams will be backing water up against reclamation dams, and it is plain to see that flood-control power sold in the same transmission area with reclamation power will break the feasibility of the reclamation projects. That is simple, that is elementary. To have them in the same transmission area where there is the same amount of water to run the machinery of each kind of dam, you are running into real trouble. So you have reclamation in competition with flood control; it is the same as free labor versus slave labor where one has to get more money to exist than the other.

See what happened up in the Columbia River where, the Interior officials have avoided the unsound situation by creating the Bonneville Power Administration, a marketing agency within the Department. They have settled the differences in these pay-out requirements by contract in order to cover up the inconsistencies in the two laws for the two dams, on the same river, that have been joined together in one transmission system. They have provided in the contract that the War Department dam would have to return 2½ percent interest a year by contract without authority of law, instead of both agencies sitting around the conference table with Members of Congress and telling us that they had reached the point where they have an unsound program. Instead of that they try to cover it up by a marketing-agency contract with the War Department and the Reclamation Bureau.

This committee must look at appropriations as a board of directors would look at expenditure of funds in a private corporation. There is nothing more nor less in the 10 pounds of the hearings than an effort to try to put the Department's huge and vast resources, owned by the Government, where they can be maintained on a sound business basis.

I contend that when the Columbia Basin is fully developed as is presently authorized; when the dams presently authorized are constructed, you will have, on the Columbia River, water backed up by flood-control dams against reclamation dams. When that happens you will find that you have to join them together in a valley authority. How many people in the West want to belong to a Columbia Valley Authority? How many? And yet if you allow this situation to continue until all the dams are constructed you will find it will be a fait accompli—it will be accomplished—and you cannot do anything about it.

This committee wants to see the program for the West put upon a sound basis.

Now, let us go on a step further. The Columbia Basin, as you know, has an unlimited amount of water. My, the huge and tremendous amount of electric energy that can be generated there. Tremendous. And already there is authorized several miles away, over in western Montana, in the Bonneville Power Administration, a dam. One million five hundred thousand dollars is carried in this bill for that dam to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Its power will be sold by the Bonneville Power Administration.

How will that power be sold by the Bonneville Power Administration that goes across the panhandle of Idaho? Bonneville Power Administration has a 5-year-plan, and I have it with me here, the advance program of a system of development for the Bonneville Power Administration. You will find a map of their program, and you will see that the Bonneville Power Administration also proposes to transmit electric energy into the larger portion of southern Idaho.

The cost of the generation of electric energy on these Idaho reclamation dams per kilowatt-hour is much higher than it is in the Columbia Basin, but just the same they will be in the transmission area of the Bonneville Power Administration. There is the transmission area of the Columbia Dam and the Bonneville Dam. They are in the area where they must sell their power which costs more per kilowatt to generate. Already Minidoka costs 3 mills plus per kilowatt-hour to generate power. They will be in competition with this cheap 2-mill rate of the Bonneville Administration. Obviously your Idaho projects with less water are not going to be feasible. If the Bonneville Power Administration and

the Columbia system are extended to Idaho, multiple-purpose dams there are not going to be feasible. This committee, as the board of directors, wants to know what the answer is. Are we going to provide funds for these projects in Idaho when we know that its people will be coming to Congress some day and asking for relief? How can they sell 3-mill power in the area of Minidoka, Palisades, and Anderson Ranch projects in competition with the 2-mill power of the Bonneville Administration generated on the Columbia River? It cannot be done, and instead of getting the pay-back we expect to get, we will have to have the Government subsidize these projects, which is an insult to the people of Idaho. Would you throw them on the mercy of the Government and upon the mercy of the country?

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what is the other thing we can do? The next thing we can do is to say: "O. K., you are in the Columbia River Basin. Columbia will bail you out." If the people of the West want to see a great valley authority develop, that is O. K., but all the information that I can get as chairman of the subcommittee says that each irrigation district wants to be independent with their own project. They want their projects to be sound, and I am for that. I think we ought to write the kind of policy that will make every one of them sound.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask a pointed question. I have been trying to follow the gentleman, but I have not been able to understand how we can build two systems of dams on the same river so that the water will back up into each other. We like to build multiple-purpose dams on western rivers. I will look into that a little further.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Already there are two types of dams there on the Columbia. There is a reclamation dam, the Grand Coulee, and the flood-control dam—Bonneville. There will be a number of dams that were presented by the Bonneville Administration in last year's hearings which shows a tremendous amount of power. The Bonneville Administration spent hundreds of thousands of dollars figuring out ways and means of marketing the power that will be generated at the War Department dams and at the reclamation dams.

Mr. MURDOCK. To come to the point, what is the committee's justification for cutting the budget estimate on Davis Dam from $18,000,000 to $6,200,000? Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The committee has been consistent with the President's anti-inflation program, and the over-all figure shows that we have been more liberal with the Reclamation Bureau than the President has been this year. Has the gentleman introduced a bill to unfreeze the funds of any reclamation project that were frozen by the President last August? Answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I have not introduced such a measure.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Then why is the gentleman kicking about this committee's action when we provide $11,000,000 for reclamation?

Mr. MURDOCK. That does not bear on my question. The point is, we are trying to build a dam costing $70,000,000 and do it in 5 years. How can you do that at the rate of $6,000,000 annually?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Ask the President. He set the pace. The committee is trying to provide funds for the sound development of the West. Did the gentleman complain about the President? No. He sits quietly by and says: "If the President of my party does it, it is O. K., but if a committee tries to be consistent in its anti-inflation program that we have committed ourselves to last November, then they are skunks."

Mr. Chairman, I think we have developed the point far enough.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that the action of the majority of this committee will delay the completion of the Columbia River Basin project from 1951 to 1965?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I will ask the gentleman, did he complain when the President froze the Columbia River Basin project?

Mr. ROONEY. I have not heard all of the debate by the gentleman from Ohio, but he continuously refers to a date of August 2, 1946.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is a very important date.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to show the gentleman exactly what the President said at a later date concerning every appropriation for which moneys are now asked.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I have read completely the President's statement, and it is in the hearings in full; every letter and every directive that the President and Mr. Steelman wrote to the Department of the Interior. There is no secret about that from beginning to end. As a matter of fact, the last letter was written to the Department just 10 days before we started hearings on this bill, when he unfroze the funds to $130,000,000 for over-all construction expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation. Did the gentleman ask any questions? Did he criticize the President in the hearings for freezing these funds amounting to $209,000,000, available for expenditure, down to $130,000,000? No, the gentleman was strangely quiet. The President could do no harm. But if the committee, standing by the Republican policy of anti-inflation, gives them $11,000,000 more, we have been inconsistent.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Apparently the committee thought that the President's freeze order had a lot of merit to it, and what I want to know is whether the argument of the President that he wants to combat inflation by that type of reduction is the pattern that this committee has set in its appropriations for the Interior Department?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This committee appropriates money. Last year the committee appropriated $209,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, and the President would not spend it. Now, I will ask the gentleman, in these 3 months and a half or nearly 4 months that we have been in session, has he filed a bill to unfreeze the funds?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. When did he do it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I filed one yesterday.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. O. K. But that is long after this committee report made known the facts which we developed thoroughly, away back in February, that these funds were frozen, and we challenge you why, if the committee is wrong, you did not introduce a bill to unfreeze them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not the problem. Is the pattern the President set in his freeze order the pattern that you think ought to be followed? That is a simple question.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This committee only has control of the legislative branch of the Government. The President has control of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And you have control of the money.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. But you have made some promises, I suppose, to cut the fat and the oil out of the appropriations for every branch of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have not made any promises along that line.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask a question merely so that we can get an idea where we are. Does the bill contain anything which specifically and mandatorily requests the President to unfreeze the funds he has frozen, or does the bill say the President has frozen these funds? We are going on the theory that if he releases them and you add those to what we appropriate, you have this much more than you had last year.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This committee has taken cognizance of the fact that the President has available to him these frozen funds, and it has added to those funds the amounts that are necessary to keep them on a 25-percent higher rate of construction basis than presently the President permits.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the chairman think that specific legislation by the Congress is even necessary or would it have any effect if we did pass specific legislation to unfreeze these funds? Is that not a matter entirely in the hands of the President?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This committee has religiously stayed away in this bill

from trying to write legislation on an appropriation bill. It has some ideas which it thinks are good for the sound development of the natural resources of our country. We believe that the subcommittee's views are sound. We could have written some legislation that might be helpful, but we did not. When it came to freezing funds, we did not legislate on that subject either, because that is a legislative matter and the legislative committee should do it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the chairman does not think that it actually is necessary to have any legislation if the President will merely rescind the action he has already taken?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. That is right; that is all he needs to do.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Does the chairman of the subcommittee contend that the sum of $85,826,767 of appropriations heretofore made has been frozen by the President?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Yes; it has been frozen.

Mr. BARRETT. In view of the fact that the President has frozen that amount of money from last year's appropriation, has the Bureau of Reclamation obligated all or any part of that money?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. The freeze order did not affect obligations, the freeze order reflected and limited only expenditures. The Bureau of Reclamation contended all the way through the hearings that they could obligate capital contracts in a larger amount than the freeze order, but the earnings under those contracts that were obligated should not exceed the $130,000,000. It has no reference to the amount they have obligated. All they had to watch was the earnings under the contract, that they stayed within the $130,000,000.

Mr. BARRETT. It is not true, then, that for the fiscal year 1948 the Bureau of Reclamation will be able to obligate only $62,000,000, being the new money that you have appropriated in this bill?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. We appropriate money; we do not appropriate obligations.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand that very well, but the point I am trying to determine here is if the Bureau of Reclamation has obligated the entire $85,000,000 which the President froze last August. Then of course the Bureau will not have any new money available except the money that is herein appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, Secretary Krug's condemnation of this bill reminds me of a basso profundo walking out from the wings on Truman's grand opera anti-inflation production, stepping to the footlights and singing the popular ditty "All, or Nothing at All," while the chorus of spenders, the tenors, altos, and sopranos of the New Deal, tiptoe and kick in tights across the stage. And they get their cue from the White House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the Interior Department appropriation bill. The Budget Bureau has made a request to Congress for $295,000,000 to run the Interior Department. The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department, of which I happen to be a member, has cut that to $156,000,000. Let us try to see in simple language what that means.

Fred Allen, the radio comedian, probably one of the highest-priced comedians in radio, was taken off the air last week for 35 seconds. There appeared in the papers on Monday last a statement by him as to how much the 35 seconds he was off the air had cost the people that were sponsoring him, just 35 seconds, and how ruthless the broadcasting company was in taking him off the air. He said the way the broadcasting company took him off the air and how cruel and nearsighted they were reminded him of the time when he went into a pool parlor years ago and rented a pool table for an hour, for which he generally paid 60 cents; we all know that. When he went to shoot, somebody had taken the cue and he could not shoot. Not only did this committee that I am on take the cue, but they even took the balls to make sure there would be no game.

Back in the days of the depression the American Chamber of Commerce used to sing a song called Who's Afraid of the Big Bad Wolf. The chambers of commerce used to open up every meeting with that song. Now, I had not heard about the big bad wolf since the early thirties until the day that this committee functioned. Every time any of the members on the majority side got a liberal idea or a progressive thought in their minds and were going to execute it, they were threatened, "If you do, I will take in the big, bad wolf," who was the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations—and he votes. That is the kind of difficulty we had in putting this bill together.

Let us see what this bill does. During this week two Members of Congress voted their convictions about a man who appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities of this Congress for saying that Russia probably was a great country and was cited by that committee for contempt. Only two Members of the Congress voted to sustain that man.

But let us turn to the fish and wildlife item that is in this bill. We cut it in half. The fish and wildlife perform a service that is rendered not only to the sportsmen of America, to the men that fish for sport, but to the men who make a living going out in the fogs and storms and everything like that. What did we do?

We had a bill before the Congress a couple of years ago, if my memory serves me right, and only one gentleman voted in the negative against that bill. He was from Ohio. That was the lease-lend bill. Under that bill, we gave to Russia, mind you—and every Republican and Democrat in this House, except one, voted for that bill—we gave to Russia 10 of the finest equipped ships in the world for research in the fishing business. The Russian fishermen go into the Seven Seas and they have already discovered where the fish beds are and where they play around. They can go and get the fish. But what have we done for John American? Remember, we gave Russia 10 of these boats. The United States Government does not have one of the boats. In this year's budget was an appropriation for one boat for the purpose of getting this information for the fishermen of America and the people of America who earn their living by fishing. We turned them down. We would not give an American 1 boat, but we gave Russia 10 boats and almost everybody in this Congress voted for it.

I wonder how they will ever record that down at the Archives? How will that be recorded in history—that they condemned one man and only two people voted against it—but to build and give a boat to America—oh, no, we cannot do that—that is for America.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to the lease-lend boats which were given to Russia, that was under lend-lease. Therefore why does not your administration get them back?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am talking about Americanism and not administrationism. I said every Republican and Democrat in the House voted for that measure at that time, and rightfully so.

Mr. KEAN. Why do you not get them back now if they were under lend-lease?

Mr. KIRWAN. The day we gave them the boats we were satisfied to give them and to give them everything they wanted to save this country and help win the war. Every Republican and every Democrat was satisfied.

Mr. KEAN. But that was under lend-lease.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is now being attended to, but let us appropriate for one boat for America. The lend-lease agreement is now being renegotiated between Russia and America, but in the interval that will take we still lack the one boat for our own people.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Going back to the gentleman's story about the pool table and the cue ball and the cue sticks, according to what has been said, President Truman has the table and we cannot play. That is what his freezing of the fund amounts to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Why did President Truman freeze the funds? Will you answer that?

Mr. McDONOUGH. You answer it.

Mr. KIRWAN. You proceeded to tell me that he had done it. Now tell me why did he do it? Why did President Truman freeze the funds?

Mr. McDONOUGH. You tell us.

Mr. KIRWAN. I can tell you very easily. After we adjourned and went back to the mountains and the seashore in July it was a godsend that somebody was down here in Washington looking after this country. We had strikes and unrest all over the Nation and President Truman froze those funds rather than put them in competition with private business. Business could not get the material to build homes for veterans, so President Truman said, "Freeze those funds and keep them frozen until the steel plants start producing steel."

Mr. McDONOUGH. But he still has the money.

Mr. KIRWAN. He still has the money and he is trying to get this committee here to let go of it.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I asked the chairman of the subcommittee when he was on the floor a moment ago how he accounted for the cut of $18,000,000 down to $6,250,000 on the Davis Dam. His reply was, "Go and ask the President what he has done with the money. He has frozen it." He did not yield to me further. But as a matter of fact, the President did not freeze any funds or withhold any funds from the building of the Davis Dam. I was over there twice last autumn. The Utah Construction Co. was going along with the building and they were ahead of schedule, but they have only a limited amount of funds to work on, and they will be stopped if they do not have the funds granted in this bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The President's order did not stop any project under construction. It only delayed the beginning of new construction, but by this bill we will stop construction, stop contracts now under way in Central Valley, in the Columbia River Basin, on Davis Dam, and on numbers of projects, which will increase the over-all cost of every one of them and when they are completed it will make the cost of water and electricity higher for every user.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his contribution.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I have in my possession a letter from Acting Commissioner Warren, giving the dates. The letter was mailed as of November 4, 1946. In the letter he says:

> You may also be interested in knowing that this lifting of the monetary restriction on our construction program will permit the awarding of additional contracts for construction and materials on the Columbia Basin project.

The point I want to emphasize is this: There may have been a freeze order. I am not contesting that, but I am here saying that that freeze order varied with projects and with degrees of construction on those projects.

Mr. KIRWAN. After that date in August when he issued the freeze order, it was reconsidered again when materials for construction became available and then the President said, writing to the Chief of the Budget, that "in 1948 I would like to see them spend up to $177,000,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was very much interested in the fact that the gentleman from Washington called attention to the unfreezing on the 4th of November. Could the gentleman tell us how many other projects were unfrozen on the 4th of November 1946?

Mr. KIRWAN. No; I could not tell.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Suffice it to say that no funds are now frozen. They are all released and are available for the beginning of construction, and are all now obligated, and the President has asked for these additional funds to go forward with the development of these projects.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I challenge that statement, because after the hearings were concluded the Department submitted a table, because I was anticipating that such a charge would be made. They have submitted a table which appears on pages 3 and 4, which I discussed in my statement. Those tables were prepared by the Budget Office of the Department of the Interior. The last word we had was that $130,000,000 is still frozen.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I inquired yesterday of the officials of the Department of the Interior, particularly in the Reclamation Division, if any funds were now frozen, and they told me that all funds had now been released from the freeze order. That is the latest information I have, which was obtained on yesterday.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. On what date were they released?

Mr. GORE. The final release was as of April 1.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. This table was furnished at a later date than that by the Budget Office. All frozen funds for construction for all agencies was contained in this statement. Assuming that the President has released all funds, there is only two more months remaining in this fiscal year.

The result would be that the money would not be used until the next fiscal year started and we would have the same result.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Was there any testimony before the gentleman's committee by any witness or by document saying that they must hold the appropriations for the Interior Department down in order to combat inflation?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. There might have been; I would not say.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] failed to distinguish between money appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 and obligated to be spent in the future and money appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 which is not obligated until that year. That is going on all the time in all appropriations.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. It is just that practice we are fighting against and that is how the department actually had $465,500,000 at the beginning of the 1947 fiscal year upon which the President operated by freezing the funds.

This Congress appropriates money. The department downtown obligates; and long after they obligate the money is earned by the contractor.

You will find from last year's hearings that the contractors building the canals in the Central Valley project could not complete their work for 600 days in some instances, in some instances 700 days, and in some instances 400 days.

Now, shall Congress appropriate the money that the contractor will earn two fiscal years ahead? Or shall we appropriate the money that is requested to pay the earnings of the contractors during the fiscal year? We have appropriated the money that is needed to pay the contractors during the 1948 fiscal year.

Mr. KIRWAN. Now I should like to proceed for a little while, if I may.

Out in California there is a project known as the Central Valley project. That project was and is not something put together by the New Deal. The people, the citizens of the State of California voted, I believe, in the year 1929 to construct the Central Valley project. The depression came and they could not continue the work so they appealed to Washington to take it over as a Federal project.

Your Committee on Appropriations this spring had the governor of that great State before it. I congratulated him as a true representative of his people. He had run for election this last year and was reelected to the office of governor. He had no opposition on the Democratic ticket and received both nominations. Surely he was a man of the people. He got the Democratic nomination and he got the Republican nomination. As a young man he grew up in the Central Valley and he voted and worked for it before there ever was a Federal project known as the Central Valley project.

He appeared before the committee this year and said that the wells were fast drying up in California, that men who had invested millions of dollars were losing their investments. When they drill for water now they strike salt water because the fresh water level is sinking and salt water comes up from the salt

beds underlying that country. The crops and trees and other vegetation are being destroyed.

He told us that the Interior Department asked for only half of the funds necessary for the construction that ought to be carried out this year to save that part of California, the funds to be used for food, transportation, irrigation and power, those things only. He said $40,000,000 is the amount necessary.

What did this great committee give them? They gave them $6,000,000 despite the testimony of a man who was born and raised with that project. He is a man who voted for it originally. He is today the governor of the State and he has at his fingertips knowledge of all parts and phases of the project. He knows what is needed in California.

If there is a man here from the State of California, a Congressman or a Congresswoman, who has the courage to vote against that governor's request I would like to see him stand up now. I see no one rise.

That is what is going on throughout this Nation.

Let us now take the Missouri Basin appropriation. That was just cut in half. That is all the funds they allowed the Missouri Basin.

What is the Missouri Valley going to do?

Remember, this is not for the people of Siam or Italy, this is for Americans who are trying to reclaim their own country. Ten out of every 100 farms in the State of North Dakota have electricity and light. The other 90 out of 100 farms are still using oil and candles. In South Dakota 13 out of every 100 farmers have electricity and light in their homes. The other 87 percent still use candles and oils. Now, this is America, this is the great country that has Marshall over at Moscow telling them about democracy and saying, "Why do you not follow in our footsteps?" The same nation that we gave 10 boats to, but not one to America.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I think our distinguished friend from Ohio might make that speech on Monday on the $350,000,000 relief bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not going into the bill for $350,000,000. I am telling you about America and I am pleading with the Congress to do something for Americans. I am not pleading for foreigners. I am down here pleading for Americans today. It is a strange thing to get down here and plead for America. We will know at the end of the day how much faith we can place in the pleading.

Let me take the place now of the gentleman from the great State of Pennslyvania who just rose. I am happy to say I came from Pennsylvania years ago. Pennsylvania was the first State in this Union to discover and develop the oil industry. Like all great Americans of that day, and they called them rugged individuals, they drilled many oil wells. In that day they did not have much use for gasoline, but when they got too much oil at Oil City, Pa., and Franklin, Pa., where the gentleman is from, they ran it in the Allegheny River. That is what they did. Today all our resources are being gone over where that great intelligent population resided in Oil City and those towns. Today we come in and ask for a couple of million dollars to take up all the abandoned oil wells at Franklin, Oil City and western Pennsylvania; to try to start the old wells; to let the oil seep back in and get more out. Oh, no, they would not give a quarter. They would not reclaim any of the oil.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution to Pennsylvania's great crude oil. It is the finest lubricating oil in the world. I hope some day he will fill his car and motor over to my district. I know he will enjoy it very much.

Mr. KIRWAN. I get over there quite often.

Mr. GAVIN. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's remarks and I want him to know that I made a very pathetic plea to the Appropriations Subcommittee for the necessary funds to continue this secondary recovery work in the Pennsylvania fields to get the greatest amount of oil that is still in the earth out; but, like the gentleman, I cannot say that the committee has given us a particularly large sum to carry out this work.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman was pleading for Americans and, I may say, every dime in this bill is to be spent on Americans.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I have been interested in the gentleman's remarks on the matter of foreign loans as against appropriations for the benefit of the people of this country. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, that while Russia received $10,000,000,000 in lend-lease during the war, I understand that Russia had some lend-lease goods in the pipe lines just at the war's end and it is the intention of this Government to shortly furnish Russia with one of the most up-to-date, complete high octane gasoline plants that is available anywhere in the world. This plant is going to cost, as I understand it, $17,000,000. We are going to ship that plant over there and show them how to produce high octane gasoline that will produce the fuel they will need for that super war plane that we may have to fight some day in the future.

Mr. KIRWAN. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. I want to put this down, that all Ohio gets out of this is just a wick which gives about enough light to keep the Perry Monument lit on Lake Erie.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to say to the gentleman that as far as the State of Wyoming is concerned, we don't get that much out of this bill, and I will tell you why. The United States owns 51 percent of the entire acreage of Wyoming. In addition to that it owns the minerals under 14,000,000 more acres. Now, then, in the last 25 years the minerals produced on the Federal lands in Wyoming have paid into the United States Treasury $89,000,000, and 52½ percent of that money or over $46,000,000 went into the reclamation fund and $9,000,000 went into the general fund; 37½ percent went back to Wyoming for our schools. So, the United States has received $55,000,000 from the resources produced on Federal lands in Wyoming and since the inception of the reclamation law only $49,000,000 has been spent on reclamation projects in our State and our irrigators must repay every dollar of it and I might say that of the $15,000,000 spent on projects that have been completed in Wyoming over one-fourth has been repaid.

Mr. KIRWAN. I hope the gentleman votes to recommit this bill and we will try to do a better job for him.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I am glad to hear the gentleman state that he is in favor of our reclamation projects in the West. I wish he would help me harmonize some of the statements he made before his own committee, which appear on page 426, volume 3, of the hearings. This is on the Provo project in Utah. The gentleman makes the statement that he is opposed to the program because the Geneva steel plant is getting some of the water. I read as follows:

> In the peacetime that plant will be operating when the plants in Pennsylvania and Ohio will be shut down, because it is an up-to-date plant. That is why I do not approve of this, unless it is Nation-wide. This reclamation act was all right 50 years ago when Theodore Roosevelt was in. I say it was one of the greatest acts that was put in. I always pay respect to his memory for putting this act in. However, today we should have an act to save the East. If we do not, everything is going to go to those 17 Western States.

Therefore, the gentleman opposes the project. Will the gentleman explain why?

Mr. KIRWAN. No; I did not oppose the project. I opposed the United States Steel, that had a dollar-a-year man down here in Washington, selling the idea to the Government to build a $200,000,000 steel plant on this water project that was built for irrigation purposes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Did the gentleman know that the steel plant was going to use the water?

Mr. KIRWAN. I asked that question, and here is my reason. I said, "Does the steel plant get the use of this water?" And the answer was, "Yes."

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. This project was authorized and under construction a good many years before the steel plant was ever put in there.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not denying that. But I am trying to tell you that any time a dollar-a-year man comes down here and advises this Government to spend $200,000,000 on a project, whether it is in Provo or Geneva, Utah, or whether it is in Youngstown, Ohio, I am opposed to it. And when it is sold to the United States

Steel Corp. for $30,000,000, that, in my opinion, is a steal of $170,000,000.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Why should the State of Utah be penalized because of the gentleman's views on Geneva Steel?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not asking that they be penalized. I say that I am not for erecting a steel plant, on a project built by the Reclamation Department, at a cost of $200,000,000 that hardly produced one ton of steel during the war. I am opposed to that. If we had spent $15,000,000 for a little addition to each steel plant we could have gotten all the steel we wanted during the war. In other words, they built the most up-to-date steel plant in the country and they furnished the water from the Reclamation Division.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Which administration authorized the Geneva steel plant?

Mr. KIRWAN. I tried to tell you that I do not care what your politics are or what the administration was. I do not care what it was. I tell you that I am trying to be an American. Whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, I have no use for the man that recommends the building of a $200,000,000 steel plant to be sold later at a loss. He was one of those phony Americans that comes down to Washington as a dollar-a-year man. He came down to build that $200,000,000 plant, and it was not worth a quarter.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to point out to the gentleman that a continued reading of the colloquy to which the distinguished gentleman just referred will show that you said on page 427 of the hearings as follows:

> If they spend fifteen or twenty million dollars in a steel plant at Provo, fine. We need it. However, the audacity is in the spending of $200,000,000 on a plant when the war was about coming to an end. They finished the plant and in came United States Steel and for $30,000,000 they became owners of it.

Mr. KIRWAN. They knew that they were not going to sell it to anyone who was selling peanuts. There was only one group that could operate it, and that was United States Steel. No fellow selling peanuts was going to buy that steel plant. That is my objection to it.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Does the gentleman object to the appropriation for this particular reclamation project because of the Geneva steel plant?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. I had to take Smith Bros. cough drops to relax this year on account of the reclamation projects. Now I come to the great Big Thompson project over in Colorado, where they are moving the Colorado River from the western side of the Rockies down to the eastern side, and with five dams it generates power and takes care of the farmers and irrigates the land down there in that rich valley. You take that great State of Nebraska, they produced a great man up there; you remember just about the time Thomas Edison was inventing the electric light, they produced William Jennings Bryan out in Nebraska. They were both good men. Nebraska has been crying for power. She has no streams in that State that she could generate power on. But they are building the Big Thompson project. They want a transmission line. Did they get it? Oh, no. They cut it in half, did they not? Only 37 out of every 100 have electricity in Nebraska. Let us take the Southwest Power Development Co. What a fight they put up down there. The Government was trying to treat the Americans down there like human beings. In the great State of Oklahoma 29 out of every 100 farmers have electricity on the farm. In Arkansas 33 out of every 100 have it, and in Texas 43 out of every 100. What a great country this is to be out trying to tell the rest of the world, "Oh, we have got the right way of living. Pattern after us and you will never see daylight."

All that is asked for in this bill is $295,000,000. You read the hearings and read the report and you will find it says that they have $28,000,000 more than they got in 1938. That is not correct. There was $97,000,000 given to the Interior Department by other agencies in that year which made a total of $230,000,000. You add the increased cost today, 70 percent higher cost, whether it is food, construction, material, or whatever it may be. Add that on to the $230,000,000 and you have $311,000,000. That is what they should rightly have today. But after all the years this project has been retarded by the war, after all the screaming for material and everything to do the job, this is the first year we have it, and yet what have we done?

Fred Allen thought he discovered something when they took the cue away.

Look at the Park Service, whether we like or do not like the philosophy of the people who are running it. Just a year ago it was my privilege, on an invitation from Mr. Krug, to go to the former home of Franklin Roosevelt, now known as a shrine, to be turned over to the United States Government. Six months after it was turned over to the Government 500,000 people went through that home and visited there.

I am going to be truthful and frank about it. I do not know whether they were Republicans who went there, but it was good to see them there. I do not know whether they were Democrats and real Americans who went there to respect the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Over half a million people went there. This Government is richer by $130,000.

But the contrast that I am trying to bring home to you is this. Just 1 mile away is the Vanderbilt shrine which was turned over to the Government some years ago. It is much bigger than the Roosevelt home. It is more valuable, and there is better furniture there. In that shrine to attract the sightseer is a rug costing $300,000 and which is 2 centuries old. There is also a master bedroom there with marble fence around it. That bedroom is half as big as this Chamber. There is this marble fence which was imported from Italy. That bedroom probably came out of the sweat and hide and blood of American labor back through the years. But only 25,000 visitors went to the Vanderbilt shrine.

That is the concrete proof that America still remembers a great man and a great person. In the book that the visitors register in they tell how they went there. They went there in rowboats or hitchhiked, or in valuable automobiles, but they went there to pay their respects to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That is what we should have throughout this country today instead of having a situation such as exists in North Dakota, where 10 out of every 100 farmers are still trying to preserve this country and make a living with electricity in their homes. With 13 out of every 100 in South Dakota, and 33 or 37 in Nebraska, and 29 in Oklahoma. Is this a great country? Do you not think that we should recommit this bill—that is, if there is any Americanism left in us—and not be calling people up here and citing them for contempt because they say they know of some utopia somewhere in some other country? Again, I repeat, I will be looking for the balance of my life how they record this week when we turned down 1 vessel for research and scientific purposes for America and yet we gave 10 to Russia, and in the same week we convict and cite a man because he said the other government is a good form of government.

Oh, we will have to do something here, because I understand that over in Russia they are getting 39 or 35 air-borne divisions, and we have not got 1. They are not building those air-borne divisions to commute between Moscow and Budapest—oh, no; there is something else they have in mind. They might be going to the relief of somebody, but it is things along that line that we had better stop and do a little something about and give some research money for because the man who is the head of the Department of the Interior today said when he was head of the War Production Board he would get up some mornings at 6 or 7 o'clock and call the Department of the Interior and say, "Did you discover yesterday the thing that the Army and Navy wants which will probably save us?" Just as soon as they saved us we would not give them a quarter from here on out.

It was my privilege as a boy to work in a mine. I remember at the end of the day we used to throw a piece of coal up to try to hit the roof. The roof was high as the ceiling of the roof here. There were times when we could not do it. I asked my brother sometime ago, "Do you mind the time when we used to throw a piece of coal up to try and hit the roof?" And he said, "Yes; I remember. Now you have to get down on your stomach and the ceiling is close to your back." I am just calling this to your attention to show you how times change.

Up in the mountain range of Minnesota there is the greatest supply in the world, but it is only due to last 12 years. Then we will have to buy coal from Canada and Venezuela, and when we buy it they will charge us for it. They will tell us, "Here you are a great people and you have been ahead of us as far as the standard of living is concerned for 50 years. We will have to take a little of that standard of living."

It was my privilege to load a sack of sand as a laborer for $2 an hour at Maricopa, Calif., in 1910, when the biggest gusher in the world that was ever hit came through and threw out 35,000 barrels of oil a day for 3 weeks, and a hole came up out of it as big as this Chamber. Ask any oilman today if he has ever hit a gusher that would bring in 500 barrels. He would think he was a wealthy man and very lucky.

Our resources are gone. Yet, we do not want to give a quarter in this bill to try and go out and discover something. The resources and minerals that are closest to the surface have been discovered a long time ago, but it takes money to go down into the bowels of the earth and find out what is down there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The greatest resource of all is the water out in the West. The only way we can conserve that is by dams?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not also a fact that many of these dams that were started, like some in the Central Valley, and other parts of the West, have been waiting to get a chance to get more money to rapidly complete them?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Under this bill, if we get this amount of money for Central Valley, it will take 27½ years to complete the Central Valley project. It was contemplated to be done in 8 years by the Department of the Interior. Is that not a fact?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is a fact. And a man who wanted to do farming adds 27 years onto his life, and if he is still here he will not be able to use it then. It is the American way of doing business.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is slightly in error. At the rate of construction provided by this bill it would take not 27 years to complete the Central Valley project but 40 years.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. At page 19 of the hearings is a table furnished by the Department of the Interior, and it shows that out of the money we did appropriate last year there is $17,265,862 unexpended balance. We have in the last 5 years appropriated from ten to twenty million dollars more than they have spent.

Mr. KIRWIN. That is easily explained. They could not get the materials. But this is one year when the governor appeared before the committee and said, "Give me the money and I will get the materials."

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Does not the gentleman realize that with the money appropriated for Central Valley, by the time the present contracts are fulfilled, under the $6,000,000 given in this bill, they will have to tie the project up in less than 18 months?

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. All I can say is I hope there is still enough Americanism left in all of us—I mean that sincerely—to realize that whatever helps California helps Ohio, helps Nevada, helps the Dakotas, and the Southwest. It will all help Ohio. I am hoping and praying that when this bill comes up under the 5-minute rule tomorrow and a motion to recommit is placed before this House the Members of this House, who in their minds and hearts are hungering for their projects to be finished, will see their way clear to give us on this side an opportunity to recommit this bill.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to congratulate the gentleman in two respects, particularly, although I could do so in several others. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman on the broad national outlook he has. He understands naturally, that in the building of the great West we have to go to Pittsburgh and to Youngstown and to Birmingham and all these great, eastern manufacturing points to get the machinery and the finished products which we need out West. Thus the gentleman recognizes the interdependency of the East and the West, which this program ought to carry out, but which it really nullifies.

I want to congratulate the gentleman on one other thing. He says that some of our natural resources are vanishing. Right now we are using scarce oil to create electricity when we should be conserving it for the great air force that we should have and must have. We could conserve it if we would turn falling water into white coal instead of using the scarce and irreplacable oil that is in the ground to produce electricity.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I am very much concerned about the reduction made in the item "Minerals on public lands in the United States Geological Survey." I notice the reduction amounts to $313,790. The fact of the matter is that the conservation branch of the United States Geological Survey supervises the production of oil and other minerals which last year were valued at $183,000,000 and on which the Government received royalties amounting to $12,500,000.

I am vitally interested in any activities of any agency concerned with the classification of the western public lands for prudent use and with the locating, measuring, and optimum utilization by prudent development and production of our irreplaceable natural resources on the public, Indian, Navy, and acquired lands. The Congress acts as trustee for the citizens of the United States and in so doing has enacted legislation providing for the prospecting, development, and disposal of these lands and resources. It has by delegation placed the responsibility on the Geological Survey to carry out its mandates. This is a multimillion-dollar enterprise and our responsibility cannot be lightly treated. That is why I am disturbed by the committee action on the "Classification of lands" and "Mineral leasing" items. I note that the bill provides only $139,000 for classification of lands, a reduction of 50 percent under present funds, and only $434,210 for mineral leasing, a 31-percent cut under present funds. Reduction in funds, imposed upon a unit whose work load has increased steadily year by year, seriously impairs the entire minerals-resource program. A resulting reduction in force of over 50 percent to a unit which, even at its present strength, cannot reduce accumulated arrearages in processing mineral-land classification cases, lease applications, unit plans of operations, effecting mine inspections, oil-well inspections, other physical tests, and supervising field operations essential to the prevention of waste, to obtain economical recovery, and to assure receipt by the United States of the maximum royalty returns resulting from such recovery, is impossible to justify.

I do not wish to burden the record with a detailed statement of facts and figures, but I only need remind you that the western public-land States, one of which I represent, contributed much to the new reserves of natural resources so badly needed during the recent war. We have great quantities remaining to be discovered or developed. The production of oil, gas, phosphates, potash, sodium, coal, shale oil, and many other minerals are still awaiting the prospectors. Is this Congress going to revert now to 1938 for classification and supervision? In 1938 the value of all natural resources produced from Federal, Indian, and Navy lands approximated $93,000,000 and in 1946 nearly $183,000,000, an increase of 49 percent. Obviously, the responsibility of development, supervision, and accounting had to exceed this percentage of increase in production, for every prospect is not a successful venture.

We must not forget that the Congress has passed considerable legislation since 1935 affecting the public lands, which added additional responsibilities to the Geological Survey. I mention the act of 1935, which became operative in 1939 and 1940; the act of July 29, 1942; the act of December 24, 1942; the act of July 13, 1946; the act of August 8, 1946; and the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946, transferring the leasing and supervision of minerals, including oil and gas, on millions of acres of acquired lands from the Agriculture Department to the Interior Department. This latter item alone includes over 400 leases.

The development of public lands is vital to the West. When new mineral resources are discovered, new industries are started, thereby increasing the industrialization and settlement of these sparsely settled regions.

Of vital importance is the contribution of the income from royalties to the reclamation fund and the school systems of oil-producing public-land States. Since the enactment of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, over $120,000,000 has been

transferred to the reclamation fund and over $60,000,000 to the State schools within which the royalties accrue.

I need only remind you of the tremendous demand for development of our natural resources to make them available for immediate use. Just a few days ago the newspapers carried a statement by responsible authorities predicting a gasoline shortage next fall. Now, it does not seem good business to cut this essential service in such a manner.

Mr. KIRWAN. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], a hard-working member of the committee and a man who has a very comprehensive knowledge of this entire bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been said about this bill and about the members of this committee. We expect it, all of us; and, of course, a lot more is going to be said and written.

I have no apologies whatever to make. I have nothing but the highest praise for the chairman of this committee, BOB JONES of Ohio. I think that before this debate is concluded it will be proven beyond question of a doubt that our chairman, BOB JONES, did one of the best jobs as chairman of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives that has ever been done for the American people.

I have the greatest respect for Mr. KIRWAN, the ranking minority member of this committee. I have had the privilege of sitting on this committee with the gentleman from Ohio for five consecutive terms, and the gentleman is always fair and tries to do the thing he feels is right. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], of course, does not see eye to eye with the more conservative members of the committee who try to save a dollar here and a dollar there, a hundred here and a hundred there, a thousand here and a thousand there, a million here and a million there, for the taxpayers of America where it can be saved without hurting the service of the Interior Department in any way, shape or form. We try to impress on the Department that money does not grow on trees, that we expect efficiency by those public servants as well as other public servants, that we do not expect them to throw money around like so much scrap paper; but in my estimation and in the opinion of the majority of the American people and of this Congress that is exactly what has been done in many branches of the Interior Department.

Then we have on the committee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] who has done yeoman service as has the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN]. There were times during the hearings and mark-up when the gentleman from Oregon could not agree with us; but the truth of the matter is that this bill came to the full committee after compromises to a marked degree had been made in the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. Did the gentleman state between whom the compromise was made?

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman was not there all the time.

Mr. ROONEY. My good friend the gentleman from Iowa knows that I am a member of three subcommittees, including the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; the gentleman has too much to do, I will admit.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman also knows that I sat in on this bill for 3 years and I know a little something about it. I know something about marking up the bill and that I objected to every mark-up except one.

Mr. JENSEN. I have the highest regard for the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. But I honestly believe that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] feels the committee did a pretty good job and cut where cuts ought to be made in most instances. I like to work with him and the other Members regardless of our differences. He is also on other committees of which I am a member. We work harmoniously and generally we can compromise our differences and finally get pretty close together.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry our good friend and colleague, the able, conscientious gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], a regular veteran member of the committee was not able to sit on the committee this year. I think he will say before the debate closes that he intends to support this bill just as it is written.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I appreciated what the gentleman has said. I have not been able to participate in the proceedings this year. I have the very highest regard for the entire membership of that committee, including my able colleague from New York who substituted for me. The committee may have made some mistakes, but the gentleman from Arkansas expects to support the bill as written.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. May I inquire whether a minority report has been filed in connection with this bill or not?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. MACKINNON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. At least, I have not seen one.

Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested in some of the remarks that were made here today about giving everything away to some foreign country and leaving little or nothing for ourselves. Of course, Mr. Chairman, that is a thing a lot of us have been trying to impress on the Congress and the New Deal administration for many long years. The fact of the matter is it has an effect on this very bill because actually the money pie we have here in America is just so big and no bigger and we are giving away and lending to other nations a mighty big piece of that pie.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. And, without a doubt, we will be obliged to give away many billions of dollars, and a lot of you fellows who are fighting this bill today will vote to give away all those billions, but you must realize that you will have to take less for a lot of things you want from the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States of America from now on.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my able colleague from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it might be well for the gentleman to point out that regardless of what we give away there is one thing we must save for America, and that is solvency.

Mr. JENSEN. Right. And there is another thing. The American people like to pay their own way, and I do not care whether they live in California or Oregon or Washington or Iowa or Utah or Arizona or Pennsylvania or New York or any other State. They know, and you know it, that construction, maintenance, operation, and administration costs have gone up between 50 and 75 percent during the last 5 or 6 years. But will anyone opposing this bill stand on the floor of this House today and say that they have recommended higher power rates or higher revenues for all the benefits for which the taxpayers of America have furnished for all these great Federal projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Did the gentleman recommend higher rates?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Wait until I answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes or no?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Let me answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. JENSEN. Wait. Is your answer yes or no?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I recommended rates high enough to get back every dollar, with interest, before the gentleman's committee several times.

Mr. JENSEN. Has the gentleman actually recommended higher rates?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have not studied the schedules or recommended specific rates.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman recommend higher rates today? Yes or no.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If they are necessary, yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I want a yes or no answer please.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, I am no expert on power rates, but I have said repeatedly before the gentleman's committee, and I believe it today, that the rates that we charge for power on

Federal projects should return every single compensable dollar plus 3 percent interest.

Mr. JENSEN. Should! Sure they should. But will they? No, not so long as we keep on appropriating all the departments ask for.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, I do not know. I assume the rate that they charge will do it.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that when they set those rates years and years ago they said, "This is the rate we need in order to pay off this project according to law and that since that time operations, maintenance, construction, and administrative costs have gone up from 50 to 75 percent."

How long do you suppose you would be in business, Mr. JOHNSON, if you bought things today and sold them for the prices in effect 5 and 6 years ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to answer that.

Mr. JENSEN. Tell me how long you would be in business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would not be in business very long.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course you would not, and the Government is no different.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to point this out: In the very area where the Central project is going to sell power, the P. G. & E. has maintained the same or lower rates, and their reports every year show a profit during the past 5 years. That is a private company, well operated and well managed.

Mr. JENSEN. All right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And they have not raised any rates at all in the last 5 years.

Mr. JENSEN. The Railroad Commission of California determines the rates of the private utilities.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I will tell you why they did not raise the rates.

The P. G. & E. would pay more, but the Interior Department officials lay down the contract before them at the same old rate and the P. G. & E. say, "Sure, we will sign it."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman knows the Central Valley is only selling power to them wholesale. We are not distributing any electricity; the gentleman understands that.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly I know it.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

If the gentleman will yield, may I point out, to finish up this colloquy, that the Bureau of Reclamation has sold power to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at 3.4 mills a kilowatt-hour for firm energy, and somewhat less than that for secondary power. The average is about 2.5. It costs the P. G. & E. produced in their own plant 5.2 mills a kilowatt-hour. In other words, the Bureau of Reclamation is such a poor dealer with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. that it is getting 3 mills a kilowatt-hour below what it costs them to generate power in their own plant.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right, as I understand it.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I have an opinion that the Bureau of Reclamation made this bad deal with the P. G. & E. in order to complain that they had to have a great transmission system in the West in order to make the project pay out, where, as a matter of fact, if they were good dealers, good sound businessmen, they would have gotten the 5.2 that it costs the P. G. & E. to generate power in their own plant.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I would like to get back again to water.

Mr. JENSEN. I will tell you how you are going to get back to water. You are going to have to change the philosophy of the Interior Department if you want to get water, because they do not give much attention to irrigation; they want power, both electric and political.

Mr. HILL. More than 10 years ago we started a project in my own county, in my own district. We mortgaged our homes, our buildings in the city, and we made a firm and solid contract with the Federal Government, the United States, that if they would bring that water under the Rocky Mountains down onto this land that is already irrigated, that has been short of water ever since it has been formed—we have water; our water systems are all in, but this is supplementary water from the other side of the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is talking about the Colorado-Big Thompson project?

Mr. HILL. I am talking about the Colorado-Big Thompson project. If they would allow us to mortgage our homes and pay each year so much on that project, we would begin immediately, which we have done. Today we have paid $300,000 on that project. I notice the testimony in the hearings where some of you said that because the price had gone up, the contractor's price, material, equipment, and labor, you think we should go back to our $1,700 or $2,000 contract that we have in that valley and make that contract over. In addition, do not forget this, that it is not our fault, the farmers and home owners and city dwellers as well in that territory, it is not our fault that the Interior Department has not finished that project. It is not our fault that these prices have gone up. Yet you come along and in your own testimony you say you think we ought to throw that contract out and accept a new and higher contract for the water.

Mr. JENSEN. You read the hearings.

Mr. HILL. I did.

Mr. JENSEN. They explained it to us in detail. Has the gentleman read what I said?

Mr. HILL. I read all the gentleman's testimony.

Mr. JENSEN. I said, "Gentlemen, I think the Government is stuck." Did I not say that?

Mr. HILL. I hope the gentleman sticks to that.

Mr. JENSEN. I also said that I believed those people out there who are getting the benefits would pay more if given an opportunity. It is going to cost about three times more to complete the job than originally estimated, is it not?

Mr. HILL. Yes. We never figured anything about the power. That is the reason I came in on this. We were not talking about those five great dams that will create all this electric current. We were talking about the water on this land.

Mr. JENSEN. The Department of the Interior has not been too concerned about water, as the record will prove. Consequently, many irrigation projects in the country have been held back.

It seems clear that it was their plan to finally drive private utilities to the wall by giving them so much competition at below-cost rates that they could not exist. But I am sure the American people who believe in all honest, free, private enterprise appreciate the fact that we have held them in abeyance at least to some degree so that they have not spread all over the United States and destroyed all the good private utilities who send to the Federal Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars a year in revenue which we need so badly today.

I have said many times that they can call me anything they like, but I shall defend all good, honest private industry, whether it be the peanut vendor on the corner or the biggest private business in the United States, against unfair encroachment by the Government.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to say to my colleagues in this House that it has been a real pleasure to serve on this subcommittee with my distinguished friend and chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, and his colleagues on the majority side, as well as my associates on the minority side.

While there were not more than two or three items in the bill in which we concurred with the majority, nevertheless relations between all the members of the subcommittee were most cordial and friendly. I have no personal fault to find with the intentions of the chairman of this subcommittee or the other members on the majority side. I believe they are sincere in what they are doing to the Department of the Interior—wrecking it. But I know they do not realize the consequences of the 47-percent slash which they are making in the budget for the Department of the Interior. However, I say I have never questioned the sincerity of the gentleman from Ohio and his associates.

The total amount of the budget request for the entire Department is $295,420,420. This sum amounts to far less than 1 percent of the total amount of the President's budget of $37,500,000,000.

The majority of this committee have started a dangerous plan of economy, in which they allow much less than one-half of 1 percent of these $37,500,000,000 for our Interior Department, for the conservation and preservation of the natural resources of this Nation, and construction of reclamation projects which will make and have already made America great.

Not one member on the majority side of the full Committee on Appropriations raised one finger to increase any one item in this bill from the amount which was decided upon by the majority of this subcommittee. You must realize that we needed very few votes from the majority side in order to overthrow the decision of the majority of the subcommittee. I repeat, not one member on the majority side in the meeting of the full committee offered any amendment to the amounts decided upon as the result of the subcommittee's deliberations. Therefore, I wondered where the information came from to support an article I read yesterday by Drew Pearson, April 24 edition of the Washington Post, in which he says:

Though they wept, begged, and got down on their knees to fellow Republicans, GOP leaders cut the heart out of the Interior Department appropriations.

Well, if any one of them did, it was not in any meeting of the subcommittee or of the full Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, when this committee met to mark up the bill the figures had apparently already been decided upon in advance. For instance, we proceeded to mark up as the first item, the Bureau of Mines. Every item of appropriation in connection with the Bureau of Mines had been previously agreed upon with somebody, and was written out on a white sheet. There was therefore, not much sense in discussing the items. Our problem was very simple—the minority stated that they disagreed in every instance with the work of the majority of the committee unless we definitely signified our assent.

Included in the Bureau of Mines appropriation were three items for mine safety, and they cut those items, and cut them viciously. About 2 or 3 weeks later we experienced a terrible mine disaster at Centralia, Ill. One day in the committee hearing I happened to be reading a newspaper and looking at some photographs of bereaved relatives of those who died in that disaster and I inquired of my friends on the majority side, "Don't you think this will have some effect upon the decision reached by the House, with regard to moneys for mine safety appropriations?" We were then informed, for the first time, by one of the members of the subcommittee that they, the majority, in quiet session, had decided to restore the full amounts of the budget estimates for mine safety appropriations.

There is a friend of mine, a lifelong and prominent Republican, who meets quite often with a number of gentlemen from both sides of this House, at the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington. I have heard him say on many occasions, "When we Republicans get back into power, do away with the school lunch program? Why, hell, we will do away with the schools."

I was therefore not surprised when the deliberations of the Republican members of this committee caused the virtual destruction of school systems and that they have done away with not only the school lunches but with the schools. What have they done in connection with the Indian Service? The cut in this bill to the extent of $10,302,646 in appropriations for the Office of Indian Affairs, from the amount available in the current year, fiscal 1947, will result in part in forcing more than 5,000 Indian children out of Government schools.

Indian education has been cut by 33 percent. Tuition payments to Oklahoma public schools were disapproved. Three million dollars must be saved by closing about 16 boarding schools which enroll only children who are homeless.

In connection with the Alaskan Native Service, a reduction, a cut, a slash if you will, of $469,000 below the current year's appropriations will result in the closing of 1 elementary boarding school for dependent children, the closing of 19 day schools, which will deny education to more than a thousand children, termination of contracts with all private hospitals for the treatment of natives, and the closing of 1 Indian Service urban hospital of 60-bed capacity.

That is more than bad economy, Mr. Chairman. That, I say, is economy created by headless horsemen of economy, headless horsemen who have no regard to the consequences that will result from their wild ride insofar as the welfare of our Nation and provisions for our children are concerned.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman concede that if we terminate the education of Indian children that the Appropriations Committee will have to come in here with an appropriation for tomahawks in order to put the Indians back into their present status.

Mr. ROONEY. I think that is a fair statement in view of what our Republican friends have done.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand the committee has recommended schooling for the Navajo Indians. That is fine. We have 17,000 Navajo Indian children of school age who are not in school. But I further understand that the cut which this bill contains will close several boarding schools, one at Albuquerque, one at Santa Fe, probably one in California at Whittier, and very likely one at Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. ROONEY. That is so.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the gentleman beside me here, from Oklahoma, probably has three such boarding schools which will be closed.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman from Arizona will cover that matter more fully in the remarks he will make later on during the course of the debate.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope to.

Mr. ROONEY. I now wish to say a word with reference to the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

At the time the slash figures were released by the full Appropriations Committee showing what the majority had done to our great irrigation, flood control, and power projects in the Northwest and in the West, how a great many people in my town laughed with glee? Where? Up in Wall Street, in the offices of Electric Bond & Share Co. which controls many of these power companies throughout the Southwest and the West, selling power from public projects built with the people's money. Yes, the the bloated plutocrats of the power lobby which, here in the Congress, are continually seeking to have turned over to them the people's dams, the people's power built by the people's money, the dams that these private utility companies are continually seeking to monopolize. The very people who originally fought tooth and nail against the erection of every one of these dams.

The Republicans cut $83,234,600 from a requested appropriation of $145,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, or a 57-percent cut. They thereby hamstring the projects which this Congress, this very House and the other body, have heretofore authorized. They are thereby creating a situation whereby enormous claims by contractors whose contracts have to be canceled will result in an enormous loss to the United States Treasury.

With regard to the Columbia River Basin project and the question I asked my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, awhile ago, the Columbia River Basin program in the great Northwest—may I say that I have had the privilege of being out there and I have seen it. I am from Brooklyn. I have always been one of the first to say that we should further and further develop these great reclamation projects in the West. The Columbia River Basin project was supposed to be completed by 1951 to supply irrigation of 400,000 acres of land for veterans' settlement. What do you think is the completion date now, if the action of the majority of this subcommittee is supported—1965?—and we commit this crime at a time when we are now debating and debated all day yesterday on the floor of this House the matter of sending $350,000,000 to Europe for relief and with another bill now pending for $400,000,000 more to be used in Europe. The situation created by this bill, as the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] very well knows has resulted in the completion date of the Central Valley project in California, which I have also had occasion to inspect, being 40 years from now instead of the contemplated 8 or 10 years.

I must say that the Governor of California did not play politics. He came before this subcommittee and requested not $20,000,000, the amount asked in the budget estimate, but $40,000,000 for Central Valley. What did the majority of this subcommittee do? They thereupon cut the amount to $6,900,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. When the Governor of California came here I am positive that before he made the recommendation to the gentleman's committee he consulted with a commis-

sion known as the Reemployment and Development Committee or the Postwar Development Committee that had made a thorough study of the needs of California in reference to public power.

Mr. ROONEY. As the gentleman very well knows, and from my visit to the Central Valley project, and as I have stated on the floor of the House previously, I am in entire sympathy with it. I feel it should be developed just as fully and promptly as possible, and I for one would go along with the request of the Governor of California for a $40,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. California got 600,000 new veterans in it since the war closed. They were men who were not enlisted or inducted from the State of California. The rapid development and completion of this project will be of material help to many of them.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from California.

In this bill there is an item entitled "General investigations." There has been a cut from the amount requested, $5,000,000, down to the insignificant sum of $125,000. What is the purpose of this item?

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this item in the bill is to plan public projects throughout these United States in advance of a depression, which would result not only in enhancing the value of our country, in giving to the people power and irrigation and flood control, but in putting to work hundreds of thousands of other people who would be engaged in work on these projects.

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

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

Mr. GORE. In cutting out practically all of the funds for this purpose, and they might as well have cut all of the fund for investigations, is it not about like the gentleman from Arizona expressed it, taking the seed corn away from the farmer?

Mr. ROONEY. That is a very good description of the situation. Of course, we all know as we stand here and debate this bill—and as we vote on it tomorrow the Republican majority will have its well-oiled steam roller working again, and will knock down deserving amendment after deserving amendment—that the very cuts you make here will be restored over in the other body.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a rumor going around of an inside deal to take care of a couple of projects, then let the others just be crushed under. Has the gentleman through his contacts received any information on that which might be of an enlightening nature or of an exposing nature?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; I have heard some rumblings about that, I will say to the gentleman. I understand that there will be a deal made with some of the gentlemen from California. I do not blame the gentlemen from California for trying to make a deal or for engaging in such a deal. But it is not a nice way to go about this situation. It would be much better if those of the majority in this committee had carefully listened to the testimony in regard to these reclamation projects and then decided on them sensibly, not on figures already written out in advance on a white paper. It was utterly useless for a minority member to disagree with the column of figures handed down by the high command.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am a Member from California, and I am right in that part of the Central Valley, but no offers have been made to me as yet. I wish they would make some offers to us:

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is one consolation that our Republican friends, who are highly dissatisfied, have, and that is that we on the Democratic side not only have complete sympathy for them in the predicament in which they find themselves, and particularly for their own constituents, but when the motions are made, that we on the Democratic side will vote in accordance with the national interest to carry on these great projects which, while they are located in certain sections of the country, are of general concern to the entire country.

Mr. ROONEY. I trust they will, but am again afraid of the headless-horseman economy that we have had so far during this Congress.

May I ask my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] if he will hand me part 3 of the printed hearings of this subcommittee? Thank you, I have not weighed this, but I meant to. You will notice that part 3, which covers the Bureau of Reclamation, probably cost five times as much to print as it has in any previous Congress. The phony economy proposed by the cuts in this bill is just as sensible as the economy practiced by the majority in printing the minutes of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the principal issue involved in this Interior Department appropriation bill is whether the recent progress that has been made in western economic development will continue and go forward or will be halted through the elimination or slow strangulation of the reclamation and power projects on which this development is based.

It is commonly assumed that those of us whose constituencies are in the East have no concern with the progress of western economic development. This is a completely erroneous assumption. Every citizen of our country has a vital stake in the development of the economic potentials of the West and the speed with which it occurs.

Every citizen has a stake in this development because he is concerned with the availability of food and the price he has to pay for it; he is concerned about the shortages of critical minerals and other materials and the effect they have on the scarcity of automobiles, housing, and the other things he wants for better living; he is concerned about the shortage of lumber and the effect this shortage has upon our national economy; he is concerned about whether our economy is going to provide the expanding job opportunities which our veterans and other citizens require, or whether it is going to stagnate and require the rationing of a limited number of job opportunities among an increasing number of job seekers; he is concerned about our national security and the fact that we have no ready reserve of electric energy, such as existed at TVA and in the Northwest when World War II came upon us, available for the expansion of our aluminum, magnesium, and other industries; he is concerned about the national security implications of our present "have-not" status which led the Seventy-ninth Congress to pass the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act so that we could import from abroad and accumulate reserves of those materials essential to our national defense, that we were not producing in sufficient quantity; and he is concerned about an assured domestic market that can absorb the increased production of our fabricating industries.

The economic development of our underdeveloped regions represents in large measure the solution to the problems I have enumerated. We have in the West, for example, more than 740,000,000 acres of desert—more than one-third the land mass of the United States—which is shortchanged on rainfall. Through irrigation, much of these lands can be turned into family-size farms for the settlement of veterans and others. They can be made to produce special kinds of vitamin-packed food raised only in hot, dry climates. These farms become new markets for manufactured products from all parts of the United States—new markets that develop in these prosperous areas reclaimed from desert wastelands.

These lands are reclaimed through the construction of dams—multiple-purpose projects which serve to create hydroelectric power, prevent floods, create navigable waterways for the cheaper transportation of goods, provide recreation areas around the large water reservoirs, as well as provide dependable water supplies for the land and for domestic and industrial purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Regarding the reclamation of those lands, I know of my own personal knowledge that in my part of California the land without water varies from $15 to $50 an acre in price. When you get water on it, it goes from $200 to $1,250 in value, showing the increased productivity of the land.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think there is any question about it. The gentleman also knows, as do I, that in the Northwest in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration there is today a greater

market for power than the amount of power which can be produced at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams.

The cheap power that results from the construction of these dams is the key that unlocks the economic door of the area. Minerals that could not be processed economically before can now be made available at competitive prices. Areas that once were poor raw material suppliers—obtaining only the price of the labor applied to extract the resources—develop fabricating and processing plants and become prosperous. In many cases items are produced for the benefit of the whole Nation that were not produced at all before.

At 1940 prices it is estimated that the total national investment in the development of our great river basins will amount to some $11,500,000,000. I am not going to make the crack that "this ain't hay," for a good part of the lands reclaimed by these projects will grow good alfalfa hay. Alfalfa hay and sugar beets are two top-ranking irrigation crops. Both are vital to the livestock industry of the West and, in turn, they are most important to the people of the Nation. They mean more meat and more sugar on everybody's table.

Of course, this investment will take place over a period of time. The question is how much time. Unless these reclamation projects are carried forward at an economical rate, hundreds of millions of dollars already spent will be wasted and the people of the East are just as much concerned as the people of any other part of the country about the destruction of an investment we have already made.

Governor Warren, of California, appeared before this House Appropriations Subcommittee to urge the acceleration of the Central Valley project—one of the large reclamation projects of which I have been speaking—so that it would be completed in 4 years instead of the 10 or 12 years contemplated by the Interior Department. He argued that then the project would begin to pay for itself sooner and the people of California and the Nation could reap the benefits sooner. If a depression is on its way, Governor Warren would apparently like to meet it with a project that will provide the basis for thousands of additional jobs and business opportunities.

The majority of this committee not only ignored the Governor's request, but cut the funds to one-third of the amount requested by the Interior Department. Instead of the 4-year period for completing the project which the Governor asked for, it will take, at the rate of expenditure recommended by the Appropriations Committee, over 40 years to complete the Central Valley project.

These western reclamation and power projects, when completed, create millions of additional jobs and business opportunities—on farms, in new communities which will be needed to serve the new farms on reclaimed land, and in the new industries which will salvage the present waste of the forests and the unused mineral resources of these areas by the application of low-cost power to the areas' resources. Forest management can be placed on a sustained yield basis, thus guaranteeing to the Nation a continuing supply of lumber and to the people of the areas a continuous source of livelihood. It means that the relatively unpopulated areas of the West will be able to support additional millions of population.

In 1946 farmers on irrigated lands served by all Federal reclamation projects harvested corps worth one-half billion dollars. This is the type of investment that pays.

But the wealth produced on reclaimed lands is only a portion of the return to the Nation—speaking in business accounting terms—on its investment in these projects. Power revenues pay the bulk of the costs and not only does the Government get back all that it puts into the power facilities in a period of time, only a fraction of the life of the project, it gets a return of 3 percent on its investment.

The investment in these projects produce other values many of which cannot be measured quantitatively. While you can measure the 3 percent interest paid on the investment in power, the millions of dollars saved annually by flood control, and the savings involved in cheaper water transportation, how can you ascribe a quantitative measurement to the value of providing economic opportunities for our citizens or measure the cumulative effect on our economy of providing communities with a higher standard of living and a higher per capita income with which to purchase consumer goods from producers all over the country.

One of the reasons for opposition to resource development of the type I have described is the sincere belief on the part of certain eastern and middle-western business interests that the economic development of the underdeveloped portions of the country would be bad for them. The railroads, for example, think that their interests require the preservation of the South and West as raw-material reserves so that they can haul—at artificially high rates—the raw materials to the East and Middle West to be processed and then haul them back to be consumed. Actually these high freight rates may serve as a kind of protective tariff behind which southern and western businessmen will produce items for their respective areas which might be more economically produced by and purchased from eastern manufacturers.

Another argument I have heard used in opposing measures which would facilitate the economic development of the South and West is that it would create competition with eastern businessmen and would eliminate their markets. This is a completely false notion. It is frequently extended to other countries of the world and you hear the argument that we must not develop the industries of China or South America because it will eliminate our own markets there.

Actually our greatest trade is always with the more highly developed countries of the world, and so it is within our own country. As the South and the West improve their regional economies the manufacturers of the East and Middle West acquire greater markets for their goods, the lawyers and doctors and other professional men are relieved of the ruinous competition of a glutted profession because their colleagues can find abundant opportunities in these areas of growing population and wealth; and everyone is relieved of the specter of unsecurity that arises from the unsatisfied search for jobs and businesses by our veterans and others.

The development of the economic potentials of our great river basins will provide the new job and business opportunities which are the evidence of a healthy, growing economy free from the stagnation of depression; it will provide an outlet for those who are displaced by reason of new technology or worn-out resources in their present localities; it will furnish us with more food, more materials to provide us with shelter and transportation, more of everything we need for a better satisfying life.

I cannot agree with the gentlemen on the majority side of the Appropriations Committee that we should turn back the clock to 1938, or any other date of the stagnant thirties. We who live in the East want to go forward to a more prosperous America along with our fellow citizens of the West.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the statement just made by my colleague from New York, may I say, that, during the five years I have been on the committee we have appropriated about three-quarters of a billion dollars for reclamation. "Quite liberal" the American people will say, I am sure.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when a bill of this importance has reached the floor it is a matter for dispassionate analysis and not for oratory. In speaking here today, I prefer not to speak of the great value of reclamation nor of irrigation nor of power upon which the West has been built. I do not want to speak at length of the fact that we from the western part of the United States know by now that it is difficult to make our projects, and the magnitude of the things done there, understood by our friends in the East. When I lived in Pennsylvania and Ohio I understood just as little as anyone who has never been in the West how dependent the West is upon water.

I probably said the same things and thought the same things then, as Members do today who have never seen California or Oregon or Washington or the Rocky Mountain States.

It seems to me today that the problem is this: We have a bill before us, and what are we going to do about it? The people of the United States said last November that they wanted economy, and my people said to me that they meant they wanted economy, and that they would stand by every effort on the part of the Congress to bring about economy in a Government which for 13 years has not known what that word meant. If we are to save the world, we must first save ourselves.

I would not stand here before you today and say that this is the best bill that ever came out of the Committee on

Appropriations, and I certainly would not stand here today and say that it was the worst bill that ever came out of that committee. There has been a great deal of discussion of the bill by those of us who come from the western part of the United States. It may interest you to know that very little of that discussion was whether we of the West feel that the amount of money appropriated is not adequate. We are more concerned about certain policy matters in the bill, and those are the things that I want to talk to you about today.

I cannot defend a policy of the Bureau of Reclamation, nor would you expect me to favor it, under which Congress, having appropriated large sums of money for reclamation or power developments, finds at the end of a fiscal year, large unexpended balances. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], said that these unexpended balances were due to the inability to get material during the war years. My district has suffered more than any district in the United States because of that policy of the Bureau of Reclamation, and yet I cannot say that it was because of the lack of material, for the equipment stood on the ground and the material was available and the labor councils offered the labor.

We would have to take each one of these issues in the bill and attempt to analyze it, to see what the difficulty was. For that reason I confine myself to a few statements.

It has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], that a motion to recommit will be made, and it would be expected we would vote for that motion. I am not sure that I would vote for a motion to recommit. In fact, I do not see any point in such a motion. If the bill has not been put into shape which might satisfy us in some of its provisions, then, what chance would we have in recommitting the bill to the same subcommittee? I shall rely upon the fact that the Government of the United States is a government of checks and balances.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield willingly but briefly.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the gentleman vote for a motion to recommit if it provided that the committee report the bill forthwith back to the House with an amount of $40,000,000 for the Central Valley project?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No; and for reasons which I shall be very glad to give the gentleman, because the problem in the Central Valley project is apparently not understood by the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. KIRWAN. How about the Governor of California, then? Does he not understand it when he says $40,000,000?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Do you mean what do I think of the Governor of California?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. You said the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] did not understand that point.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes; I said that.

Mr. KIRWAN. How about the Governor of California, when he said $40,000,000 was necessary?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. What the Governor of California said to the committee—and I was present at the time—was that it would be economy if, instead of spreading the completion of the Central Valley project over a longer number of years at the rate of about $20,000,000 a year $40,000,000 were spent every year to complete the project in a shorter time, after which repayments would start.

I have a very high regard for the present Governor of California. I think that the country needs him on a bigger job. But I think the Governor of California would be one of the first to say that no more money should be appropriated in any one fiscal year than can reasonably be spent in that year. He would not like any more than I did the Bureau of Reclamation policy of having money appropriated, only to find it unspent at the end of the year. The subcommittee says that more than $17,000,000 right now rests in the unexpended funds of the Central Valley project. Some of my friends who live there say it is nearer $12,000,000. The point remains the same: There will be available, from the total of present unexpended funds and the new appropriation, more than the $20,000,000 asked for in the budget request. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] asked me if I would vote for a motion to recommit, if it increased this item to $40,000,000, and I said "No." That figure is just plucked out of the air, without analysis of the labor, material, ability to contract the work, or other items in the picture.

I would much rather have my distinguished friends the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] or the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] or the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] talk about Central Valley, but I can easily show the gentleman what I mean. The item, on page 35, line 7, shows Irrigation Facilities, $5,134,980, without earmarking the irrigation projects for which it could be expended. Our experience with the Bureau of Reclamation has been that although for years the farmers of California have begged that the water be taken down through the Friant-Kern Canal, as the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has said time and time again, the Bureau will not build that canal. The committee evidently was not fully aware of the fact that when work begins upon that canal it must at the same time begin upon the Delta-Mendota Canal, because one project balances the taking of the water in the other project. It would have been better to make that item $10,000,000 and earmark it for construction on those specific projects. I would have said that would be a good idea. I might agree to other increases if you will designate them. But to ask me if I would vote for $40,000,000 is just exactly the same kind of appropriation request I have been subjected to for the 4 years I have been here, and which I, as an analyst, do not want to be subjected to any further.

I find it hard to justify the item of $256,680, in line 11, to build a transmission line from Shasta to Delta. It may be necessary, but my understanding is that the power is to be sold at the end of that line for less than it can be sold for at the dam. I will support public development of power, and I will remind the Members of this House that before power construction began in connection with the Central Valley project, power in that area, from the private company, was so high in cost that it was ruining the farmers who had to buy it to pump water for their farms. I simply do not see how you can build a power line and sell power at the end of the line for less than you can sell it for without the line being built, and then call that good business from any standpoint.

In other words, I think these are cases that require consideration and not lump-sum treatment. The gentleman from New York asked me if I would vote for some round figure in a motion to recommit. I do not want to vote that kind of an appropriation in any bill. I will not vote for flat percentage cuts if I can possibly avoid such votes, and I will not vote for percentage increases, nor for increases picked out of the clouds. However, to get back to what I was saying, I am basing my decision on what to do now on this floor, about this appropriation bill on the fact that the Government of the United States is a government of checks and balances. I never saw a perfect bill yet and I have never seen a bill that was completely bad. When a bill comes to the floor and is reviewed openly on the floor it then goes to the other body and there corrections are made on the basis of what is said in this House and upon what the Members of the other body want.

So I believe that we should say here what it is we think requires correction in this bill; and when the bill goes over to the other body and comes back to us I think that it will be a bill I can support and defend to the people of my district.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would yield gladly but only if I can get more time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will not the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The committee chairman has indicated that I cannot get more time; I am sorry. I would like to yield to the very able gentleman from Nebraska.

On page 43, the committee has specified that there shall be no more work on a force account basis. I know why the committee put that in, but the fact remains that if it stays in the bill it will be impossible to do certain work. For instance, if a weir breaks, or a bank gives way, it is absolutely impossible to wait for contract work in such emergencies; it must be done by force account. There

are types of construction and maintenance work which can be done only by force account. I know that was put in to correct a policy that I cannot defend, but if it is not changed, the effects will be disastrous.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] the chairman of my own delegation, but I have used nearly all my time, and I want to refer to specific items.

Mr. WELCH. I am sure my colleague does not want to misrepresent the Governor of the great State of California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Certainly not. I yield briefly, but I have only a few minutes left.

Mr. WELCH. Just long enough to quote the Governor correctly. Quoting from Governor Warren in his statement before the committee he said:

> It is because of the belief that the people of my State want the project accelerated that I appear before you today and urge an appropriation of $40,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. "Instead of $20,000,000 as provided in the President's budget."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I was there and heard the Governor say it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are certain specific comments I want to make regarding items and policies. I have spoken of the Central Valley project and shall not return to it.

On page 34, the bill shows that the committee cut the requested appropriation for $5,000,000 for general investigations to $125,000. That is not in the interest of economy. I understand the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] is going to discuss this, and that he will submit an amendment to increase that item. I shall vote for that amendment, and I hope the Members of this House will listen carefully to the explanation and that they will vote favorably.

On page 35, at line 5, the Davis Dam project is given $6,200,000. The Congress is obligated to build this dam. It is a detail of the Mexican Water Treaty. I am advised by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL] that this is not the proper amount. I do not know; but I do know, like other Members of this House, that in the short time he has been here, the gentleman from Nevada has established himself firmly. I have confidence in his statement. It should be checked carefully before the bill comes back from conference. Also, I have in my district a situation similar to one which this bill now forces on Nevada. Boulder City, Nev., is entirely on Government land; no taxes are paid to Nevada, from which school money can be secured. The Federal Government has an established policy that in such instances, a subvention is made to help meet the costs of educating the children of the workers. We cannot, and should not, change that policy here. I think perhaps the subcommittee could not visualize such a situation, as we can who have seen it in spots like this one, and that this will also be corrected before the bill comes back from conference. In connection with the Big Thompson project: The farmers in that part of Colorado contracted to pay a certain sum; a poor guess on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation, plus rising construction costs, now makes that sum inadequate. The committee thinks the farmers should pay more. We cannot decide that here. They have a contract with the Government. The item, on page 35, at line 14, should be increased by enough to keep the work moving until the matter is settled. Probably the amount at issue is not more than a couple million dollars. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], who is a distinguished Member of this House, will undoubtedly talk about this.

I know that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] will place before this House, and if necessary, before the other body, the details of the Columbia Basin project, on line 6 of page 36. These items are the only ones, to my knowledge, in which the decisions of the committee in the opinions of the western Members, justify discussion here. There are, however, items that are not money items that are important.

Turn to page 39, lines 7 to 10, inclusive. The hardest thing any of us had to do, has been to get figures regarding the unexpended balances on which we can rely. Two separate computations may be millions apart, and both may come from the Department of the Interior. We cannot decide that puzzle now. It must be decided before the bill is signed. The committee depends on these unexpended balances for the fiscal year 1948. We depend on the committee. The lines to which I just referred say that only money in the reclamation fund may be used, or only money to the total of the fund. I ask now if these lines in any way jeopardize the use of the unexpended balances and particularly I ask whether these lines would interfere with the use of any money in the unexpended balances, if that money came from the general fund in fiscal year 1947 appropriations?

On the same page, beginning with line 23, those last 3 lines, and the first 8 lines on page 40, should definitely be struck out. I shall make a point of order if the committee does not, as I hope, strike them out by previous action. Without realizing it, the committee attempts to legislate on a matter which I expect will someday go to an international court or arbitration board. At best, this is based on questionable legislative action which does not take effect for perhaps 5 years, and this decision was specifically reserved in that legislative action, the Mexican Treaty referred to on line 4.

I hope that the committee will keep in mind that water is now stored back of Hoover Dam, and no longer back of "Boulder Dam." I am looking at line 11 on page 41.

The most important item, to me personally and to my district, is on page 42. About a dozen years ago, the farmers of the Coachella Valley signed a contract under which the Bureau of Reclamation agreed to build an extension of the all-American canal into that area, where the water table was falling dangerously low. The water is not yet on the land. It lies in the canal, a few miles from date groves, the result of years of work and investment, and the wells are turning salt in the groves. The people of the valley came to Washington, and put aside the technicalities, and were willing to overlook the inexcusable delays and the broken promises, and consented to sign an additional contract for the lateral canals, and finally they consented to a change in the engineering design, to hurry the completion of the project. We are working against time, no longer years, now it is months. When a well is drilled now, a flowing well goes out.

The farmers had contracted to pay about $13,000,000. They came here and agreed to pay an additional $13,500,000. That is a big addition. The Government will save about $8,000,000. The Bureau is to pay only for the protective features, now estimated to cost only $4,500,000, one-third of which is already spent. It is a wonderful deal for the Government; and only the urgency of the need for water would compel the farmers to consent to it. The Bureau now says that, on page 42 of this bill, the words, "including distribution and drainage systems)" must be taken from line 1, and placed after the word "California," on line 4. I am not a lawyer and so I will not call it quibbling; perhaps it really is necessary. All I know is that if this is not changed in this bill, I do not know how we can possibly save the date orchards which supply more than 90 percent of the commercial dates grown in the United States. I ask no increase in appropriations; I have asked the committee for this change.

On page 43, at line 8, there is another item for my district. I am told by the engineer there that $1,000,000 is not enough. I am not asking for any increase for a reason which I will make my final comment on this bill. This bill is for the fiscal year 1948. Congress will be back in January of that year. If the Bureau of Reclamation will go to work at once, seriously, earnestly and nonpolitically, and show that this amount, or any other like it, is being expended in a business-like manner, and economically, and still is not enough for the fiscal year, I would have no hesitation in asking the Appropriation Committee for the necessary money to finish the job that year.

If the Bureau dawdles, and plays politics, and sends its propagandists swarming over the various projects like ants, as it does over the Central Valley of California, my heart will not bleed over the cuts which the committee has made in the appropriation requests. It seems to me that the prospects of good will in the Congress and good appropriations in the bills rest entirely with the Bureau of Reclamation from now on.

My own conclusion is therefore that this bill is a good bill inherently, that in almost all cases it provides the amount of money which may be spent in one fiscal year, with three major exceptions, which will be discussed by the Members

from those areas. I do not believe it provides enough money for general investigations. If an amendment is offered to correct that I shall vote for it. I shall vote for the bill feeling that what is not corrected in this House will be corrected in the other House and that there will finally be brought out a bill that we can support here and with our people.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, soon we will have before us for consideration the adoption of a greatly expanded and new international world policy. The President and the State Department have recommended that we extend a special loan to Greece and Turkey in the amount of $400,000,000, this loan to be expended in Greece partially for food and medical supplies but largely for the revival and rehabilitation of that nation's industries and part of the loan will go for military supplies to help modernize the Greek army.

This new policy provides for sending a military mission consisting of Army officers to Greece and also to Turkey to help train and reorganize the Greek and Turkish military forces. It is estimated that about $150,000,000 of the loan will go to Turkey and with it will go a military mission of Army officers who will help to reorganize and revitalize the military forces of Turkey.

The President in laying down this new world expansion policy says in substance that the United States Government commits itself to help defend and protect any nation in the world from being overthrown either by aggression or infiltration by another power. This new world policy committing our Government to the defense of other nations throughout the world which are so threatened is a thousand times more important than the consideration of the $400,000,000 involved. The President says this move is necessary to stop the spread of communism and the possible overthrow of these two governments leading into the Middle East.

Two questions arise which we should seriously consider. Will this amount of money and what we do for Greece and Turkey under the plan likely stop the spread of communism into the Middle East? The next question arising is how much money and manpower will it take to stop communism in Italy, France, China, and a half dozen other countries in Europe which are on the verge of being thrown over by Communist organizations at the present time? Personally, I seriously doubt whether the money we are called upon to expend and the effort we intend to make in Greece and Turkey will be sufficient to stop the expansion of communism if Russia really desires to go into the Middle East. You can find able men in Washington whose judgment is respected on military matters and throughout the Nation who will tell you that most countries on the European continent are in such a state of chaos and financial insolvency that Russia, if she so desires, could occupy and conquer the continent of Europe within 8 weeks' time.

Much as I detest, as we all detest, the ideology of communism, much as we detest the reprehensible conduct of the Russian Government in the past 2 years in her failure to cooperate with the United States and other peace-loving nations, and the United Nations Organization as well, we must not let our hatred of her policies influence our judgment and mislead us in our thinking on so grave a problem as this expansion of foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, we can all endorse the laudible ideal of the President who says we must stop the spread of communism. Every decent person in America is for the ideal of stopping the spread of communism. The Congress would unanimously approve the $400,000,000 requested for the Greek-Turkish loan if they felt certain that would stop it, or seriously retard its expansion in Europe, but the Members of Congress know that we must consider the realities and not laudible ideals.

Mr. Chairman, in reality we have served notice on Russia that we propose to stop her from expanding into the Near East. Much as we may regret it, Russia is now the greatest military power on the Continent of Europe. If Russia decides now or within the next year or two to move into the Middle East we will either have to back down on our foreign policy, or World War III will be upon us and the world. When this Congress thinks of the realities coupled with this new foreign expansion policy you must realize that if this move hastens World War III, that we have in fact established a military beachhead over 3,000 miles away which we will have to defend with all of the men necessary, the munitions of war and the might of the whole Nation.

Mr. Chairman, you must keep in mind that our acts on such momentous legislation as this and on all legislation is supposed to express the approval and thought of the American people. There is no question in my mind but that the majority of the American people are opposed to us taking this step at the present time. In fact, the Gallup poll, in its latest research on this question, some weeks ago showed that over 63 percent were opposed to it. You must visualize the possible reorganization of the draft boards throughout the Nation. You should visualize the possibility of millions of young men being filtered through these draft boards, again putting on the military uniform, the organization of the entire industry of the Nation in the war effort, controls of every kind again placed on our people, our resources geared to the production of implements of war, our national debt now standing at $260,000,000,000 possibly being increased by $50,000,000,000 a year. It appears that the majority of the House will follow the lead of the Senate and approve this legislation. If it does it is to be hoped that none of the things I have pointed out here today will happen, but I submit in deciding on this question we should not decide it on our emotional desires to stop the spread of communism in Europe, and fail to look at the practical side of what it may cost in human lives, American resources, and American finances.

Mr. Chairman, another question I want to raise is, can we afford to commit our Government to such a policy that may cost us many billions of dollars, for we will doubtless find that this $400,000,000 is only a first small down payment on the commitment of the American taxpayers to finance and pay out countless billions of dollars to defend and protect the rest of the world.

Let me point out to you that England and France, who fought two world wars as our allies, are in financial ruin today and France is in social chaos. We have piled up a debt of $260,000,000,000 and now the President and the State Department want us to rush in, declare this our new foreign policy, and furnish, at least temporarily, the international police force for the world. Such a move may well wreck our Nation financially, dragging the American people down into abject poverty where we cannot take care of our own people and cannot render further aid to the world. If we, the only great nation, believing ourselves solvent today, step into this trap and become involved world-wide in financing the rest of the world, all Stalin has to do is to threaten a little here and a little there on starting war on any boundary in Europe until he bleeds this Nation white financially, causing us to finance other threatened nations with millions of dollars each in their turn, until we wreck our Nation financially.

Mr. Chairman, nothing is so important to the American people and to the contribution in leadership it can make to the world for peace in the future than for us to make certain we keep this country sound financially. Unless we keep this country sound financially unemployment, want, and chaos will envelop this Nation as it has other nations under similar conditions. Such a condition would give the Communists in this country who want to overthrow it the very opportunity for which they and Communist Russia are hoping may ultimately happen. We cannot support our Army and our Navy for the defense of this country unless we remain sound financially.

It is one thing to have laudable ideas and use courageous words, but after we have just emerged from a Second World War which has cost us $400,000,000,000 and has left a debt of $260,000,000,000 with the rest of the world broke, not to mention the 300,000 of our finest American soldiers killed and 1,000,000 wounded, which sacrifice can never be repaid, we must figure the cost and deal with realities. It is time that the Members of this Congress who are fearful to take this step stand up and be counted against it.

Mr. Chairman, this will go down in history as one of the most momentous weeks in the Congress of the United

States. It may rank as of greater importance than the week in which we declared war on the Axis Powers a few years ago. Of course, it may turn out all right if the move is made. Every decent American hopes that it will—then again, things may happen to our Nation and to the world too fearful to contemplate. Another question arises: Can you buy off or stop with money that godless thing called communism? We helped liberate France for the second time, and we have given her over $2,000,000,000 since VJ-day, yet she shows no gratitude and her Government is practically controlled by Communists elected by her people. The newspapers of France cry out against the United States Government and praise Russia. We gave Russia over $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease and kept her from being conquered.

We accepted her in the finest embrace of friendship with the hope that she would be our friend and work with us and the other nations of the world for peace. You know the blackness of her record up to the very present moment. She has never kept her word once and has grabbed all the power possible. We have expended $3,000,000,000 on China, and we have not stopped or retarded communism there. We expended over six hundred million on Yugoslavia, millions on Poland, millions on Rumania and Bulgaria, and they are all Communist today, and not one of their rulers is friendly to the United States. We have expended over five hundred million on Italy, and she is tottering on the brink of communism now.

Mr. Chairman, Great Britain has spent over $500,000,000 on Greece and we have spent $485,000,000 on Greece, and yet we are told that we must go in and help to reorganize her army, for in this nation of 7,000,000 people a few thousand guerrillas are trying to overthrow the Government. There is no income tax paid by the well-to-do in Greece today. They have 120,000 people on their federal pay roll. The well-to-do class ha. largely been the beneficiary of the aid we had hoped would go to the poor people of Greece. Now we propose another loan, and, a thousand times worse, we propose to send two military missions, one to Greece and one to Turkey, and to establish, if necessary, a military beachhead, which may mean that the Balkans again has been chosen as the site upon which another world war is to be started.

Mr. Chairman, last week on the floor of the House I said that, in my judgment, there was another and a better way. We know now that the President and the State Department made a mistake when they rushed into this thing, bypassing the United Nations organization.

The fact that the Vandenberg amendments have been offered, asking the United Nations to approve or reject in substance our going into Greece, is an admission that a mistake was made. If our first move was a mistake, when you add this to all of the mistakes in our foreign policy from Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam—mistakes which will cost us billions of dollars, made by the State Department and our leaders—that will keep millions of European people in poverty for years—how can we swallow this thing with any certainty that this new policy is not another and greater mistake against the interest of the people of this country?

Mr. Chairman, if this Government wanted to do something in a substantial way, in a sensible way, to stop world expansion of communism, it should have suggested to the other peace-loving members of the United Nations organization that this Greek-Turkish problem be brought with all the force and power before the United Nations organization, demanding that Russia and her satellite nations cease and desist putting this pressure on Greece and Turkey. You answer that the United Nations is not completed to the point where they have the power. You do not know, because you have not tried it. The United Nations was set up for this purpose; and almost a year ago, when a like and serious situation arose, where Russia would not take her military forces out of Iran, that feeble nation came before the United Nations organization and demanded that it act. It did act, and Russia took her military forces out of Iran. There is not a question in my mind but that we are starting at this thing the wrong way, no question but that we have made a mistake; and I, for one, refuse to follow through to save the face of the State Department or the bipartisan movement in the House and Senate, thereby compounding their mistakes, which may prove to be the most tragic made in the history of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the only way to call Russia's bluff is to call it before the United Nations, representing 51 nations of the world. In addition to taking this matter to the United Nations, I think that the United States should take the leadership, asking other nations to join with her, first, to immediately amend the United Nations Charter, doing away with the veto power; secondly, to provide for inspection under the United Nations organization of atomic energy from the mines through the laboratories into the factories of every country in the world; and third, that another amendment should be passed that would provide for fixing military armament quotas for nations world-wide. This can be done and should be done without further delay. If these two bold moves were made instead of the approach we are about to make, Russia would be put on notice before the world, and it is the judgment of many of the best minds of this country that the United Nations organization does have the moral power, suasion, and force to stop this expansion in Greece and Turkey by Russia as it did in Iran.

Mr. Chairman, if these amendments were rapidly driven through under the leadership of the United States and Great Britain and they can be, millions of subjugated people in Poland who want liberty, millions in Rumania, millions in Czechoslovakia, millions in Greece, millions in Austria, millions in France, Italy, and other nations could then look with hope to the United Nations as a great, powerful living force for liberty, freedom, and peace.

Mr. Chairman, these millions in the grass roots of these countries would start a pressure against the domination of communism in their countries that would drive it back into the confines of Russia. If the United Nations Charter is amended along the lines I have suggested, and I may say that I made a speech on the floor of the House almost 2 years ago advocating such a move, it will sweep the power and the influence of the United Nations organization forward to where the people of the whole world can indulge a real hope for lasting world peace.

You may answer, if these amendments are made to the United Nations organization, Russia may walk out. Well, on her past record, the sooner she walks out the better. This will call her bluff, and maybe make her dictatorial leaders think. She should be invited to stay in with the door left wide open, with a standing invitation for her to come back in, which no doubt within a short period of time she would do, because she would be given one choice to line up in full, honest fellowship with the rest of the world for peace, or become an aggressor nation, against which 70 percent of the world could be legally hurled against her through the United Nations organization. She can join with the rest of the world for peace or commit national suicide.

Mr. Chairman, they have urged that the United Nations organization cannot immediately finance aid to Greece. This Nation could authorize the expenditure of $100,000,000 through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Export-Import Bank. In fact, it could be turned over to the United Nations organization as one of our first contributions; possibly other nations, if they were invited in, would begin to make their contributions through the United Nations with the same purpose in view.

The President could be given the authority to authorize the Secretary General of the United Nations to begin to use our funds immediately through UNRRA or some other organization it would desire to bring into being. Funds for relief could be gotten to those countries as quickly through the United Nations as can be in the course provided by the legislation we are considering. In that way prompt and immediate help could go through the United Nations organization.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations organization has been dealing with Greece in a practical way. Months ago a Food and Agricultural Organization committee was sent to Greece by the United Nations, which investigated the entire situation there and came back with recommendations. That committee recommended that only temporary aid should be given by England and the United States in the way of some food and other necessary imports. They said some emergency relief was necessary and recommended a long-term permanent rehabilitation program for the Greek economy for assistance to that nation and that such assistance should be furnished through the World Bank. As I recall, the committee which made this study thought an emergency fund of about $100,000,000 would be ample at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, since VJ-day our Nation has contributed over $7,000,000,000 to help to feed, clothe, and rehabilitate the European nations and China. We are committed to a billion and a half dollars in relief to other nations this coming year. There are requests for billions of dollars through the Export-Import Bank and a great amount of money will go out through that organization. All of this money must come from the American taxpayers.

While I am willing to go as far as we can to help world humanity and while I am anxious to oppose the spread of communism anywhere and everywhere, I cannot bring myself to believe this legislation is the right approach to these vexing problems. For over 30 days I have kept an open mind, sought information from every source and thought seriously about this problem in the hope so far as I am individually concerned that I might be able to cast my vote in the best interest of the people I represent and of the entire Nation. Unfortunately, none of us can be certain, however, as to our decision. Time only will tell. From my study of this problem, however, it is my honest conviction, which I fear a majority of this body does not hold, that I will be serving the people of this Nation best by opposing this legislation.

The people in my district are divided on this question; some of my best friends favor it while I believe the great majority of my people are opposed to it. I believe the majority of the American people, if they understood this legislation, would hesitate to endorse it.

Mr. Chairman, I am so certain that this approach settles nothing and that it may ultimately prove to be disastrous to this Nation that I cannot support it.

We cannot have world peace unless we cast the burden of keeping the peace of the world on the United Nations organization and back that organization. We can have peace, world peace, in my judgment, if those who are leading us would reverse their position, and join their forces behind the United Nations organization through which, in my judgment, only can world peace ultimately be achieved.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Committee on Appropriations I was assigned to the Department of the Interior Subcommittee. I found the members of the Interior Subcommittee to be the finest type of gentlemen possible with which to be associated, and I may even say, to be locked up with, for a period of 2 months, of any group that I could have hand-picked myself. The chairman of this committee, while we have not always agreed, and many times violently disagreed, on matters as to how to proceed and arrive at conclusions on matters, I found to be one of the most estimable gentleman with whom it has ever been my pleasure to serve. He has given unlimited and precious time to a study of the problems concerning a section of this country with which he is not particularly concerned, and the highest honor that I can bestow upon him is that every proposition that I have heard him advance has been an honest conviction. As for the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the same thing can be said. I found him to possess the most comprehensive and charitable views of problems of the western part of the United States that I doubt are shared by any other member of the committee who has seen as little of that part of the country as has he. I can speak equally well of the other members of the committee, and we certainly worked under conditions of high compatibility during the entire 7 weeks time that were taken up by these hearings.

In regard to the matter of reclamation, which as you probably know is closest and dearest to my heart, there was a sharp degree of variance of opinion upon that great work. The figures for 1948 submitted to the Bureau of the Budget by the Reclamation Department was $260,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget in its wisdom cut this amount to $145,000,000. That was the amount which came before us and which was considered by our committee.

In the final analysis, we allowed $62,000,000 to carry on this great work, which as you all know is of major importance to the West.

A member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], earlier today made a statement that I think is at some variance with my understanding of what transpired in the committee and, with the gentleman's permission, I should like to give my idea of it at this time. He said awhile ago, if I quote him correctly, and if I do not I stand for correction, that this was a report of a majority of the committee. Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. The bill before you today is not a report of the majority of the committee, and I want to tell you just exactly why it is not a report of the majority. It was announced in our committee hearings on a certain day that in case of variance of opinion among the members of the committee as to the general policy that would be outlined to us, if the majority of the committee could not see fit to go along, another very important Member of the Congress was ready, willing, and waiting to come down and assist us in our work, that he would be only too happy to assist us in our work, and that he as a member of the full committee would be allowed to cast a vote in our deliberations. In other words, the sword of Damocles was dangled over the heads of the committee members.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that the "big, bad wolf," may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. STOCKMAN. That could be.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman that just preceded the gentleman told us that there were just a few items in this bill that were objectionable. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to a few provisions of this bill, among others, that are objectionable to Wyoming.

Now as the gentleman well knows about 75 percent of the area of Wyoming drains into the Missouri River Basin and for that reason I am intensely interested in the appropriation for the Missouri River project.

The State of Wyoming is dependent to a great extent upon irrigation for successful and well-balanced agricultural economy. The benefits derived from the lands now under irrigation have proven so great that there is no question as to the desirability or necessity among the people for expanding this irrigated land as rapidly as possible.

The committee's report provides for reducing the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation's Missouri River Basin Project from $23,000,000 to $9,611,600 and restricting the use of this money to units now in the construction stage.

This appropriation as it now stands provides for continuation of construction on the Boysen and Kortes units and for continued planning on Owl Creek, Paintrock, and Shoshone extensions in Wyoming. No allowance is made for continuation of work on many other units which are in various stages of development. The following Missouri Basin project units in Wyoming have been completely eliminated from the 1948 program by the committee's action:

Belle Fourche Storage	$10,000
Glendo	200,000
Tongue River Development	25,000
Powder River Development	100,000
North Platte River Development	60,000
Shoshoni	13,000
Sheridan Canal Unit	25,000
Total	433,000

The first two units are included with that group of projects on which plans are being prepared for construction. The $200,000 requested for the Glendo unit will be used to continue detailed surveys, right-of-way negotiations, economic studies and geological explorations, in order that preconstruction work on all features can be practically complete by the end of the fiscal year 1948. The area that will be served by the Glendo Project has been under water for many years and this project will provide supplemental water badly needed. The area to be served was involved in the case of Nebraska v. Wyoming decided June 11, 1945, and apportioned the natural-flow of the North Platte River between those two States and Colorado. The apportionment was made in sections, and the last section of the river covered by the decree was that portion between the Whalen Dam, which is the diversion dam for the Interstate Canal on the North, and the Fort Laramie Canal on the South of the North Platte River, extending to the Tri-State Dam, which is just over the line in Nebraska. The natural flow of the river in this section was apportioned, 75 percent to Nebraska, and 25 percent to Wyoming.

Up until said decree was made, Wyoming had refused to recognize some 700 feet of the Tri-State Canal appropriation now owned by the Farmers irrigation district, and up until that time Wyoming had furnished her direct-flow right ditches with sufficient water; since that

time there has been, and probably will continue to be, an insufficient supply for these older ditches.

The special master in the Wyoming-Nebraska case found that the early appropriators, with their priorities and appropriations, were as follows:

Stat	Canal	Priority	Acres	Second-feet
Wyoming	Grattan	1882	614	9
	North Platte	1883	3,153	45
	Rock Ranch	1884	2,250	32
	Pratt-Ferris	1886	1,200	17
Total			7,217	103
Nebraska	Tri-State	1887	51,000	729
	Mitchell	1890	13,633	195
Total			64,633	924
Wyoming	Burbank	1891	292	5
	Torrington	1891	2,061	29
	Lucerne	1893	4,221	60
Total			6,574	94

There is usually direct flow available to the four Wyoming ditches first named, whose total requirements in second-feet amount to 103. This would require that there be 412 second-feet of water natural flow in the river, however, before these four oldest rights could be supplied.

Then in order of priority come the two Nebraska ditches, with requirements for 924 second-feet.

Then come the second group of three Wyoming ditches, with total requirements of 94 second-feet.

This makes a total of 1,121 second-feet required for the 9 ditches, but the total of the 2 groups of Wyoming ditches is 197 second-feet. Whenever there is 788 second-feet in the river the Wyoming ditches are taken care of. In other words, where Wyoming used to be able to satisfy her 197 feet of appropriations whenever there was that amount plus 195 feet for the Mitchell ditch, or 392 feet of water in the river, it now takes almost 800 second-feet to accomplish this. During the irrigation season the river frequently falls far below this 800 feet requirement.

In 1932, 1934, and 1936, the direct flow frequently fell below 1,000 second-feet. In 1934 it rose above 800 second-feet for only about 33 days during the entire season, and was below 400 second-feet about 34 days. In 1936 it was below 1,000 second-feet for over 50 days during the season, and below 800 second-feet about 28 days.

I quote the above from page 1385 of the court's decision in the Nebraska-Wyoming case in 89 United States.

During the crop season of 1946 the Burbank, the Torrington, and the Lucerne were out of direct-flow water much of the months of July and August. There would have been a very disastrous water shortage had it not been that the water users depending on storage rights in Pathfinder Reservoir graciously rented to these older ditches some 12,000 acre-feet of storage water which was temporarily available. These same ditches are trying this year to rent storage from the same source. No decision has been reached as yet, and if these storage waters are not made available to these three ditches again this year, the result will be disastrous.

It is only very occasionally that any storage is available for rental. The entire storage supply is needed by the Bureau of Reclamation districts comprising the North Platte project and the Warren Act contractors who have heretofore purchased a permanent supply of stored water from the United States. This situation affects not only the almost 6,600 acres of land under Wyoming ditches that are now made short of water, but it also affects the Mitchell ditch, whose lands lie on the south side of the North Platte River in Nebraska, and amount to over 13,600 acres. Before the Mitchell ditch can be supplied with its full appropriation there must be 924 second-feet of water available to Nebraska appropriators, and that requires that there be natural flow in the river of 1,232 second-feet. Nebraska is as much interested in the proposed Glendo Reservoir as Wyoming, or should be. With all available storage rights disposed of, some additional storage must be developed to save the lands under the Mitchell ditch and the three Wyoming ditches. This is not adding new acreage, it is not developing a new territory, the lands served by the Mitchell ditch lie in the famous Mitchell Valley, south of the towns of Morrill and Mitchell, Nebr. The Burbank ditch serves lands lying in what is known as the London Flats country southwest of Lingle, Wyo. The lands under the Torrington ditch immediately surround the town of Torrington, Wyo. Some 200 water users under this ditch reside on tracts of from a fraction of an acre to 4 or 5 acres, live on these semifarm homes, and work in or in the vicinity of Torrington. They have developed these farmsteads with trees, shrubs, lawns, berry patches, orchards, and gardens, and their future, indeed, looks dismal. The lands under the Lucerne ditch surround the town of Lingle. I venture that there is not another 4,000 acres of irrigated land in the West that produces more heavily than do these fine farm lands when they have an adequate supply of water.

The Guernsey Dam lies some 8 or 10 miles up the river from Whalen, and just above the town of Guernsey, Wyo. The original capacity of this dam was 69,000 acre-feet; it has silted up until today its capacity is only about 45,000 acre-feet, and it is continuing to silt at the rate of about 1,000 acre-feet per year. This dam was built to serve two purposes, first, as a regulating dam to assist in handling the waters of Pathfinder Dam. It takes about 4 days for water to flow from Pathfinder Dam to Guernsey, but only an hour or two to flow from the Guernsey Dam to the headworks at Whalen serving the two large Government canals, the Interstate Canal and the Fort Laramie Canal. With a small supply of storage available at Guernsey, excess waters in the river can be caught and held when it becomes necessary to reduce ditch diversion, and ditch diversion can be speedily augmented when necessary.

Secondly, the dam has served to catch and hold flash run-offs from small tributaries of the North Platte River that would otherwise go to waste.

The proposed Glendo Reservoir would catch the silt which is now destroying Guernsey Reservoir and would leave that reservoir available for regulating the flow of the two Government ditches referred to above and the waters for Warren Act contractors that depend on it, and the Glendo Reservoir would also conserve these flash floods which the Guernsey Reservoir is presently going to have to let go to waste, and would make available for these old ditches a supplemental supply of stored water, and restore the value and fertility to upward of 20,000 acres of the finest irrigated farm land in the West.

On page 42 of this bill the committee proposes an appropriation of $250,000 from the Colorado River development fund for the investigation of projects in the four States of the upper division of the Colorado River Basin. Now this money does not come out of general funds of the Treasury but out of a special fund from power receipts of the Boulder Canyon project, and I cannot see why that item was reduced 50 percent.

The Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations and public reports of the feasibility of projects for irrigation, generation of electric power, and other purposes in the States in the Colorado River Basin, and of formulating a comprehensive scheme for the control and improvement and utilization of the water of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act provides that $500,000 annually of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for the years of operation ending in 1938, 1939, and 1940—amounting to a total of $1,500,000—are authorized to be appropriated only for the continuation and extension, under the direction of the Secretary, of studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of waters of the Colorado River system for irrigation, electrical power, and other purposes, in the Colorado Basin States. The next such receipts up to and including the receipts for the year of operation ending in 1955 are authorized to be appropriated only for the investigation and construction of projects for utilizing the waters of the Colorado River system in the four States of the upper division of the Colorado Basin, namely, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Appropriations for fiscal year 1948 would come from the second reservation in the special fund which has been set aside for investigations and construction of projects in the States of the upper division. From this fund $2,599,750 has been previously appropriated, leaving $400,250 unappropriated. An additional $500,000 will accrue to this fund at the beginning of fiscal year 1948.

Without the appropriation of the funds requested in the budget estimate the Bureau cannot proceed with a project-planning program to provide for an orderly and adequate development of the water, land, and power resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin. Without such planning, this development, which Congress provided for in the 1940 act,

will be materially delayed. The withholding of $250,000 of the $500,000 requested, which is the amount allowed by law, is false economy, as the money comes from a special fund derived from the sale of power and not from the General Treasury. If the money is not appropriated, it merely accumulates in the special fund and does no good for anyone.

There are 100 potential within-basin projects in various stages of investigation in the States of the upper division of the Colorado River Basin. About one-quarter of this total are under active consideration and those investigations should be pushed. The States of the upper division are now negotiating a compact for the equitable allocation of the available water between the States. Additional information on the potential projects is urgently needed in order that the States may arrive at a fair and workable compact. The withholding of necessary funds, particularly when those funds are already dedicated to a specific purpose, would serve to slow down unreasonably this extremely vital work of the compact commission and at a time when the Bureau has a force on hand in the area to do the work.

In 1922 the States of the upper division entered into the Colorado River compact which apportions the water of the Colorado River system between the States of the upper division and the States of the lower division. In entering into this compact the States of the upper division assumed an obligation to deliver 75,000,000 acre-feet of water at Lee Ferry in any 10-consecutive-year period. To meet this obligation the upper basin States must have hold-over storage reservoirs. The experience of the past 16 years has brought to our attention the fact that the upper basin States must provide some hold-over storage in the very near future. I feel strongly about this point and I have already introduced H. R. 2841, a bill to authorize the construction of certain Federal reclamation works in the upper basin of the Colorado River. Investigations on these important storage works are performed with funds appropriated from the special fund I have already mentioned. It is extremely important that these investigations be completed so that the upper division States may know when and how best they can meet their commitments.

The investigation in the upper Colorado River area, such as those of the Lyman project now nearing completion, and of the Sublette and Little Snake River projects now well advanced would be greatly retarded. All upper basin States would be affected by stoppage of work on investigating the hold-over storage projects required to meet the Colorado River compact commitments.

Now, then, I certainly cannot agree with the cut in the general investigations fund from the requested amount of $5,000,000 to the token appropriation of $125,000, which will completely eliminate investigation programs now under way in the Western States.

The maintenance of an adequate program of Federal irrigation development is essential to a sound national economy. Irrigation is a sound investment. It pays its way. It creates new wealth and new permanent opportunities for business expansion and employment, but sound irrigation development is impossible without adequate planning.

The Bureau of Reclamation is now preparing comprehensive plans for 35 river basins and subbasins and is reviewing by means of these plans the entire water-resources situation throughout the 17 Western States, with the purpose of evolving the best plans for the optimum utilization of this resource for irrigation, power production, industrial and domestic uses, and to provide silt and flood control. The comprehensive basin plans present a program of development which will provide a means of maintaining a desirable standard of living for our future expanding population. In addition to the comprehensive basin plans being studied, the Bureau is actively investigating 115 individual projects. The token appropriation proposed will mean complete abandonment of all investigations throughout the West. It is less than 2 percent of the program now being carried out. Complete disintegration of the highly trained technical staff of the Bureau would result.

The importance of having adequate funds, so essential to sound planning, cannot be overemphasized. The costs of construction of irrigation power features of Bureau projects are reimbursable. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate thoroughly and to review the proposed plans adequately in order to be certain that all possibilities are carefully explored and the best plan selected Not only are there 115 projects now under investigation, but there is a constant demand from local interests for investigations of other new projects in all 17 Western States. This is inevitable, considering that water is the most valuable natural resource and the foundation upon which the economy of the arid and semi-arid West is built.

Continuing study and planning for the best use of the combined water and land resources of the West is essential. The general investigation program now under way is designed for this need, but the amount proposed to be allotted will not permit worth-while results.

The work of the Bureau of Reclamation in investigations and planning of new projects, including the preparation of project planning reports for the authorization of construction of new projects, is carried on from three sources. These are the annual appropriations for general investigations, the Colorado development fund, and in the Missouri Basin, a portion of the Missouri Basin project appropriation. This bill, as reported out by the committee, practically eliminates all planning activities.

If the appropriation is limited to $125,000 for general investigations and $250,000 for the Colorado River development fund, together with the elimination of nearly all planning from the Missouri Basin project appropriation, all of the project planning work in the State of Wyoming will be stopped.

The type of expenditure represented by irrigation development is an investment as distinguished from a nonproductive expenditure. These projects will return the full amount of their cost to the Federal Treasury and will at the same time bring benefits of inestimable value not only to the areas in which they are located but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes. May I interject at this point that I expect to offer an amendment tomorrow upon that specific item?

Mr. BARRETT. I will certainly support that amendment.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. While this committee was working long hours and very diligently, plans were being made for a visit of the President of Mexico to the city of Washington. One of the purposes of that visit will be to secure a loan of $25,000,000 for the development of irrigation and public power in Mexico.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Does the gentleman believe there is any question but that he will get it?

Mr. CURTIS. I am not going to give it to him.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I was going to explain why it was that it was not necessary to call in the "big, bad wolf." It was brought very tangibly to the attention of the committee that in case of disagreement under the general policy as outlined this gentleman would be brought in and he would be allowed to vote with the committee. If the contemplated or anticipated alinement of the members followed, then with the gentleman coming in it would probably make a tie vote, and if a tie vote ensued it was announced that the rules of the House would be invoked, and, consequently, no amount of money would go into the item. In other words, in case of a tie vote, nothing would be allowed.

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman has explained it quite well.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say, of course, the other side of the fence played smart politics by putting my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the committee to take Mr. NORRELL'S place and, of course, knowing that Mr. ROONEY would go along with the spending of any amount of money that anyone could suggest. So, in order to offset that, it was necessary for the Republicans to do that which we thought is right and proper. That never would have been done if it had not been for the fact that the other side of the aisle had placed the liberal on that committee for the sole purpose of outvoting us.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Iowa, if it is not the fact that I have always been for proper economy in Government. I have opposed appropriations for the Grazing Service when my good friend, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and I had it out hot and heavy in this

Chamber. I have opposed appropriations in this bill in connection with the Park Service when I found out they were giving concessions entered into under the Hoover regime in 1932 which practically was a larceny on the Treasury of this country. The gentleman from Iowa knows that I never did ride on headless horseman economy where we cut out the very vitals of America by denying appropriations for projects such as the one in the district of the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say the gentleman also showed his conservatism when he opposed the concession plan for the Statue of Liberty. He said that the Government was not getting a fair proportion of the money that was derived from that concession so he has shown how he stands on economy.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman knows that I showed in the case of the Statue of Liberty, where the little fellow could go in and buy some soda pop and a hot dog, that the revenues to the Federal Treasury were about 100 times more than they were out at Yosemite Park in California, where the concessionaire was appointed by Secretary of the Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur, where they do $3,000,000 worth of business a year and Uncle Sam's Treasury gets the huge sum of $5,000 for the privilege of using the entire park and any number of structures and the use of Uncle Sam's roads and police and water and garbage-removal service and everything else. Uncle Sam gets $5,000 for that nice concession. The gentleman from Iowa well knows I am the one who brought that to the attention of this committee and this House.

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. ROONEY. What has the gentleman from Iowa done about it up to date?

Mr. JENSEN. I give the gentleman credit and I want the House to know that the Republicans on the committee went right down the line with him. He was absolutely right, but the fact still remains, they renewed all of those concession contracts. It was not this committee that did it. It was the Interior Department that renewed them, just about as they were before. So I am sorry that all the work he did came to almost nought because of the fact that the boys downtown just said, "No, we cannot do this."

Mr. ROONEY. I would like the gentleman from Oregon to continue with the tale of the "big, bad wolf."

Mr. STOCKMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in answer to his nicely worded statement, I am not an analyst of politics in any degree. I am probably unable to surmise the political aspect of the various Democratic and Republican maneuvers, if there were any such.

But to proceed, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] referred to the majority report of the committee. That is, the foundation of the report. I believe you will all agree with me that that is not exactly what one would term a bona fide majority report as is usually accepted by the House.

Mr. ROONEY. I dislike to interrupt my good friend, but I will give him such time as has been taken in the colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa and myself. Is it not a fact that the three members of the minority, serving on the subcommittee, voted for a greater amount than the amounts allowed by the majority of this committee, in connection with the reclamation projects?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. On last Monday the Appropriations Committee, composed of 43 members, approved the committee report. It is the majority report of the entire Appropriations Committee. The gentleman did not object in the committee meeting to any part, any word, any phrase, or any figure in the report. It is the committee report.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the sense in wasting time? It is just like marking up the bill.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. May I continue without being interrupted? The force of the gentleman's statement is that this is a subcommittee report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. As a matter of fact, this Appropriations Committee consisting of 43 members approved this report before it was made public. There cannot be any question but what it is the majority report of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not see what there is to argue, belaboring the point as to how the votes were cast in the subcommittee, because if the gentleman had any complaint to make, he should have raised it in the committee on last Monday. If the gentleman from New York feels wronged, he is in the same position I was for 6 years on the committee when I was a member of the minority. I was a part of the 17 and he was a part of the 25 that rolled this up year after year and broke the economy of Uncle Sam.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio whether or not any member of the majority in the full Committee on Appropriations offered any amendment to increase any amount in this bill as reported by the majority of the subcommittee?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. In the executive session of the committee the majority voted the bill out. The report filed was by authority of the Appropriations Committee. What happened in the committee is of no importance, except that the majority voted it out.

Mr. ROONEY. I absolutely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield, gladly.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will agree with the gentleman if he will use the remainder of his time. I would like to hear him.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Now, a belated answer to my distinguished colleague from New York in the matter of the vote in the subcommittee. I want to keep the record straight. Let me say here and now—and if I am wrong I desire correction—at no time was a vote taken in the subcommittee. But, you say, this is the majority report of the subcommittee. I just merely want to have the facts as they appear to me firmly established in the record.

Now, to proceed, this committee in its wisdom allowed $62,000,000 for the reclamation fund. The amount originally proposed by the Bureau was $260,000,000. This is a cut of $198,000,000, slightly more than a token cut, if I may be allowed to make the observation.

Mr. Chairman, there are two kinds of appropriations in my humble judgment: One is what may be termed "pork-barrel" legislation, that is money that is perhaps in most cases wisely expended and so spent for the benefit, use, and advancement of most of the people in the United States of America. It has, however, a feature and that is that that sort of money is not reimbursable. The other type of appropriation is what may be termed "for capital investment" and it is entirely reimbursable to the Treasury of the United States whether it be in the reclamation fund or the general fund, and it is under that heading that the amount of money appropriated for proposed reclamation projects come.

That makes a vast difference. This money is only being loaned to the people interested in these irrigation projects; and, in passing, let me say that the settlers on these projects are not merely citizens of the 17 Western States, they are citizens of every State in the Union. It directly benefits all of us.

A question has arisen as to whether money appropriated from the general fund and for the construction of reclamation projects is proper or not. It has been decided in one way that it is not proper. I think there is merit to the fact that the money from the general fund of the United States Treasury which is used for reclamation projects does not come back to the general fund. Instead, that money is repaid and, I may say, with 3 percent interest to the reclamation fund.

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I think that proposal to make repayments to the general fund has merit. I believe, however, it is folly and short-sighted economy at this time to cut off all the reclamation projects there are in progress of construction and limit them to money that is available in the reclamation fund. In so doing I want to subscribe to the theory of the gentleman from Ohio, that money appropriated from that fund when it comes back should be credited to the fund and the people of the United States, who furnish the money for that fund, should be reimbursed. But in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is not the right way to do it, to cut off our nose in order to be able to get even a just proposal before the American people. That may be one way to do it. There is a dif-

ference of opinion, and there is no one who is a greater admirer of the chairman who has proposed that proposition than I am, but I think this is a pretty rough method in order to enforce that demand.

In the reclamation section of the bill the committee—and I say in its wisdom—saw fit to cut the salaries and expenses budget from an amount which was based on the Bureau of the Budget request of $4,800,000 to $3,000,000. Maybe that is too much; maybe it is not. I yield to no man when I say I am first and foremost a champion of economy and especially of Government funds. I believe that the figures will justify my statement that there are some personnel in the Bureau of Reclamation that could properly be dispensed with. The Bureau of Reclamation is somewhat in the same situation as Topsy, it has just growed, to use the vernacular, and I think there may be some cut made in that connection, but if it will eliminate the key men, the top men, the brains of a great million-dollar organization, then, Mr. Chairman, it is poor and false economy to cut the amount to the amount which we did cut it.

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I appreciate that the gentleman is the first speaker who has mentioned this vital point. In addition to the fund the gentleman has mentioned, the cut in appropriations, in that same section they have placed a specific limitation of $6,500,000 that will reduce the number of engineers by 1,300, destroying the whole engineering structure, design and construction program for this great project and in 1,552 pages there is not one scintilla of testimony or evidence justifying this cut.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his very valuable contribution.

I would like to call attention to another matter which I intend to follow up further tomorrow. That is the matter of general investigations. The Budget Bureau saw fit to allow $5,000,000 for this item. I submit to you that the Bureau of the Budget is not giving away money and when it allowed $5,000,000 for this important work it scrutinized the item very closely. The committee saw fit to allow $125,000 in place of $5,000,000.

The work of the general investigation department is to see beforehand just what the possibilities are of a proposed reclamation project, find out what type of soil is there, whether or not it is susceptible to irrigation, whether or not it is practical for irrigation; and the saving of four or five million dollars in that item could very well in the future lead to the ill-advised use of many, many, many millions of dollars. That is one item which could well receive the close scrutiny of this House and probably be raised to a modest amount which will allow the Bureau to keep on its staff men who have been trained by lifelong experience in the work of finding out what can or what cannot be irrigated.

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the amount that was spent for investigations during the past year by the Bureau of Reclamation? Does the gentleman have those figures?

Mr. STOCKMAN. No; I do not have the exact amount but I would think it would be close to the budget figure.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I have been advised that there is a large sum being carried over. I do not know whether it is enough to take care of the requirements or not, but I wonder if the gentleman has the figures. I am interested in what the gentleman is saying and I intend to support his amendment raising the amount to whatever he thinks is fair and reasonable. I think we ought to check these projects and find out those that are feasible; in other words, get all the information we can.

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

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

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman proposes to offer an amendment to increase the amount for these general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall support that amendment too.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. MURDOCK. When I said earlier today that this bill really sterilizes the action of the Bureau of Reclamation, I had in mind just this kind of cut, taking away the seed corn from our great western irrigation farmers of the future.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In addition to finding out whether the land is susceptible to irrigation, they have to investigate the stream flow and the dam sites, which takes a great deal of preliminary work.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes; and that sort of work requires trained men, engineers who have followed that sort of work for years. It is a highly specialized profession. You cannot just pick those men up off the curbstone to do a job like that because if you do it will cost a great many millions of dollars if they are entrusted with that important work.

Members of the House, I have gone along, I think, with fairly good grace on most of this bill. I do believe that the Department of the Interior has many men who could be economically dispensed with. I do feel that they spend some money in disseminating information to the people that the people probably do not want. I was very happy to go along with those cuts, but when it comes to our investing the money of this Nation in a capital investment, in other words, a reimbursable investment that will be paid back with interest, and which is producing capital that makes for the prosperity of the entire United States, we should look at it in a different light. This is a Nation-wide proposition. It is not sectional. It is not confined to the 17 Western States. It is confined, gentlemen, to the 48 States, and it is a matter which is dedicated to the 140,000,000 people of this country, to which they are all eligible, and which you will find on these projects, coming from every section of these United States. It is our last greatest natural resource to be developed.

It has been said here on the floor today that our Mesabi iron range is only good for another 12 years, that our oil resources are only known to be good for another 20 years, that our timber is fast being depleted, that our fields are being mined of what was once thought to be an inexhaustible resource. Our food production in this country is likely, in the next 10 or 15 years, to be the exact reverse of what it is today. Today we are living in the land of plenty. Fifteen years from today, which is the tomorrow of today, it can and will very likely be an entirely different problem that will face us. It takes time to get these projects ready, and within the next 15 years we must not have it said that we failed in our duty here today to advance money for reimbursable projects which have all the worth-while values that anyone who analyzes the situation any way at all cannot help but say is feasible.

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman think that we need at the present time to exploit these natural resources? Does our agricultural production indicate that we need to bring these additional lands into production through irrigation?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes; in my opinion it does.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman not believe that to further increase irrigated areas at this time would displace present agricultural production in other sections of the Nation?

Mr. STOCKMAN. No.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman not believe that the opening up of irrigation projects in recent years has caused a transfer of agricultural production to be concentrated in certain specific irrigated areas?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman think that will continue?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes. I hope it continues.

Mr. HARDY. Then, would the gentleman be in favor of consolidating the production of certain specified crops in an area where a hazard of some water condition might completely wipe out that production?

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Let me place my thoughts before the House and not accept the gentleman's viewpoint to that extent.

Mr. HARDY. I am asking the gentleman for some answers.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I am not at all in favor of concentrating agricultural produce in any area, but that is a matter that is going to come whether we like it or not. All one has to do is to take a short automobile trip in either Maryland or Virginia and see the erosion of the soil in that territory, and I think it is indicative of the eastern seaboard; that it has been mined to the point of exhaustion, and the corn crop that you see growing there is mighty scant, being as charitable as I can about it, and it seems to me like bluegrass is one of the main crops.

Gentlemen, as sure as I stand here in the well of this House today, that within the next 15 years, if we do not open up the available irrigable acreage in the West, the ones that are the most productive acres of any country in the world, this country will face a food famine.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the failure of this bill to provide adequate funds for the education of Indian children, and for the maintenance of Indian hospitals. These are, I believe, two services which the Government should perform for the Indians to the best of its ability. That cannot be done on the amounts recommended in the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

One of the increases denied is the sum of $155,000 to meet the added costs of contracts between the Federal Government and local school districts for the education of Indian children. In my State and in several others where Indian children attend the public school, it has been the practice of the Congress to permit a Federal contribution on behalf of these children. This is necessary because most of the Indians live on nontaxable land, while the school districts depend on local property taxation for funds to operate the schools. Costs in these schools have been rising steadily. In Montana we estimate they have increased from 20 to 25 percent. Meanwhile the contribution of the Federal Government has not increased, and it is not paying its fair share of the expense of educating the Indian children. Where the Federal contribution fails to increase with rising costs, the school districts will be forced to curtail their school terms, increase the ratio of pupil to teacher, or even close their doors, with consequent serious effects on both the Indian and white children of the districts.

The Federal contribution for this purpose in all States has been about $600,000. This year the Bureau asked an increase of $155,000 so that the Government's contribution would be increased in proportion to rising costs. This increase has been denied, and instead all funds for education have been cut about $2,000,000.

As an example of the effect this will have in my district, I would like to explain the situation in the Brockton, Mont., public school. In this school 71 children out of a total enrollment of 105 are Indians. Most of their parents live on nontaxable land. The land of the white people in the district, the parents of the 34 white children, certainly cannot be expected to bear the cost of the entire school district. If the Federal Government does not pay its share of the expenses, the district will have to cut its services for both whites and Indians. This situation is repeated throughout my State, and it is serious.

The Federal Government has an obligation to perform in this matter, and I believe it must accept that responsibility. When the Federal Government made wards of the Indians it also assumed the responsibility for their welfare, and that includes adequate educational facilities. The Indian Bureau has been criticized repeatedly for not advancing the Indians so that they can take their places in our society as full citizens. It cannot advance the Indians if it is not allowed funds for their education. Education of the children is the very basis of all our hopes that the Indians may someday become free and independent citizens, a goal toward which we all should strive.

This applies also to hospital facilities for Indians. The costs of operating these hospitals has increased greatly. Even now we have in committee, deficiency appropriation requests which are absolutely necessary to maintain our Indian hospitals for the remainder of the current fiscal year. We are morally obligated to maintain these hospitals. Everyone knows that the costs of running such institutions have increased. Yet the committee has refused the $766,430 increase requested for the coming fiscal year. In view of the fact that we are going to have to furnish additional funds within a few days to keep these hospitals from closing May 1, it seems to me a short-sighted policy to attempt to hold the hospitals for another year under what has been proved to be an inadequate amount.

Adequate provisions for hospitals and schools are obligations we have assumed for our Indian citizens, and I hope that the House will see fit to restore the amounts cut in the committee report.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I have made at various points in the debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have long been interested in the work of the Geological Survey in the fields of mineral and water resources, topographic mapping, and the supervision of mineral production from public lands. Consequently, I am concerned over the action of the Appropriations Committee in regard to the activities of the Geological Survey and believe that the House should realize some of the results of that action if the committee's recommendations are included in the Interior bill when it is finally passed.

We all realize that the strictest economy should be practiced in Government operations, but care should be exercised to insure that we insist on true, and not false, economy. Large sums were wastefully expended during the war in obtaining information in a desperate hurry because earlier investigations had not been sufficiently extensive. Such a situation should not be allowed to occur again.

I note that the ground-water investigations of the Geological Survey have been eliminated entirely. These are important studies and have been in progress for more than half a century. Their worth has been proved and the well-being of the Nation demands that they be continued. The ground-water studies of the Geological Survey are supported by such organizations as the American Water Works Association and the United States Chamber of Commerce. The use of ground water today is nearly double that in 1938 and irrigation interests, industries, States, and municipalities have come to look to the water facts determined and made available by the Survey as a necessity in planning development and growth.

The committee recommends that funds for land classification be reduced approximately 50 percent below the 1947 level and for mineral leasing work about 30 percent below this year's level. The committee apparently overlooked provision for work on Indian land leases. The value of minerals produced from the public and Indian lands has increased from $93,000,000 in 1938 to $183,000,000 in 1946. The Geological Survey is responsible by law for the classification of the public land as to its mineral character and for the supervision of mineral leases on the public land. If the committee's recommendations regarding these activities become law, the Survey will have to attempt to handle nearly twice the work load with a staff equivalent to that of 1938.

The committee recommends that topographic mapping by the Geological Survey be supported by only about one-third the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Few will doubt the vital importance of adequate maps in the conservation and use of natural resources; in the location and production of minerals; for the planning and construction of highways, railroads, and airfields; for the protection of the public health; for planning industrial expansion; and for many other purposes. The amount recommended by the committee for topographic mapping would permit only a small fraction of the most urgently needed mapping to be done. The mapping possible with the funds recommended by the committee would not even satisfy the minimum needs of the War Department alone, if no mapping were undertaken for other purposes. This seems like poor economy indeed.

In spite of the facts that new mineral deposits are discovered with increasing difficulty, that our resources of many minerals have been seriously depleted, and that others are being mined at a rate far exceeding the development of new resources, the committee recommends for 1948 geologic surveys on a scale about 15 percent below those carried on in 1947. Geologic surveys provide the best, in fact the only, systematic guide to the discovery and appraisal of additional mineral resources. The Geo-

logical Survey has worked out carefully a long-range plan of geologic studies designed to keep the United States, so far as is possible, in the enviable position in regard to mineral resources that the Nation has traditionally occupied, a position that all-out war use has already jeopardized. Experience has shown that Federal geologic surveys return their cost to the taxpayer severalfold and immeasurably increase the country's security through increased mineral resources.

It seems to me that other anomalies appear in the action of the Appropriation Committee in regard to the Geological Survey. With all the drastic cuts recommended for technical operations, the committee has approved an over-all survey budget of a little more than $9,000,000. This is a little more than three times the total amount appropriated for survey work 10 years ago. Corresponding increases, however, have not been recommended for administration and some servicing operations. For example, the amount recommended for the Director's salary roll provides for the same number of people in that official's office as was necessary in 1938. Topographic mapping is to be carried on at a rate about five times that in 1938, but the committee recommends provision for no increased production by the Division of Map Reproduction which performs the final steps necessary in making maps available to the public.

The committee recommends language prohibiting the transfer to other agencies of funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation. This language would deny to the Bureau of Reclamation the specialized services of the Geological Survey in the formulation of sound plans. The bureau depends largely on the survey for essential facts related to both surface and ground water, for river surveys, for topographic maps, and for basic geologic information. All these activities would have to be abandoned by the survey except those that could be financed with funds appropriated to the Geological Survey, which funds as I have indicated are recommended in amounts far too small to even approximate the investigations that should be carried on.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, this is the third of the regular appropriation bills to come before the Congress. Compared with the amounts involved in the two previous bills, the sums appropriated herein are almost inconsequential. Indeed, we appropriate by the bill before us only about 1 percent of the amount the three bills will appropriate, yet the actual reductions, the actual cut-backs in this bill are several million dollars more than in the two previous bills taken together, the sum of which is ninety-some-odd times larger than that in this bill. One would think that the promised $6,000,000,000 reduction in expenditures was to be accomplished by castrating the program for development of our natural resources, particularly by the emasculation of our great reclamation projects of the West. This, however, could not be because the total budget request was less than three hundred million.

I disagree with well-nigh every change that the committee has made in this bill. My disagreement does not arise out of any desire to be profligate or prodigal with public funds. It rather grows out of a feeling and conviction that here is the real false economy about which the President warned us not long ago.

Let me cite you, as one example of false economy, the complete elimination of the Power Division in the Department of the Interior. You will find in the first paragraph of the bill, after the enacting clause, the proviso that "no part of this appropriation shall be used for a Power Division under the Office of the Secretary. One must recognize the responsibility placed upon the Department of the Interior with respect to power to realize the really false character of this economy.

By the Flood Control Act of 1945 the Congress placed sole authority for the marketing of power from flood control hydroelectric dams constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Interior.

I hold in my hand a list of dams now under construction and now nearing completion; some of these will come into production of power within the next fiscal year. Others are under construction, but I would like to read this list:

Center Hill, Altoona, Dale Hall, Clark Hill, Wolf Creek, and Bugs Island.

At current power prices, the output of those dams will bring revenues to the Government in a sum, I am informed, exceeding $3,000,000 a year.

The committee recommends denial of any funds whatsoever for a division within the Department which exercises this responsibility placed upon it by law. I say that is very false economy. The estimates of the amount required for this particular division is quite small, too.

You remember, Mr. Chairman, what happened with the Wilson Dam after the other war. For years the dam stood idle. The water and energy was wasted and no return was produced on the Government's investment except that meager little amount that the power company would pay for the power at the bus bar. Are we creating here six more Muscle Shoals? Is that economy?

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, in addition to these marketing of power responsibilities, the Secretary of the Interior has supervision over the largest power program in the world, taken as a whole. Nevertheless, the Secretary may have no experts at hand to supervise and review rate determinations, or cost allocations, or operating practices, or contracts involving the more than $30,000,000 of revenue which is annually received from power operations. This division was abolished entirely despite its great responsibilities and although the amount of money involved in all was probably no more than the salary of the president of a big privately owned utility.

Is this economy? God save us from such shortsightedness.

I find myself in disagreement with the political philosophy and the fear for the future of America that I think is inherent in the provisions of this bill. I hasten to add that that disagreement in no way is based on any question of personality.

I have never worked with a committee among whose members there was more compatibility and genuine regard and real affection for every member. I pay tribute to every member. It is a great thing that in this grand government of liberty, in this country where freemen govern themselves by working their majority will, where citizens, Members of Congress, and great national political parties, can disagree and resolve their disagreement by majority action.

I was quite interested to hear the inner workings of the subcommittee revealed. My distinguished, able, and fine friend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] says this is not a majority report. Well, if it is not a majority report, it must be a minority report. But I hasten to disclaim that it is a Democratic report or a Democratic bill. Historically, the Democratic Party has stood for progressive development of our natural resources and development of the West. The gentleman indicates that a majority of the subcommittee opposed these uneconomic, unsound curtailments of these beneficial projects. Since he has said so, I will not disagree with him in any respect. Certainly, no member of the minority party of the subcommittee favors this kind of bill.

So if it is not a majority report and bill, and if it is not a minority report and bill, in the sense that it is a Democratic bill and report, just how can we classify this monstrosity? I suppose we will have to call it what it really is, "The bill of the Republican leadership." One cannot escape the conclusion that Western Republicans, to say the least of it, do not control the policies of their party. Through the workings of our two-party system, the people have a choice, and, practically speaking, it is about their only effective means of expressing their choice upon issues and political philosophies national in scope.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. I was not only disappointed in the outcome of the election last November but I was disappointed that the people were not given the clear-cut choice between policies and programs of the two parties which the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, now the beloved Speaker of this body, promised them as the minority leader, before election. True, some promises were made, but they were rather general in character. But apparently the majority of the American people, including, may I regretfully say, some Democrats, thought perhaps it would not be a bad idea to let the Republicans have control of the Government for awhile. There are indications that many, many such people have already had enough, and are only awaiting the opportunity to correct their mistake.

But despite the many mistakes and costly bungling of public affairs, one thing stands out, the two-party system is now working to the extent that by next

year the country will for once have that "clear-cut choice." The people are now having a look at the Republican program.

My distinguished friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, says that this bill is brought in in response to campaign promises. I have looked over the campaign promises and platforms and I have not found one word indicating that the Republicans promised to cut Central Valley 66 percent. I have not found a single word about destroying the Columbia River Basin project. I did not find a single promise that the people were to be denied transmission lines from the Bonneville Power project, the Southwest Power project, necessary to make cheap electricity available to the people. I just wonder where those promises were made. They do not seem to be a matter of record.

Now, with respect to these transmission lines, I want to say just a word. You will find a statement in the report that the committee believes that the consumers should erect their own substations. Let us look at that a minute. Here is a very high tension power line leading from a generator in a public power dam. The high tension power must be stepped down in order to be in usable form. So this committee says to the Rural Electrification Cooperatives out in the West, they say to the municipalities out there, the small towns, cities, and villages who own their own municipal utility systems, "You build your own substations." What does a substation cost? You could not hope to build a substation to tap one of these high Bonneville power lines for less than around a million dollars. How do you expect a small rural electrification cooperative, largely composed of farmers who contribute their mites every month, to build a million-dollar substation? That is like holding bread before a hungry child, but holding it beyond his reach.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That means that private monopolies will make profits by the expenditure of public funds in the generation of electricity.

Mr. GORE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I have a very high regard for him, and I know how sincerely he feels about this. Who in the West other than the private power companies could afford to build a million-dollar substation?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No one. That is the point I am making. The only thing left is for us to turn it over to the private utilities who already monopolize the whole valley.

Mr. GORE. Then will the gentleman join me in amendments tomorrow to strike such provisions from the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these few minutes to present an eyewitness account—a kind of report highly prized by the press, but to which no particular value seems to attach here in the Congress. At least, that is often my impression, and I think it is a mistake. The Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, has recently taken action regarding the Central Valley project of California, and that bill, containing an appropriation for the project, is soon to be followed by other legislation relating to different aspects of this vast undertaking. When early this month I had occasion to be in California and see the project for myself, talking with the people on the spot, it came to me that I had been acting on the basis of what was really a very vague conception of this large operation, and that most of my colleagues doubtless shared the dimness of my vision. Insofar as I can, I would today correct this situation. I make no recommendations. Simply, for the reference of the Members of the House, I am reporting what I saw and heard and learned at first hand.

I went there as an out-of-stater who had done more than the usual citizen's share of listening to the superlatives of the California story. I had heard the statistical arguments regarding the relative urgency of completing the great Central Valley project—arguments which reduce miles upon miles of fertile farmland to a figure 1 inch long and which translate the realities of human life into the tricky words of a fiscal debate. But without having seen for yourself an uncompleted canal—the water at one end and the dry land waiting, extending out from the unfinished end—you do not know really what a broken promise looks like. Those are emotional words—"broken promise"—and we do not, sitting here, approve of emotional words. But all the time that water is standing there behind its dam and the canal is taking off and then abruptly stopping, and all the time the land is lying there waiting—the land and the farmers.

Well, when you have been there and seen it and talked with the people, about all you can come back and tell anybody is that the words are not good enough—my words or anybody else's—because you have really got to see it for yourself. But the experience is so compelling that then you have got to contradict yourself and try to tell about it. I am going to do that, briefly, because I wish that this body might be able to see beyond and behind the arguments, the words, when this California project comes up for discussion here.

It is not difficult to see the Central Valley or to see and understand the meaning of the Central Valley project. Its meaning is as clear as those before-and-after photographs which show plain women becoming beautiful. Whether you fly over it in a plane or drive across it in a car or walk over the fields—I did all of these—this is an open-and-shut case of liability becoming asset, and the process which brings this about is as clearly to be seen as the result. You go along for 150 miles—and that takes a long time, even in a plane—looking at dry land with not much on it. You do not have to close your eyes and imagine what it would look like with a water supply because always, interspersed with the arid lands, are lucky lands where water is available. Often the green, watered stretch expands and almost fills the breadth of the valley, but always, again, within sight, is a stretch of the unlucky land, stricken with dryness. Then you hear how the irrigated acres are losing their water supply—how it is dropping out of reach into the ground. They tell you about the wells that used to pump at 20 to 30 feet, down now to 10 times that depth, or even as low as 450 feet. That is expensive pumping, but what is worse is that that is near the bottom. There is a bottom to that underground water. They know it, those Central Valley farmers, and they also know they have just about reached it. You can go over on the west side and see the scraggly crops that are becoming more common because there the wells have begun to bring up salt water, and again you do not have to close your eyes to see what these cultivated areas will look like when their water is entirely gone because right alongside is the desert. That is the way it will look. Sometimes—and I know it is not easy to believe this if you have not seen it for yourself—the two kinds of land lie just on opposite side of the highway. To your left, as you drive along, lush, prosperous fields; to your right, the desert. Before and after. But which is before? Which is after? Is the desert on your right hand the way the fields will look after the water is gone and no more has come to replenish it or is the desert an exhibit of the "before," which makes the scene on the left a promise of what can be?

It was a promise, and it was the Congress that promised it. The Congress set up the Central Valley project as a Federal reclamation project to secure the water supply of lands already watered, and to bring water to lands that have been dry since the time of man. The outlines of the promise are spelled out there across the land in white concrete, and you cannot miss them. The San Joaquin River is backed up behind the long, low span of Friant Dam, a half million acre-feet of water, and taking off from the pool at each side are the curving lines of the two canals—37-mile Madera to the north; 160-mile Friant-Kern to the south. Downstream, you see the natural Mendota pool, where the long Delta-Mendota Canal will terminate which is to bring water from the north to replenish the San Joaquin River supply. You see where that canal has to go, along the foothills lining the valley, but you do not see the canal itself—no trace of it until you are 100 miles farther north, near its take-off in the delta behind San Francisco Bay. There you see the raw soil of new excavation and a few miles of concrete lining. You go on north, following the Sacramento over 200 miles, and finally you reach the source of the project's promise—Shasta Lake backed up behind the great arch of Shasta Dam. Here, four and a half million acre-feet. This is the water that will flow down to the delta to be lifted into the foothills and then flow by gravity down to Mendota so that the San Joaquin can be dammed at Friant and feed its two canals. This water is waiting, too. And almost 500 miles to the south of you as you stand

there at Shasta, the dry land of the San Joaquin Valley waits.

My tour of the Central Valley began at Los Angeles and it ended there. On my return south, I looked at the farms and I talked with the people. I saw ranches that extended for miles, growing vegetables and fruit. And right next to these big operations, growing the same crops on the same soil, I saw small farms, their fields clustered about the farmhouse in the pattern familiar to most of agricultural America. On both kinds of farm the water-story is the same—the deepening pump-lift is costly, but high market prices still give a profit. If a dry year strikes, a lot of farmers will be hurt, maybe wiped out; and in any case the pumping's getting more expensive every year. I asked the same question any of my colleagues here would be prompted to ask: Why is the water table sinking so much more rapidly, when you have not been having dry years? The answer I got in each case was the same, and it was astonishing. I was always answered with an account of more intensive cultivation of lands which already had wells; or the sinking of new wells on already cultivated land; or, finally, of entirely new lands being brought into cultivation. And I reacted as probably any of you would react: I said, this expansion seemed very unwise in the face of a threatened water shortage. Privately I thought: These fellows are operating on a dog-eat-dog basis, making as much as they can while prices are high and while there is still a little water left. They are not making any effort to conserve their water supply, I thought.

But then I heard the rest of the story. This large expansion of California agricultural production on the brink of disaster was that State's calculated risk in the war effort; California was called upon to produce as much as she could; and she proved that she could produce more than that—by overextending her water lines. Almost 100,000 acres went under cultivation in the Central Valley Basin between 1940 and 1945 in a California that badly needed the Central Valley project 15 years ago. Fifteen years ago, in 1932, those people feared the consequences of a dry period. If the rains fail now, the ruin will be on a scale many times more vast. And it will affect many more people, because during the war California has grown in population even more strikingly than in cultivated acreage. I understand that one out of every six Californians has come into the State since 1940, and the wartime expansion of food production must now be maintained in order to keep this new population employed and fed. It cannot be done on the pre-1940 water supply, and it cannot be done with unfinished canals.

That is the story, as I saw and heard it. It makes sense, when you see the crowded towns and cities of the Central Valley, when you learn that over half of all these peoples work with food and fiber. The Central Valley people are aware that the wartime increase in population and production will more than absorb the water to be made available by the primary features of the project, and already they are asking for studies of new water sources by the Bureau of Reclamation. Many valley towns have felt the pinch in their domestic water supply. The situation which is bad on the valley floor, which gets the drainage water from the hills, is even worse in the foothills and in some coastal areas. Towns along Suisun—pronounced Soosoon—Bay are hard hit by lowered wells, and many of the old mining towns, now booming with industry, are looking desperately for new water supply. The Santa Clara Valley is worried, and the city of Santa Barbara faces an acute water situation. The Reclamation Bureau has a lot of planning work ahead of it out there, and already it has had to turn down some dozen requests for investigations because of lack of funds and personnel.

Californians do not give the impression of crying before they are hurt. Their story is too convincing for that. They just point it out to you—the water waiting and the farmers waiting, and the people still coming in—and they let it tell itself. I wish every Member of this body might go there to hear it and see it. Since that cannot be, I hope I have conveyed something of the Central Valley situation to you today.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I have read with alarm the report of the Appropriations Committee on funds for the Department of the Interior. I am especially surprised and shocked at the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. The 45-year history of that agency does not justify the proposed action. Since the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, 50 projects have been constructed which now provide water for 4,500,000 acres of land. In 1946 these reclamation projects produced over $500,000,000 in income from lands that were once valuable only for desert grazing purposes. The contribution of these projects to the wealth and security of the Nation is not measured alone in crops produced, but also in power, flood control, recreation, and other related services. It is measured also in increased purchasing power of the Nation as a whole and increased receipts for taxing institutions. It must also be remembered that the costs of irrigation and power development are returned by the direct beneficiaries to the Treasury. The contribution of reclamation projects to the country's war effort was tremendous. The contribution of reclamation in the postwar picture can be even more significant. The fruits, vegetables, sugar beets, and urgently needed livestock required to maintain the high-standard diet of the United States must come, in part, from western irrigated land. It should also be realized that irrigated crops are noncompetitive with other production areas of the country and they do not involve to any marked degree the surplus commodities such as wheat, corn, tobacco, or cotton. The Bureau of Reclamation more than any other single Federal agency has contributed to the development of western resources, for the benefit of the country as a whole.

The wise provisions of the Reclamation Act of 1902 and the careful planning that has followed has achieved the success thus far measured. It is the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee regarding the continuation of the careful measurement of western land and water resources and the careful planning for their development that I find most disturbing. The recommended cut in funds for general investigations of from $5,000,000 to $125,000 and the cut of from $500,000 to $250,000 in the Colorado River development fund would mean virtual liquidation of planning work carried out under these programs. If this recommendation is accepted, the total appropriation would amount to less than 7 percent of the budget and would force a complete disintegration of highly trained technical staff. The 7 percent of the budget in fact would not be sufficient to liquidate planning operations. The Nation as a whole and particularly the West would suffer for generations to come. This action would effectively tie the hands of the Congress for many years to come in the matter of the development of western resources. I cannot believe that such action was intended by the committee nor is intended by the Congress. A reduction of this kind cannot be justified in terms of curbing inflationary trends or of balancing the budget or of contributing to the efficiency of Government. Nor do I believe it the intention of this Congress to tell the West that the Nation is no longer interested in the highly profitable self-liquidating development of western water resources. The proposed cut in general investigation funds specifically would force the immediate closing of all or practically all of the project panning field offices in Utah and would require writing off all funds expended to date for incompleted investigations. Work in Utah financed from the Colorado River development fund would be materially slowed down. The Colorado River fund should be given special consideration. Money is already available from net revenues from the operation of Boulder Dam. This money is earmarked for basin development and is not available for other purposes. There is no reason for its being withdrawn. I therefore strongly urge that adequate funds be provided in the general investigation appropriation for the continued orderly investigation and planning activities in the West and that the Colorado River development fund appropriations be restored to the full budget estimate.

The proposed appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation for purposes of project construction does not affect any of the projects in my district. I am, however, interested in the net result of the proposed recommendation as it will effect efficiency of project construction throughout the country as a whole. For example, it will take 9 years of appropriations at the proposed level to complete the Provo River project in the State of Utah. Nine years of ineffective and inefficient operation. Nine years to complete a program that could and should be completed in a little over a third of that time. The same is generally true of other irrigation developments

currently under way such as the Columbia Basin, Central Valley, and other great projects in the West. It should be made abundantly clear that slowing construction down not only decreases efficiency, but postpones the day when the Government can start collecting for the completed works.

In these troubled times when this great Nation is being called upon to provide leadership, stabilization, foods, and resources to a war-weary and hungry world, we must not falter in the development of our country and its resources. We must not contribute to inefficiency in our own internal operations, and we must not encourage sectional differences.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the curtailment of the funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, as recommended by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Interior would seriously threaten the orderly development of our Western States and be a body blow to their economy.

It will cause stoppages of work on our reclamation projects commencing in about 6 months and paralyzing them within 18 months.

The excellent staff of engineers and other personnel built up by the Bureau of Reclamation for over 40 years, at a great expense to the Government, would be destroyed overnight.

This is no time to experiment with false economy. Time is of the essence in the development of the West through multiple use of the waters that fall in that country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], told you of the close association our western irrigation projects have in the structure of our national defense; now let me point out their effect on the domestic front.

Since the turn of the century our population has increased about a million a year. In 1900 we had about ninety million people in this country. Today we are pressing a hundred and forty million. Where are we going to get the food, the clothing, the shelter to take care of these people and the 15 additional million that we will have 15 years from now. That is what the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], had in mind when he told you that our economy would change within about that period of time. The only place we have to look is to the development of new lands in the West and toward increasing, and rather let me say, retaining the present productivity of the lands now under cultivation. That spells out supplementing irrigation waters. It spells out salinity control, it spells out navigation, it spells out power at a price within the reach of those who use it.

Let me analyze briefly for you the recommended appropriations as they pertain to the Central Valley project of California:

The appropriation reported by the House subcommittee for the Central Valley project is only 34.4 percent of the amount requested. In fact, the reduction of 65.6 percent from the $20,000,000 requested to a total of $6,900,000 will definitely eliminate the prosecution of work on many features.

An amount of $12,000,000 was requested for irrigation facilities. The committee allowed but $5,134,980. This small appropriation will undoubtedly result in seriously curtailing construction work now under way on the irrigation systems and will prevent initiation of new construction. Currently, contracts in force for canal construction alone will require funds during the fiscal year 1948 for progress payments in the amount of nearly $9,000,000. It is therefore quite evident that the $5,000,000 appropriation is definitely inadequate. The $9,000,000 figure does not include the cost of materials which must be purchased nor the cost of rights-of-way, engineering, and contingencies. On the Contra Costa Canal the contract for the connecting link between the existing works necessary to complete the main canal to the Martinez Reservoir and construction of the Clayton and Ygnacio Canals, is presently in the process of being awarded. Under the appropriations as reported by the House, it will be impossible to proceed with the work even though this contract is awarded as the funds for the necessary progress payments will not be available.

The lateral system on the Contra Costa Canal could not, of course, be advertised for bids. On the Friant-Kern Canal the work currently under contract will require something in excess of $5,000,000 for progress payments; and current contracts on the Delta-Mendota Canal will require nearly $3,000,000 for progress payments. It will accordingly be necessary to suspend work on a part, if not all, of these contracts. Bids for the construction of the Delta-Mendota pumping plant near Tracy, Calif., are scheduled for advertisement about May 1 of this fiscal year. In view of the recommendation of the committee report it will be necessary to withhold award of contract until sufficient funds are available to permit this work to proceed. Work on the Delta cross channel will be held to a minimum amount of surveying and designing, and the start of construction will be delayed.

Under the power facilities, the request for $6,400,000 was reduced to $1,075,020. This amount was then further limited in its use by the fact that it was specifically earmarked for certain of the power features. The appropriation as reported by the committee will curtail the work on the power facilities at Shasta Dam, and preclude any work beyond completion of the bare installation of units 1, 2, and 5. At the Keswick Dam and power plant the reduction from the requested $645,838 to $318,040 will virtually stop operations. It will probably mean that work at the dam will have to be stopped in order to have sufficient funds to meet the progress payments on the turbines, generators, and other electrical equipment currently under contract.

Under the transmission lines, the committee report specifically provides funds for only two lines, these being the lines from Shasta to Delta via Oroville and Sacramento, and the Contra Costa 69-kilovolt line; and even for these specific lines the funds have been seriously reduced from the amounts requested. Elimination of funds for the Keswick tap line will have the effect of constructing a power plant with no physical means of conveying the power from the plant to consumptive load centers.

All switchyards, substations, and communication equipment have been eliminated; and the Keswick tap line, the west side Shasta-Delta lines, the Sacramento-Antelope line, and some transmission line additions all have been eliminated.

Under the item "Joint facilities" $1,600,000 was requested, and $690,000 was the amount allotted by the committee. This reduction will mean that the remaining work necessary to complete Shasta Dam will have to be suspended; work on the camp and warehouse area will be seriously curtailed; and work on the installation of the additional gates and valves at Shasta Dam will be slowed down.

Progress payments in fiscal year 1948 on all contracts now in force will require some $10,000,000 and about $6,000,000 will be required in connection with work proposed for performance by Government forces, administrative expenses and additional contracts for equipment and supplies to support the construction contracts, and for other materials. The estimated carry-over from the current fiscal year is $10,000,000 and with the appropriation recommended by the committee, we may not even be able to complete the contracts currently in force. Additional contracts scheduled for award during the balance of this fiscal year could not proceed due to insufficient funds. Thus, so drastic a reduction in funds makes it difficult even to hazard a guess as to when the irrigation facilities can be completed and deliver water urgently needed in the San Joaquin Valley and also in the delta area, and to construct the necessary power transmission facilities to deliver the power to the pumping plants. A good guess would be that it would take 27 years to finish the job at the rate indicated by the Appropriations Committee.

As you know, Governor Warren—see page 1232 of the hearings—of California appeared before the subcommittee and testified in favor of the continuing and even speeding up the construction work on the Central Valley project. The Governor pointed out to the committee the dire need for bringing the Sacramento River waters to the San Joaquin River Valley at the earliest possible moment in view of the overdraft currently being made on the ground-water supplies in that Valley. The Governor specifically recommended the completion of the public-power features of the Central Valley project, including the construction of a stand-by steam plant in the interest of providing competitive power for the people of central California.

Of course, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s president, Mr. Black—see page 1312 of the hearings—also testified before the committee, particularly with respect to the construction of electrical-transmission facilities by the Bureau. It would appear from the amounts reported out by the subcommittee that irrespective of the Governor's testimony, considerable weight must have been given Mr. Black's statements.

In closing let me say to my Republican friends that at no time do I remember the issue of sabotaging the Bureau of Reclamation, in the name of economy, being raised in the last election in California.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am totally unable to comprehend the reasons which prompted the Appropriations Committee to act as it did in emasculating the appropriation request of the Department of the Interior. The activities of every agency within the Department have been severely crippled, activities which we as a Nation cannot afford to curtail, activities which are vital to our economic welfare as well as to our national defense and security. One of those activities which has suffered most is that pertaining to electric power developed at federally constructed dams—public power, if you please, power that belongs to the people themselves. There is in this country a school of thought that believes that this natural resource should not be developed, or if developed, that it should be turned over to private corporations for private gain—that power to be sold back to the people who really own it, sometimes at an exorbitant price. Those who believe in this philosophy are comparatively few in number but extremely powerful and resourceful. They will stop at nothing to obtain their ends. At this moment there is in this city one of the most powerful lobbies that has ever confronted the Congress, the power-trust lobby headed by Purcell L. Smith, of Chicago, who is reportedly receiving a salary of $65,000 per year, plus certain expenses, as president of the National Association of Electric Cos. Mr. Smith was formerly president of the Midwest Corp., an Insull holding concern.

In spite of the opposition of these vested interests and of the tactics they have used, the Congress since the days of former President Theodore Roosevelt, has developed a Federal power policy in the passage of such legislation as the Reclamation Act, the Raker Act, the acts creating the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration, the Bonneville Act, the Fort Peck Act, and others. The fundamental principle of that policy is that the benefits of power developed at Federal projects shall not be monopolized by limited groups but that those benefits shall be widely distributed. With the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority—TVA—and the Rural Electrification Administration—REA—the Secretary of the Interior has the responsibility of administering the other power activities embraced in the above acts.

In addition, the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944 placed a further responsibility upon the Secretary in that all surplus electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, preference being given to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

The responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior in Federal power matters can be more readily appreciated when it is realized that at this time the Department of the Interior is operating and marketing power from the largest aggregate of hydroelectric power in the world. In 1938 the electric plants being operated by the Department had a capacity of only 579,000 kilowatts, whereas as of December 31, 1946, that capacity had increased to 2,790,000 kilowatts, with a total generation for that calendar year of over 12,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours, bringing in a revenue of approximately $32,000,000. Projects which have been authorized or are under construction and which will be completed before 1952 will add 6,331,000 kilowatts of capacity, making a grand total of 8,121,000 kilowatts.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Office of the Secretary, which is $472 under current-year requirements, and $665,000 less than the budget estimate.

To assist the Secretary in supervising and promoting the efficient coordination of the power activities of the Department, he has in his office a small staff known as the Division of Power, consisting of 12 administrative and professional people and 10 clerical employees. The appropriation request for this staff was $131,917 and an additional amount of $32,500 for the handling under section 5 of the 1944 Flood Control Act of the sale of power from dams constructed by the War Department in the southeastern section of our country where there is no operating agency of the Department to which this work could be delegated.

The total investment in power facilities for which the Department of the Interior has responsibility for pay-out is over $500,000,000. Construction now underway by the Bureau of Reclamation and the War Department will bring this investment figure to at least $1,500,000,000 by 1952. The return of this huge investment to the Government is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior. Yet in spite of this tremendous responsibility the Appropriations Committee has, for some unaccountable reason, refused to appropriate any funds for the Division of Power. It is incomprehensible to me why the committee should take such action, thus making it impossible for the Secretary to meet his responsibilities. This is penny-wise and pound-foolish. No private corporation would so conduct its affairs. I refuse to believe that this Congress will sanction such ridiculous management of this Nation's property.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS].

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, recently a former Federal mine inspector characterized many of the inspectors employed by the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior of the United States as not qualified to make an inspection; many of them were appointed and hold their jobs through fraternal and political pull; many are derelict in their duties to the extent of jeopardizing the welfare of workers in the mines; some viciously find faults with mines they inspect apparently upon orders from someone higher up; and as a whole the Bureau of Mines is like a plum tree from which plums are doled to the faithful.

Protégés find sponsors. Many of the inspectors are men who apparently have failed to find their niche in other industries or trades and some are given berths in the Bureau to fulfill promises of soft jobs.

Those are declarations of a man who should know whereof he speaks. For 5 years he was an inspector in the Bureau of Mines. Once he tried to quit, because they sent him to Montgomery, W. Va., to inspect a mine, and all the equipment with which he was equipped was an electric safe-lamp for a cap, with no means of recharging the battery.

He is a miner who resigned rather than keep up the fraud which he was expected to continue, but was dragged back into the Bureau of Mines in 1943, because he was told he was "frozen" to his job and must stay on the job for the duration. And when the "duration" was over he resigned again, this time to stay resigned.

He is P. S. MacLaine, of Cambridge, Ohio.

Mr. MacLaine has had wide experience in the mining industry. He had been a miner; he was foreman of a mine and superintendent of a mine. He has worked in some of the best mines in the country, and today works in the largest mechanical mine in Ohio, and perhaps in the country, and the mine in which he is now working, and has been since last November, was one of the 518 ordered closed by Secretary of the Interior, J. A. Krug, as being unsafe.

Mr. MacLaine adds:

> And if the Misco mine of the Muskingum Coal Co. in Perry County in Ohio were not a safe mine, I would not be in there working.

Mr. MacLaine's comments upon the functioning of the Bureau of Mines, however, are paramount in his mind today. He is happy on his present job, but his story of the Bureau of Mines should come first.

A similar incident was in another mine inspected, with 176 recommendations made After again being criticized, the report appeared officially with four recommendations.

Typical of other experiences, Mr. MacLaine told of Inspector Joe B. Yanity, after an inspection of the Misco Mine, returned with a report that the workings were gassy, to the point of the working air containing 8.4 percent methane, or explosive gas. Inspector Yanity made numerous recommendations. Knowing the safety record of Misco Mine, a reinspection by Inspector E. M. Lewis and Inspector J. C. Reardon was made. Their recommendations were made in the September report, making suggestions, but not finding explosive gas. Incidentally, one of the recommendations made by this pair of inspectors pertained to the conveyor system, relating to grounding the electrical connections.

Mr. MacLaine only very recently—2 weeks ago—demonstrated to the Ohio State inspector, Mr. Tom Richards, that had the recommendations made been followed, there would have been repeated accidents, for it was impossible to make the proposed electrical connections. Employees of Misco had already tried to follow the suggestions, but anyone with an iota of knowledge of electricity would know how it was impossible to make the proposed electrical connections. Misco workers tried, however, but only proved to anyone it could not be done.

But prior to Inspector Reardon and Lewis visiting the mine, Mr. MacLaine, who was still an inspector for the Bureau, accompanied by Inspector Mechlin, were ordered by George Grove to make a reinspection of Misco. They found no trace of the explosive gas as reportedly found by Yanity; they learned Yanity had spent 1 day inside the Misco Mine and 1 day outside, which was described by Mr. MacLaine as not long enough to make a complete inspection of such a vast operation; they learned Yanity found his gas in a bleeder pipe—an innovation developed by Misco engineers, designed to release any possible accumulation of gas. Yanity, it was said, had lowered his gas-testing apparatus into the escape pipe and covered the vent with his cap, which anyone should know would catch every last minute portion of gas if any were prevalent.

Mr. MacLaine, as an example of the inefficiency of the Federal Department with which he was formerly affiliated, tells some of his own personal experiences, not quoting the words of anyone else. But before he began his discussions, he emphasized it was not with malice, but only in justice to the men who work in the mines; men like those who died in the Centralia, Ill., disaster.

Of the department headquarters itself, Mr. MacLaine points to the laxity of the headquarters such as in Pittsburgh, Pa., from which office he worked. He pointed out that after an inspection is duly made, the inspector or inspectors return to the mine office, or other convenient place and compile their preliminary report. When this report is finally completed, with recommendations noted, so that the mine inspected can be told of faults found and remedies suggested, it is sent to the Pittsburgh office. About 2 weeks later, after 14 or so copies have been made, it is returned to the inspector for signature, but the inspector by that time may have moved on to other stations. The reports are signed and 12 copies returned to the Bureau office, and then quite often months pass by before the official report is submitted to the company operating the inspected mine. Under this particular category, the Misco Mine in which Mr. MacLaine is now employed, was inspected in September 1946; a public information service release was submitted to the press in November, but the Muskingum Coal Co. has yet to receive the official report summary. This is not part of Mr. MacLaine's comment.

By the time suggestions made by the inspectors thus reach the mine operator, hundreds of accidents could have occurred; perhaps faults have been remedied, but also new faults could easily develop.

Mr. MacLaine pointed, as an example, to the Misco Mine, his present location. In the Misco operations, rooms 300 by 28 feet, which not so long ago in other operations required about 10 months to work out, are now worked out in a matter of days—in some instances in only 3 days.

Mr. MacLaine cited other examples of headquarters' actions, especially since the Federal Government seized the mines in May of 1946.

He cited one mine in which he made a routine inspection, and listed 161 proposed improvements. He was criticized by his superiors for being unduly hard in his inspection, being advised not to forget the United States Government was then operating that mine. And when the report was finally completed, 158 of his suggestions were wiped out and only three recommendations were made. That was in the official report.

Bleeder pipes in the Misco operation are drilled ahead of the mine as it progresses into the earth. They release any gas, if any should be found. When the diggings reach the vent, which is 6⅞ inches in diameter, there already is waiting an outlet through which electrical cables can be dropped from the surface and not carried through the main entries, thus eliminating another major hazard. After parts are worked out, the vents are then in the sealed-off areas, alleviating the threat of an accumulation of gases, if there are any, which automatically eases the pressure often discovered in sealed workings of other mines and averting the threat of explosions due to accumulations of gases in worked-out areas, if the mine has gas. English and other European coal-mining experts, who inspected the Misco mine and who were dumbfounded by the speed of operations and productivity, marveled at the idea of bleeder pipes and were enthusiastic of their success. They promised to try the same experiment in their own mines back home.

Mr. MacLaine's companion inspector—Mechlin—was described as being indifferent to his duties during the inspection, even to the extent of crawling off in a secluded corner and falling asleep. According to Mr. MacLaine, he—Mechlin—was later transferred to another Pennsylvania district. Mr. MacLaine does not know at this time whether he is still with the Bureau.

Mr. MacLaine told of an incident that occurred in St. Clairsville, Ohio, while he was still an inspector, and before he ever thought of seeking employment elsewhere. He tells how he, with Inspectors Oscar Simpson, Maize, Yanity, and others were called to the meeting, which he believed was to discuss routine subjects. When all were present—the writer believes Mr. MacLaine said George Grove arranged the meeting—the inspectors were shown a mass of newspapers and newspaper clippings and the entire session was devoted to making Earl Jones, operator of Misco, "walk the chalked line and checking up everything you can on that man and his mine." Mr. MacLaine was emphatic in his declaring it was his belief someone higher up was after Earl Jones and the Misco mine at the St. Clairsville meeting.

Incidentally Mr. MacLaine said Inspector Yanity is generally known in the Bureau as a protege of Jack Forbes.

As for Inspector Reardon, Mr. MacLaine says he believes Reardon, who has been with the Bureau about 15 years, spent about 13 of these years as a first-aid specialist, which does not qualify any man to be an inspector of mines.

Another incident relative to Bureau personnel, Mr. MacLaine told of a young man training in a class in Pittsburgh declaring "damned if he would go down into the mines." During the few weeks the school was in progress the protesting candidate for an inspector's post was given two promotions, and upon completion of the training school was given a "softer" assignment. Mr. MacLaine does not believe the candidate ever became an inspector.

Mr. MacLaine said he was personally acquainted with the inspector who had checked the Centralia, Ill., mine 5 days before the explosion which killed 111 men, and expressed the belief no inspector could have made an inspection without discovering gas such a short time before an explosion. Mr. MacLaine expressed the belief the Centralia explosion was due to gas and not dust, after studying the nature of the blast. He questioned the thoroughness of the Centralia mine.

Mr. MacLaine's record with the Bureau includes his ordering the shutting down of a Hanna Coal Co. mine at Dunglen when he discovered gas accumulated near trolley wires. He admits he had not authority to close the operations as an inspector of the Bureau of Mines, but declares he acted out of his role as inspector and only as an American citizen who seeks to protect his fellowman. Mr. MacLaine did not include the incident in his report, which he considered unnecessary, inasmuch as the trouble was cleared up at once by mine officials, but he was criticized for not making public the incident.

Mr. MacLaine also pointed out that it was Inspector Mechlin, who accompanied Mr. MacLaine on his inspection trip of the Misco mine, mentioned before, who spread around rumors at a Columbus, Ohio, meeting to "watch that Misco mine. She's going to blow up." Mr. MacLaine is at a loss to explain Mechlin's tactics, inasmuch as there was no basis for any such thoughts.

Mr. MacLaine's opinion of the Misco mine in which he now is employed, can be summarized thus:

Misco is the safest mine in Ohio, and Ohio's mines are the safest in the Nation. That makes, in his opinion, the Misco mine in Perry County, the safest mine in the United States.

Mr. MacLaine says Misco is not a gaseous mine; every precaution is taken to safeguard the welfare of the workers; the air is the purest found in any mine anywhere and is adequately kept circulating; there is an auxiliary slope entrance in addition to the main entrance; a third is to be built; it is the best-organized mine he has ever seen in a long

career of mining; its employees knowing their jobs well and working together for one objective—production; he says any mine that can produce more than 4,000,000 mine tons of coal without a fatality must be safe, for the longest record in history is about 6,000,000 tons production without a fatality; all conditions are conducive to safety and cooperation at all times on all shifts in all parts of the big operations; the "bleeder" vents such as used in Misco should be used in every mine in the country.

Mr. MacLaine made these comments in ordinary discussions, without consulting his personal notes kept for 5 years while working as an inspector for the Bureau. He added the complete books of notes are available for reference.

Mr. MacLaine expressed the belief that Bureau inspectors should be more carefully chosen, and not be cast-offs from other industries; that they are underpaid, for a competent inspector should be a mining engineer, with a thorough knowledge of electrical engineering, and the present rate of pay is too little for a man so qualified.

In conclusion, Mr. MacLaine pointed out that the Bureau of Mines itself is nothing but what might be described as a racket, for, although it has the power to make inspections, it can do nothing to see that recommendations are enforced; it has no police powers and cannot penalize offenders of violations uncovered.

He also pointed out that for many years the Bureau of Mines has directed the writing of mining laws—and none of the Bureau heads are miners—men who know mining. He advocates that when mining laws are written, setting up standards to be followed, that mining men should be consulted. He declared, "They may not be able to write the laws, but they know what the laws should contain."

He recommended that in the future when mining laws are written, or existing mining laws be amended, they first be discussed with men who know mining and not by lawyers, or protégés of "big wigs" and henchmen chosen for their fraternal and political connections.

I saw in yesterday's Washington paper that a House Labor Subcommittee is planning to check mine safety and I most sincerely suggest to this subcommittee that they include the Misco mine of the Muskingum Coal Co. in their inspection and contact Mr. MacLaine, who is now employed there in charge of safety operations, as I am sure he can give them information they will find most valuable.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 3, 1947.*

JONES MOTOR SALES, INC.,
Zanesville, Ohio:

Review of Federal coal-mine inspection reports indicate that while inspector did not find eminent danger in above mine, safety conditions are apparently deficient and makes operation hazardous. You are directed immediately to consult the safety committee at this mine with respect to these conditions. You are further directed to cease operations until either (1) mine safety committee (or if there be none, president of mine local union) joins in the certifications required by order number CAMN 16 of this date. (2) There has been a reinspection by Federal coal-mine inspectors followed by my order authorizing mine operations after consideration of his report.

H. H. COLLISSON,
Captain USNR, Coal Mine Administrator.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *April 4, 1947.*

Capt. H. H. COLLISSON,
USNR, Coal Mine Administrator,
Washington, D. C.:

In accordance with your telegram ordering our mine to be closed until certification by mine safety committee, you are herewith advised we have contacted the mine safety committee and the answer of the mine safety committee is this: "We are unable to talk to you until we receive orders from the international union headquarters."

JONES MOTOR SALES, INC.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, there are many features of this Interior Appropriation bill that I cannot approve. However, I wish to direct my particular objection to the cut in the amount the committee has allocated for investigations of projects for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River system in the four Upper Division States as authorized by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act.

This money is set aside from the income derived from certain power revenues at Boulder or Hoover Dam. It is used for investigating potential projects and the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River. In no sense can it be considered as a direct appropriation out of the Federal Treasury. Out of moneys derived from this fund, the Bureau of Reclamation has already prepared a comprehensive report listing potential projects for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River. The next step will be to make detailed investigations as to their feasibility and the cost of construction.

Additional information on the potential projects is needed by the States of the Upper Division to aid them in their current negotiations on the division of the water of the Upper Colorado Basin. Also, a large amount of detailed work must be done before these projects can be made ready for construction. This work must not be allowed to lag if these projects are to be ready for construction at the proper time.

Regardless of whether the Committee on Appropriations allocates funds for the construction of new reclamation projects at this time, information should be made available to the Bureau of Reclamation and to Congress as to the future needs along the Colorado River, so that when funds for new construction are made available, we may have the necessary information.

The amount set aside each year for this investigational work, is small in comparison to the need, but to reduce it 50 percent, as provided in the bill, would result in almost total stoppage of the present investigations under way.

I request that the committee restore the $500,000 originally asked, bearing in mind the fact that this is not an expenditure out of the Federal Treasury, but rather is derived from the sale of power, and held in a special fund for this study along the Colorado River.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Interior appropriation bill for 1948 is of particular interest to my State of Nevada, and this is especially true of the reclamation section of this bill, as we have within our borders the major parts of the Boulder Dam, including Boulder City and its great power-producing facilities.

In operation in Nevada are such widely known reclamation projects as the Newlands which was named for the late Senator Francis G. Newlands whose leadership in the House of Representatives brought the Reclamation law into being in 1902 along with the sponsorship of President Theodore Roosevelt. Nevada also has in operation the Truckee Storage and Humboldt projects that provide supplemental water for substantial areas.

Under construction on the Colorado River between Nevada and Arizona is Davis Dam, a structure that is important in the fulfillment of the treaty obligations between the United States and Mexico and which will produce substantial blocks of power for the Southwest.

I mention these developments for the purpose of illustrating the great interest the State of Nevada has in the reclamation program of the Department of the Interior. We, in Nevada, are also interested in the planning of new projects which will utilize the meager water resources of Nevada and to bring about more land development and crops. Irrigation and the use of any available water that can be stored is essential in Nevada for the production of agricultural crops, forage for livestock, and to support the increasing population of the State.

For the latter reasons, Mr. Chairman, I deplore the drastic reduction in the budget recommendation of $5,000,000 for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation. With but a limitation of $125,000 for the general investigations, as provided in the bill, the State of Nevada would experience a set-back in reclamation progress.

That portion which would be allotted to Nevada would be insufficient to carry forward the program already initiated and probably would mean the closing of the project planning offices in Nevada at Carson City and Overton. The work in the Lahontan and lower Colorado River Basin areas, including the important investigations in the Carson, Truckee, and Walker River areas, would, for all practical purposes, be suspended resulting in great delay and costly shut-down.

The reduction in the items for Boulder Dam, operation and maintenance, and construction are particularly untimely, especially since all of the expenditures for these activities at Boulder Dam are reimbursable under the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 and the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940. The $51,000 reduction in the operation and maintenance item for Boulder Dam should be restored. Similarly, the halving of the

construction appropriation for the project will delay badly needed work for the completion of this great structure. I am particularly concerned that the committee on page 20 of the report stated that $35,000 of the reduction is applied "to a request for funds to complete designs and specifications and award a contract for a high school and appurtenant facilities. The committee is opposed to the Government providing educational facilities at this project, it being of the opinion that assessments levied against the beneficiaries should provide funds for such facilities as is the practice in other American communities."

Boulder City is a Government town. The land and most of the buildings are owned by the United States Government and are nontaxable by the State of Nevada. The State, therefore, is deprived of revenue which it would acquire were it to provide educational facilities at the project. I protest this effort to saddle on the State of Nevada the cost of educational facilities at Boulder City which have been borne by reimbursable appropriated funds. The previous arrangement should be continued at least until a permanent cooperative plan is worked out.

The reduction from $18,000,000 to $6,200,000 from funds for construction of Davis Dam, I believe, is short-sighted, and if such a policy is followed the construction of that great dam will be slowed up from 4 to 5 years in its completion. Power from the dam is urgently needed in the Southwest; a delay now means a putting off of the time when power will be available from the dam, as well as to the time when revenue from the power comes back to the Government. The dam is not a subsidy, but its power will pay for the cost of construction—returning the money back to the Government—as well as paying an interest charge of 3 percent.

The Nevada Legislature has provided $40,000 for the continuing of the cooperative ground-water program in that State, and this program has been underway for a year, yet this bill completely eliminates appropriations for cooperative ground-water investigation, a program I consider one of the most important for development of our latent resources in Nevada.

We all believe in economy and reductions at this time, and many appropriation cuts are justifiable, but I protest again that the West be singled out in such a deep cut in the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation pertains more to the West than the East or South, for it grew up in the need of developing the Western States.

I have been told that Davis Dam will have no unobligated balance on June 30 next, and that Boulder Dam for completion of construction will have only $797,000 unobligated to do a $12,000,000 job of completing this structure.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Members of the House the facts about the Colorado-Big Thompson project, which is in my district, in northern Colorado, and for which the Appropriation Committee has cut the budget estimate of $14,000,000 down to $4,815,000, or only 34 percent of the amount actually needed to carry on existing construction contracts where the work is now going on.

This project was started back in 1935, 12 years ago, when the Bureau of Reclamation took over the plans of the farmers to get a better water supply from the Colorado River and worked out a combination power and irrigation project.

After several years of conferences and study, a plan was agreed on between the people of my district and the Government to get the project built. This plan left all the enormous power benefits in the hands of the Government and the final use of the water for irrigation to the farmers.

A conservancy district was organized under a new State law to guarantee the repayment of the cost of the water to the Government.

As this cost was more than the farmers could afford to pay, it was provided that the district can levy a mill tax on all real and personal properties in the district to carry a share of the cost. This tax will cover about one-fourth of the cost that the district has agreed to pay.

I think this is the first time such a thing was ever done, but it shows that all the people in the district are behind the project and willing to help pay the cost.

Then in July 1938, when all the details had been agreed to, the district made a contract with the United States to build the project. This contract listed all the features of the project that are to be built and stated exactly what the obligations of both the United States and the district are.

At that time it was understood by the district that the project would be built in 5 or 6 years.

The first construction work was started in the fall of 1938 but for several years the appropriations available from the Reclamation Fund were limited and then the war came on and construction almost stopped.

Green Mountain Dam and power plant on the western slope was completed in 1943 and has been paying good dividends to the Government from the sale of power but the people who started the project and need the water will not get any benefits until the other parts of it are completed.

Even if all the appropriations needed to expedite the plans of the Bureau are made it will take 4 or 5 years more, apparently, to complete all the work.

Last year, including the 1945 deficiency item, the Congress appropriated a total of $12,254,075 to the project which certainly indicated that it was the intention to complete the project and get it on a repayment basis as rapidly as possible.

The Bureau of Reclamation finished their plans and specifications and proceeded to let contracts for construction on that basis.

Right now there are at least 15 major construction and supply contracts, in addition to many smaller ones, on which work is underway and which will have to be stopped if money is not available.

I find that these contracts, on which work is now going on, amount to over $30,000,000 and that the Bureau estimate that over $14,000,000 will be needed to keep them going in the 1948 fiscal year.

On page 935 of the House Appropriations Committee hearings, in response to a request by Chairman JONES, the Bureau furnished an estimate showing that if all the present contracts are to be canceled at the end of the 1947 fiscal year, the losses to the Government would probably exceed $5,000,000.

Regardless of such a probability, is it good business or good government to drag out and postpone the completion of a project on which already more than $35,000,000 has been expended over a period of 10 years and which can produce no benefits to the water users or returns to the Treasury of the United States until completed?

This certainly is not economy in any sense of the word.

It is true that the project is going to cost far more than originally estimated but most of the increase is on account of changes and improvements in the power part of the project.

None of the changes in plans improve in the least the irrigation part of the project or provide any more water. These benefits are just the same as they were when the contract was made in 1938. The conservancy district, in fact, has never been advised or consulted about these changes in plans.

Anyway, the conservancy district people in cooperation with the National Reclamation Association, have presented to the congressional committee a definite detailed plan which shows that the project can still pay out in full and return interest on power features to the Treasury. This can be done with rates for the power well below the so-called competitive value of power in the area.

So, why should the Congress hold up this project any longer than necessary to get it into production?

This project was started to furnish a better water supply to the 700,000 acres of fine land in northern Colorado and stop the enormous crop losses that occur when we have water shortages.

Of course it will help the farmers themselves but the big gains will be to the country at large which needs more of the crops that we produce.

Last year, for instance, in our 13 beet-sugar factories in this district, we produced over 5,000,000 100-pound bags of sugar and we can double that yield when we have dependable water supplies.

Mr. Chairman, I include a table showing major existing contracts:

Major existing contracts

	Contract amounts	1948 requirement
Gramby Reservoir: Total construction and supply contracts	$6,925,532	$3,000,000
Gramby pumping plant: Total construction and supply contracts	5,639,998	3,500,000
Estes Park Aqueduct and power plants: Total construction and supply contracts	7,788,028	4,244,000
Horsetooth Reservoir: Three large construction contracts	9,937,549	3,150,000
Total	30,291,107	13,894,000

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the report of the Appropriations Committee sharply criticizes the National Park Service for an apparent failure to follow instructions given it by the committee a year ago to investigate the concessions system in the national parks, where the committee asserts that the concessions return too little money to the Government from their operations; that better accommodations should be provided at reduced rates; and that in some parks there are virtual concessions monopolies. The committee is critical because the Service, instead of conducting such studies itself, with its own personnel, is having them done instead by an advisory group of consultants.

We are all aware, I believe, that there has been considerable criticism of this concessions system, including the charge of monopoly, of high prices, of too little return to the Government. That the whole problem should be carefully studied with an eye to recommendations that will remedy whatever faults may be found certainly is desirable. But I am unable to follow the committee when it complains that this is being done by an outside group. Director Drury is responsible for recommending to the Secretary of the Interior that the studies be conducted by such a group, and I believe his reasons are thoroughly sound. The Park Service lives very close to the whole problem; it would be much more difficult for it to perform such a task in unprejudiced and dispassionate fashion than to have it done by an outside group of highly qualified consultants. And it is persons of that sort, coming to the work without any preconceived notions about it, but with open and intelligent minds, who have been picked by Secretary Krug for it.

I do not know that the Government does obtain materially less from these concessioners than it should; I do not know that it is possible, in these days of rising costs, to provide accommodations at more moderate cost in the parks, especially considering the shortness of the season in a number of them; I do not know whether a controlled monopoly is or is not the best way to assure the public what it needs. I do know, however, that the Department of the Interior is going to find it difficult, if not impossible, to enlist private capital to provide necessary accommodations for the public as long as the concessioners continue to be subjected to uninformed criticism. I suspect that the consultants appointed by Secretary Krug will come up with about as good answers to the questions the committee has raised as can be obtained, and, without impugning the honesty of the Director of the National Park Service or any of his staff, I believe that the public would accept the findings of such a group more readily than if the committee's suggestions were followed.

I cannot offer any evidence to confirm this belief better than to name the consultants that have been called on to do the job—and who are devoting a great deal of time to it, at the expense of their own private work. The chairman is Mr. Clem L. Collins, an accountant and former President of the American Institute of Accountants; the other members are Mr. George B. Smith, president of the Mark Hopkins Hotel in San Francisco and a former president of the American Hotel Association; Mr. Elmer Jenkins, manager of the Touring Bureau of the American Automobile Association; Mr. Charles G. Woodbury, of Washington, D. C., active and prominent in the field of conservation; and Mr. Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, who has behind him a long and varied record of exceptional public service. I believe these consultants will do an intelligent and thorough job; and I believe that anything less than a thorough job is not worth having.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON], a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the work of a Member of Congress was a vastly easier program when our Government was dedicated to the principle of deficit spending. All intellectual people recognize that deficit spending if continued will destroy the very foundation of any Nation. The people of the United States have demanded that the Government of the United States cease deficit spending and balance its budget.

This makes the task of the Committee on Appropriations extremely difficult. It is well for us all regardless of the district or the State we represent to reconcile ourselves to the fact that all of us must take some reduction in the great national spending program. Now the manner in which we take it is the all-important question.

I pay great tribute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and his able assistants on the committee in bringing before the Congress today this bill. Surely they have made some drastic reductions—drastic in the face of the policies that have been practiced the last several years.

In considering the action of the committee, however, we must not overlook the fact that it was confronted with the humiliating experience last year when the President froze practically all of the appropriations which were made at the request of the President and his Budget Bureau. Unfortunately much of this remains frozen.

Were the committee to appropriate liberally again—and I should like to remind you that the President signed last year's bill which he subsequently froze—the Appropriations Committee would again be humiliated.

The committee has spent considerable time in listening to hearings and has performed a most conscientious duty. No man is infallible, and the committee must arrive at its decisions as a result of the information it obtains by reason of the hearings. In many instances it is my belief that some of the facts are not too well presented and the committee is therefore compelled to arrive at its decisions without all of the essential information, or at least information that is crystal clear.

The vast amount of material which must be covered in a hearing such as this makes it next to impossible for the most accomplished of human mentality to deal with all of the intricate phases involved in a great hearing of this magnitude. It is reasonable then that there should be honest differences of opinion between men seeking a common objective. I therefore do not feel that I am inconsistent with my position for a balanced budget and a reduction in Government expenditures when I call attention to a few items in the bill which in my opinion seem to have been reduced below an economy level. And I am not one who proposes to balance the budget in somebody else's State. I want the RECORD to show here and now that I propose to be in the position of North Dakota's taking its rightful share of reductions necessary for a balanced budget.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For a moment I shall deal with the question of general investigations and the reduction made thereon. This has been reduced from the five million estimate of the Bureau of the Budget to a sum of $125,000. This excessive reduction effectively eliminates all investigational work thereunder. I feel it is imperative to deal with the investigational work and its relation to the Bureau of Reclamation. Those of us who make up the personnel of the Congress of the United States are largely lawyers, professional men, and businessmen. But in the sum total we are substantially all businessmen. We have established down through the years certain definite practices in our business relationships that have been accepted Nation-wide as the best plan for the exchange of affairs among men. We find, however, in dealing with some of our governmental problems such as the Bureau of Reclamation that the situation cannot be paralleled exactly with the question of business relationships between man and man.

I am reliably informed that by this tremendous reduction the amount is insufficient to even pay the terminal leave of those affected thereby. This, you will readily understand, wipes out immediately all investigational work. This would not be so serious were it not for the fact that irrigation and reclamation is an institution which must move on from year to year, and only by the processes of investigations can its maintenance be kept up. So by the elimination, or by this extreme reduction, the machinery has been practically stopped until a later date when appropriations for this purpose can be made.

I express particular interest in this connection because in the Missouri Valley Basin we are about to enter upon an era of new development through the proposed utilizations of the waters of the great Missouri River which bisects my State, and which in varying degrees affects the economy and welfare of 10 great agricultural States in the middle of the continent.

The general plan for development of conservation, control, and use of water resources of the Missouri River Basin, described in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and approved by the 1944 Flood Control Act, provided a basis for full development of all the water resources in the

basin. This plan was based on preliminary data which was not represented as being sufficient for initiation of construction work on individual units which were proposed for inclusion in the Missouri Basin project.

Continued forward planning therefore is essential to achieve constant or orderly development of the Missouri Basin water resources. Prior to actual construction of any unit, detailed studies are necessary to anticipate fully and make provision for all of the various engineering, repayment, financial, economic, and other problems peculiar to each individual unit. As a general statement, planning must precede construction by at least 2 years and operation by 3 years or more. The halting of planning work at this time will throw the construction program off balance for several years to come.

When the problems related to planning an individual unit are considered, the necessity of a thorough and well-ordered program becomes evident. Water studies must be made and past history of rivers and rainfall studied in order to determine the quantity and quality of water available. Soils must be studied to determine their ability to support crops and provide sufficient drainage to prevent the land from becoming waterlogged.

Investigations and surveys must be made in order to select the best site for a dam structure to impound water, and the best and most economical means of conveying water to the land. These studies lead to preliminary design work and cost estimates. Current crop returns must be studied along with potential increased returns due to irrigation in order to establish the repayment ability for a project and still meet the many and complex requirements of the reclamation law.

Added to all the above factors, a basin-wide development includes many additional problems of coordination. Availability of water must not only be determined for an individual unit, but for an entire river, a subbasin, and the basin. Each unit must be considered in relation to other units. In addition, all uses of water must be considered, including flood control, hydroelectric power generation, and domestic water supply. Full consideration must also be given to the possibilities for recreational facilities, preservation of fish and wildlife, silt control, pollution abatement, and other related developments.

The operating plan of each irrigated area—management of water on the land, proper operation and maintenance of canals, ditches, and laterals, and so forth—must be developed with a view to contributing maximum support to the broad areas of range and dry farming land surrounding each of the irrigated areas. It is necessary that studies be made well in advance of construction to determine these factors and their costs. In addition, proper schedules for land development must be established.

It is my considered judgment that the program of investigations and detailed planning now under way must be considered at an increased rate, if you please, if full development of the Missouri Basin is to be achieved in this generation. I should like to remind the Congress right here that when this law was passed in the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, the people who live in the States affected had reason to believe that the development was to go forward. They have made their plans accordingly and while they will be tolerant to the extreme in a desire to assist in the stabilizing of the Nation's economy, they will insist that this program continue to live and move forward. If we fail them here it must be conceded that the Seventy-eighth Congress misled them. The most beneficial, economical development of the Missouri Basin water resources, in my judgment, requires orderly planning and construction.

MISSOURI-SOURIS

Reducing the budget request for the Missouri Basin project from $23,000,000 to $9,611,600 will seriously retard work on this all-important new development. This unit is well advanced in the planning stage and when fully developed it will provide 1,000,000 acres of new irrigated land in North Dakota, and will include canals, reservoirs, power plants, and pumping plants.

I should like to remind the Congress that many sections of the Plains areas are subject to recurring droughts. By the development of small areas scattered throughout the table lands of the mid-continent in irrigation and reclamation projects, the Government is stabilizing a very important economy. Let me remind the Congress that from these lands come most of your fine steaks and roasts. It is a difficult problem to maintain these herds in drought years, and the record reveals that there have been times when almost the entire number have been moved from the plains or killed due to lack of feed.

This Congress has been called upon to make excessive appropriations to many of these areas in the past for relief purposes, and I cannot fail to remind you that if we have these recurring conditions of drought which are sure to come, the Congress will again be called upon to make these relief grants. They are only of a temporary and passing nature. While on the other hand, by the development of irrigation and reclamation areas you provide a plan by which these areas become self-sustaining.

In these areas of irrigation, forage crops can be grown irrespective of the dry years, and the herds can be carried over from one year to the other. Thus you sustain the economy of the local community and substantially improve the general welfare of the national picture so far as food is concerned.

The action of the committee in cutting the budget request and in restricting the use of new funds to units now in the construction stage will virtually stop all activity on the Missouri-Souris development. This includes Sheyenne Dam which was to have been the first feature started and which is urgently needed to alleviate municipal water shortages for a number of towns along the Sheyenne and Red Rivers.

The Missouri-Souris unit holds more promise for the future prosperity of North Dakota than any other single development in the State's history.

HEART RIVER

Although funds are provided to permit the start of construction on a part of the Heart River unit, there is no allowance for continuation of work leading to construction of Dickinson Dam. This dam is urgently needed to provide municipal water for the city of Dickinson, N. Dak.

KNIFE RIVER

The President had recommended funds to continue preparation of plans on the Knife River unit and the Missouri River pumping unit. No allowance is made by the committee for this work in the fiscal year 1948.

CANNONBALL

Elimination of the item affecting Cannonball unit for which it was planned to use approximately $20,000 precludes the possibility of any work thereon in fiscal 1948.

GARRISON RESERVOIR DIVERSION UNIT

The item of $35,000 needed for work on the Garrison Reservoir diversion unit was also eliminated.

I should like to call the attention of the Congress to the question of cooperation with other agencies. In examining this bill and the report of the committee, I note a restriction in the report which disturbs me considerably. The bill authorizes that the appropriation for the Missouri River Basin "shall be expended either independently or through or in cooperation with existing Federal and State agencies." That is as it should be and as it has been for the past 3 or 4 years. This permits the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Geological Survey, and other bureaus that have a vital interest in the Missouri River Basin development to participate in the original planning so that all interests may move forward together.

Some very effective work has been accomplished by this coordinated approach, and this plan should be continued. In studying the committee's report, however, I find the following language:

> The committee has denied all funds requested for transfer to other bureaus for proposed cooperative work pertaining to their activities for which $3,850,000 was contained in the budget estimate, and has provided that this amount shall be applied to work on units selected for construction under phase A.

The people of my State and other States in the Missouri River Basin want a coordinated approach to river basin developments as the fish and wildlife resources in particular are of great value. North Dakota has more and better waterfowl refuges than any State in the Union, and many of these will be jeopardized or influenced by the river basin development unless the Fish and Wildlife Service is able to work closely with the Reclamation Service in the original planning stages. North Dakota has seven large waterfowl breeding areas where 175,000 acres of marsh and upland have been restored. This includes the Souris River

development which has been made into one of the finest duck-producing areas in the country. In addition to the Federal refuges, small refuges built on private lands under an easement arrangement have been developed on another 145,000 acres.

I understand that almost $3,500,000 have gone into this program in North Dakota alone, and I want to see that this investment is protected through proper planning of the whole Missouri River water development program so that these values can be protected and new areas created wherever feasible.

For this reason I would like to have the prohibition against the transfer of funds for the Missouri River development, as contained in the committee report, eliminated so that various bureaus in the Interior Department that have interests in this whole scheme, may continue to participate as they have in the past and as is clearly authorized in the bill. If the funds to be appropriated to Reclamation Service are insufficient to take care of the needs of the other bureaus, an additional appropriation should be provided so that this coordinated study may go forward as it has in the past.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Ground-water investigation: The elimination of all items in the bill relating to ground water activities for both cooperative and noncooperative work is, in my opinion, a most serious action of the committee.

More than 85 percent of the people of North Dakota are totally dependent upon water obtained from underground sources by means of wells and springs for all their water needs. As the State receives 20 inches or less of rainfall per year, water is a scarce commodity. The problem of obtaining adequate water supplies of good quality is, therefore, a difficult one. Critical water problems have existed in the State for many years and large sums have been spent with only partial success in remedying the conditions.

Recognizing that the Federal Survey is the only agency that has the trained staff that could render effective assistance, and because of the large interest of the Federal Government in advancing the public welfare by protecting the public health through the procurement of permanent water supplies of good quality, which are so essential in the maintenance of a sound economy, and in assuring sound and stable development of public water supplies, the State Geological Survey in 1937 began cooperating with the Federal Survey on a small basis.

Since July 1945 the cooperation has been between the State water commission and the Federal Survey with the State geological survey acting as intermediary agent for the water commission. The primary purpose of the cooperative work has been to obtain reliable information on the ground-water conditions of the State, with attention being given first, as part of an integrated program, to those areas where problems were most critical and where the largest number of inhabitants could be most quickly benefited. With reliable information available as to the nature and extent of their water recourse, the people are then in a sound position to go ahead with water-supply developments without the continued waste of funds which has so frequently occurred heretofore. The selection of the type, plan, and design of the water-supply development is then carried out by private consulting engineers who prepare the specifications and supervise the construction of the wells installed by the private well contractors.

The Federal survey has at no time engaged in the construction of producing wells. Investigations under the present program are being made in seven counties in North Dakota—Barnes, Benson, Cass, Nelson, Steele, Traill, and Wells—with very gratifying results. In Wells County, for instance, one small part of the study is estimated by the engineers for the town of Fessenden to have provided information that has saved the city $20,000. In this and other regions there had been constant haphazard and costly drilling of wells over a period of many years without obtaining a satisfactory water supply. Other localities such as those in the vicinity of Minot and in Fargo, are benefiting greatly from the program. It is upon work such as this that the Federal Government is able to provide vital assistance that can be obtained from no other source and it must be continued unless our national development is not to be seriously retarded.

The vast development program in the Missouri River Basin, which has been authorized by Congress and which has progressed to the construction stage in several units, can be successfully and economically completed only if adequate basic information on the quantities and quality of surface and ground water is available. As indicated in Senate Document 191 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, reliable stream flow records covering sufficient time to reflect variations in flow are a prerequisite to sound planning, to assure proper control and full utilization of the waters, to avoid waste of construction funds on the one hand and the hazards of water shortage, flood damages, and power shortages on the other.

Similar data are required on the salt load to determine the siltation of reservoirs and on chemical quality of the water to determine its effect on the land and on crops. Likewise, ground-water studies are needed to determine where irrigation and domestic supplies are available for small communities and for farmsteads where surface supplies would constitute serious health hazards because it is not feasible to install plants for the purification of surface waters. The pattern of the water-bearing beds is extremely complex, and haphazard drilling to discover water supplies would be very costly. Exploratory drilling for water would likely result in more failures than successes unless it were based on sound investigation.

Ground-water investigations are also needed to determine the effect on ground-water resources that will result from reservoir construction and from irrigation where special care will be needed to avoid water logging and a host of other problems.

The cooperative State and Federal programs are entirely inadequate for these purposes. A greatly expanded program is needed to the end that project plans may be confirmed or modified on the basis of more complete information before construction is started.

The State Water Conservation Commission of North Dakota recently purchased a rotary well-drilling machine which has been used in ground-water investigations under the cooperative arrangement with the Geological Survey during the past 2 years. Under this cooperative arrangement the State puts up 25 percent, the municipality 25 percent, and the Federal Survey the other 50 percent of the funds, and in addition the State furnishes the well-drilling equipment.

My State has cooperated with the Federal Survey since 1938, and in the fiscal year 1946 drilled 41 test holes, and in fiscal 1947 drilled 72 test holes. In those 2 years, my State expended approximately $40,000 for equipment and matching funds. The legislature has again appropriated $30,000 for cooperating with the Geological Survey in North Dakota for the next biennium.

I just have information from the State water commission that at this time there are more than 50 applications from municipalities requesting test-hole drilling on a cooperative basis, and elimination of funds with which to carry on this work would seriously affect those communities where the matter of obtaining a domestic supply of water is a serious problem of paramount importance.

In the face of this demonstrated value, in the face of official statements from the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Water Works Association, whose membership is composed of the engineers concerned in water-supply developments, and in the face of letters from hundreds of drillers testifying to the help received from the Geological Survey, the House Appropriations Committee has reached the alarming decision that this work must be stopped.

Apparently, this decision was reached largely on the representations of one man, a well driller, whose statements have been shown to be without foundation in fact. If this bill is passed in its present form, these activities will cease on June 30, millions of dollars invested in ground-water developments will be endangered, and this highly trained group of specialists will be dispersed and largely lost to the Nation. Such wasteful economies can only lead to national economic bankruptcy.

BUREAU OF MINES

The last item I wish to mention is testing fuels in the Bureau of Mines budget. Included in this estimate is an item for lignite- and subbituminous-coal investigations, including the operation of a lignite gasification and drying plant at Grand Forks, N. Dak., and work at Golden, Colo., and the University of Texas.

The plant at Grand Forks is located on the university campus, the ground for which was transferred from North Dakota to the United States Government. The university is also providing free of

charge rooms and many other facilities. and Dean Harrington, of the department of engineering of his school has given a large part of his time to this investigation.

This plant was constructed primarily for the purpose of utilizing lignite for the production of a high-hydrogen gas at low cost for use in the reduction of Minnesota iron ores to metallic iron without putting them through blast furnaces that require metallurgical coke that must be made from eastern coal. Such cheap commercial hydrogen also may be used for the production of nitrogen fertilizers, synthetic wood alcohol and other materials used in the chemical industries.

This program was set up on a continuing basis and in order to realize the Government's investment therein, which now is about half a million dollars, it would seem only prudent business practice to give this operation sufficient funds with which to carry forward the work begun to the end that the experiments conducted may be proved.

The reduction in the "testing fuels" item from the estimate of $595,000 to $302,285 completely eliminates any possibility of continuing further work on lignite and subbituminous coal at Grand Forks, N. Dak. This is the information received from the Bureau of Mines. The part of the Budget estimate for the Grand Forks plant was $190,760 and in reducing the item of $302,285 barely leaves enough to carry on the regular work of testing and analyzing samples of coal in connection with the purchase of coal used by the Government, leaving nothing for the Grand Forks plant.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, this measure calls for a 40-percent cut in the funds for the Geological Survey mines and the elimination of the Oil and Gas Division. This reduction will seriously cripple the Department's work in an area of vital importance to the Nation at this stage of its economy. We are now desperately short of petroleum, copper, lead, zinc, and many other vital materials, materials absolutely indispensable to our expanding economy, and materials vital in a future emergency if one should occur.

We are today establishing ourselves as the great leader Nation of the world. At the same time we are virtually the only great bulwark against the forces of totalitarianism and socialism. The achievements of this leadership was made possible not only by our idealism but by our great economic strength. That economic strength was achieved through an abundance of the basic materials essential to our industrial economy. In providing the arsenal of democracy which supplied ourselves and our allies we made substantial inroads into our visible and immediately available reserves of metals and minerals. While this does not mean that we have become a have-not Nation as the result of such expanded activities, it does mean that we must make gigantic efforts to discover and develop some part of the substantial reserves which our more enlightened engineers tell us still exist in this great country of ours. Years of forced production in the face of manpower shortages has made it impossible for our industry to keep its developed reserves as far ahead of their production as it must do to maintain the high rate they are called upon to produce. This Government must do all in its power to encourage and lead the basic materials industries back to a production commensurate with the needs of our manufacturing industries in order that we can, insofar as we are able, maintain the economic strength that backs our external operations. It does this through the agency of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey.

The constant attention that we have been forced to focus on international affairs has caused many of us to temporarily lose sight of the necessity of watching our internal economy so that it remains strong enough to support our external obligations. We have just recently committed ourselves to $400,000,000 for our economic and political operations in Greece and Turkey; we are throwing $200,000,000 per year into the rehabilitation of our zone in Germany, to mention only two very essential activities. Yet we are proposing today to slash the equivalent of just 3 percent of those two items alone from the appropriations of the two Government bureaus on whose services the Government depends for the administration and advancement of the basic raw materials industries, whose enterprises supply the fodder for the manufacturing industries the taxes from which will be required to support those very activities.

Not only our economic strength but our actual military security depends on careful planning for the use of our available resources. We appropriated last year $100,000,000 for the stock piling of those materials which will always be in short internal supply in case of an emergency. The decisions for the expenditure of these funds are based on the statistical and technical work of the Bureau of Mines, which has asked for only $1,233,000 to cover all of its economic activities, the fruits of which are used for many other governmental and industrial activities. Assuming that these statistics and the experts who assemble them were used for stock-pile planning alone, would any one of us say for a minute that 1¼ percent is too much to spend on assuring the proper technical advice and information on which to plan intelligent procurement? One error of judgment based on inadequate information could easily cause the expenditure of that amount of money needlessly or endanger our security. Yet I am told that the overworked staff of this Bureau, which in many cases can afford only one expert to cover a number of its multitudinous fields, is already behind in its technological advice needed for intelligent procurement planning.

In the face of these facts it would appear to me that the Interior Department has been too modest in its requests for funds to cover these activities. If this Congress upholds the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee on the curtailment of these activities, many of the technical brains which have been trained at great expense will be lost to the Government with the resulting actual loss of money going into ill-advised procurement of stock piles alone.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, if I had 5 hours instead of 5 minutes, I could begin to discuss this bill and criticize it. In the few minutes furnished me, however, I should like to point to bad features on reclamation, Indian education, and some of the omissions regarding the Bureau of Mines.

When Chairman JONES was presenting the case in the beginning of the discussion I asked a pointed question and was not satisfied with his answer. I asked specifically why the Budget estimate of $18,000,000 for Davis Dam was cut to $6,200,000. The answer was not satisfactory. I cannot take the time now to ask him the question again, but I want to elaborate on the question, and perhaps the chairman or somebody on the committee will answer it for me later.

Why am I asking this? I think the answer given me which was unsatisfactory was, "Ask the President what he has done. He has frozen the funds." But I pointed out at the time, I recall, or as soon thereafter as I could, that the construction of Davis Dam has been going along regularly, according to schedule. There was no freeze on that. The point I wish to emphasize is that we are expected to build a $70,000,000 dam as a treaty obligation in 5 years' time, and we cannot do that by appropriating six or seven million dollars annually.

Why are we expected to build this dam? Because a recent water treaty that we have entered into with Mexico requires this to be built within 5 years to carry out the obligation of that treaty. Do we intend to abrogate that treaty? Congress can abrogate a treaty by an act of Congress, an act of commission, or Congress can nullify a treaty by an act of omission. If we do not carry out that treaty we will abrogate it, which might please Mexico.

I heard the gentleman from Nebraska ask a question a moment ago, "When the President of Mexico comes up here he wants to borrow $25,000,000 for irrigation. Do you think he will get it?" I do not know about that, but I can tell you this. If Mexico borrows $25,000,000 of us to carry on reclamation within the Republic of Mexico, I know a good place where they can carry it on. They can do it in the delta of the lower Colorado, where they have more than 1,000,000 acres of delta land that may be irrigated if they had sufficient water. How can they get the water? The treaty that we recently adopted with them provides 1,500,000 acre-feet annually out of the Colorado River. If we abrogate that treaty, they can get twice that amount of water, and use it profitably—Mexico demanded 3,000,000 acre-feet as well as the money to develop the land. That I do not want to see happen, because that robs our country of the water we ought to have for use in the Colorado River Basin.

I said quite a bit about the lack of funds for investigation. I believe the committee is practicing birth control on

the Bureau of Reclamation when they cut off funds for general investigation. Reducing that item from $5,000,000 to $125,000 will kill many good projects before they are begun. That is the worst blow of all.

I notice in the committee's report on pages 15 and 16 that they recommend education for the Navajo Indian children. I notice they also say, "Let the State take care of education for the Indian children." I want to call your attention to the fact that there are 17,000 children of school age on the Navajo Indian Reservation, and less than 5,000 of them are in school. The Navajo Indian Reservation is about as large as the entire State of West Virginia, and it is impossible for the State of Arizona and the State of New Mexico to include these children in our public-school systems.

But, by the cut which this bill contains, 1,000 Navajo Indian children who are in boarding schools will be taken out of school. In other words, several boarding schools must be closed; one, I understand, at Santa Fe, one at Albuquerque, one at Riverside, or some place in California; and I am told that possibly the Indian school at Phoenix, Ariz., will be closed.

I see the gentleman from Oklahoma in the Chamber, and he says there will be three boarding schools for Indians in his district that will be closed because of this.

Gentlemen, that is false economy. From all over this country I am receiving letters and communications from thinking people asking, "What are you doing for the Navajo Indians? Why are they not getting the schooling promised them by treaty?" Similar questions are asked about other Indians. The Christian people are more keenly alert to this very bad situation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] such time as she may require.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, as a preface to my remarks, I offer the attached telegram from the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Chamber of Commerce:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 23, 1947.*
Hon. GEORGIA L. LUSK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously protest House Appropriations Committee proposed 47 percent budget cut which would wipe out all hope of reclamation irrigation, power and conservation development at this time so badly needed throughout Rio Grande Valley. To hamstring this development now by false economy can conceivably reduce this valley to America's second potential dust bowl. We urge no cut of reclamation funds. We deem such funds positively essential to preservation of human life and inhabitation in Rio Grande Valley.

CHARLES C. BROOME,
President, Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply shocked by the action of the Appropriations Committee on the funds for the Bureau of Reclamation. I cannot believe that the members of that committee are aware of the vital importance of reclamation developments in the arid and semiarid States. In the 45 years since Congress enacted the first Reclamation Act, 50 projects have been constructed to serve 4,500,000 acres of irrigated lands. Those areas, which were vacant desert and sagebrush before the projects, are now highly productive farming areas, which, in 1946, yielded crops worth $500,000,000. The crops are desperately needed livestock feeds, sugar beets, and fruits and vegetables required to maintain the high-standard diet in the United States. Those irrigated crops are not competitive with the production of other areas of the country, and they do not involve any of the surplus commodities, such as wheat, corn, or tobacco. The crops produced on irrigated lands are a vital part of the economy of the Western States, and are the principal source of income which builds up the trade and interstate commerce drawing on the manufactured items and the basic food staples produced in all other States of the Nation.

The Bureau of Reclamation is the agency constituted by the acts of Congress to develop western water resources for irrigation and electric-power production. For 45 years the Bureau of Reclamation has surveyed those western resources and reported on them to the Congress with recommendations of the projects needed to maintain western communities and to provide the basis for balanced economic development. The Congress has authorized projects, with a total cost of about $2,000,000,000. The appropriations for the construction of those projects by the Bureau of Reclamation are returned to the Treasury by the water users and the power consumers so that this western program is no drain on Federal finances. It is, in fact, a profitable investment, because, in addition to securing the return of the construction costs, the Federal Government has gotten back several times that amount in increased income taxes that are paid by the project people as a result of the increased productivity of their land. I am informed that surveys show that those income taxes represent a 300-percent profit on the investment in Federal reclamation projects.

My State of New Mexico is not wealthy. In several portions of the State, there are large numbers of small farmers who must get their living from a few acres of land and incidental work when they can get it on the railroads or as migratory labor in the beet fields of other States. There are also, in my State, large groups of Indians who do not have now enough agricultural land on their reservations to support themselves, and, therefore, the Federal Government appropriates annually for their maintenance and livelihood. Reclamation projects now under study would greatly improve the farming lands of those people. Along the middle Rio Grande, projects are needed to store the floodwaters so as to provide assured irrigation supplies and to reduce the damage from inundation. There is a desperate need for completion of those project studies so that proposals may be presented to the Congress for authorizing the needed works.

In other States I know that the same need for project-planning work is as urgent to provide the factual basis for authorizations. In past years, the Congress has been fully aware of the need for project planning by the Bureau of Reclamation. Last year, Congress appropriated $5,000,000 for this work, and in previous years the appropriations were comparable. As a result of that congressional action through the years, the Bureau of Reclamation has been able to inform the people of the Western States of the opportunities for reclamation development, and there have been presented to the Congress, on a sound engineering basis, project plans which have led to authorization and construction. If the bill as reported by the committee should be enacted, all of that work would cease. There would be no information available to the Western States and to the Congress concerning the feasibility of additional projects and the economic basis for returning to the Treasury the costs of their construction. I know that that would be disastrous to my State of New Mexico and I feel sure that it would be equally disastrous to all 17 Western States.

I cannot believe that the Congress will, by this bill, legislate out of existence the Federal program based on specific legislative authority which has done more for the West than any other Federal activity. Reclamation projects now in operation are the principal basis for income and tax revenues. Additional projects are vital so that New Mexico and the other Western States can take their proper place in the national economy. With that end in view, the project-planning work of the Bureau of Reclamation must continue. The $5,000,000 appropriation requested in the budget is a very modest figure, and should be the absolute minimum of the appropriations provided in the pending bill.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak for an adequate appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. My feeling in regard to this runs very deep. I have seen the hot winds blow across western and central Nebraska, leaving in their wake burned and withered crops. Some of the more fortunate sections of our country talk loud and long when they have a light crop. I have seen sturdy, hard-working, and independent farmers face, not a small crop, but a total crop failure, not for a single year, but for as long as four, five, or six consecutive years. To many people in the United States, the dust storms were something that they read about in the middle thirties. To my friends and neighbors in Nebraska they were a real experience. I have seen the dust blow so that in the middle of the day adult farmers would get lost in the field and were unable to find their way to the house. Individuals were caught on the highway with their automobiles and found the storm so severe that they could not see the radiator cap on their car. This same territory that has suffered from drought and dust storms has had other years where the rainfall was ample and a fair crop could be raised. The soil is rich and deep and black. The streams in such a territory are a divine blessing and a source for a sound solution for drought and dust storms. Yet

if these streams are uncontrolled and unmanaged that same region faces floods. The Republican River flows for approximately 200 miles in southwestern Nebraska. It is in the heart of the drought and dust bowl area, yet in 1935 we had a terrific flood that cost the lives of 110 people and millions and millions of dollars in property loss.

There are two ways to deal with this problem: One is by means of relief, grants, and other temporary measures of like character. This is costly, wasteful, ineffective, unwise, and temporary. The other plan is to develop the streams and to prevent floods and store water for irrigation. This is an all-time solution, it is the economical answer, its benefits are manyfold. Much of the cost of such a program is reimbursable. It is not a part of our current costs of government and should not be so considered.

Those people who are opposed to irrigation should come out of their shell and read the history of America. For the 70-year period from 1850 to 1920, 5,000,000 acres of new farm land were brought into production each year. At the present time 4 acres of farm land are needed per capita. This means that for every increase in population of 1,000,000 we need to bring into production 4,000,000 acres of new farm land. Our public domain has now been exhausted. The only place to which we can turn for more land and for more available farm sites is through the expansion of irrigation. It has well been said that that part of the United States west of the Mississippi River could not feed itself in peace or in war without irrigation. I am satisfied that it can be safely said that the entire United States could not feed itself without irrigation. With the exception of 2 or 3 years during the war, the United States has been an importer of food since the middle twenties. We have imported more than we have exported. We have not fed ourselves.

In order to make more farm homes available, expand production in the United States, provide a market for our industrial centers, and strengthen us as a nation, a reclamation act was passed in 1902. I wish to quote from the first message to Congress in December 1901 of President Theodore Roosevelt:

> It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for the storage of water as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid regions by engineering works of another character.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every section of our country just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States.
>
> The increased demand for manufactured articles will stimulate industrial production, while wider home markets and the trade of Asia will consume larger food supplies and thus effectually prevent competition with eastern agriculture.
>
> Indeed the products of irrigation will be consumed chiefly in mining and other industries which would otherwise not come into existence at all.
>
> Our people as a whole will profit, for successful homemaking is but another name for upbuilding of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate to point out that irrigation farmers are the only citizens who pay any portion of the cost of developing our waterways or harbors. The Federal program for flood control is a 100 percent subsidy. The navigation interests repay no part of the tremendous cost of improving our streams for the purpose of navigation. Our great wealthy cities, who boast of a harbor, do not repay the Federal Government the tremendous cost for developing such a harbor.

President Roosevelt's successor, William Howard Taft, likewise was a supporter of the extension of irrigation. Speaking at Spokane, Wash., September 29, 1909, he said:

> The plan of the Government to reclaim the arid and semiarid lands manifested in the Reclamation Act has been carried out most rapidly by the Bureau charged with its execution. There are more than 30 projects which have been entered upon by the Reclamation Bureau, and I believe all of them are to be commended for their excellent adaptation to the purpose for which they were erected, and for the speed with which the work has been done.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The work has been well done and reflects credit on the engineers that have had charge of it.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the witness stand a great Ohioan. A man whose home surroundings were not influenced by the demon drought, yet he said:

> There is yet unappropriated approximately 200,000,000 acres in the public domain, 20,000,000 acres of which are known to be susceptible of reclamation and (being) made fit for homes by provision for irrigation.
>
> The Government has been assisting in the development of its remaining lands until the estimated increase in land values in the irrigated sections is full $500,000,000 and the crops of 1920 alone on these lands are estimated at $100,000,000. Under the law authorizing these expenditures for development the advances are to be repaid, and it would be good business for the Government to provide for reclamation of the remaining 20,000,000 acres, in addition to expediting the completion of projects long under way.

The above is from the message to Congress on December 6, 1921, of President Warren G. Harding.

Here is what Calvin Coolidge said in a letter dated September 17, 1924:

> Some minor criticism has been made as to the policy of our unremitting development of these (reclamation) projects by those who have thought we were already overproducing in agricultural products. They feel that these projects should be stayed until agricultural production had readjusted itself.
>
> These criticisms lie in the lack of understanding that these projects take many years for development; that they furnish but a small portion of the increased food supply required even by our increased population; that the utilization of their supplies lies in the development of the West itself.
>
> It is my purpose to unremittingly stimulate and encourage the development of these projects by every authority of the Federal Government.

The Bureau of Reclamation has made a success of things because it has had the guiding hand of intelligent, well-trained, and sound engineers. It is no wonder that Herbert Hoover, the engineer, was a stanch supporter of the extension of irrigation. As President of the United States he enthusiastically supported the program of the Bureau of Reclamation. In a letter to the conference of western governors held in Salt Lake City in the summer of 1930, President Hoover said:

> The undertaking (reclamation) has been of great benefit to this region (the West) and has been the cause of adding much wealth to the Nation.
>
> If the fundamental facts are properly appraised, it seems certain that the arguments of opponents of Federal reclamation will find satisfactory answer and that they will no longer countenance the misleading information that is now being broadcast through different agencies.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The projects themselves furnish extensive markets for manufactured goods as well as for farm products not raised under irrigation, and thus seem to afford material benefits, rather than detriment, to other sections. It may be further said that crops raised under irrigation are generally supplemental to, rather than competitive with, the products of other farms.
>
> * * * No valid arguments appear to oppose this constructive Federal undertaking. Rather support should be given in the light of the contribution to the Nation's good.

While our reclamation program was initiated and developed by the Republican Party, it is not a partisan matter. Nebraskans of all political faiths are supporters of irrigation. It has always been supported by men of all parties who have investigated the problem with which reclamation deals. I predict that the money spent under the Roosevelt administration for the extension of irrigation will prove to be the soundest and most enduring of all expenditures made in that era. When money is spent on things that do not lead to the production of new wealth its value is limited. It is not so with the development of irrigation. It supplants drought with adequate moisture, poverty with a reasonable living, and citizens on relief with citizens who are substantial taxpayers. It does all of these things in addition to the fact that a large portion of the principal cost of construction is repaid directly. When the National Reclamation Association met in Boise, Idaho, in 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote:

> Reclamation as a Federal policy has proven its worth and has a very definite place in our economic existence. Spread over one-third of the territory of the United States and creating taxable values and purchasing power affecting municipal, State, and Federal governments and private industry, it is only reasonable that we should all take pride in its achievements and success.

When the drought and dust storms came in the thirties, President Roosevelt visited Nebraska on his tour of the stricken region. One of his stops was at McCook, Nebr., on the Republican River. President Roosevelt rightfully recognized that the answer was in the utilization of our water resources. In a letter of October 1938, President Roosevelt said:

> The providing of new opportunities to make homes and gain decent livings for a

large number of our farmers through irrigation of western deserts serves to increase the wealth of the Nation and to cement us economically into a more perfect whole.

I have felt concern for the large number of families which have been forced by drought and adversities from their homes in various sections. The construction now in progress in the West will, in part, solve the problem.

The fact that these projects are expected to repay the cost of their construction, through revenues from water and from power, when power is possible of development, is not to be overlooked nor underestimated. This makes it possible for me to justify expenditures on a scale commensurate with the needs for such work.

The scores of dams, the thousands of miles of canals, the many power plants, and the thousands upon thousands of homes which have resulted from Federal reclamation are monuments to the sound plan which is being so ably executed by the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Chairman, when I appeared before the Appropriations Committee urging an appropriation for irrigation, I pointed out that the Federal Government had spent and loaned in one way or another over $25,000,000 to relieve the distress in the counties that comprise the Republican River Basin. This amounts to an average of $2,458 for every farm family in the watershed. The drought will come again, for it is an area of insufficient rainfall. These expenditures have not solved the problem, the solution is the utilization of the water of our streams. Herein lies protection against floods and the storage of water to be applied on the land for the growing crops. This is the wise and economical solution. It means the saving of dollars, the saving of water, the saving of soil, and the saving of a great people.

Shortly after I came to Congress in 1939, the west coast, particularly California, was disturbed over their relief load, school expenses, and other heavy charges by reason of the fact of the migration of thousands of families to that part of the Nation. They caused this House to create a select committee to investigate the interstate migration of destitute persons. A great portion of these people came from the drought area. Believing that the answer was not more and better Federal relief programs, but in combatting drought, I sought and obtained a place on that special committee. It was headed by the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. John Tolin. The committee found that the primary cause for the disruption of these American families was drought and that the solution was the extension of irrigation.

Nebraska is where the Middle West, with its ample rainfall, and the arid West meet. This is generally true of the greater portion of the Missouri River Basin which comprises one-sixth of the area of the United States. It has not received its share of the Nation's reclamation development. It may have been partly because, in the years gone by, many of our people and their representatives hoped that the rain would come, while the people a little farther west knew that it would not. One of the first irrigation projects built by the Bureau was in Nebraska. It was started in 1902. That locality is now a rich, thriving, thickly settled, prosperous section of our country. The United States Government has collected and will continue to collect millions and millions and millions of dollars in income taxes in this irrigated section. This prosperity is due to irrigation. We, in Nebraska, are grateful for some much-needed and successful irrigation development under PWA, but the Bureau of Reclamation has not built any projects in Nebraska in the last 40 years. Other semiarid spots of Nebraska which were similarly situated in 1902 with the portion that received development in irrigation have not moved ahead like that irrigated section. They have not provided homes for the additional thousands of people, they have not paid the millions and millions of dollars in income taxes, they have not provided the huge market for the products of our industrial centers. The cost of developing this irrigation in Nebraska in 1902 has been repaid many times.

Work is now under way by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Republican Valley. This is an important part of the Missouri Basin program. That program is sometimes referred to as the Pick-Sloan plan. As a member of the Committee on Flood Control, I introduced the resolution, back in 1943, that brought forth the plan of the Army Engineers known as the Pick plan. At the same time, the Bureau of Reclamation undertook their basin-wide plan for the Missouri The House of Representatives approved the Pick plan and authorized it by law. When the bill reached the Senate, the Sloan plan was added to the Pick plan and thus was evolved the joint Army-Bureau plan for the Missouri Valley. I served as one of the conferees on that measure. The conference accepted the combined plan and the program for flood control and irrigation for the Missouri River Basin became law in December 1944.

Nebraska is the only State that lies entirely within the Missouri River Basin. Construction work by both the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation is now under way on the Republican River. The bill before us today is the appropriation bill for the Bureau of Reclamation. The appropriation bill carrying the Army funds will come before us at a later time. Last year the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives recommended an appropriation of $10,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation for the Missouri River Basin. It was raised by the Senate and there was finally appropriated $17,500,000. In the bill before us today, the House Committee on Appropriations has recommended nearly the same amount as they did a year ago. I am informed that when the new year begins July 1, there will be an unexpended balance of $10,000,000 for the Missouri River Basin from previous appropriations.

Nebraska's share of this construction money will be spent in the Republican River Basin. The Frenchman-Cambridge project consists of the Enders Dam and a dam on Medicine Creek, north of Cambridge, plus diversion dams and canals. The contract for the Enders Dam was let some months ago. It was for the sum of $4,109,927. This is approximately 20 percent below the original estimate made by the Bureau. The entire Frenchman-Cambridge project is estimated to cost $19,839,039.

One other project on the Republican River is being constructed by both the Army and the Bureau. The Army is building the large on-river dam. The Army calls this the Harlan County Dam. Since the bill before us today does not deal with Army money, the figures quoted do not pertain to the Army's portion of this job. In addition to the Harlan County Dam, which is for both flood control and irrigation, there will be the diversion dams and canals to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau refers to this project as the Bostwick project. The Bostwick project will consist of the Superior-Courtland, Franklin, Red Cloud, Scandia, and Republican subunits. The total cost for this Bostwick project is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to be $15,774,523. Again let me state that these figures do not include Army appropriations for the Harlan County Dam. It might be in the interests of clarity to refer to this joint project as the Harlan County-Bostwick project.

There are other portions of the program for the Republican River Basin that have not yet reached the construction stage. This does not mean that they are less meritorious. Due to the extreme drought inherent to the Republican River Basin and the very continuing danger of floods, our efforts must not stop until every possible acre of land that can be irrigated is irrigated and until the greatest possible degree of flood protection is provided.

The Bureau of Reclamation was created to bring water to the soil where the rainfall was insufficient. If there ever were any projects that fall clearly and distinctly within the original purpose for which the Bureau was created it is these Republican River projects. Compared to huge river developments elsewhere and compared to some of the gigantic projects throughout the country these developments are small. The engineers have not found the production of power to be feasible on this stream. They are farmers' projects. A great portion of the money advanced to the Government will be repaid by farmers. They will be operated by farmers and the water will be used on family-sized farms. It will make possible many new farm sites for returned veterans and others. This development should have first claim on any funds that are given to the Bureau of Reclamation, because the Bureau was created to bring water to the farmers' land in areas where the rainfall is insufficient.

Projects such as these are in the interest of long-range economy. A considerable portion of these funds are repaid to the Treasury of the United States. To that extent, at least, these items should not be considered as any part of the current costs of Government. To slow up their construction is wasteful. It means more overhead and it delays the time when the benefits will start, resulting in increased taxes and repayments to the Treasury. It is both necessary and sound that these projects move forward. In

that connection I have two suggestions. They are:

First. The appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation for the Missouri River Basin will have to be increased before the Congress completes its work on this measure.

Second. A permanent, long-range program must be worked out whereby the reimbursable part of reclamation projects can be financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and not carried as a cash appropriation item.

It is my information that the rural-electrification program is financed by the RFC and that it is not counted in the annual budget of the Government. The record for repayment for REA is good and this arrangement is right. It is a Government loan and not an expenditure for the operating costs of Government. The Bureau of Reclamation's expenditures, which are repaid to the Treasury, do not represent the running expenses of this Government. They constitute a loan. These loans should be made by the RFC. If a hard-up and failing business corporation gets an RFC loan it is not handled as a cash appropriation by the Congress and the issue of budget balancing does not enter into it. Such loans have been made to banks, manufacturing concerns, railroads, hotel corporations and practically every type of business. Why should not the loan part of reclamation be financed in the same manner? The answer is, it should. This Congress should write such a program before another fiscal year rolls around.

I do not suggest that the RFC be an additional agency to pass upon a reclamation program. The control of both money and RFC credit should remain in the hands of the Congress. An accounting should be made to the Congress and expenditures should be scrutinized to prevent waste and keep the cost down. Then when the Congress makes a cash appropriation to run the Bureau of Reclamation and to carry the nonreimbursable parts of the construction program, they would at the same time make mandatory provisions for the extending of stated amounts of RFC credit. Until such a financing program is worked out, wasteful delays must not be permitted nor prolonged overhead invited. The program of extending irrigation must go on and an adequate appropriation should be made therefore.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I believe if every Member of the House will seriously consider the proposed $3,856,000 cut in the budget estimates for the "Education of Indians" he will join me in regretting this action. This represents a reduction of $2,000,000 with respect to appropriations for the fiscal year 1947. If increases based on the Pay Act are taken into account, the cut amounts to an actual reduction of $2,889,700. Unfortunately, these cuts come at a time when food and other costs have reached an all-time peak.

You will pardon my reference to my own State if I say that Oklahoma has more Indians than any other State in the Union. We are proud of our Indian population. We are proud of the progress they have made. They have distinguished themselves in every field of endeavor. One of our own and most beloved colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], is of Choctaw Indian descent. To my own knowledge at least two members of the Five Tribes of Oklahoma won the Medal of Honor for "heroism above and beyond the call of duty" in World War II. Such progress, of course, is largely the result of education.

I do not like to single out my own State, for what I have said, and will say, will apply equally to many other States, particularly Montana, South Dakota, New Mexico, Arizona, and others. However, in swinging the so-called Republican economy ax the committee has seen fit in its report to refer specifically to the State of Oklahoma. From page 15 of the report I quote these words:

> The committee is aware of the fact that the Congress could spend unlimited funds in the support and education of this group. It wishes to point out, however, that the States have some obligation to the Indians and that some aid could and should be extended by local communities. In some States, such as Oklahoma, the State is obligated to provide educational facilities for all citizens. For these reasons the committee has made substantial reductions in many items in the bill for administration as well as for education and relief purposes.

Oklahoma, of course, does not deny its obligations to any citizens. In its high schools and colleges, and to a great extent in all its schools, Oklahoma has provided educational opportunities and facilities for all citizens, including its Indians.

Under various solemn treaties under which Indians were driven from their native homes; under acts of Congress, and under the ordinary rules of justice, the Federal Government has through the years assisted in the education of Indians who looked forward to the day when all restrictions might be lifted from their population. This educational assistance has been rendered through the establishment of reservation and nonreservation, boarding schools and day schools, through financial aid to school districts and to missionary schools, and to a limited extent through scholarships in special cases. If I construe this bill properly, its enactment will result in the reduction of expenditures in just about every item except with respect to aid to mission schools.

In the time allotted to me, I would like to discuss briefly the matter of aid to school districts and the matter of nonreservation boarding schools. It should be remembered that the enabling act under which Congress made provision for the admission of Oklahoma to the Union, restrictions were placed on Indian lands and large quantities of lands were exempt from State or local taxation for all purposes. The same situation is true in many other States where most Indians live on nontaxable lands and, therefore, do not contribute to the support of schools. It is obvious that in districts in which many acres of tax-exempt lands are located, it would throw an unusual burden on other taxpayers, if they were required to carry the entire load of supporting their local schools. It appears from the report that in writing this bill, the committee has not taken this matter into account and has departed from a long established practice of granting assistance, which was little enough at most, to schools serving Indian pupils. Unfortunately this cut touches many districts which have been struggling for years to maintain even minimum standards of elementary education.

In the establishment of nonreservation board schools, our Government has taken care of cases that could be taken care of in no other manner. They are limited to orphan children, to children from broken homes, and to children who reside so far from ordinary schools that attendance at such schools is impossible. They are limited to children whose parents have no financial means of keeping them in school. They are only placed in these boarding schools when all other efforts to place them in homes or in other appropriate institutions have failed. There can be no doubt under this bill that all of these schools will be curtailed, and some of them may be closed entirely.

In view of salary raises, or the 40-hour week, and increased commodity costs, these cuts cannot be absorbed by operational economies. I have known children who have graduated from these schools. They have uniformly made fine substantial citizens. Mr. Chairman, in all these cases, these are students who have had no other chance to get an education. To cripple such a program would appear to me to be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Right now this Congress is in the midst of considering an authorization of $350,000,000 for relief in foreign countries. Shall we deny a pitiful 1 percent of this amount to assist, where assistance is sorely needed, in the care and education of the children of our original Americans?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, as the entire delegation from the great Territory of Alaska, although not a voting delegation, I would like to enter my bid now on a nonpartisan basis to be cut in on any deals that might be floating around. I am imbued with the spirit of compromise.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I am not happy with all the provisions of this bill and I expect to detail the reasons why I am not. I should be less than fair, however, if I were not to state here that the distinguished Chairman and members of the committee have, generally speaking, dealt most fairly with Alaska. They have recognized its national importance, they have recognized that it is at the strategic crossroads of the world. Dollar-wise, Mr. Chairman, this bill contains more for the Territory of Alaska than last year's bill and we are grateful for that. We are especially grateful that the committee saw fit to report the bill with an item of $4,000,000 for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Alaska Railroad. That is work that has long needed to be done. The War Department made an urgent recommendation that it be started without delay. The needs of the Army in the

Territory are such that the railroad must be put in first-class shape with the least possible delay and that work can now be started under the provisions of this bill.

I am extremely happy to note that the Geological Survey is given funds over and above those available for the current fiscal year for unlocking the mineral storehouse that Alaska is.

The bill does not contain enough money for the enforcement of laws and regulations having to do with the Alaska Fishery, the bill does not contain money enough for the enforcement of game laws, but I do not think that is fundamentally a fault of this committee. Alaska produces 80 percent and more of the entire world's pack of salmon. It is a great Alaska resource, it is a great national resource, it must be protected, and I think it is the duty of the executive arm of our Government to come before the Congress with an adequate program for the protection of and building up of that valuable resource. The same is true with respect to requests for the enforcement of game laws. That is a Federal responsibility now. I do not think the executive arm of the Government has ever asked this Congress for enough money to insure adequate protection for the great herds of caribou and moose in the Territory of Alaska, for the Alaska brown bear, and for the other animals which have a value over and above that which can be expressed in terms of dollars.

In the general items not specifically referring to Alaska, Mr. Chairman, the funds are inadequate to maintain for the next fiscal year the fishery laboratory at Ketchikan. I think that is poor economy because that laboratory has been a most valuable work in connection with utilizing fishery products in Alaska that are not now commercially marketed.

Over and above all things, that which concerns me about the bill as it relates to Alaska, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that there has been a rather substantial reduction in the budget estimate for the Alaska Native Service. In that connection I should like to say to the members of the committee that I only regret that you did not have the opportunity this year as you did last year to have before you personally Mr. Don C. Foster, the very able Superintendent of the Alaska Native Service. If he could have testified I feel confident that the bill would have been more liberal with respect to the needs of the Indians, the Eskimos, and the Aleuts of Alaska.

In development of the great national resource which is Alaska there is a continuous need for intelligent direction. As a Territory we are prevented from giving that direction ourselves to the many problems which are involved, and the direction must be furnished, in large measure, by the Secretary of the Interior and his immediate staff.

The deep and undiscriminating cuts recommended for the Office of the Secretary would be particularly harmful to Alaska. They would be harmful not only to the people of the Territory of Alaska who expect soon to be the citizens of the State of Alaska—but they would be doubly harmful to the thousands of young veterans still in the States and who, with the traditional pioneer vision that has made this country so great, are making their plans and preparations to go to Alaska to live.

Our knowledge of a large part of even the most attractive parts of Alaska is still fragmentary. It cannot be denied that it is a proper and a necessary function of the Government to conserve this great natural resource. To the performance of that function we must bring the true conservative spirit—namely, to use our assets wisely today, while thinking of the needs of tomorrow. If, therefore, today we deny to our Government the very instrument which we have designed to assure the prudent development of Alaska, then tomorrow the hoped-for population will not be there—or it will be only a disappointed, embittered remnant of the group of young pioneers whose hope and courage will have carried them up there without the expert guidance which this Congress again and again promised them while they were offering their blood and their lives in defense of their country.

I have mentioned the Office of the Secretary particularly. In that office there is located the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, whose appropriation for the coming year has been cut by the committee a fourth below the amount that agency received for the present fiscal year. I am acquainted with the work load being borne by this division at the present time. Inquiries reaching the division from citizens, particularly veterans, living all over the United States and from every place where our armed forces are still stationed, number in the thousands. From this division the citizens who express interest in going to Alaska get intelligent and informed answers to their questions. The division is doing a real job of service in aiding the development of a broader economy and a larger population in Alaska. I know that the facilities of the Division of Territories are already taxed to the limit in handling this work. It is neither an economy or good sense to require the reduction of staff which will be necessary should the Interior bill as reported by the House committee pass in that form.

The bill, as reported, would abolish entirely the Division of Power. Alaska is just beginning to receive from this division substantial assistance in meeting the power problems which confront a rapidly developing area. This cut which would produce a saving which is infinitesimal in the whole picture of Government expenditures will have real and highly unfortunate consequences as far away as Alaska.

The Congress has prescribed in great detail the land and mineral policies to be followed in Alaska. The solicitor of Interior with a carefully chosen small staff has the final responsibility of assuring that the activities of the Department of the Interior and of the Government as a whole conform to these congressional requirements. To slash his small staff by more than a third would be to place upon the solicitor a task practically impossible of performance.

Hundreds of thousands of square miles of public domain in Alaska containing forest resources whose commercial volume is estimated at 225,000,000,000 board feet have been protected in the past by an organization known as the Alaska Fire Control Service. An item of $170,000 requested for this service in the next year has been disallowed.

The appropriation for the Alaska Native Service which has responsibility for the health, welfare, and education of about one-third the people of Alaska has been reduced by the committee by $819,000. This will mean that many establishments including schools, hospitals, nursing-staff stations and tuberculosis sanitoriums will have to be closed.

Alaska, which has less than 3,000 miles of roads in an area one-fifth as large as the entire United States, is never going to be developed as the Nation should insist it be developed in the interests of National defense, as well as domestic progress, unless the highway system of the Territory is expanded materially. The bill as reported by the committee would reduce by $603,000 the modest funds sought for maintenance, repair, and construction of roads.

Alaska's principal wealth is the fisheries industry which, over the past half century, has contributed something like $50,000,000 annually to the prosperity of the Nation. We thought that up until a few years ago the salmon fishery was at a level which could be maintained indefinitely, but for the past half dozen years it has been declining steadily. The decline is due to the lack of sufficient personnel and equipment to enforce the fisheries and game conservation regulations. The cut recommended by the committee will mean the closing of a fisheries research laboratory operated by the Fish and Wildlife Service at Ketchikan, Alaska, the only research institution located in Alaska and dealing with the problem of obtaining a more intelligent utilization of those rich resources.

I am sure the Congress is aware of the fact that Alaska is not standing still. Our population is increasing from month to month Our problems, too, are increasing. It happens that most of these problems under the territorial system fall to the Department of the Interior to solve. To my mind, the Department has never been equipped by Congress with the tools which it really needs to do the job in Alaska which must be done to develop that great land for the future generations who will live there and for the people of the United States, including Alaskans. No , the committee proposes to take some of even these few tools out of the hands of the Department and to weaken the Federal effort in the Territory. With the Nation in its present situation with respect to the rest of the world and with Alaska occupying so important a place in that situation, it behooves the Congress not to weaken but to strengthen the hand of its chief administrative agency in Alaska.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, the West is steeped in the tradition of reclaiming arid lands and developing natural resources. It is a part of us. We have lived with it for years. We have worked, and worked hard, in a pattern of repayment to our Government for benefits received. We have seen dust changed to green pastures, and sagebrush to truck gardens and orchards through an enlightened self-interest program of irrigation and reclamation. In 1902 the Reclamation Act was passed. It was inaugurated, supported and put through by Theodore Roosevelt and the Republican Party. The program has been carried on by both parties ever since. It is a question of national policy and has been the policy for many years.

The wealth-building power of this program has been prodigious, both through the increase of production and the building of taxable wealth.

The most valuable commodity on the face of the earth is bringing water onto the rich volcanic soil of the West. The State of Washington feels and knows through direct experience the fact that we have the collateral and we pay back.

I will place the record of the reimbursable features of Government money spent in the Western States and the repayment of these moneys for water control and development against any section of our country. I can cite you one valley in the State of Washington that in 40 years of reclamation history is not delinquent one cent in its repayments to the Government and has produced in crops alone three times the value of the gold take of the Klondike.

I can cite you one town in the same State that has a drawing this week of 1,500 applicants for 28 homesteads on newly brought in irrigated land. All of these applicants are World War II veterans, and the drawing this week will award homesteads to 28 out of 1,500 applicants, who in turn were 1,500 out of 10,000 inquiries from every State in the Union.

Do you call it economy not to offer credit to develop this great collateral? Do you call it economy not to provide generators for dams already built and sitting there waiting to manufacture power to start repaying their cost? Is that a wise use of money?

Yes; some of you may think that the West is not carrying its share of the burden. For Government moneys invested in the Western States, 50 percent is reimbursable, while for the rest of the country it is one-sixth to one-seventh reimbursable.

Is it economy to start these projects, invest millions in them, develop them from their elementary stages on through to where they are just beginning to make money and then deprive them of their ability to pay back?

It would be similar to starting a business, getting it up to its producing stage and then deciding to quit.

We are not asking for promiscuous spending of money. We are asking for a capital investment. And we are not the least bit afraid of our ability to pay back the amount advanced. And, as a specific example, I offer you the record of irrigation in my State to prove our confidence.

On February 14, 1947, the last payment on the Tieton project was made to Secretary Krug. All costs of construction were paid off—lock, stock, and barrel—in 37 years, an area comprising 27,000 acres, whose average gross per-acre yield last year was around $840.

You cannot meet these arguments, Members of the House, the proof is in the pay-off. I should think it would stir the very cockles of your hearts to want to have a part in building these investments with the people of the West, where there is the climate, where there is the soil, where the program will bring the water, and where your own fellow countrymen are clamoring for a chance at the ratio of 1,500 to 28. I should think that you would want enthusiastically to build that wealth for the Nation.

All peoples benefit. Why, some of the projects were so important during the war that the War Production Board allowed strategic materials to go into their construction, and through their production of power and produce they made one of the most astounding records of any of the segments of our economic system. Look at aluminum and light metals and their alloys. Look at the production of foodstuffs. Look at them through the actual facts which I want to present further to prove my contentions.

During the life of the Tieton project referred to, between the years of 1910 and the present, the Northwest and Nation have been richer by $157,000,000 from crops produced on this project. This represents 45 times the cost of constructing it. This does not even include the amount of taxable wealth that has been built through the use of the original construction moneys.

The entire Yakima Federal reclamation project has repaid approximately one-half of its repayment contracts.

Since 1919 the Yakima project, embracing 350,000 acres of irrigated land, has produced $819,100,000 in crops, or more than 20 times the construction cost of the project. The 1946 return alone on this project was $76,056,000, or nearly twice the Federal expenditure.

The Sunnyside division of the Yakima project from 1907 to 1946 has produced $234,000,000 in crops, or 48 times the total construction cost, which is $4,885,-442. The average annual production for these years is 1.14 times the total cost of the irrigation works of this division.

The Roza division of this project, which is not yet all irrigated, from 1941 to 1946 grew crops valued at $15,366,000, or an amount approximately equivalent to the cost of the project—and let me add that this division of the project not yet fully constructed has already made its first payment back to the Federal Government.

The Columbia Basin lands are right next to them; the climate is the same, and the soil is the same quality, the potential possibilities are the same, and in order to guide your wisdom for future action, I present you the record of the past. We have the collateral. You have the power of extending the loan; we will pay for it, and promptly.

The budget request for this Columbia River Basin project was $27,500,000, cut by appropriations to not quite $9,500,000. We have in that area an investment of approximately $200,000,000 in the Grand Coulee Dam and subsidiary construction. With the appropriations granted us last year in the Seventy-ninth Congress through the wisdom of this body, we began the actual construction of canals and laterals to bring water from the great Columbia River onto arid soil. Some of these contracts are now under construction, and one of the main canals is in the process of being built. They cannot be neglected nor can they be abandoned without tremendous loss of moneys already spent.

To give you some idea of how important that is, when you are constructing a canal 30 or 40 feet wide at the base, 30 feet in depth, and approximately 100 feet wide at the top, you cannot start that construction with the heavy machinery necessary to be in there to do the job and stop it, neither can you stop lining the canal. For any stoppage or delay means a great loss in work already done and in money already spent. It is a matter of wisdom and common sense to see to it that these contracts are maintained and continued

The veteran has top priority upon this available land. The program is built and amortized upon the plan that will permit that settler to make his living, develop his land, and build revenue-earning wealth along with valuable crops. We feel that it is sound; we know what can be done; and we submit to you this record of proof as to what our State has done in the matter of its reclamation and irrigation projects. There is no doubt in my mind or in the minds of those acquainted with the whole picture, but that this is completely reimbursable. Again let me repeat, we have the land, we have the water, and we have the climate. I ask you to scrutinize the record for yourselves, with the welfare of the whole country in mind. Please judge it in relation to the creation of wealth not only through annual crops but through the creation of real property and taxable property. We are proud to stand on our record.

Certainly we believe in economy. Most certainly say, "Spend our money wisely and well." And most certainly we think such true capital investments are sound and safe. I am not afraid to spend a few dollars as an investment, repayable in American development. Are you? Suppose I were asking for the promiscuous use of money as a gift or a dole from which there were no monetary return. Yes; I could easily see disagreement. But I am not asking for any rat-hole appropriation. I am asking for an investment for the veteran, for the little man, the young fellow trying to get a start—for an investment which he will pay back.

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

Mr. HOLMES. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sorry the gentleman confines me to a question, for I wanted to compliment him on his statement. The gentleman speaks of money being repaid promptly, but do not your people also buy a great deal of merchandise east of the Mississippi River?

Mr. HOLMES. A tremendous amount.

Mr. MURDOCK. And do they not sell their specialized products to the eastern part, and, therefore, is there not a mutual exchange beneficial to the whole country?

Mr. HOLMES. There is complete mutual reciprocity in the interchange of trade between both the West and East.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has made a splendid statement, appropriate to his projects, but I fail to hear him say anything of the amount of income taxes which the people who have developed that project have paid during the years, as well as the amount of payments made in the form of reimbursement.

Mr. HOLMES. Naturally, they pay in a tremendous amount of money.

Economy is the wise use of money, not the absence of any use whatsoever. Economy is the wise use and not the abuse of money, and I strongly maintain that it is an abuse to withhold from a known good investment of national importance the proper funds. It is not economy. It is a lack of vision.

This is the last frontier of development, the only lands that are left in the United States, and water must be brought onto them to make them live.

The budget request for the Columbia River Basin project was $27,500,000. The amount granted by the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations was $9,435,000—a cut of better than 66 percent.

Have we so soon forgotten our promise to the returning veteran of World War II, our promise that life offers him an opportunity and not a dole? And that place of opportunity is in the West. Shall it be for only 28 out of 1,500 out of 10,000? No. You know in your hearts that the American concept of enterprise and opportunity should still prevail and that just as common man must have his day so the land of this last frontier must continue to be developed. The building of wealth in that area will diffuse its benefits to all parts of our country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill for the Interior Department for 1948, H. R. 3123, that has been brought to us is not a good bill. In the name of economy, it has reduced to crippling size the appropriation for many of the programs of primary interest to the West, such as irrigation and reclamation, ground-water studies, mineral and mining activities, and public-power expansion and operation.

Commenting specifically on one or two of these points, I would like to point out a little matter that has crept into this bill for the first time this year which is seemingly innocent but which will wreck the great reclamation engineering organization that has been built up through the years in my home city—Denver, Colo.

I refer to the proviso on page 33, beginning in line 17 and reading as follows:

Provided, That in addition to the foregoing amount there may be transferred to this appropriation from other appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation not to exceed $6,500,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects.

Heretofore there has been no limit except the limit of necessity itself on the amount used by the Bureau of Reclamation from project funds for work performed in the engineering office at Denver for the benefit of specific projects. This placing of an arbitrary limit of $6,500,000 in this bill is without regard to any information presented to the committee. It represents a cut of approximately 50 percent in the size of the operation and will force a reduction of something like 50 percent, or 1,300 men, mostly highly skilled engineers in the reclamation force at the Denver Federal Center where the great engineering office is rapidly being moved and reassembled from downtown Denver.

This reclamation engineering force is noted throughout the world. It developed and pioneered the great dams. Here Boulder Dam was designed; here Grand Coulee Dam was designed; here Shasta Dam was designed; here the highest dams in the world have been designed one after another for more than 30 years. This is the mecca for engineers from all over the world, and more than 50 nations have sent their experts as students to the Denver reclamation engineering office. There is no reason given anywhere in the 1552 pages of testimony taken by the Committee on Reclamation activities for such a reduction in the Denver reclamation engineering office. I am informed that the engineering design work and the engineering laboratory work that is conducted there must go forward unabated in the coming year if the construction program that this bill contemplates is to be carried out without disruption. I am informed that this limitation of $6,500,000, if it stands, will not save anything in the cost of design and engineering of reclamation construction but will force a dispersal of the design groups to far-flung projects and the rentention in Denver of only the top experts, consultants, and advisers. If this engineering group is broken up, technical men all over the world will mourn its loss.

This heedless action is, in my judgment, paralleled by nothing else in the bill, unless it may be the reckless reduction of general engineering and investigation funds for the Bureau of Reclamation which would force liquidation of the project planning staffs in the 17 Western States.

On page 34, line 11 of the bill, is an item of $125,000 for all the general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation. The budget estimate was $5,000,000, the amount appropriated for 1947 was $5,000,000. One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars will not pay the terminal leave of the staff so carefully built up that will have to be destroyed.

On page 40 of the bill, line 25, is an item of $9,611,600 for the Missouri Basin project. The report indicates that this sum contains only $50,000 for general planning in the entire Missouri River Basin, and that $50,000 is confined to the investigation of a single project in Wyoming—the Shoshone project extension in Oregon Basin. Here is $50,000 substituted for approximately $2,000,000 in the 1947 appropriation act.

On page 42 of the bill in line 17 is an item of $250,000 from the Colorado River development fund into which the power users at Boulder Dam pay $500,000 each year for this purpose for investigations in the Colorado River system in the four States of the upper division; namely, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico.

Add these sums all together and you find only $425,000 for general investigations in the entire West. That means no irrigation projects will be developed for consideration by the Eighty-second, Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth, and later Congresses. We are tying their hands. This bill would provide less for the entire 17 Western States, nearly half the country, than is deposited annually into a fund that can be used for no other purpose than for investigations in the four States of the upper division of the Colorado River Basin.

Irrigation is basic to the economy of the West. Its expansion through carefully planned projects will be the governor of the growth and development of the West. Should this bill not be revised, irrigation development in a few years will die on the vine because its investigation roots are herein cut.

Now to look at one of the construction items. On page 35 in line 14 is $4,815,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, a sum substituted for the budget estimate of $14,000,000. This will bring the great transmountain diversion project to a grinding discordant stop, with contracts half completed, facilities unusable, benefits postponed. There is no economy in the stop-go method of programing our construction work. It doubles the cost to liquidate, reinstitute, liquidate, and reinstitute the program as has been done and is herein proposed on the Colorado-Big Thompson project. I realize that almost the same situation would be created by this bill on the Central Valley project in California, the Columbia Basin project in Washington, and others.

Now for a quick glance at the power situation. This bill would negate the national power policy. It eliminated the Power Division of the Interior Department which coordinates activities of five Interior Department agencies in the power field and which is the only facility available to the Government to carry out the authorized task of the Secretary of the Interior to market the power from dams built in the East by the Corps of Army Engineers; it wrecks both the construction and operation programs of the Bonneville Power Administration in the Northwest, an activity essential to the economy and the growing industrial strength of that region; it eviscerates the Southwestern Power Administration; it does violence to the power programs of such great reclamation projects as the Central Valley in California and the Colorado-Big Thompson in my State of Colorado.

The carrying forward of the multiple-purpose projects of the Bureau of Reclamation is not a partisan matter in the

West. The Republican Governor of California made a special trip to Washington to support, indeed to ask the Congress to double, the President's estimate for irrigation and power facilities of the Central Valley project. He said:

I am appearing, however, to plead for the earliest possible completion of the several units of the project—

The Central Valley project—

because I believe that it is in the best interests of both the Nation and California.

The Governor said further after asking for transmission lines:

I believe the vast majority of the people of our State and particularly those who live within the boundaries of the San Joaquin and Sacramento River watersheds will agree with what I have said to you. Every administration of our State for 20 years and our State water authority since it was created in 1943 have consistently urged upon Congress every point that I make to you today.

The great power company—

And he was referring to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.—

which serves the people of Central Valley will, of course, not agree. It has always been opposed to the project not because it objects to the solution of our irrigation and domestic water problem, but because the project includes the incidental development and transmission of hydroelectric energy and the company desires to develop and distribute all the power in that great portion of our State.

The Governor was right. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in the person of Mr. James B. Black, president, would object, as he has consistently through the years, to the Central Valley project power features, especially the transmission lines. His was the only small voice raised against the transmission lines, and in favor of them were such great voices as that of the President, that of the Secretary of the Interior, that of all the witnesses of the Bureau of Reclamation, that of the Governor of the State of California, and many of the California delegation in the Congress. Except for a few niggardly exceptions, this bill as now written would give Mr. Black his way with the Central Valley project. The lines to take the power away from Keswick and Shasta Dams are not provided. The power will be bottled up and either lost or left like a ripe peach to fall into the lap of the P. G. & E. on its own terms.

On the Colorado-Big Thompson project both irrigation and power features would of necessity be disrupted. Their construction would be delayed, service to rural-electrification users would be postponed or made impossible, and the costs of the project, which already make it exceedingly difficult to get low-cost power, would be forced to take another loop on the upward spiral. The Nation cannot afford this kind of economy. The West will not soon forget, nor fail to hold accountable, that sterile leadership of the Republican Party, who lack the vision and the foresight to view the place of the West in our Nation's economy.

Let me quote to you from an editorial contained in the Denver Post. This was the paper which in 1946 urged upon the people of Denver that we send here a Republican Congress. That paper now says you are making a serious mistake. Let me read their own words:

The House Appropriations Committee of Congress may be able to delude itself with the thought that it is saving money by cutting $83,000,000 from the 1947-48 budget of the Bureau of Reclamation, but it will not fool the people of the West.

What the committee proposes to do to the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado is typical of its efforts on behalf of false economy. The Reclamation Bureau had budgeted more than $14,000,000 for the project during the coming year but the committee reduced the appropriation to $4,815,000.

Approximately $30,000,000 already has been spent on the Colorado-Big Thompson project and the total cost of the completed project now is estimated at $128,000,000.

By reducing next year's allotment for the project, the Appropriations Committee is merely delaying necessary work and postponing the time when full benefits of the project will be realized and full repayments from water and power users will begin coming in.

That is not economy—it is merely poor business.

This is the paper that stood by you in 1946, and I suggest to you that perhaps if you will not listen to a Member from the right side of the aisle, perhaps you may listen to a former friend who wants to give you fair advice.

I sincerely hope that overnight the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] may see fit to change the wording of this bill and reincorporate the basic law in the reclamation appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I will grant to no Member of this House a greater interest in economy in Government operation than that which I have myself. There is such a thing, however, as false economy. This Department of Interior Appropriation bill is filled with that false economy. I can understand how the zeal of some Members to reduce governmental expenditure will blind them to greater good by some expenditure, but this appropriation bill is fraught with danger to our peacetime economy and future national security.

As reported, this bill places in jeopardy the national reclamation program which was born under the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt and which has been developed through a generation of scientific investigation and study.

Reclamation is no longer limited to the simple reclaiming of land. Out of it has grown one of the most vital products necessary to our whole economy—the generation and transmission of hydroelectric power. One of the finest examples of this work is the great Central Valley project in California.

The Central Valley project was inaugurated in 1933 through a referendum election. The project was too large for the State of California to undertake at an estimated cost of some one-third of a billion dollars. I was one of a group of Representatives who took the matter up with President Roosevelt and he gave it his wholehearted support.

The Central Valley project embraces a vast empire equal to the combined area of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and one-half of New Jersey, as I have previously pointed out. It is traversed by two great navigable rivers flowing into the bay of San Francisco. One of the primary objects of the project has been to save over 1,000,000 acres of the most fertile land in the world from salt water filtration. Before the Federal Government undertook this project more than 50,000 acres of land had already been destroyed.

To carry out this project it was necessary to build two large dams—the Shasta Dam and the Keswick Dam—capable of developing 450,000 kilowatts of hydroelectricity. These dams with their power development are an integral part of the entire project designed as a soil conservation measure, but they are also of tremendous importance from a national defense standpoint.

Oil and electrical energy are two of the greatest assets in our national economy and national defense. Every barrel of oil we take from the ground and use is gone forever. Our national petroleum resources are irreplacable and when they are gone it will be too late to conserve them. Each and every year we diminish the petroleum resources of the United States by 20,000,000 barrels of oil used in the production of electrical energy. During the last year of World War II hydroelectric energy generated by the Bureau of Reclamation amounted to approximately 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. If that energy had been generated from fuel oil it would have required 36,000,000 barrels of oil.

Mr. Chairman, the American Petroleum Institute has estimated that the oil reserves from known petroleum deposits in the United States, at the end of 1946, amounted to slightly over 20,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil. Consumption is now at the rate of 1,750,000,000 barrels per year. This means our reserves will be exhausted in 12 years.

Hydroelectric power, on the other hand, is almost inexhaustible. Every reclamation project developing hydroelectric power conserves just that much of our oil reserves for future use and extends the life of those reserves.

Money appropriated for reclamation projects is not a Government subsidy. It is an investment in the future of America, every dollar of which must be repaid over a period of time.

Under the terms of this bill the appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the Central Valley project has been reduced some 65 percent by the Committee on Appropriations, while the proposed appropriation for general investigations into such projects has been curtailed 97.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, those Members of Congress who are advocating such false economy as this are taking a terrible responsibility upon their shoulders—one which this Congress should not assume. Instead of retarding the development of great hydroelectric projects we should be advancing their construction to further conserve the oil reserves of this Nation, so necessary for our national defense.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish at the outset to refer to recently published comments on the pending bill by two eminent authorities on the affairs of the Interior Department, the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. J. A. Krug, and the former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Harold L. Ickes.

In a press release dated April 21, 1947, Secretary Krug declared that the 47 percent reduction in the Interior Department budget requests which is recommended here by the majority members of the House Appropriations Committee "threatens to economize the Nation into a bankruptcy of the natural resources."

This is a very serious criticism, Mr. Chairman, but I know, from the anxious inquiries I have received from leading businessmen and financiers of the Pacific coast, that they do not regard it as exaggerated. They have a solemn conviction that the drastic cuts proposed in this measure for reclamation, irrigation, public power development and mining alone would break the economic back of the West in the postwar era ahead. These major slashes, and many others of lesser magnitude which are embodied in this bill, would destroy all hope in that vast section of our Nation for realization of the great program of postwar reconversion and progress which all of the Americans have so eagerly envisioned.

Secretary Krug expresses surprise that the committee should consider 1938 a sensible standard for present-day appropriations.

I quote from Mr. Krug's statement:

> The last decade has seen history's greatest war, with an enormous depletion of our mineral resources. A search for ore bodies and extraction methods at the leisurely rate of 1938 would invite disaster. In 1938 we had not made the present investment in large reclamation project expenditures, which must be continued at an economical rate, if hundreds of millions of dollars already spent are not to go to waste. In 1938, for example, the Department had not been instructed by Congress to market power from all Army dams, had not assumed responsibility for the fish and wildlife of the Nation, and had a much smaller park system.

Cutting the general investigation funds of the Reclamation Bureau from $5,000,000 to $125,000 would halt all of the vitally important river basin reports, according to Secretary Krug. He said that adoption of this provision would immediately stop all field work on several hundred projects in 17 States, and would cause the complete liquidation of the general engineering and planning organization of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Irrigation of vast areas of future farm lands for veteran settlement would be so seriously delayed, the Secretary declared, that most veterans of World War II would become too infirm to undertake irrigation farming before the projects could be completed.

The great Central Valley project of California has been described as the economic backbone of our State in the future. Recently our distinguished Republican Governor, Earl Warren, appeared before the subcommittee in charge of this bill and urged an appropriation of $40,000,000 for the expeditious completion of this great project, so that the people of California and the taxpayers of the entire Nation could begin to enjoy at an early date the rich economic and financial benefits which the project would provide.

At the conclusion of Governor Warren's testimony, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], made a lengthy reply in which he severely criticized the Governor's economic arguments, and now, instead of the $40,000,000 which Governor Warren requested, the committee has recommended $6,900,000 for construction purposes.

If this ridiculous pittance is all that is eventually allowed it might be an act of economic wisdom for the Federal Government to abandon the project entirely and charge off the $180,000,000 of Federal funds already invested in Central Valley to profit and loss, with all hope of profit eliminated.

Former Secretary of the Interior Ickes has made an interesting diagnosis of the political implications of the pending bill, so far as the Republican Party is concerned. He classifies our distinguished Speaker and the majority leader of the House, as well as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as supporters of Governor Dewey for the Republican Presidential nomination. The chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], is described as apparently an adherent of Senator TAFT, also of Ohio.

As a result of their sponsorship of this bill, which Mr. Ickes correctly assumes to have destroyed all hope of future political support in the great Western States for the present Republican leadership in Congress, the former Secretary asserts that these gentlemen are laboring, perhaps unconsciously, in the vineyard of Governor Warren. He points out that our California Governor has taken a forthright position on reclamation and cheap public power which, in the opinion of Mr. Ickes, may win for him in the Republican national convention next year important backing from every State west of the Missouri River.

"Governor Warren has annexed to himself an issue that will be very appealing in the West," says Mr. Ickes. This is undeniably true.

Unhappily for Governor Warren, however, he may be unable to reap the benefits of the unwitting aid which the proponents of this meat-ax legislation have given him. The Republican Party is not now and never will be the proper vehicle for such an issue. Its persistent hostility in Congress to the development of the West renders such a role impossible.

The Democratic Party, always the party of the people, is the traditional party of progress in reclamation and public-power development. So perhaps we of the present minority in Congress should extend our thanks to the leaders of the present majority for having created for us by the submission of this bill an issue which will restore us to leadership in the next national elections. At the same time we should perhaps voice our sympathies to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the very embarrassing political predicament, within their own party ranks, into which they have blundered.

The proper approach to reclamation appropriations is on the basis that these are Federal loans which will be repaid by western water and power users. Multiple-purpose projects, such as the Central Valley in my own State of California, are a good investment in American enterprise. Failure to advance the full amount of $20,000,000 for work on the Central Valley development will eventually put this project in the category of a white elephant.

Agriculture and industry alike are threatened by failure to appropriate enough money to permit completion of the Central Valley job in a reasonable time. Very soon urban and rural communities will be up against a blank economic wall without water and power which they have expected from this development. The Nation, as well as California, will feel the impact of failing farms and orchards, and cities darkened by power shortages.

Some of you have heard power companies do some tall talking about being able to take care of any power needs in the region. But I am wondering if you have examined the facts. As a former member of the California Railroad Commission, I know these facts.

The truth is that the California utilities have to keep every wheel turning in order to meet the present power load. They do not have surplus capacity sufficient to insure delivery of additional power loads. Here are the figures.

The estimated capability of power systems in northern California, including the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., is about 1,680,000 kilowatts. Predictions are that by August the Pacific Gas & Electric load may reach a peak of 1,870,000 to 1,890,000 kilowatts. To meet this peak, under the most favorable conditions, additional generating capacity of 75,000 kilowatts will be required.

Yet the appropriation cuts will not permit the construction of facilities to deliver this power. Power generated at Central Valley dams will be bottled up because there is no way to get the Shasta-Keswick kilowatts to the consumer.

If funds are allowed, two 230-kilovolt transmission lines from Shasta to Red Bluff can be built to deliver power from the Shasta plant to the Pacific Gas & Electric system at Red Bluff on a temporary basis. Later, this hydro system can be extended to pump irrigation water into the Delta area. A short tap line for the Keswick power plant to the existing Shasta-Oroville line is needed to provide the only outlet for power generated at Keswick Dam. Without these vital transmission lines, cities may be darkened, industries may slow down, workers may be laid off because there is not enough electricity to meet the needs of the region.

This is waste, my colleagues, waste of both material and human resources—waste of money invested in the project; waste of potential revenues. Each year that Central Valley power is not marketed the Government will lose about $2,000,000 in revenues which would help repay project construction costs.

I am asking you now to reconsider this appropriation cut and to restore the full amount of $20,000,000 for continued work on the Central Valley project, so that we can protect our investment in the project, the farmer's investment in his crops, and insure power delivery to keep the wheels of Pacific coast industry turning and employment at a steady level. I need not remind you that slowing down of the rate of construction, necessitated by limited appropriations, will increase the costs of building the whole development.

It has been rightly said that we are at the crossroads of western development. If we fail to advance sufficient appropriations for reclamation, irrigation, and multiple-purpose works, I believe we are starting down the road which leads away from the peaks of prosperity into the slough of false economy. Remember you are not asked to vote appropriations to subsidize any part of the West. You are advancing money which will be repaid to the Nation—in the form of water and power payments and taxes to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the action of the House Committee on Appropriations in reducing its appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service pertaining to services to the Nation's fishing industry amounting in some cases to nearly 80 percent, comes as a distinct shock to the fishing industry.

I am mindful of our party's pledge to reduce taxes. I appreciate that we must curtail in every direction possible. However, it would be extremely unwise and very false economy to reduce appropriations to any departments where it would be impossible to carry out absolutely essential services, some of which have been provided by the Government for several generations. The funds that will be available under this cut in this bill will provide services barely equivalent to those received 20 years ago.

Action of the House committee represents severe reduction of funds in activities provided for by laws of Congress after careful consideration by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and passage by both Houses of Congress through the normal procedure of legislation, all of this enacted previous to World War II. It is in effect a nullification of previous acts of Congress.

A decrease of these proportions set forth in the bill virtually eliminates the technological, statistical, and economics sections of the Division. It will permit only a skeleton staff, which will be unable to answer inquiries satisfactorily or to conduct even a minimum of surveys or research. Even if all activities are drastically curtailed as promptly as possible, the proposed appropriation would little more than pay for accrued annual leave of the Division's personnel on July 1. Thus payment for such leave, which is required by law, would largely wipe out the Federal fishery activities to which the industry has looked for guidance in solving its technical, statistical, and economic problems for more than 75 years.

The proposed cut, we are told, will terminate virtually all the statistical surveys, research, and services for the commercial fisheries. Thus, annual canvasses for securing statistics on catch, employment, operating units, and processed products could no longer be made. This will deprive industry of data essential to its operation; Government, of data necessary for planning; and conservation authorities, of data required for intelligent action to protect natural resources. Other statistical services which industry assumes will be available as a matter of course will be eliminated. Thus, collection and release of all the following data will cease: Freezings and cold storage holdings, landings at principal ports, canned and processed fish production, fish meal and fish oil manufactures, and vitamin A production and stocks.

Termination now destroys a continuity essential to industrial and onservation planning. Cooperative programs for the collection of fishery statistics are in effect between the Federal Government and many of the States. If funds are eliminated, the Federal Government cannot carry through its part of these programs so that statistical surveys of the States will also suffer.

The proposed cut would end virtually all economic research and services for the commercial fisheries. Thus, the studies of international fishery economics would cease, depriving the industry of data with which to combat the threat of competition from imported fish.

The proposed cut would end virtually all the technological research and services for the commercial fisheries. It would close all five technological laboratories of the Fish and Wildlife Service. They are located at Seattle, Wash.; College Park, Md.; Boston, Mass.; Ketchikan, Alaska; and Mayaguez, P. R.

All technological research and consultant services, we are told, will have to be terminated. It will end research in the Maine sardine industry, designed to improve its products and eliminate difficulties with the supply of fish.

It will end all shelifish pollution research designed to safeguard the quality of the products and to reopen closed areas and avoid the closure of open areas.

It will eliminate many other activities that we think are essential to the fishing industry.

It is suggested in the committee report that the fishing industries should pay for these services themselves. Such a suggestion would place an additional burden of expense on the fishing industry that it would be impossible for it to assume and at a time when, under reciprocal trade agreements, the domestic fishing industry is struggling to meet the competition of many foreign countries and which in most cases is subsidized by these foreign countries. While the Reciprocal Trade Conference is being conducted in Geneva, many foreign countries are pleading for the reduction of protective tariffs that already are so low that little or no protection is afforded the American fishing industry.

The commercial fisheries of this country is a very substantial industry. It provides direct employment to about a quarter of a million persons. Investments in vessels, shore plants, processing, freezing, and cold storage facilities total upwards to $600,000,000. This investment is the base of a capitalized business of over $4,500,000,000—and that does not take into account allied industries and industries that service the fishing industry.

I come from a section of the country where some of the largest of our commercial fisheries are located—New England. In the district I have the honor to serve is located the oldest, and in recent years, the largest fish-producing port in the country. I refer to Gloucester, Mass., a city of some 24,000, where upwards of two-thirds of its working population depend for their livelihood upon the fisheries or industries allied with it. Firms in the city last year handled and processed more than 218,000,000 pounds of fish.

The agency established by the Congress to assist, to promote, and to develop the commercial fisheries of the country and to give attention to its problems is Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

The two divisions within Fish and Wildlife Service most directly concerned with and of the utmost, vital importance to the fishing industry of the country are:

First. The Division of Commercial Fisheries.

Second. Fishery Market News Service.

The Division of Commercial Fisheries provides many essential services to the fishing industry that have been available and utilized by many Government agencies. Many of these services date back to 1880. This information is most essential to operations of the industry and provides a base for State and Federal conservation programs to protect our natural fishery resources.

The only source of data on daily prices, production, storage, and shipments would be closed, and the result would be chaos in the industry at a time when it needs every help this Government can possibly give.

As I have previously stated, I subscribe to our party's pledge to reduce taxes and to effect every economy possible. I wish to emphasize, however, the extreme importance of these two services to the fishing industry. It would be disastrous to the industry for this Government not to continue to provide them.

It is my most studied conviction that the cuts in the appropriation bill on these items in the Fish and Wildlife Service are altogether too severe and it may be well for us to consider the prewar 1942 budget as a base to determine what services should be retained rather than to wipe out these activities altogether as it is intended to do by these drastic reductions.

In respect to the Division of Commercial Fisheries:

The 1942 appropriation was $186,940; personnel, 60.

The 1947 appropriation was $400,000; personnel, 93.

This Division submitted a budget for the current year of $401,000. The subcommittee's recommendation reduces this amount for the current year to $75,000, a reduction of nearly 80 percent.

This proposed reduced appropriation would permit only a skeleton staff which could hardly answer inquiries satisfactorily, and would eliminate practically every service this Division now provides.

In respect to the Fishery Market News Service: The 1942 appropriation was $86,220; personnel, 25. The 1947 appropriation was $136,900; personnel, 66.

This Division submitted a budget for the current year of $141,600. The committee's recommendation reduces this amount for the current year to $75,000, a reduction of about 46 percent. This proposed reduced appropriation would eliminate at least five of the eight market news field offices. The fishing industry consists of so many small and widely scattered enterprises that it could not possibly in itself assemble complete and accurate market information.

For instance, in the frozen-fish industry, fish must be processed and held in storage for shipment to inland centers. It is imperative that processors know the amounts of fish of the various species in storage over the country, how the fish is moving, whether inventories are going up or down, what the price levels are over the country. If the processor does not have this data, he has no basis on which to determine the price he should, or the price he can afford to, pay for the fish to process. Any curtailment of this vital information would result in a chaotic condition throughout the entire industry.

These reductions in appropriations come at a time when the fishing industry itself is trying desperately to effect every possible improvement and economy through the formation of a national trade association designed to assist the Federal and State Governments in an orderly manner to build an industry that will provide more employment for our people, more animal protein food for our people and to provide the necessary meals and oils to aid the agricultural industry, to assist the poultry program and provide the life-giving vitamins and amino acids that medical science claims is available in a greater degree from marine resources than any other source.

These greatly reduced appropriations practically eliminate all hope for the American fishing industry to grow and develop and occupy its proper place among the natural resources of the Nation, and at a time when our foreign competitors are spending and girding to take their fair share of the products of the seas. It places a potent weapon in the hands of our competitors and takes away from American industry the sources of vital statistical and market news information that is provided agriculture and other American business.

It comes at a time when the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations is getting under way a uniform method of fishery statistics which is essential if the United States is to occupy its rightful position among the nations of the world in the development and utilization of the products of the sea.

The fishing industry does not seek aid and support of the Government. It historically has stood on its own feet; it has sought no subsidies, no crop insurance, no parity. It has sought none of the Government aids that have been extended to agriculture and to other industries. It has carried its own responsibilities and intends to continue to do so, but the fishing industry does expect the Federal Government to carry its own responsibilities. It has a right to expect proper and adequate Government services.

It seeks these services to be in a position to fairly compete with foreign nations, the majority of which are heavily subsidized by government aids of various kinds.

No complaints were registered by the fishing industry in World War I and World War II, when the armed services took over its ships and men to wage war. Throughout our history, the fishing industry has served as the first line of defense in every way. It was the fleet of the fishing industry that enabled us to build fortifications in the Aleutian Islands; it was the North Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf fishing fleets that supplied the vessels and men in a few hours' notice when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

Just at a time when the fishing industry is trying to organize for the difficult days to come, it finds appropriations for the one Federal agency that renders a service to the fishing industry, severely cut. If the House permits this action, the services and statistics that are hardly adequate at present to guide the industry will be pared to such a low point that what few are left will be almost worthless.

Facts have just been released to show that through lend-lease funds we have expended some $21,000,000 to equip Russia with a large, modernized fishing fleet, yet we are called upon to eliminate the few services available to the American fishing industry when they are struggling to keep abreast with foreign competition. Other nations are rebuilding their fishing fleets. Almost every country is enlarging its fishing fleet. We know the French Government is building a considerable fleet of fishing vessels at Bath, Maine; Great Britain has increased her fleet by 25 percent; Norway is enlarging her fleet; Iceland and Newfoundland are adding to and further modernizing their cold-storage facilities—yet we propose to abolish the information supplied by the Government as to cold-storage holdings, catch records, and so forth.

These inadequate appropriations will destroy the one source of information upon which fishery biologists must depend to check the trend of our fisheries. This is information used by the Government, not by the industry, insofar as the life histories of such valuable fish are concerned, such as salmon, halibut, mackerel, cod, haddock, shrimp, crabs, oysters, sea trout, herring, and a host of other food fishes that contribute so much to the American way of life. There is no other source of fishery statistics in the United States. Time and again the Budget Bureau, the Bureau of Statistics, and other impartial Government agencies have studied ways and means of providing this information through other Government sources. Without exception, these studies have all reached the same conclusion, that this information can be attained more efficiently and at less cost by the Commercial Fisheries Section of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Surely we do not have to turn back the wheels of progress to such an unwarranted extent.

There are many American communities whose sole means of livelihood depends upon the fisheries. Are these people to be denied the limited Federal services that have heretofore been provided? Is the fishing industry to receive no services for their share of tax dollars? Is the industry that throughout history furnished America its first line of defense in times of great emergencies to be thrust aside? If the few services now provided are to be dispensed with, then does it mean that the American farmers are to be treated in the same manner? Are we going to dispense with Agriculture Market News, with agricultural statistics, with crop forecasts? Are we to dispense with the vital statistics of the Bureau of Statistics, which surely must be used by our insurance agencies to arrive at just premiums on life insurance? If the United States Government plans to eliminate these services, then the fishing industry has no right to complain. But if these services are to be provided, then surely it is the duty of the Federal Government to maintain these varied essential services which Fish and Wildlife Service now provides.

Mr. Chairman, the following table shows the appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service, Commercial Fisheries Division, for various years from 1938 to 1948, including the amount recommended in the fiscal year 1948 appropriation bill:

Commercial fisheries and Fishery Market News Service

STATUS OF OPERATING FUNDS, VARIOUS YEARS 1938–48

Item	Commercial fisheries		Fishery Market News Service	
	Personnel	Amount	Personnel	Amount
1948 House bill	-------	$75,000	-------	$75,000
1947 appropriations	93	400,000	66	136,900
1942 appropriations	60	186,940	25	86,220
1941 appropriations	53	150,640	25	78,900
1940 available funds	46	133,669	25	86,378
1939 available funds [1]	42	140,000	30	70,000
1938 available funds [1]	40	123,000	29	75,000

[1] Estimated in part.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including page 1, line 6.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK,

having assumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEWIS L. LORWIN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it probably startled most of us to read in the papers of yesterday that Mr. Henry Wallace, former Secretary of Agriculture, former Vice President of the United States, former Secretary of Commerce, and more recently a private citizen and editor of the notoriously radical New Republic magazine, has declared that only a $15,000,000,000 loan to Soviet Russia will make possible some degree of peace in this currently troubled postwar world.

Mr. Wallace, during his entire political career, was consistently a friend of Russia. Since his return to civilian status, he has continued his exposition of pro-Russian political vaporing, even though that trend of thought placed him in sharp opposition to the political thinking of his party and the patriotic-thinking American people as a whole.

It may be said that Mr. Wallace, no longer an official of the American Government, has every right to speak freely in any political vein which may suit him. That, constitutionally, is his right. So, too, was it the right of Dr. Rex Tugwell, of Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, the late Sidney Hillman, and scores of others who passed through the spectrum of the public spotlight during the 14 years of New Dealism until the public revolt last November against that communistic school of thought.

But Dr. Tugwell, Dr. Lovett, and many of the other outstanding exponents of Marxian ideologies have passed from the public pay rolls into the comparative luxurity of private life. They no longer can command free radio time, free publicity services through Government agencies, and the listening audience that may always be assembled when an important Government official is prepared to pour forth his words of wisdom.

Transition of these verbal generals of the Marxian army through positions of power in Government saw many of their colonels and captains and lowly privates placed in positions of Government subordinate to them while they were in power.

Many of these satellites of original New Deal generals are still in Government, still on Federal payrolls, still feeding from the public trough.

Recently the President of the United States, for motives known only to himself but possibly in response to the political necessity of meeting public demand for purging from the American Government all employees of doubtful loyalty, issued an Executive order calling for such action. He indicated that it would cost many millions of dollars to adequately screen those employees in Government and to fully investigate those whose loyalty was found by such screening to be of doubtful quality.

The President's Executive order, however, left final decision as to the removal or retention of employees in the agencies and departments of the executive branch subject to the discretion of the heads of those agencies and departments, all of whom are appointed by the President himself. In other words, the question of purging disloyal employees from the Government continued to rest under the President's Executive order with those appointees of his upon whom dependence for Democratic successes in 1948 must largely repose.

Seldom does a day pass on the floor of this House when some Member of Congress does not present documented indications at least of doubtful loyalty to the United States on the part of some employee of the Government. If the President of the United States is sincere in his demands that communism and other ideologies contrary to the American constitutional form of government be removed, a simple order on his part would go far to prove that sincerity.

The President of the United States needs only to direct the Attorney General of the United States to order the Federal Bureau of Investigation to prepare lists from existing records of all individuals now on the Federal pay roll whose documented records in the files of that agency show membership in, sympathy with, or participation in the activities of groups, organizations, associations, or other units of men and means whose motivation is in consonance with legislation, activity, or other support of movements directed at change of our American form of government by other than constitutional means.

It is a known fact that as far back as 1920, more than a quarter of a century ago, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been cognizant of and has kept documented records of the persistent and continuing efforts of international communism to overthrow the Government of the United States. Records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation prove conclusively that American Communists are merely a section of the Third International and prove that the Third International is pledged to overthrow by violence if necessary of the American system of free enterprise and its replacement by a Soviet form of government. Records of the FBI will prove that for more than a quarter of a century the Communist International has provided funds to finance this termite activity on the part of American Communists to disintegrate loyalty in the American armed forces and to inculcate disloyalty in the thinking processes of an entire generation of young Americans.

It may be that additional legislation may be required to preserve our internal security against this Russian-directed effort to destroy this Nation. The President of the United States if he is sincere in his determination to eradicate communism in the United States might call upon the Attorney General of the United States to examine all existing statutes, particularly those dealing with treason and sedition, and for the preparation of a formal opinion as to whether or not additional laws are necessary, or if a mere enforcing of the existing statutes is sufficient.

If additional legislation is needed to protect the American form of government, the President might call upon the Attorney General of the United States to draft a statute to be submitted to the current Congress to give the United States of America its Constitution and its flag the degree of legal protection demanded by the people of the United States in the elections of last November.

Only yesterday on the floor of this House, my colleague from Wisconsin mentioned a specific instance which he believed merited investigation, the case of Lewis L. Lorwin, economic adviser of the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce. Mr. O'KONSKI pointed out an apparent dual nomenclature used by Dr. Lorwin in his writing of books, pamphlets and lectures. The Russian-born Dr. Lorwin aparently used the names Lewis L. Lorwin, Lewis Levitzky Lorwin and Louis Levine interchangeably.

Representative O'KONSKI indicated at least a suspicion that Dr. Lorwin, or Levine, had at one time been closely associated with Leon Trotsky and the late Sidney Hillman at that period of the Russian revolutionary era when there was no disagreement between any of the factions of bolshevism.

If investigation should prove this to be true, Dr. Lorwin, or Levine, might well be a far more important figure in the chain of command between international communism and the sections of the Third International, which are the Communist Parties in nations throughout the world, than Gerhard Eisler, Leon Josephson, or even William Z. Foster, who is currently the titular head of the Communist Party of America.

As long as such a suspicion exists, Mr. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Chief of the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce, should not be permitted to send Dr. Lorwin to London in a highly paid position as an economic representative of the United States, as is currently believed to be the plan. I may add that Dr. Lorwin has reportedly told associates that he plans to rent his Washington apartment and sail on the Queen Elizabeth on June 29 of this year for his new assignment.

I believe that cases such as that of Dr. Lorwin, or Levine, and the many others that have been named on the floor of this House in the present session of Congress bring up a far more important question than the mere ideology of the individual involved. I believe that it is vital to American security to know these things:

First. Who puts these people in Government positions in the first place?

Second. Who keeps them there?

Third. Who is responsible for failure of any movement to eliminate them?

Does the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States or the Director of the FBI underwrite the loyalty of an individual who would personally write:

A violent revolution is necessary to seize the powers of Government. Violent methods must be used afterwards to eliminate the capitalists and the large landholders who are hostile to the Socialist idea. * * * The

violence involved * * * can diminish in severity only as the workers succeed in establishing their power and in destroying resistence to the construction of socialism.

Yet Dr. Lewis L. Lorwin, economic adviser in the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce of the United States; the economist supposedly named by Thomas C. Blaisdell for an important assignment representing the United States abroad; the Dr. Lorwin who has been on Government pay rolls for 14 years, serving part of the time at least under Henry Agard Wallace, wrote those quoted words.

They will be found on pages 506–507 in his comments on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in his book, Labor and Internationalism, written in 1929 while Dr. Lorwin was on the advisory council of the Brookings Institution.

If President Truman, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Director of the FBI underwrite those words, I have nothing further to say.

If they do not underwrite those words, I have one question to ask. It is: "Why not get rid of him and all others like him?"

LIGHT UP EVERY FARM IN ALABAMA—$13,500,000 AVAILABLE—BUILD MORE REA CO-OP POLE LINES, STRING MORE WIRES THROUGH OUR COUNTIES, INSTALL MORE SWITCHES, MORE TRANSFORMERS, AND DISTRIBUTE THE AMAZING QUANTITIES OF CHEAP ALABAMA POWER NOW AVAILABLE TO EVERY RURAL TOWN, FACTORY, AND FARM IN OUR STATE

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to extend my remarks and include therein some several letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, spring has again come to our great South. For some years past and with its coming there arrives a deluge of letters from my constituents. They come by the dozens, telling me of their bitter disappointments at not receiving the benefits of the Rural Electrification Act, passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, and approved by President Roosevelt, April 8, 1935.

Mr. Speaker, even in those days there was little or no party opposition to a bill sponsored by the President, providing that the Federal Government finance the construction and erection of rural electrification distribution lines for the benefit of our American farmers.

Extensive committee hearings were held—and a bill was reported from out of the committee to the floor. Long, constructive arguments and debates were had in both Houses. All defects present in the committee bill were cured by deliberate, well-thought-out and constructed amendments in order to perfect the original bill.

Limitations with respect to the building of generating plants with the money to be provided were written into the law, inasmuch as it was the declared purpose of Congress in passing the bill that in no measure whatever was it their purpose to invade the field of private industry or to set anything up in direct competition with existing public utilities—except in such areas where electric power in sufficient quantities and at reasonable rates was not otherwise available to our farmers.

Merit and efficiency were made the sole bases for the appointment of all officials. The President himself was charged with the selection of the Administrator. Political tests and party qualifications were forbidden by the law, which spelled out—black on white—a stringent penalty for the violation of this provision.

With an original appropriation of $40,000,000 for each of eight succeeding years, the Rural Electrification Act passed both the House and the Senate through acclamation by a voice vote. There was no recorded opposition.

It was a day of rejoicing on both sides of the aisle. The magic of electric power to light the rural homes of America—to remove much drudgery from our good farm women—at last was made available to our rural villages, factories, and farms.

Mr. Speaker, what a reflection it is upon the administration of the Rural Electrification Act that, in spite of all the labor and the toil that this Congress put into the formulation of REA, the year 1947 finds my State of Alabama practically at the bottom of the roll of States in extending the provisions of rural electrification to the Alabama farmers.

Table 6 taken from the annual report of the Rural Electrification Administrator, Mr. Claude R. Wickard, to the Congress for this year, discloses that only 34.1 percent of Alabama farms today are electrified. Compare that 34.1 percent in Alabama with the national average of 52 percent for all States and note in the following table taken from the Administrator's report that many of the other States have averages of from 75 to as much as 96.2 percent.

TABLE 6.—*REA loans and results accomplished by their expenditure, by States, June 30, 1946*

States	Borrowers		Total allocations [2]	Funds advanced [3]	Miles energized	Consumers connected	Percentage total farms electrified June 30, 1946
	Energized	Not in operation [1]					
Alabama	23	3	$25,159,649	$11,570,294	11,473	48,855	34.1
Arizona	3	4	1,984,000	1,268,020	640	2,439	71.5
Arkansas	18	2	21,421,000	12,906,069	11,574	40,659	30.8
California	4	2	2,414,500	1,995,103	1,607	4,697	96.2
Colorado	19	2	16,044,551	10,114,419	7,941	24,210	62.4
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	89.9
Delaware	1	0	1,376,000	1,102,310	1,047	3,468	72.1
Florida	15	2	11,359,000	5,693,698	4,662	16,837	47.3
Georgia	42	4	36,975,402	19,032,319	22,632	89,015	41.7
Idaho	9	0	5,995,750	3,817,405	3,243	7,880	88.4
Illinois	28	0	32,792,803	23,980,420	22,401	66,379	64.5
Indiana	44	3	30,230,564	22,336,160	23,500	85,025	83.9
Iowa	53	2	44,647,698	33,022,212	32,557	79,693	74.2
Kansas	23	10	23,663,851	11,074,012	10,527	22,366	36.1
Kentucky	25	1	26,618,855	14,268,254	14,828	61,400	32.1
Louisiana	15	2	17,270,600	12,742,757	8,677	30,740	36.8
Maine	4	0	1,012,500	672,132	477	1,905	56.9
Maryland	2	0	5,018,500	2,926,662	2,079	9,101	71.4
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	90.0
Michigan	13	0	17,514,500	14,136,518	10,082	37,726	94.3
Minnesota	50	1	48,525,301	32,291,605	34,741	80,998	55.7
Mississippi	23	1	26,622,953	14,724,220	16,491	65,668	24.8
Missouri	39	5	44,233,325	30,379,178	24,951	85,821	38.5
Montana	16	5	11,984,598	5,070,866	3,795	11,803	37.6
Nebraska	23	9	24,522,663	14,440,106	13,331	28,961	37.[illegible]
Nevada	1	1	296,000	240,383	121	518	57.6
New Hampshire	1	0	1,794,000	1,580,903	1,427	3,304	83.8
New Jersey	2	0	668,500	559,062	437	1,780	98.5
New Mexico	8	2	4,781,500	2,846,229	1,641	6,011	34.6
New York	6	1	4,548,618	3,737,029	2,773	9,540	84.2
North Carolina	33	6	32,000,352	18,875,713	13,605	54,910	43.8
North Dakota	8	15	17,054,972	5,924,777	3,673	7,570	10.4
Ohio	28	0	28,663,301	22,542,635	20,265	72,728	90.3
Oklahoma	23	4	24,581,506	16,686,206	17,277	42,191	29.0
Oregon	12	3	8,539,584	5,411,407	3,281	11,461	88.9
Pennsylvania	13	0	14,817,200	12,064,572	10,593	38,015	74.8
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	87.4
South Carolina	23	5	16,539,269	10,309,268	11,690	41,622	44.7
South Dakota	7	14	10,930,154	3,253,034	2,556	5,355	13.5
Tennessee	30	0	25,686,608	16,046,238	14,162	104,633	30.3
Texas	74	23	67,319,074	44,486,111	48,479	128,505	43.1
Utah	5	1	1,702,000	1,323,407	879	2,896	81.9
Vermont	3	0	1,905,000	1,619,724	1,210	3,262	75.1
Virginia	16	4	18,123,356	12,944,966	10,302	34,126	41.9
Washington	21	0	11,996,611	7,395,216	6,471	15,819	87.0
West Virginia	2	0	802,000	736,241	560	1,976	37.1
Wisconsin	32	1	40,462,822	22,650,018	17,465	49,371	76.7
Wyoming	13	2	5,723,000	3,119,070	2,546	6,446	52.1
Alaska	2	0	488,000	429,324	116	879	----------
Virgin Islands	1	0	275,000	273,572	52	493	----------
Total, United States	856	140	817,086,990	514,819,844	474,837	1,549,057	52.9

[1] Includes 36 borrowers with refrigeration loans only.
[2] Includes allocation from 1947 appropriation.
[3] Includes $200,000 repayments to RFC as adjustment on 1942 note.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that such a palpably low percentage of Alabama farmers are today receiving the benefits of rural electrification certainly is not due to the lack of funds made available to the State of Alabama for fulfillment of that

act. The money for electrifying more farm homes in my State has long been available.

Equally certain is the fact that the low percentage of our farm homes now electrified is not now due to a lack of available power—inasmuch as there are but two States in this whole Union of States having such a superabundance of electrical energy as is available—readied on the bus bars on the switchboards of our existing generating plants and facilities for lighting up the farms of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, the honored, the beloved, the revered, and the respected Speaker Will Bankhead, of Alabama, led the fight when this bill was up in the House. God bless and prosper his soul. His spirit hovers in these halls even to this day. The memory of the good things he did will always live in the hearts of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in the cities and on the farms of his native Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, you, then the minority leader, will well recall my wholehearted cooperation with Will Bankhead in the work that was done in fostering and furthering that bill, S. 3483, and you well remember, the acclaim with which its adoption was met.

I have given wholehearted support not alone to every rural electrification measure that has ever come before this Congress in the long years of my service in this body—but I have given equally wholehearted labor and support—as the record will disclose—to every other bill, farm and nonfarm, presented that was calculated to give special benefits to the farmers in Alabama, as well as to all farmers throughout this great country.

To date the astronomical sum of $817,086,990 has been allocated to the Rural Electrification Administrator, as disclosed in his annual report of 1946 to this Congress.

Out of that total of more than $817,000,000, the sum of $25,159,649 has been allocated to my State of Alabama.

Of this huge sum, only $11,570,294 has to date been advanced, and the vast remainder of $13,589,355 is as yet, and of this moment, unexpended.

Mr. Wickard's report shows that only 48,555 Alabama farms have so far been electrified. This could have easily been made twice that number in the years that have passed. We ought to double that number this year.

That electric power is available to the REA Administrator and at very low rates to all existent and prospective rural electrification co-ops is revealed by figures furnished by the office of the REA here in Washington and by the Administrator's report to this Congress.

Inasmuch as that table in the report did not include the rates charged by the Alabama Power Co. to the REA co-op borrowers, I contacted Mr. W. W. Arnett in the Administrator's office in order that I might learn at first hand what the local public utility was charging the good farmers of Alabama and their farm cooperatives for the power furnished them.

What follows is table 5 abstracted from the report to Congress of Mr. Wickard, the Administrator, with the Alabama Power Co. rates inserted therein:

TABLE 5.—*Rates per kilowatt-hour offered by principal power suppliers contacted by REA*

Supplier	Old average rate per kilowatt-hour (cents)	New average rate per kilowatt-hour (cents)	Number of borrower co-ops served
Empire District Electric Co.	0.95	0.77	1
Kansas Gas & Electric Co.	1.14	.85	6
Mississippi Power Co.	.95	.80	5
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	.85	.68	6
Southwestern Public Service Co.	.82	.72	10
West Texas Utilities Co.	1.05	.80	11
Alabama Power Co.	.80	.70	11

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, hear me well on this point:

I want you to know that the rate for electric power per kilowatt-hour of 7 mills—0.7 cent—given by the Alabama Power Co. to the Alabama electric co-ops is even lower than the rate of 7.5 mills, or 0.75 cent per kilowatt which the TVA charges the Rural Electrification co-ops in southern Virginia, as is disclosed in the Administrator's report to this Congress.

Why, then, the deplorable condition that exists with respect to the denial of electric power to the farmers of the State of Alabama?

That deplorable conditions do exist, and have long existed, is due primarily to the fact that REA Administrator Wickard, even when as Secretary of Agriculture he was administering that act, for some reason, determined he was going to build a power plant in southern Alabama—at an ultimate cost of $12,000,000—"come hell or high water."

He is determined to spend that money, despite the fact that the Alabama Power Co., without home markets for all of its available surplus power, is now exporting outside of the State of Alabama more than 13 times as much power as would be required to service all of the Alabama electric co-ops' customers and consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I charge that the building of rural lines throughout Alabama has been sacrificed and the funds permitted to accumulate in ever-increasing amounts to build a power plant in order to rejuvenate the old, obsolete, dilapidated physical properties acquired from the Alabama Water Service Co., and which it has been alleged should never have been acquired.

These properties had for years been notorious for their poor service—power failures—and for their frequent and long continued "outages." They are today failing the good people in my district in greater wise than ever before in the long history of their past.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago I received word of a telegram from the manager of two large cotton mills at Opp, Ala., which he had sent several days previously thereto to Mr. Claude R. Wickard.

This telegram made urgent request upon Mr. Wickard that he do something about the situation. It recited the fact that at that very time both of the cotton mills at Opp were shut down, that 1,500 employees were standing idle, and that the manager of those mills informed Mr. Wickard that they were unable to tell their people when they could resume full operations. All of this for lack of power from one of his REA co-ops in Alabama. More the worse, nothing has been done about it.

These are atrocious conditions and burdens to impose upon the good people of my State—whether they stand behind the spindle or the looms in one of our cotton factories, operate our hatcheries, our creameries, or are farmers deprived of the use of electric power in their incubators, their refrigerators, their water pumps, their milking machines, or in lighting up their homes.

Information now at hand supports the fact that, in addition to the immediate and unnecessary and wasteful planned expenditure of upwards of $6,000,000 of Federal funds, it will take from 3 to 5 years to remedy the existent hardships imposed upon the customers and consumers of the present operations.

It further means that there will be $6,000,000 less of REA funds available to put up more rural-electrification distribution lines for farmers elsewhere in the State of Alabama.

In this, a year when President Harry Truman himself has cut the Federal budget to the bone, and wants to reduce the national debt, in a year when your party, Mr. Speaker, has further trimmed the budget of our President, does it not appear wasteful and extravagant for the REA Administrator not to make use of the cheap power already available and use that money to bring electric power to twenty-five or thirty thousand more farmers in Alabama so that they, too, may "light up their homes"?

What follows are but a representative few of the many complaints with respect to REA which I have received this spring. I am not going to burden this House or the record of our proceedings by publishing all. I am, however, going to submit a few in order to bring to the attention of my colleagues the deplorable conditions now existing in my State for want of rural power.

This annual crop of letters always arrives in our "springtime in Alabama," when our good citizens see the Alabama public utilities—power, telephone, telegraph—extending their lines throughout the State and no work being done by the REA.

Mr. Speaker, let me but read one or two of these letters and then insert into the RECORD a few more in order that my colleagues may study the same. In doing so, let me say that you are going to hear still further from me about this matter until it is corrected—once and for all.

NEW YORK FIRE INSURANCE CO.,
MARTIN REALTY & INS. CO., AGENTS,
Mobile, Ala., April 21, 1947.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I understand that many of the Representatives in Washington are enjoying the telephone strike because their constituents cannot call them up to worry

them with things they don't like. Maybe some of you are wishing that the air-mail or railway mail employees would also go on strike.

About 2 years ago, I wrote to you to complain about the atrocious service we in south Baldwin County were getting from the REA, which is known as the Baldwin County Electric Membership Corp. You referred my letter to the chief of the REA, who in turn sent it over to the St. Louis division (if I am not mistaken), and it finally got some very satisfactory action. They sent a number of inspectors down to Baldwin and they fired the local manager and made a number of corrections. The service was immediately improved and all last summer the electric service was reasonably dependable.

Now it has dropped back to a deplorable state. To give you an example, during the past week end the current went out Friday evening about 7 o'clock and did not come back for about an hour and a half. The same thing and about the same length of time was repeated on Saturday night. On neither of these nights was there any electrical disturbance nor strong wind. Again on Sunday morning about 11 o'clock, coincident with a thunderstorm, the current went off again. This failure of the electric current has now taken on a more pernicious form. Instead of cutting off entirely, the lights become very dim. There is not enough current to turn over the motors in electrical refrigerators and electric pumps, and consequently these heat up and burn out. This sort of brown-out failure is much worse than if the lights went out entirely, and it will cause thousands of dollars in damage to electric pumps and refrigerators.

In addition to giving the worst sort of service we have ever had, the management state that they will not be able to supply current to any new cottages that are being built this entire summer. It seems that they don't have enough material or substations or whatever else is necessary. Why is it that a Government-operated system doesn't have the necessary materials to supply its customers when the Alabama Power Co. seems to have unlimited supply and the Riveria Utility Co., of Foley, seems to have unlimited facilities for supplying its customers.

I think this REA should sell out to a private corporation which could give satisfactory 24-hour service, make repairs in 30 minutes instead of hours, and charge the same rates as charged by the Alabama Power Co., instead of double those rates which we are now paying.

I sincerely hope that you can get something done about this situation, which seems to be getting worse instead of better all the time.

With kind regards and best wishes, I remain,

Yours very truly,

CARL T. MARTIN.

W. W. THOMPSON DRY GOODS,
CLOTHING, HATS, SHOES,
Fountain, Ala., April 15, 1947.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: About 7½ years ago, we the citizens of the community of Fountain, Ala., signed and paid the Clarke Washington Electric Corp., of Jackson, Ala., $7.50 each.

We are in receipt of information that this corporation will have to build a new line or a new power plant before they will have power enough to furnish us with electricity. The line they now have which comes as near us as Franklin, Ala., is already so much overloaded it does not give satisfaction. We are also informed that it will take them from two to five years to get a loan from the Government and build this new line. We have waited over 7 years on them, and it seems as far off as ever. In fact this is the third time we have taken up this matter with you, each time they have promised you they would build this line in a few months.

We are asking you to use your influence to get this corporation to release us and let the Alabama Power Co. furnish us with electricity. When the Alabama Power Co. finishes their line they are working on now they will only be be about two and one half miles away, and they cannot bring it to us unless the Jackson corporation will give up their franchise.

We will appreciate it very much if you will do something to help us get rid of these 7½-year promises.

Thanking you.

Yours very truly,

W. W. THOMPSON.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: I would appreciate it very much if you would let one of your admirers of long standing ask you for a little help.

I live in the small town of Fountain, Ala., which lies 7 miles north of Monroeville, in Monroe County. For several years now we have been doing everything in our power to obtain electric lights in that section.

Several years ago the REA came in and we put up deposits to obtain lights. Then the war hit us, and materials became short. After the war, we contacted them and they informed us that materials were still short.

A few weeks ago a party of us went over to Jackson and contacted the manager of this district, and he could give us no encouragement whatsoever. It seems that they need extra power plants before they can do anything, which means about 4 or 5 years.

Now the Alabama Power Co. has assured us that if the REA will give up the franchise, that they will come in and give us lights. But the catch is getting the REA to give up the franchise

My mother and I are in the poultry business. At the present time we have 500 laying hens. We wish to expand but without electric facilities we just can't do it.

I would appreciate it very much if you could find time to see just what you can do to help us in obtaining a release from the REA, or in getting them to come on in and give us lights as they are only 6 miles from us now.

I am looking forward to catching some of those big crappies out of Three Rivers Lake again this year.

Hoping you can do something for us in the near future.

Yours very truly,

(Miss) LOKEY DAUGHDRILL.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are very badly in need of electric current in Fountain, and so far we have been unable to get it. The people of Fountain have contract with Clark Washington Corp., of Jackson, Ala., but this contract has been signed for more than 7 years and they advise us it will be around 5 years yet before they can put in the line.

We would like to get this contract canceled, if possible, as the Alabama Power has already got a line within 2 miles of Fountain and cannot come into Fountain account this contract.

Anything you can do to help us will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

ORMOND DUNKIN.

DEER PARK, ALA., *April 10, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Congressman of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: The enclosed petition is our latest move toward electric service in this area. We learned that the Mississippi Utility Co., now furnishing power to Chatom, would like to sell their lines, and wanted REA to take them over. Chatom, however, knowing how consistently bad the service from REA in this area is had petitioned the public service commission to allow Alabama Power Co. to take over these lines. It looked like an opportunity for us as the high lines would likely come up No. 45 and right through Deer Park.

We have sent the original petitions to the Alabama Public Service Commission, and this copy to you is to let you know how in earnest we are about this service and in what numbers. We feel that you will "go to bat" for us with the commission, and that is just exactly what we are asking you to do.

Your old friend and supporter.

V. T. DEES.

MARCH 10, 1947.

To the Public Service Commission, Montgomery, Ala.:

We, the undersigned citizens and taxpayers of Washington County, Ala., hereby petition your commission for immediate redress from both total lack of electric service for some and the irritating inadequate service for others now being served by the REA and the Mississippi Utility Co.

Those undersigned now receiving service are unable to cook their meals at the proper time because of insufficient current, and those not receiving current have been waiting for years for promised service. Some even have built and wired homes on the strength of these promises.

We believe the Alabama Power Co. is able and willing to relieve the above distress. We have been so advised. We hereby petition you to permit the Alabama Power Co. to take over existing lines, and build additional lines to service this area

Arnett W Richardson, Henry O. Richardson, Blake B. Richardson, Leroy A. Richardson, Mrs. Jacobena Richardson, Beatrice Graybill, Walter F. Dees, V. T. Dees, Mary L. Dees, H. T. Baxter, Mrs. H. T. Cooley, Winfred Dees, Marion Dees, Irene K. Ritchie, J. C. Ritchie, Dovie Odom, Aron Odom, Joseph W. Odom, H. T. Cooley, George D. Landrum, Carrie B. Landrum, Ruben L. Cooley, Norell M. Cooley, Frank Dees, W. A. Culpepper, J. R. Culpepper, James P. Stringer, J. L. Gardener, C. J. Davidson, T. J. Dees, John T. Davidson, A. C. Brown, Ellis Brewer, C. A. Ard, Roy Patrick, Lee Baxter, Clifford Dees, Wes Weaver, J. L. Lewis, O. P. Lewis, C. R. Brewer, W. E. Mott, B. D. Baxter, R. A. Hennis, Dan Williams Jr., Leroy Brown, Mrs. J. B. Stringer, Jim Stringer, Mat Copeland, M. D. McFarland, W. C. Scarbraug, C. W. Wood, Mannal Nickles, Bias Lane, James Woods, Elvara Smith, Mattie McKeller, George McDonald, Daniel V. Turner, Ulesee Arso, Octavia Carter, Mary Francis Carter, Albert Turner, Clem Carter, Ike Turner, J. R. Woods, Mrs. Ernest Merritt, W. M. Williams, Peter Smallwood, Tom Mizel, G. C. Prine, Clinton Prine, Ernest E. Prine, Irvin Turner, Mrs. J. P. Turner, Mrs. H. A. Baxter, B. U. Turner, P. L. Tedder, Woodrow Mizell, Troy Turner, Woodrow Turner, G. H. Dees, Mrs. Ethel Dees, H. G.

Miller, C. B. Turner, Earl Woods, James Woods, Willie Hayes, Merrill Milton, Troy Milton, J. A. Turner, Otto Batcher, Leo Lewis, Marion Simmons.

MOBILE, ALA., *April 12, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: I have resided in Mobile all of my life with the exception of the last 5 years which I served in the United States Marine Corps as an officer.

Since my separation from the service I have started the development of a nursery and tung orchard near Silverhill, Ala. I intend, in the near future, to make my home in Baldwin County.

I have located my business in a fine community of people and have made friends with them all. In my conversations with them they have expressed their desire to have electrical power in their homes and have asked me to be their spokesman. I, too, am very interested in electrical power for my home and I urgently need it for the development of my nursery.

This is why I am writing this letter, to solicit your help. I am sure that if there is anything you can possibly do for us you will not hesitate to do it. We all know that our community is not within your congressional district, but we also know that you have a deep interest in your heart for the welfare of Baldwin County and its development.

I have enclosed a copy of the petition which we sent to the Baldwin County Electric Membership Corp. and also a copy of the letter we have written to your worthy colleague, the Honorable George Grant.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. CALLOWAY, Jr.

DAPHNE, ALA., *April 8, 1947.*

Hon. GEORGE GRANT,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRANT: The members of our community have petitioned the Baldwin County Electric Membership Corp., Robertsdale, Ala., to extend their rural electrification lines and services to our homes. This is the third time such a petition has been presented to the corporation. The first petition was made in 1938, the second shortly after the war was over, and a copy of the third is enclosed with this letter.

We have consulted Mr. Frank Schlichting, manager of the Baldwin County REA cooperative at Robertsdale, Ala., recently. We presented our problem to Mr. Schlichting and he explained to us that the cooperative has on hand the necessary wire, poles, and meters to extend the lines to our homes. However, he further explained that it will be impossible to extend the services because of the acute shortage of high-capacity transformers. We understand that the substation at Silverhill, Ala., is overloaded to the point of danger, and that it will be some time in the summer of 1948 before the cooperative expects delivery of the higher capacity transformers which would have the capacity to carry electrical services to our homes.

Mr. GRANT, we are tolerant people, and we have waited patiently since 1938 and throughout the war for electrical power. We are within three-quarters of a mile from two different power lines, and we feel that our community, with seven families and representing some 35 people, merits the extension of the electrical power lines.

We know that you are a very busy man, but we feel sure that you will be able to help us with this problem and we will be greatly indebted to you for your kind attention to this which concerns our community deeply.

E. R. CALLAWAY, Jr.,
Spokesman for Group,
Route 1, Daphne, Ala.

[Enclosure: Copy of petition.]

MARCH 25, 1947.

Mr. FRANK SCHLICHTING,
Baldwin County Electric Membership Cooperative, Robertsdale, Ala.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Baldwin County Electric Membership Cooperative to extend their rural electrification lines to our homes.

J. C. HILL,
C. C. HILL,
C. L. CREAMER,
LYDIA CREAMER,
W. E. NEWPORT,
W. E. PERRY,
E. R. CALLAWAY, Jr.,
Daphne, Ala.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: All the citizens of this community, Fountain, Ala., signed and paid the Clark Washington Electric Corp., of Jackson, Ala., $7.50 each for lights several years ago and have not received any benefit yet.

We have been informed that it will be from 2 to 6 years longer before this corporation can serve us, because they will have to build a new line and power plant to furnish us with electricity as their lines are already loaded.

We are located only 2½ miles from the Alabama Power Co.'s line and wish to be furnished with their electricity, but they cannot bring it to us unless the Jackson Corp. will release their franchise.

We are asking you to use your influence to get this corporation to release us and let the Alabama Power Co. furnish us with electricity.

We would greatly appreciate your influence and help to us in this matter.

Thanking you, I am

Yours very truly,

J. W. MCBRIDE.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 16, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: About 7½ years ago the Clark Washington Electrical Corp., of Jackson, Ala., accepted our initial fee and promised to give us service at once.

Recent information received says that it might be 5 years before this corporation can serve us, as their line near us is already overloaded, and a new substation is necessary.

The Alabama Power Co. will be only 3 miles from us when the line that they are working on is completed, and we are led to believe that they, the Alabama Power Co., will serve us on this line also.

We know that you are an influential man, and that your opinions and ideas are appreciated by everyone in the State. Will you please use your influence in helping us to get a release from the Clark ashington Electrical Corp. and a permit from them for the Alabama Power Corp. to serve us?

We have around 50 families in our community who need electricity.

Thanking you, and

Very respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ERLE B. FAIRLY.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some time about 7½ years ago my mother, Mrs. Annie McDonald, signed up with Clark Washington Electric Corp. to obtain lights. Up to this date we have no lights and from what we understand will be probably 5 years before we do get any. Sometime last year the Alabama Power Co. made a survey in here and would have put us lights in Fountain but, due to fact the corporation at Jackson, Ala., had franchise, were unable to do so.

What we would like to do is to get release from the RWA Corp., at Jackson, Ala., so the Alabama Power can come in, and they have promised they will.

If you can help us get this release it will be very much appreciated.

Thanking you for any assistance you may give us.

Yours very truly,

GUY MCDONALD.

FOUNTAIN, ALA., *April 15, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The people of Fountain are without power line. We signed contract with Clark Washington Electric Corp., of Jackson, Ala., REA 7½ years ago. We have made several investigations and they claim it will be 5 years before can arrange loan and get current in this territory.

The Alabama Power Co. has a line within 2 miles of Fountain, but claim cannot come into Fountain on account of our contract with REA. We will appreciate anything you can do for us in having this contract canceled and getting the Alabama Power or some other corporation in this territory.

Yours very truly,

B. ROBINETTE.

Mr. Speaker, picture with me the enormous generating capacity of the great TVA, available to our farmers from the North. Couple their production to the tremendous electrical capacity of the Gulf Power Co., entering our State from the great neighboring State of Florida in the South. Add to these the magical operation of the gigantic hydroelectric plants supplementing the most modern steam-driven turbo generators of our own Alabama Power Co., never faltering, ever turning, ceaselessly and hummingly dispatching a never-ending current of over a million kilowatts of electrical energy—one and a third million—H. P.—out over the Alabama Power hi-lines, crossing and crisscrossing our State, all of which create a veritable empire of power, now existent—and available to the Rural Electrification Administrator—at one of the lowest wholesale power rates which he has ever been able to contract for anywhere in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in order to assure myself and my colleagues with respect to the actual availability of power necessary to relieve the distress and the overburden created by lack of power of the generating co-ops, I posed a question to the chief engineer of the principal supplier of the 87,000,000 kilowatt-hours purchased by the Alabama Electric Co-op last year.

What follows is the telegraphic response to my inquiry:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *April 18, 1947.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In response to your request: Alabama Power Co. has available capacity now in its 110-kilovolt transmission lines on both east

and west of the Alabama Electric Cooperative's system to supply all this cooperative's needs now and for time to come. Each line has a capacity of 50,000 kilowatts, which is twice capacity of the cooperative's proposed generating plant at Gantt.

The only limiting factor now is the cooperative's connections to company's system. Company has offered to help them in any way possible to strengthen these connections, and if cooperative will accept company's recommendations the immediate troubles can be corrected in 90 days.

The cooperative's 44,000-volt transmission lines are now of limited capacity and must be improved before good service to this cooperative's customers can be improved irrespective of the source of power.

If the cooperative will work with the company it can relieve the present emergency with a new connection to company's 110-kilovolt line from the east and within 12 to 14 months extend taps from company's two major 110-kilovolt transmission lines to approximate load centers of Alabama Electric Cooperative on the east and west and there install modern 110,000-44,000-volt substations. It will require approximately 3 years to build a steam electric generating plant at Gantt located on one side of the Alabama Electric Cooperative's system and only 12 to 14 months to provide high capacity connections on both sides of the system from Alabama Power Co.'s 110-kilovolt transmission lines.

There is no need for the construction of an REA generating plant as company is ready and willing to supply all present and future needs of this cooperative's at costs less than cost of power that might be so generated in a plant at Gantt.

CHESTER GAUSE.

You can therefore see, Mr. Speaker, that we in Alabama do not need any more federally-paid-for power plants—we do not need to spend any more Federal money whatever for generating equipment and we do not have to wait 3—or maybe 5 years—to solve our immediate power problems. The immediate distresses can be solved in 90 days—with a local company and at the lowest-cost power in the United States.

I want personally to see this Administration in its every department of Government use every last dollar available to the REA in the State of Alabama and in all other States throughout this Nation in extending rural electrification to our every last farm.

I want personally to see the Administrator of the REA give the people in my district and elsewhere in Alabama what they want—a good dependable power source, and at once.

The dirt-root farmers of Alabama and our other rural citizens want cheap electric power, and it does not have to come from a bureaucratically imposed and "super-duper" supervised federally-paid-for power plant.

My people in Alabama do need and they do actually want more rural electric co-ops, more rural electrification lines, more poles, more wires, more switches. They want to avail themselves now of the great quantities of cheap power now at hand, and transmit this low-cost energy to every farmer in Alabama.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain tables and other extraneous matter prepared by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some radio script.

Mrs. LUSK (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include a telegram.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on wool legislation.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Sanity and Steel" from the Washington Daily News.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JACKSON of California, for Friday and Monday, April 25 and 28, on account of official business.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1009. An act to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 23, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 25, 1947, at 11 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:

588. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems; to the Committee on Public Lands.

589. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed donations to the Borough of Haddon Heights, N. J., and to the city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

590. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a printed copy of the Forty-sixth Annual Report of the Governor of Puerto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

591. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations of the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 215); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

592. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting request that the case of Alfredo Garofolo be withdrawn from those 1,187 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of January 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

593. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

594. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, involving a decrease of $220,000, for the legislative branch, Library of Congress (H. Doc. No. 216); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

595. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $5,420 for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 217); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

596. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $1,175,000 for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 218); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 191. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 18; without amendment (Rept. No. 301). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1874. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3029. A bill to provide for the

acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3190. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," without amendment (Rept. No. 304). 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. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 182. Resolution authorizing the payment of 6 months' salary and funeral expenses to the widow of the late R. C. Hicks; without amendment (Rept. No. 300). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 3190. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3191. A bill to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3192. A bill to establish a sinking fund for the payment of Government obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3193. A bill to make the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code granting percentage depletion with respect to vermiculite permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3194. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEOGH (by request):

H. R. 3195. A bill to extend the coverage of Panama Canal employees eligible to the benefits of the act of March 2, 1931, chapter 375, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3196. A bill to provide for the distribution of nonappropriated moneys derived from the operation of officers' clubs of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROCKWELL:

H. R. 3197. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos water conservancy district increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 3198. A bill to provide for recognition of the State of Pennsylvania as a community-property State for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3199. A bill to divide income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3200. A bill to provide for the leasing of trust and restricted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3201. A bill to require approval by Congress of Executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3202. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3203. A bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating David Wilmot, author of the Wilmot proviso which was finally adopted as the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 196. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 197. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by Rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 198. Resolution providing that the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118 and House Resolution 135 of the Eightieth Congress shall be effective from February 13, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Costa Rica, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to expression of sympathy to the American people because of the Texas City tragedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3204. A bill providing for the payment of the findings reported by the Court of Claims in favor of certain engineers, firemen, mechanics, and laborers for extra time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 3205. A bill for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3206. A bill for the relief of the Willow River Power Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3207. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

372. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Communication from Edward F. Doolan, regional director, Textile Workers Union of America, disclosing financial reports of local unions of the TWUA; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

373. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of a group of citizens of Milton, Wis., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

374. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the delegates from the Townsend Clubs of the First Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

375. Also, petition of members of the Victory Townsend Club, No. 13, St. Petersburg, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

376. Also, petition of Civil Rights Congress of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition of any legislative measures for the suppression of the Communist Party; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

377. Also, petition of members of the St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father which art in Heaven, we pray for all the people of our country, that they may learn to appreciate more the goodly heritage that is ours. We need to learn, in these challenging days, that to every right there is attached a duty and to every privilege an obligation. We believe that, in the eternal order of things, Thou hast so ordained it, and what Thou hast joined together let us not try to put asunder. Teach us what freedom is. May we all learn the lesson that it is not the right to do as we please, but the opportunity to please to do what is right. Above all, may we discover that wherever the Spirit of the Lord is there is freedom. May we have that freedom